

## **ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION**

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

**Date: Wednesday, 23rd October, 2013**

**Time: 2.00 p.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 6 - 16)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 6 - 10)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 11 - 23)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 13 - 21)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 6 - 10)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 13 - 19)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 1 - 5)
8. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 1 - 3)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION  
12th September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Barron, Beaumont, Dalton, Hoddinott, Middleton, Wootton and Watson, together with Mrs. V. Farnsworth, Mr. R. Parkin and Mr. P. Scholey.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Goult, Havenhand, Kaye, and Roche.

**22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

**23. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**24. COMMUNICATIONS**

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Adviser, reported on the following:-

**1. Previous Scrutiny Reviews**

The response from Cabinet had been received for the Continuing Health Care and Residential Care Homes scrutiny reviews and would be going to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board next week. All recommendations have been accepted and monitoring reports would be presented to the commission in due course.

**2. CQC Hospital Inspections**

New style inspections of NHS acute hospitals were commencing. The inspection teams would spend longer inspecting hospitals and cover every site that delivered acute services and eight key services areas:-

- Accident and Emergency.
- Maternity.
- Paediatrics.
- Acute Medical.
- Surgical Pathways.
- Care for the Frail Elderly.
- End of Life Care.
- Outpatients

Engagement with the public and Health Scrutiny would feature strongly. The initial list covered eighteen Trusts including some that

were high risk, some low risk and some that were in between those two extremes. Rotherham was not one of the eighteen and Airedale was to be the first one in the North.

3. Local Health Website

Public Health England had launched a new online tool to help Councillors, Local Authority officers and other partners. The website included health information presented clearly for users. The information was available at upper and lower tier Local Authority level, as well as by Ward, using interactive maps, summary charts and more detailed reports. The website could be found at the following link, but an executive summary was to be provided for all Members of the Select Commission:-

<http://www.localhealth.org.uk/#v=map9;l=en>

4. JHOSC Meeting - 13 September, 2013

A new review was being established at this meeting to consider the whole lifetime pathway of care for people with congenital heart disease. Councillor Steele would be in attendance.

5. The Health Scrutiny and Care Quality Commission Event for Health Scrutiny Members in York which was due to take place on Thursday, 26<sup>th</sup> September, 2013 had been postponed and a new date was to be confirmed.

6. L.G.Y. & H. Events

A report had been circulated outlining forthcoming events, detailing co-ordinated activity to make best use of resources.

7. Briefings – Sign Up

The following briefings were available to sign up for:-

- LGiU Monthly Health and Social Care Round Up.
- Minding the Gap - the Local Government Regional capacity building project for health inequalities for Yorkshire and Humber.

8. From Yorkshire and Humber Health Scrutiny Officer's Network

CCG allocations

NHS England was currently reviewing the local allocation of resources across the full range of its responsibilities, covering both allocations to CCGs and the budgets available for direct

commissioning functions in area teams. 'Indicative' future funding allocations for CCGs, suggest a reduction for the North of England overall by 3.84% (approx. £722 million) and all CCGs across Yorkshire and the Humber were likely to see a reduced allocation of funding to varying degrees.

9. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Health Select Commission held a positive meeting with the Chair and the Manager of Healthwatch to look at ways for joined up working.
10. A report was also being prepared to look at protocols for the work of and links between the Health Select Commission, Healthwatch and the Health and Wellbeing Board and was due for submission to this Select Commission shortly.

## **25. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 11th July, 2013.

Reference was made to Minute No. 17 (Health and Wellbeing Board) and whether or not any further information was yet available for S11 relating to Domestic Abuse Injuries. No information had yet been received and this would be investigated further.

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

## **26. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 10th July, 2013.

With regard to Minute No. S18 (Performance Management Framework) there seemed to be some confusion over the age range for NEETS of being 12-14 and it was suggested that this be clarified.

Reference as also made to Minute No. 24 (Health Select Work Programme) and the clarity that was required to ensure all relevant parties were kept up-to-date with report outcomes.

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

## **27. REPRESENTATIVE ON WORKING PARTY**

Resolved:- That Councillor Watson represent the Select Commission on the Environment Climate Change Working Group.

**28. CHILDHOOD OBESITY**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, which provided an overview of the workshop held by a sub-group of the Select Commission to consider the re-commissioning of Childhood Obesity Services in Rotherham.

The Sub-Group were provided with the local context for the Rotherham Healthy Weight Framework and details of the current services provided. The Framework brought together strategies to both prevent and treat obesity. Due to the high number of overweight and obese adults and children across Rotherham, there was a continued need to provide several services with different levels of intervention for both adults and children.

The present services for children were contracted to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2014. It was proposed to re-commission the services subject to funding being agreed at the same level. Targets would be in line with NICE Guidance and recent Department of Health best practice guidance.

It was noted that children and families appeared to express a preference for participating in clubs rather than attending Rotherham Institute of Obesity (RIO). The respective balance of services in the two areas and referral criteria would be revisited when determining the new contract specification.

Public Health worked closely with providers, partners and other services as part of the Whole Population Prevent Activity underpinning the four tiers in the model. The sub-group was interested in exploring additional areas that could contribute to preventative activity and stressed the importance of connectivity across the Council with wider policies linking in to support reducing childhood obesity.

The Sub-Group also considered an overview of the wider issues including:-

- Planning
- Leisure and Green Spaces
- Schools
- Health Implications
- Business Rate Incentives

The report also made recommendations with regard to both the Service re-commissioning and to wider Council policies which should also be supportive of the work to reduce and mitigate the impact of childhood obesity.

The Head of Health Improvement valued the involvement in the two meetings, welcomed any opportunity to improve performance and had received positive feedback on reducing childhood obesity. From the

numbers involved in the services over the past four years, there had been 4,000 weight management successes.

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

- Parents cannot always be blamed for their children being obese and agencies must look at outside influences or encourage parents to involve their children in menu planning/meal preparation.
- Reasons for the greater emphasis on the More Life Weight Management Camp as part of the Rotherham Healthy Weight Framework.
- Role of the Local Planning Authority with the consideration of a 400 m exclusion zone for new fast food takeaway businesses near schools.
- Pros and cons for the “closed door” policy by keeping pupils on school premises at lunchtime.
- The wider issue of enforcement and legislation to keeping children on school premises and the wish for them to consume healthier food.
- Personal choice by students when supermarkets and takeaways are easily accessible.

Resolved:- (1) That the positive work being carried out in Rotherham on childhood obesity through the Healthy Weight Framework be noted.

(2) That the following recommendations of the Sub-Group be endorsed and forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

- The balance of activities commissioned for children between clubs and RIO should be reviewed as there appears to be an expressed preference for attendance at the clubs;
- Establish interim contract monitoring and improved data management for obesity services once re-commissioned.
- Promote more individual success stories of children and young people who have done well on the programmes to encourage others.
- Consider including targets for referrals to weight management programmes as part of the new specification for school nurses.
- Provide more information about services and encourage greater engagement with parents through schools, particularly in primaries, to reach children at a younger age.
- Continue to promote whole family interventions and free activities such as walking initiatives and park runs.

- Promote Rothercard more extensively to encourage increased participation in activities.
- Explore the feasibility of introducing a healthy vending policy in DCL leisure centres.
- Introduce a 400m exclusion zone for new fast food takeaway businesses near schools in Rotherham.
- Strengthen the requirement for report authors to show awareness of the health implications of their proposals.
- Feed in the points regarding whole population prevention activity and how this related to schools.

(3) That a further report be submitted to the Health Select Commission by the Head of Health Improvement on the new contract specification and criteria for Childhood Obesity Services.

(4) That a presentation be made to the Health Select Commission from the provider(s) of Childhood Obesity Services about their services and development plans once commissioned.

(5) That consideration be given to the current legislation and whether this could be revised similar to that for smoking.

## **29. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF HOSPITAL DISCHARGES**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which set out the findings and recommendations of the above Scrutiny Review.

The four main aims of the Review had been:-

- Definition of a good discharge from hospital and, therefore, how was a failed discharge identified.
- Reasons for failed discharges.
- Discharge arrangements for those with care plans and those without.
- Patient experiences.

The review was conducted by way of a spotlight review and made eight recommendations:-

1. That ways should be considered as to how to involve Community Services more effectively with complex cases and their discharge arrangements.
2. The perception of problems relating to discharge was not supported by factual information, therefore, feeding this back to Elected Members should be a priority. Methods to achieve this should be

explored. Any individual issues raised with an Elected Member needed to be fed in by the most appropriate route. Recommendation 2 also applied to staff and should be built into training programmes

3. Communications were key within the discharge process and scope to improve this should be explored. Literature in plain language and making the process understandable for vulnerable patients should be considered.
4. The Care Co-ordination Centre and its discharge support service were supported by Members and they request that a progress report on this is brought to the Health Select Commission in 6-12 months.
5. Members welcomed the re-activation of the Operational Discharges Group and requested a progress report on their work in 6-12 months. This should also go to the Health Select Commission.
6. Members endorse the implementation of the business process re-engineering as a result of this review and request that the outcomes are monitored by the Health Select Commission
7. The policy on speeding up delayed discharges due to patient choice should be looked at as part of the business re-engineering process.
8. ***Cabinet should consider whether Social Care Services should be provided at a greater level out of hours to move towards a 7 day week service, however, members noted the potential resource implication of this***

Discussion ensued on the integration between health and social care services and whether this could feed into the integration funds that were going to be available for Councils.

Reference was also made to the mismatch between perceptions about discharges and the actual reality of the situation.

Resolved:- (1) That the findings and recommendations be endorsed.

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

(3) That the report be considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board.

(4) That the Cabinet response to the recommendations be fed back to the Health Select Commission.



**30. SUPPORT FOR CARERS**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, which confirmed how the Health Select Commission and the Improving Lives Select Commission had agreed to undertake a joint Scrutiny Review of Support for Carers. To begin evidence gathering and setting the context, the report submitted provided a profile of carers in Rotherham and an overview of the Carers' Charter and Joint Action Plan for Carers.

A carer was defined as an adult/young person who provided unpaid care for a partner, relative, friend, an older person or someone who has a disability or long term illness including those with alcohol/substance misuse and mental illness.

The 2011 Census showed that Rotherham continued to have a higher rate of people with limiting long term illness than the national average of 17.6% - 56,588 (21.9% of the population). It also revealed that Rotherham's population was ageing faster than the national average with a 16% increase in the number of people aged over 65. Those aged over 85 increased at over twice this rate.

In 2011, 31,001 people in Rotherham said that they provided unpaid care to family members, friends or neighbours with either long term physical or mental ill-health/disability or problems related to old age. The number of people providing 20-49 hours care had increased as had the number providing 50 or more hours.

The Rotherham Carers' Charter and Joint Action Plan for Carers 2013-16 had been reviewed and published in March, 2013. Work would focus on 4 priority outcomes based on the views and experiences of carers. The priorities also linked to the 6 priorities in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy:-

Priority 1 – Health and Wellbeing: all carers will be supported to make positive choices about their mental and physical health and wellbeing

Priority 2 – Access to Information: accessible information about the services and support available will be provided for all carers in Rotherham

Priority 3 – Access to Services: all carers will be offered and supported to access a range of flexible services that are appropriate to their needs

Priority 4 – Employment and Skills: all carers will be able to take part in education, employment and training if they wish to.

It was suggested that the spotlight Review could add value to the recently established Carers Service Review Task and Finish Group by looking at available support from the perspective of carers especially adult carers of adults with long term conditions such as Dementia.

Discussion ensued on the liaison between Children and Young People's Services, especially around the lifestyle survey, given that a high number of young people were also carers.

It was also noted that not all carers were aware of the allowances that were currently available.

The Commission were made aware of some avenues where support was available, the importance of providing the right support and the value of respite care.

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

(2) That Councillors Beaumont, Barron and Steele be part of the Review Group representing the Health Select Commission.

(3) That any comments arising from the report be forwarded to the Review Group for consideration and inclusion in the scope of the Review.

### **31. UPDATED WORK PROGRAMME**

Consideration was given to the updated report presented by Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, setting out the 2013/14 Work Programme for the Select Commission.

The Programme also included a provisional timetable to provide Members with a clear focus and plan and providing supporting officers and partner agencies with advance notice of when their input would be required.

Reference was made to the "How to Improve Health in Rotherham" subject area and it was suggested that in order to understand the wider work of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the work of Public Health that it would be helpful to know how the two linked together and perhaps a presentation to a future meeting would assist.

Resolved:- (1) That the updated work programme, as submitted, be approved.

(2) That the reviews, as suggested, move forward and the arrangements with relevant officers be made.

### **32. ACCESS TO GPS**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, which provided an overview of the current NHS England "Improving General Practice – a Call to Action" consultation which would set the context of the above Scrutiny Review.

GP Primary Care Services were commissioned by NHS England through the local area team – NHS South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw. Although the standard appointment time to see a GP should be 48 hours, waiting times were perceived to be much longer in many cases. Evidence provided for the Urgent Care workshop included a survey of 166 patients who attended the Walk in Centres in January, 2013, that showed that before attending the Centre 35% of patients had tried to get a GP appointment, 26% had taken over the counter medicines and 21% of people had not accessed any services before attending. Other consultation by the CCG had also highlighted public confusion about where to go for what health problem.

NHSE was currently undertaking a large scale consultation “Improving General Practice – a Call to Action” to inform the future of general practice services in England as part of its wider consultation launched on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2013.

The National G.P. Patient Survey Information contained a number of questions and a short presentation on some of the responses received was delivered to the Commission.

The information received from the responses from the survey would be used to inform decisions made as a result of practices requesting changes to their contracts such as:-

- Temporary Closing Lists.
- Mergers with Other Practices.
- Branch Site Closures.
- Changes to Opening Hours.
- Changes to Practice Boundaries.

It was also noted that NHS England also commissioned “extended hours” which in Rotherham mean twenty-nine out of thirty-six practices provided extended hours outside of core hours, which in turn provided an additional ninety-two hours and five hundred and fifty one appointments, in addition to those provided during core hours.

The Commission welcomed this evidence, but expressed some concern that there was still 1:4 people waiting a significant period of see a G.P., but only 57% of people knew how to contact an out-of-hours G.P. service. It would also have been useful to know how many G.P. surgeries offered open surgeries and the detail behind some of the questions in order to understand the position locally.

It was suggested that the review group set up to look at this area be provided with a breakdown for each surgery to understand the problems people were facing, if any, which would assist and feed into the work being undertaken.

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

(2) That the membership of the review group include Councillors Dalton, Hoddinott (Chair), Middleton and Wootton.

(3) That any comments arising from the report be forward onto the review group for consideration and inclusion in the scope of the review.

(4) That the review group consider submitting a collective response to the on-line NHSE consultation.

**33. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2013, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION**  
**5th September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Ellis, Godfrey, J. Hamilton, Sharman, Tweed, Vines and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Beck.

**19.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**20.       QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**21.       COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no items to report.

**22.       MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 25TH JULY, 2013**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**23.       CORPORATE PLAN OUTCOMES - OUTTURN 2012-13**

Consideration was given to the report, presented by the Performance and Quality Manager, which provided an analysis of the Council's current performance against the 29 key delivery outcomes contained within the Corporate Plan. The submitted report contained an outturn (for 2012/13) and current position statement based on available performance measures for all outcomes together with an analysis of progress on key projects and activities which contributed to delivery of the plan.

The report also aimed to highlight the various economic and political influences including changes in national policy and funding which were already, or could potentially impact, on the performance of the corporate plan outcomes.

As a result of service reductions, the Council's ability to deliver all the corporate plan objectives was a high risk. The potential for under performance as a result of budget reductions highlighted the importance of integrating performance, risk and financial reporting.

The current position was:-

- Red - 2 outcomes requiring major intervention at Strategic Leadership Team level.
- Amber - 8 outcomes requiring intervention at Directorate level.
- Green - 19 outcomes requiring no intervention at this time.
- 0 outcomes which cannot be assessed at this time.

The direction of travel between March, 2012 and April, 2013 had been positive, with a decrease in the number of Red and Amber rated outcomes demonstrating that effective performance management processes and procedures were in place across the Authority.

A recent Investors in People external review had resulted in the Authority retaining the 'Gold' standard, reinforcing performance to customers as being of utmost importance.

The review of the Council's Corporate Priorities has begun and a revised version of the Corporate plan-on-a-page had been developed and was included as part of this report. The revised plan was now subject to a period of consultation and had already been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. As part of the consultation process, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board asked the Self-Regulation Select Commission to examine the way in which the new priorities and commitments would be delivered through the Council's service plans and key strategies (i.e. the "golden thread"). There would be a separate meeting arranged to facilitate this process.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

: Members questioned specific indicators where service performance could be improved; it was agreed that the appropriate departmental officers ought to attend future meetings and explain the reasons for current performance.

: reference was made to the various measures which under-pin each indicator and the work being undertaken to try and secure improvement in performance;

: the impact of budget reductions upon service performance (eg: highway maintenance and street cleansing);

: Members suggested ways in which the reporting of information could be improved, emphasising the direction established by Council policy;

: the impact of external influences (eg: national Government policy);

: the 'poverty gap' and the Council's work within deprived communities.

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

(2) That the current position against each of the Corporate Plan outcomes, ensuring implementation of the proposed interventions and corrective actions be endorsed.

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

(4) That, further to (3) above, the appropriate departmental officers responsible for specific indicators whose RAG rating changes shall attend future meetings of this Select Commission in order to explain the reasons for such changes.

(5) That the Corporate Plan outcomes currently being reviewed and undergoing a consultation process be noted and the results of this process shall be used to influence future performance reporting.

(6) That the Self-Regulation Select Commission be consulted on the developing outcomes and their performance management.

(7) That a group comprising the Chairman of the Self Regulation Select Commission and Councillors Atkin, Ellis, Godfrey and Watson be established to (i) work with officers from Performance and Quality and examine the Performance Management Framework for the newly-refreshed Corporate Plan, (ii) make recommendations for its further improvement and (iii) submit a report on the outcome of this process to a future meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission.

#### **24. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST MAY 2013**

Further to Minute No. 50 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Finance concerning the funding reductions implemented by the coalition Government since 2011 which have required the Council to make savings of over £70 millions, including £20.2 millions of savings which the Council must deliver during the 2013/14 financial year in order to achieve a balanced outturn budget.

The submitted report provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2013/14, based on performance for the first two months of the financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its budget by £4.849 millions (+2.2%). The main reasons for the forecast overspending were:-

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough area.
- Income pressures within Environment and Development Services.
- Demand pressures for Direct Payments, Older People's Domiciliary Care services and day care for clients with Learning Disabilities.

- 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.
- Some savings targets were currently pending delivery in full during 2013/14.

Although the current forecast revenue pressure was significant, through the implementation of appropriate management actions it should be possible to mitigate the forecast pressure and prevent it from becoming serious. A strategy for addressing the forecast pressure was proposed within the submitted report. This strategy would ensure that the Council was able to deliver a balanced outturn and preserve its successful record of managing both its in-year financial performance and its overall financial resilience.

Support for the strategy was requested to address the 2013/14 forecast pressure of £4.849 millions. This proposed strategy consisted of three stages and incorporated key principles of increasing income, controlling costs and managing demand. Escalation to the subsequent stages of the strategy would be dependent upon the degree of success in reducing the forecast overspending towards a balanced outturn position.

Members raised the following issues during the debate of this report:-

: budget issues concerning Children and Young People's Services (including : school places; foster care placements within and outside the Authority area – and the consequent difficulty of being able to forecast budget spending accurately);

: spending on the use of consultants, which is reducing considerably (Members asked to be informed of the expenditure details); reference was made to the scrutiny review of the Council's use of consultants, containing a recommendation that no procurement process for the engagement of consultants should commence unless a clear business case is stated and can justify the appointment of external consultants (Minute No. C24 of the Cabinet meeting held on 17th June 2009 refers);

: reductions in income affecting several service areas across the Authority (including the impact upon Council facilities such as the Rockingham professional development centre);

: the impact of employee sickness absence;

: the use of shared service arrangements to try and achieve budget savings;

: the forthcoming scrutiny review of Elected Member structures and the scrutiny function, within the 2013/14 scrutiny work programme.

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



(2) That the current forecast outturn and significant financial challenge presented for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2013/14 be noted.

(3) That the Cabinet's approval of the proposed strategy to bring spending in line with budget by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2014, be noted.

**25. 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 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person).

**26. DIGITAL REGION LIMITED**

Further to Minute No. 73 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Chief Executive with regard to the urgent decision taken by him, in accordance with delegated powers, in respect of the termination of the Digital Region Limited project. Discussion took place on the financial implications, the Council's management of risk and the forthcoming evaluation of the project.

Reference was made to the possibility of an investigation and evaluation of the project by the National Audit Office and of a joint scrutiny review by the four South Yorkshire local authorities.

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

(2) That the decision taken by the Chief Executive on 12th August, 2013, in accordance with his delegated powers, in respect of the termination of the Digital Region Limited project, be noted.

(3) That, in due course, a further report be submitted to Scrutiny Members on the outcome of the evaluation of the Digital Region Limited project and, in the meantime, the Director of Finance continue to report to Members on the financial aspects of the project.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
18th September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ali, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Clark, Dodson, J. Hamilton, Kaye, Lelliott, Pitchley and Read and co-opted member Mrs. A. Clough.

An apology for absence had been received from co-opted member Mr. M. Smith.

**18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to record.

**19. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**20. COMMUNICATIONS**

There was nothing to report under this item.

**21. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10TH JULY, 2013.**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2013, were considered.

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

**22. ROTHERHAM LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2012-2013.**

Councillor G. A. Russell, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed Steve Ashley, Chair of the Rotherham Independent Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and Phil Morris, Business Manager, Rotherham Independent LSCB. Steve and Phil had been invited to attend this meeting so that the annual report of the LSCB could be considered.

Also in attendance for this item were Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services, and Rotherham's Lead Member for Children, Councillor Paul Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services.

Councillor Russell especially welcomed Steve Ashley to the meeting. Steve had started his new job at the beginning of September, and this was the first meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission that he had attended. Councillor Russell looked forward to working with him and the LSCB in the future.

Steve presented the annual report of the Rotherham Independent LSCB. The Annual Report covered all areas of the Board's activity during 2012/2013, including: -

- LSCB governance and partnership arrangements;
- Progress against the Board's priority areas and business plan;
- Activities of the Sub-groups;
- Information about the Child Death Overview Panel;
- Contribution of Lay Members;
- Challenges and Priorities for 2013-2016.

The Children Act (2004) required LSCBs to produce annual reports that provided a 'rigorous and transparent assessment of the performance and effectiveness of local services', 'published in relation to the preceding financial year' and 'fit with local agencies' planning, commissioning and budget cycles' and 'list the contributions made to the LSCB by partner agencies and list what the LSCB has spent'.

Reference was made to Rotherham's LSCB's priorities for 2012/2013 and how these were reflected in the business plan for 2013-2016 and the work of the Board's Sub-groups.

The Rotherham LSCB had its own budget; the main contributors were Children's Social Care Services, Children's Health Services and the Police. The 2012/2013 outturn for the budget was a £6,940 under-spend. £841 of this had been earmarked for learning and development activity and the remaining £6,099 would part-fund the 2013/2014 budget.

The main risks and uncertainties surrounding Children and Young People's Services was the revised Ofsted inspection framework for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers due to be implemented nationally in November, 2013. The Rotherham LSCB was working with partner agencies to assess performance and ready evidence of the positive outcomes of children and young people.

The Independent Chair referred to a separate piece of work that he was undertaking in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation to determine how effective Children and Young People's Services was in protecting children and young people at the present time. This was a separate piece of work to the Inquiry that had been commissioned by Rotherham's Chief Executive.

Discussion ensued and the following items were raised by member of the Improving Lives Select Commission: -

- Impact of Welfare Reforms: – were referrals to social care services increasing as a result of the welfare reforms?

- An increase in contacts/referrals had not been identified at the present time;
- The recommendations from the Serious Case Review into Daniel Pelka's tragic death were being reviewed by Rotherham's Safeguarding Children and Families Service;
- Rotherham's Safeguarding Children and Families Service was also responsible for the Early Help Panel, which aimed to provide help to families before they reached crisis point. The Service had also provided robust training for all schools on identifying signs of neglect and the appropriate response.
- Social care thresholds: - were the thresholds correct?
  - The Independent Chair was confident that social care thresholds governing which intervention children and families would be subject to were correct;
  - Further work was on-going on whether all agencies knew the thresholds and understood whether it was their role to refer and how to do this.
- The Local Safeguarding Children Board and its associated Sub-groups: - were these groups working well together?
  - The Independent Chair was the chairperson of the full Local Safeguarding Children Board, and also of the Performance Sub-group;
  - Due to the time-limited nature of the full Board meeting, the Independent Chair would be working to ensure that the focus of the Board meetings would be performance and how the agencies were working together;
  - Board meetings would also be a forum for professional challenge between the agencies that were represented.
- What were the main areas of concern?
  - It was right and proper that huge amounts of local and national attention were being paid to the issues of Child Sexual Exploitation. However, it was possible that this could lead to other areas being missed;
  - The levels of neglect of children and young people was also an emerging issue;
  - The Independent Chair had received projections relating to deprivation upon starting his role. He was aware of the Council and partner's work aiming to reverse this, and would keep a watching brief on the issue.
- Safeguarding Children and Families' Services four RED rated performance indicators, as shown the annual report. What was being done to ensure that performance improved?
  - The Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services confirmed that it was a concern to the Service to have RED rated areas. The Service carried out fortnightly performance and analysis reports. There were no cases

- that had not been allocated to a named worker. The Strategic Director received a weekly report on the allocation of cases;
- Children and Young People's Services participated in a Multi-Agency Support Panel (MASP) that sought to support families, explore all options available and undertake a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) on the family's situation.
- Performance Indicator NI65 (Children becoming subject to a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time) (RED rated) and NI67 (percentage of child protection cases which were reviewed within required timescales (GREEN rated) were discussed to fully understand their direction of travel.
    - The Independent Chair had charged the Strategic Director with benchmarking Rotherham's performance against national outcomes;
    - It was expected that Central Government would shortly be announcing changes to the overall suite of performance indicators;
    - The Independent Chair agreed to produce a critical suite of performance indicators that was user-friendly.
  - Working with Partner Agencies to safeguard children: -
    - The Independent Chair confirmed that all partners were currently participating on the Board, following the outcome of an audit of attendance;
    - The LSCB had worked to ensure that reporting pro-formas were as user-friendly as possible to enable partners to contribute their opinions.
  - Publication of the Serious Case Review into Child S's death had now taken place. What had happened since publication?
    - The Strategic Director confirmed that hundreds of workers had been trained in the lessons learned. This also included each 'generation' of new workers that joined Children and Young People's Services;
    - Training sessions aimed to be 'two-way', and allow front line workers to outline their thoughts and explain job related pressures to facilitators and managers;
    - A robust action plan was implemented following each Serious Case Review.
  - Different agencies working together to safeguard children and young people was a very positive thing, were there any barriers preventing this from being fully realised?
    - IT systems used by different agencies were not always consistent and did not always communicate. A consistent system for reporting and recording concerns would have been implemented with the Contact Point IT system, but

- funding for this had been withdrawn by Central Government whilst the system was being piloted;
- Co-location of area teams was considered important to increase the wealth of multi-agency interface. The Strategic Director was determined to continue supporting the practice of staff being located in their areas with multi-agency colleagues, despite reducing resources bring pressures to centralise teams.
- What was the role for members of the public in reporting their concerns about a potential case/s of Child Sexual Exploitation. What would be the message, for example, to people who were reluctant to report their concerns for fear of being ridiculed/ignored/laughed at?
    - The Independent Chair was clear that no agency would support an attitude of such complacency following a contact from a member of the public;
    - Literature had been circulated within the community informing people how to report their concerns.
  - The Councillor who had raised this question had not seen any of the literature referred to within his local community.
    - The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services referred to the Countering Child Sexual Exploitation training that had been made available for Rotherham's Elected Members. 60 of the Council's 63 Elected Members had participated in this training. The training had also been rolled out to Parish Councils;
    - The Strategic Director spoke about the training that had been offered to all Schools;
    - Age-appropriate training would be designed for children in Years 6 and 7 by the Healthy Schools Team, which informed young people about the risks and what to do if they felt threatened;
    - A training package had been put together for Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Governing Bodies;
    - A communication campaign had been designed, including the Rotherham Advertiser, and the use of social media, leaflets, e-safety training.
  - Other issues discussed included: -
    - Children Missing Education;
    - Domestic Abuse.

The members of the Improving Lives Select Commission thanked the Independent Chair and his colleagues for the annual report. The Commission's feedback was that the report was very specific and that it would be useful to have general statistics included within the report to provide a balanced view of the numbers of children, young people and families that interacted with Safeguarding Children and Families' Services.

Resolved: - (1) That the 2012/2013 Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual report be received and its content be noted.

(2) That the Independent Chair develop a critical suite of indicators for use by Elected Members, Select Committees and so on, to scrutinise the performance of Safeguarding Children and Families' Services.

(3) That future annual reports of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board include general statistics that could be used to contextualise the information within the report.

**23. WORKING TOGETHER - LINKS BETWEEN SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE.**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Phil Morris, Business Manager (Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board), and Sam Newton, Safeguarding Manager (Health and Wellbeing, Neighbourhood and Adult Services) that outlined the legal and policy similarities between children and adult safeguarding, outlined the services provided by all organisations across the Borough and the potential for future joint working across Children's and Adult's Services.

The report outlined a number of issues of difference between Children's and Adult's Services: -

- The Council had a responsibility to safeguard all children and a responsibility to safeguard all vulnerable adults;
- Where families had adults with social care needs (such as substance misuse or mental health needs) and the family also had children, there was a need for both sets of services to work together to ensure continuity and consistency of support;
- Where there were adults in the family that were unable to protect themselves from abuse, it would be unlikely that they had the capacity to provide effective and safe parenting.

The report set-out the frameworks both Services were governed by: -

**Children's Safeguarding: -**

- Working Together, 2013, was national statutory guidance for safeguarding children;
- Every local authority had to have an independent local safeguarding children board;
- Rotherham's Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) was established as a statutory body following the Children Act, 2004;
- Rotherham's LSCB was chaired by an independent person and had senior representatives from all agencies that operated across the Borough, including the services that worked with adults.

**Adults' Safeguarding: -**

- There was a range of pieces of legislation and guidance supporting social care for adults. These included 'No Secrets' and guidance provided by the Association of Directors of Adult Social Care (ADASS);
- A policy framework from the ADASS had been implemented through the South Yorkshire Safeguarding Adults Procedures. All relevant partners, including the police and NHS, had signed up to this in order to work together to safeguard adults from abuse;
- Rotherham's Safeguarding Adult Board had been established in 2003.

**Links between the two Services on their formal frameworks: -**

- The Rotherham LSCB had representatives from services working with both children and their parents;
- The Adult Safeguarding Board had representation from the Director for Health and Wellbeing, representing Adult Services, and the Director for Safeguarding Children and Families' Services, representing Children's Service;
- The specific links between the two Services occurred mainly when adults who were parents or carers were: -
  - **Adults with substance abuse;**
  - **Adults involved in domestic abuse;**
  - **Adults with mental health problems;**
  - Adults who were involved in criminal activity;
  - Adults with disabilities or learning difficulties.
- The text in bold indicated the main areas of concern for both Services within Rotherham, including working with parents who had learning difficulties;
- Joint work was undertaken between Children's and Adults' Services in the transition of young people with significant learning difficulties and disabilities as they became adults;
- The Children and Young People and Families Strategic Partnership Board was the overall strategic planning group for agencies working with children and families;
- This Board linked to the Health and Wellbeing Board and also the overall priorities for communities within the Borough;
- The overall strategic group for children's safeguarding was the Rotherham LSBC;
  - The LSCB had a Sub-group with responsibility for Child Sexual Exploitation ('CSE Gold Group'), which oversaw the implementation of the CSE Strategy and Action Plan and the work of the 'Silver Group' that had operational responsibilities for CSE.



- The strategies for joint working across Adults' and Children's Services was the Think Family Group, which consisted of partner agencies including the Local Authority, Health, Probation, Police and voluntary sector organisations;
- The Domestic Abuse Priority Group oversaw the strategic work to reduce domestic abuse and support victims, including children living with families where this was an issue.

**The report detailed the other forums whereby Children's and Adults' Services co-ordinated support and actions: -**

These groups included: -

- The Early Help Support Panel;
- Multi-Agency Support Panel;
- Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements;
- Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference;
- Proposals were in place for a Vulnerable Adults Risk Management approach to bring all agencies working with adults together to address concerns;
- Common Assessment Framework was the key part of delivering frontline services that were integrated and focused around the needs of children and young people;
- Universal services that supported parents and carers;
- Services that supported adults in overcoming problems that affected children.

**Main tensions and obstacles of working together: -**

- The impact of public sector savings and the resulting reduction in members of staff and resources available;
- Changes in personnel working with children and families and adults, which could lead to discontinuity in service delivery;
- Changes in legislation and guidance for each area that could result in changes to information sharing protocols;
- High demand on one or more public sector services that diverted staff to focus on specific projects.

**Future developments: -**

The report had outlined that there was already established links between the two Services and also communications with partner agencies, spanning operational delivery and strategic planning. National legislation and local changes were being incorporated.

Current and future work included: -

- Ensure that agencies working with adults who were parents fully understood the impacts their interventions would have on the children in the family;
- This included workers identifying children who may be affected by their parent/carer's issues;
- The Rotherham LSCB agreed in June, 2013, to examine the interface between the two Services across the Borough. This piece of work was being undertaken by the LSCB's Quality Assurance Sub-group and would be reported back to both the Adult and Children's Safeguarding Boards;
- The Rotherham LSCB was also planning to use developing performance information about Early Help Services and their impact on outcomes for children to examine the effectiveness of services.

The representatives of Children's and Adults' Services shared case studies with the Improving Lives Select Commission to illustrate the different types of social care interventions and legal frameworks available to each Service.

Discussion ensued between members of the Select Commission and the representatives of the Services. Issues raised included: -

- How easy was it for people to get access to the services/support they wanted/needed?;
- Thresholds within Social Care;
- Members of the Select Commission recognised how difficult the job of front line workers could be;
- Were there areas where young people who had less significant learning disabilities could fall through the gaps and not receive a suitable transition?;
- Co-location of workers and multi-agency teams.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content relating to the benefits, challenges and obstacles of multi-agency working to improve family's lives be noted.

(2) That the Improving Lives Select Commission receive a further report relating to the transition for young people from Children's to Adults' Services.

#### **24. DOMESTIC ABUSE SERVICES: SCRUTINY REVIEW.**

Consideration was given to the report that outlined the main findings and the recommendations of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse services in Rotherham.

Minute No. 48 (Work Programme Update) of the Improving Lives Select Commission meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2013, agreed to undertake a scrutiny review of domestic abuse services as part of the 2013/2014 work programme.

The submitted report outlined the information presented to the Select Commission at this meeting and the scope of the review subsequently undertaken.

The review had been concluded and it was found that there was excellent local work taking place driven by the Domestic Abuse Priority Group on behalf of the Safer Rotherham Partnership. This had brought about positive changes to local practice in the last few years.

Areas for further improvements included: -

- There was less consistency and integrated working by partners for standard and medium risk cases;
- The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service represented the voice of the victim and co-ordinated measures to reduce the risk to victims and their families. However, it was only funded on a year-by-year basis, something which was inconsistent with the level of priority afforded to domestic abuse within the Safer Rotherham Partnership. The short-term approach inhibited service planning for the essential and effective service;
- Funding allocation for target hardening and early intervention and prevention had reduced in recent years and required further review as the effectiveness of easy and low-cost intervention had the potential to prevent escalation.

The submitted scrutiny review report outlined the twenty recommendations of the review. The twenty recommendations were grouped into the following categories: -

- Commissioning and funding;
- Strategy;
- Roles and responsibilities;
- Protocol and process;
- Prevention and early intervention;
- Forced marriage and so-called 'honour' based violence.

The focus of the review recommendations was to develop a more integrated domestic abuse service that had clear protocols and pathways for all risk levels and were understood by every partner agency. It was also recommended that domestic abuse should be more integrated at a strategic level so that the other workstreams were addressing the impact it had on victims and families as the long-term effects to individual were harmful on many levels.

Discussion ensued on the scrutiny review report: -

- Domestic abuse was not always reflected in the Council's strategic frameworks;
- Short-term funding of the support agencies was inefficient and was leading them to use a disproportionate amount of their time seeking future funding streams;
- Were all agencies using the same protocols?;
- Did victims feel able to come forward and report these crimes;
- Portrayal of domestic abuse within the media and television programmes;
- Individuals can be both victims and perpetrators of domestic abuse.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review be endorsed.

(2) That the scrutiny review on domestic abuse report be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and then to Cabinet.

(3) That Cabinet be requested to refer the report to the Safer Rotherham Partnership for their consideration.

(4) That Cabinet's response to the recommendations be fed back to the Improving Lives Select Commission.

**25. SCRUTINY REVIEW: SUPPORT FOR CARERS (EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST).**

The Scrutiny Manager (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Resources Directorate) presented a report that outlined a joint review that was being undertaken by the Improving Lives and Health Select Commissions on the support available for carers.

A Members' Seminar had recently covered the topic of carers, and one of the comments raised by Elected Members was that sometimes carers were unable to get adequate support and access to services.

Councillor B. Steele, Chair of the Health Select Commission, would be the Chair of the Joint Scrutiny Review.

The submitted report outlined: -

- The accepted definition of a carer;
- The profile of carers in Rotherham, which showed that, compared to national averages, Rotherham had higher numbers of carers caring for higher numbers of hours per week;
- Existing strategies to support carers were the 'Rotherham Carers' Charter' and 'Joint Action Plan for Carers 2013-2016', which included priority areas;

- Neighbourhood and Adult Services had already committed to undertaking an Officer review, it was intended that the Scrutiny Review would add value to this exercise;
- The potential scope of the review: -
  - Looking at available support from the perspective of carers, especially adult carers of adults with long term conditions such as dementia, focusing on access to information;
  - Did all carers identify themselves as a carer?
  - Did they consider that they need support?
  - Who did they go to for initial support when becoming a carer?
  - Where did they go for support?

Discussion ensued on the information presented and the proposed review: -

- Working with and supporting young carers;
- How did carers define their role, and did 'caring' differ from the tasks that extended families would expect to do for one another in the course of life?;
- Caring responsibilities usually built up gradually over time.

Expressions of interest were sought from the members of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

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

(2) That Councillors J. Hamilton, Lelliott and Pitchley join the Scrutiny Review group.

(3) That all of the co-opted members of the Improving Lives Select Committee be contacted about joining the Scrutiny Review.

## **26. REPORTING SAFEGUARDING CONCERNS ABOUT A CHILD / CHILDREN.**

During consideration of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board's Annual Report, a member of the Improving Lives Select Commission asked for clarity on the correct ways to report concerns about a child's welfare.

**What to do if you are worried about or have concerns about a child in Rotherham: -**

- If it is an emergency ring 999;
- Contact Children's Social Care Services (Contact and Referral Team) – 01709 823987 (Out of Hours – 01709 336080 );

- If you would like to share information which might help protect a child – Crimestoppers - 0800 555 111 anonymously, or the Police on 101;
- Or Childline – 0800 1111;
- For advice and information relating to Safeguarding Children Issues – Rotherham Safeguarding Children Unit 01709 823914.

**27. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING: -**

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2013, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**20th September, 2013**

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Beck.

**48.           DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**49.           QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**50.           CONTINUING HEALTHCARE SCRUTINY REVIEW - CABINET RESPONSE**

Further to Minute No. 65 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director Health and Wellbeing stating that Continuing Health Care relates to NHS funding which is allocated to people whose health care needs meet a nationally agreed threshold. As a consequence of concerns that citizens in Rotherham were not being served well due to spending on Continuing Health Care being lower than nearby and statistical neighbours, a Review of Continuing Health Care was led by the Joint Health and Improving Lives Select Commissions during 2012. Actual expenditure per person on Continuing Health Care in Rotherham is below the average for the region.

A number of recommendations were made, which it is intended will improve the experience of citizens and ensure that a fairer share of Continuing Health Care funding is received within Rotherham. The Cabinet had accepted all of the recommendations of this scrutiny review.

Following receipt of the report, a senior management working group consisting of both Borough Council and NHS Rotherham staff agreed a set of actions to ensure effective multi-disciplinary working and deliver better outcomes for customers.

Members noted that Continuing Health Care and social care assessments are completed by health and social care staff presently or recently involved in assessing, reviewing, treating and supporting the customer. A better working relationship exists, as well as an understanding of each professional's role in participating in a multi-disciplinary assessment and completing the Decision Support Tool for each customer. Reference was made to training available for service providers and their staff.

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

(2) That a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the scrutiny review of Continuing Health Care be submitted to a meeting of the Health Select Commission in six months' time.

**51. SCRUTINY REVIEW ON RESIDENTIAL HOMES - CABINET RESPONSE**

Further to Minute No. 64 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Health and Wellbeing setting out the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Council's two residential homes, Lord Hardy Court and Davies Court. The recommendations of the scrutiny review, which had been undertaken from September to December 2012, were appended to the report, all of which had been accepted by the Cabinet.

The report also included a brief outline of the progress made by Senior Management, Residential Managers and Human Resources Business Partner in line with recommendations from the scrutiny review and progress from the proposed restructuring of the homes and service in line with budget savings and proposals for 2013/2014.

Reference was made to the different view expressed by consultants Price Waterhouse Cooper in respect of the minimum working hours of staff, as part of a financial analysis. As part of the scrutiny review, comparisons were made between the public sector and the independent sector provision of residential homes. Members noted that some of the financial details were commercially sensitive. The report stated that the cost savings to be made in line with budget proposals will have an impact on future delivery of services in the residential homes. Reference was made to the quality cost of provision of residential care, the charges levied upon residents and the proposal to lease some facilities within the Council's residential homes.

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

(2) That a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Council's two residential homes be submitted to a meeting of the Health Select Commission in three months' time.

**52. CHILDHOOD OBESITY REVIEW**

Further to Minute No. 43 of the meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 22nd November, 2012, consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor Steele, which contained an overview of the workshop held by a sub-group of the Health Select Commission, with officers from various services in the Council, to consider the re-commissioning of childhood obesity services in Rotherham. The report



provided details of:-

- : the background to the workshop;
- : the Rotherham Healthy Weight Framework;
- : Services for Children (More Life Clubs; Rotherham Institute for Obesity; More Life Weight Management Camp, based at Leeds);
- : Whole Population Prevention Activity (e.g.: with Leisure and Green Spaces and with DC Leisure);
- : Local Plan (e.g.: ensuring hot food take-away premises are not situated near to schools, leisure centre, nor parks);
- : Schools (e.g.: encouraging schools to have on-site policies for pupils and students at lunch time).

Members' discussion of this report included the following issues:-

- : the report about the contract specification and criteria for Services for Children (More Life Clubs; Rotherham Institute for Obesity; More Life Weight Management Camp) will be considered at a future meeting of the Health Select Commission;
- : the twelve recommendations prepared by the sub-group.
- : the provision and take-up of school meals, the healthy options available and also the take-up of free school meals.

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

(2) That the positive work being undertaken in Rotherham on childhood obesity, through the Healthy Weight Framework, be noted.

(3) That the recommendations of the sub-group concerning childhood obesity services, as set out in the submitted report, be endorsed and forwarded to the Cabinet for further consideration.

### **53. HOSPITAL DISCHARGES REVIEW**

Further to Minutes of previous meetings of the Health Select Commission (Minutes Nos. 76 of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2013 and 29 of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2013), consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor Steele which set out the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of hospital discharges in Rotherham. The draft review report was included with the submitted report.

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

(2) That the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of hospital discharges in Rotherham, as detailed in the report now submitted, be endorsed.

(3) That the report be forwarded to the Cabinet for further consideration and Cabinet be requested to:

(a) provide its response to this scrutiny review to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board within two months; and

(b) agree to the report of this scrutiny review being submitted to a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

**54. DCLG TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT 2014/15 AND 2015/16 CONSULTATION RESPONSE.**

Further to Minute No. 84 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Finance providing details of the Council's proposed response to the Department for Communities and Local Government Department for Communities and Local Government Technical Consultation on the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2014/15 and 2015/16. The Council would be:-

- : submitting a Rotherham specific response;
- : providing input to and endorsing the SIGOMA response;
- : providing input for any South Yorkshire response; and
- : sharing this Council's response with the Local Government Association.

The Council's proposed response was included with the report. Although the Consultation paper requests only local authorities' views on six technical questions around the process of determining control totals and feeding in cuts in funding, it is proposed that the Council's response highlights its concerns around both the impact of the proposals on the Council and the process itself.

Members noted that this approach is also being favoured by both SIGOMA (the campaigning network of urban local authorities) and the Local Government Association in their responses and the Council has stated its concerns around the implications of the proposals to these bodies, for inclusion in their responses.

Reference was made to the various views of local authorities, nationally, with regard to the Government's proposed financial settlement.

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

(2) That the contents of this Council's proposed response to this Government consultation, as now reported, be noted.

(3) That it be noted that:-

(a) the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Leader, will finalise the

submission of the Consultation response, which will reflect comments made by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board;

(b) the Council has informed both SIGOMA and the Local Government Association of its views for inclusion in their respective submissions to the Department for Communities and Local Government;

(c) the three Members of Parliament for the Rotherham Borough area will be informed of this Council's response; and

(d) a copy of the Council's response will be sent to the Local Government Information Unit.

**55. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS' SANCTIONS REGIME**

Further to Minute No. 43 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 26<sup>th</sup> July, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Policy Officer stating that the Management Board's 2013/14 work programme included a review of deprived communities, incorporating jobs and employment issues and an examination of the Government Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions (as referred by the Welfare Reform steering group). Subsequent discussions produced agreement to divide the review into two distinct pieces of work.

The submitted report provided a brief background and an initial summary of the issues for Members' consideration as part of a scrutiny review of the application of sanctions by the Department for Work and Pensions.

Members noted that Jobcentre Plus will be participating in the scrutiny review.

The report stated that the use of sanctions is part of the 'conditionality' regime which applies to claimants for jobseeker's allowance and also to some employment support allowance claimants, ensuring that they are making reasonable efforts to find and prepare for work.

Reference was made to a number of individual cases, affecting benefits claimants locally. Such cases were usually dealt with by the local Members of Parliament.

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

(2) That a sub-group, comprising the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Councillors Currie, Falvey and G. A. Russell, to consider the issues contained in the report now submitted and to scope the terms of reference of this scrutiny review.

(3) That the broad timetable for this scrutiny review, as set out in the

submitted report, be approved.

## 56. ASSISTED AREA STATUS

Further to Minute No. 78 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Policy Officer stating that the Government is reviewing the United Kingdom's assisted areas map in response to the European Commission's 2014-2020 regional aid guidelines, which were issued in June 2013. The guidelines contain the rules stating how, when, where and to whom regional aid (a form of state aid) can be granted.

Members noted that the Local Enterprise Partnership areas, including the Sheffield City Region, are asked to identify a contiguous map of priority wards covering a total population of 80% of current assisted areas coverage (based on 2007-13 maps). This Council is also able to make the case for retaining 100% coverage of the whole Borough; however, because population levels have increased since the 2007-13 maps were agreed, this process would still involve a loss of coverage. All Rotherham wards are covered in the 2007-13 map (appended to the report), providing the Rotherham Borough with wider coverage than most of the other districts in the Sheffield City Region (only the Doncaster Borough also has full coverage).

The Government is consulting on a number of elements which will inform the 2014-2020 assisted areas map, which cover the period from 1st July, 2014 to 31st December, 2020. The consultation is made up of two stages:

Stage 1 (deadline 30th September 2013) - this focuses on principles, indicators, local economic intelligence and priorities for coverage; and

Stage 2 (Winter 2013/14) - building on stage 1, this will be a consultation on a draft of the revised assisted areas map.

Local Economic Partnerships, through the Sheffield City Region executive team in Rotherham's case, have been asked to co-ordinate the response to stage one, working with local authorities and drawing on consultation/evidence that is informing the Sheffield City Region's emerging economic strategy/growth plan.

The submitted report included a brief rationale for identifying those Wards which Rotherham could be most prepared to lose from its current coverage, in order to contribute to any required overall reduction for the Sheffield City Region, although a strong case is to be made to retain the current coverage of the whole of the Rotherham Borough area.

Several Members made reference to the implications for various electoral Wards within the Rotherham Borough area and it was agreed that additional information should be provided for individual Members.

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

(2) That the approach taken to identify the Rotherham electoral Wards which should be prioritised for retaining Assisted Area Status and those which may lose that status be noted.

#### **57. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY**

Further to Minute No. 77 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Policy Officer outlining the key points to be covered in a joint City Region response to the Government consultation on establishing a combined authority for the Sheffield City Region. The report stated that, earlier in 2013, agreement had been reached by the City Region local authorities to form a combined authority to replace South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and have strategic responsibility for transport and economic development issues affecting the Sheffield City Region (the following minutes of the Cabinet meetings refer : Minute No. 138 of 6<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 and Minute No. 191 of 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2013).

Members noted the proposed approach of submitting a joint City Region response to the consultation (a copy of which was appended to the report) by the deadline of Monday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

Discussion took place on the indicative costs of the combined authority arrangements and the financial contributions required from this Council.

Members suggested that there ought to be joint scrutiny arrangements to monitor the role of the combined authority.

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

(2) That this Management Board endorses the approach of submitting a joint City Region consultation response, as now reported, which highlights the issues outlined in the report, instead of this Council submitting a separate response.

(3) That the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the Scrutiny Manager shall meet with the Sheffield City Region representatives and discuss scrutiny arrangements for the combined authority.

#### **58. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES**

Arrangements are being made in respect of the forthcoming Eleven millions take-over day, scheduled to take place during November 2013. Suggested issues for consideration are:-

: young people taking a lead role in a scrutiny review of the problem of

self-harming;

: progress with the transport issues considered at the previous Eleven millions take-over day (February 2013);

: discussion concerning the issue of child sexual exploitation.

**59. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH JULY, 2013**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 26th July, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**60. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Self Regulation Select Commission:-**

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

: the beginning of the scrutiny review of the Council's commissioning processes;

: the Council's Corporate Plan and financial strategy - review of performance;

: forthcoming consideration of the Council's budget for 2014/2015.

**Health Select Commission:-**

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

: scoping of the scrutiny review of GP medical services;

: the scrutiny review of support for carers is progressing (with representation from the Improving Lives Select Commission);

: participation in the regional scrutiny review of cardiac services in hospitals.

**Improving Places Select Commission:-**

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

: investigation of standards of Highways maintenance;

: consideration of the gardening scheme for vulnerable tenants of Council Housing, which has transferred to provision by Age UK;

: forthcoming scrutiny review of the local economy, with representation from the Self Regulation Select Commission;

: the scrutiny review of Homelessness has begun;

: forthcoming study of Planning Section 106 agreements and the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

**Improving Lives Select Commission:-**

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

: consideration of the Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2012/13 – with a contribution from Steve Ashley, the recently appointed Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board;

: study of the links between safeguarding children services and adult social care services;

: the report of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse services is being prepared.

**61. CALL-IN ISSUES**

There were no formal call-in requests.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**4th September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Dodson, Ellis, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Read, Roche, P. A. Russell, Vines, Wallis and Whysall; together with co-opted members Mrs. P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Johnston, Pickering, Sims and Swift.

**13.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**14.       QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**15.       COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no items to report.

**16.       MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 24TH JULY, 2013**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 24th July, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of the following additional wording to minute No. 11 (Revision of RMBC's Council Housing Allocations Policy):-

“Members discussed the implications of the proposed mandatory requirement for all new tenants of Council housing to sign a direct debit or standing order form to pay their rent.”

**17.       HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE CARRIAGEWAY DEFECT REPAIRS - MULTIHOG**

Further to Minute No. 61 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 16th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Principal Engineer (Streetpride) describing the provisional outcome of the trials of the new method of repairing highway defects (potholes) using the maintenance milling machine (Multihog).

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

: highway repairs carried out by statutory undertakers;



- : the code of practice for highway repairs has been amended to reflect the new way of working (to the satisfaction of lawyers and insurers);
- : extension of the target for completion of the patching repair of highways – from five days to ten days;
- : the target of dealing with highway safety defects within 48 hours;
- : the costs of highway repairs, comparing the use of the milling machine with previous methods of maintenance; certain larger-scale repairs were unsuitable for the milling machine;
- : the use of different materials for different types of highway repairs (ranging from small potholes to much larger areas of highway);
- : the trial method of highway repairs was suspended during the worst of the Winter weather; instead, the milling machine was able to be used for Winter maintenance and snow clearing;
- : the future availability of the 'Multihog' milling machines for hire;
- : the use of the milling machine in all Wards of the Borough during the trial period and the notification provided for Elected Members;
- : the Council's robust method of highways inspection, enabling the repudiation of insurance claims;
- : the arrangements for the temporary storage of materials removed from the highway, after the use of the milling machine, which are later delivered to a recycling company;
- : the prioritisation of specific highways for repair, within the annual maintenance programme; the use of highway condition surveys (by machine) and inspectors walking the highway and carrying out visual inspections; the surface treatment of highways.

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

(2) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission explaining (i) the prioritisation of specific highways for repair, within the annual maintenance programme; (ii) the detail of the various methods of highway surface repairs, ranging from safety defects and small patching works to surface dressing and large-scale highway repairs.

## **18. VULNERABLE TENANTS GARDENING SCHEME**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services concerning the Council's provision of a

partial gardening scheme to some vulnerable tenants throughout the Borough area (ie: tenants who have a disability and tenants aged 65 years and over and none of whom have relatives to help them with gardening). The gardening service, previously delivered by Morrison Facility Services, was insufficient and impacted on the contractor's core work of delivering estate-based caretaking services. On Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2013, the service transferred to Age UK (Rotherham), enabling the provision of an enhanced gardening service to existing customers and ensuring the service has the potential to expand in line with demand. In turn, Morrison Facility Services are able to focus on the core caretaking services.

The report and Members' subsequent discussion of this matter included the following salient issues:-

: a basic gardening service was provided (eg: mowing the lawn and trimming hedges);

: before the transfer to Age UK (Rotherham), the scheme was at full capacity with 185 tenants receiving the service (two or three cuts per year) and there were eighteen tenants on the waiting list; tenants were charged between £10 and £20 per visit;

: Age UK (Rotherham) was issued with a small grant agreement and service specification, to ensure that monies were spent accordingly and that the gardening work was undertaken in line with this Council's local offers to customers;

: the report outlined the costs of the scheme, the method of charging tenants for the work and the take-up of the gardening scheme by tenants after the transfer to Age UK (Rotherham);

: arrangements for gardening and grounds maintenance in aged persons' sheltered accommodation schemes (Members noted that the responsibility for keeping gardens tidy remains with the tenant);

: the overall capacity of Age UK (Rotherham) to expand the gardening scheme to assist vulnerable tenants and to tenants of private sector housing landlords;

: Age UK (Rotherham) utilises its own workforce for the gardening work;

: the extent to which the existence of the gardening service is promoted to tenants effectively.

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

(2) That the transfer of the gardening scheme to Age UK (Rotherham), the expansion of the scheme and the provision of an enhanced service to appropriate Council housing tenants, which have enabled caretaking staff to focus on core responsibilities, be noted.

#### **19. 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 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 Council)).

#### **20. SUPPORTING THE LOCAL ECONOMY**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Senior Category Manager, Procurement outlining the work currently being undertaken by the Borough Council in support of the local economy. The Select Commission noted that this activity continues to be a Council priority.

At the Supporting the Local Economy Clinic, held on 9th September, 2010 and attended by Councillors Wyatt, McNeely and Whelbourn, the Borough Council's representatives and colleagues from the Local Strategic Partnership agreed to define "local" as being the Sheffield City Region, in order to accord with the Local Enterprise Partnership's proposals.

Reference was made to the YORbuild employment and YORfuture scheme, concerning the provision of apprenticeships (Minute No. 71 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 3<sup>rd</sup> October, 2012, refers).

The Select Commission's discussion of this matter included the following salient issues:-

: advice provided by the Council to local suppliers (for example, instruction on how to submit tenders electronically);

: the Rotherham 'Master Vendor' scheme, dealing with the allocation of agency staff;

: the Council policy of issuing longer term contracts (up to three years), thus providing more financial security to local providers;

: the use of efficient methods of invoicing and payment of invoices (eg: e-invoicing and procurement cards), in order to improve the cash flow of local businesses; the Council is a member of the Government's Prompt Payment Scheme;

: the use of Fairtrade goods;

: compliance with United Kingdom and European Union legislative requirements concerning procurement, including the provisions of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012;

: the procurement bench-marking of local authorities in the Yorkshire and Humber region.

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

(2) That the Council's work undertaken in supporting the local economy and the outcomes achieved to date be noted.

(3) That a scrutiny review be undertaken of the Council's arrangements for the procurement of goods and services from the local economy and the review group shall comprise the Chairman of the Improving Places Select Commission and Councillors Atkin, Jepson and Wallis, together with Councillor Beck of the Self Regulation Select Commission.

**COMMITTEENAME****MEETINGDATE****DECISIONS**

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the meeting of the Cabinet held on MeetingDate. The wording used does not necessarily reflect the actual wording that will appear in the minutes.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact MeetingContact.

**1. FIELD\_TITLE****FIELD\_TITLE****FIELD\_TITLE****2. FIELD\_TITLE****A. FIELD\_TITLE****B. FIELD\_TITLE**

**APPEAL PANEL  
3rd September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Sharman (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 - D1/09/01 - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/09/01 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
1st October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Doyle (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Barron, Beck, Burton, Clark, Dalton, Doyle, Ellis, Godfrey, Goult, Kaye, Lelliott, McNeely, Rushforth, G. A. Russell, Sharman, Sims and Swift.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Hoddinott and Stone.

**ALZHEIMER'S SOCIETY**

Consideration was given to a presentation from Kathryn Rawling (Information Officer) and Liz Hopkinson (Service Manager, Rotherham and Doncaster), representatives of the Alzheimer's Society, concerning:-

- the awareness of dementia;
- local service provision for dementia sufferers;
- organising dementia friends.

The presentation included the following summary issues:-

(a) Awareness

- recognition of different physical conditions;
- the link between damage to the brain and the impact upon a sufferer's everyday skills and abilities;
- the creation of dementia friendly communities – bringing together organisations which are able to make improvements for dementia sufferers;
- currently 800,000 people in the UK have dementia (17,000 aged under 65 years), with 11,500 people of black and ethnic minority communities;
- dementia causes 60,000 deaths per year;
- the costs of dealing with dementia exceeded £23B in 2012;
- two-thirds of people with dementia live independently, not in care homes;
- many sufferers feel that they are burden upon their families;
- 3,086 people in Rotherham (2012) were suffering dementia and the prediction is that there will be almost 4,000 sufferers by 2014;
- other cases remain undiagnosed;
- dementia is not a natural part of ageing – it is a disease of the brain and affects a person's memory;
- Alzheimer's disease is one form of dementia; another form is vascular dementia;
- there is no cure for dementia; it is a progressive disease;
- dementia sufferers have communications problems, loss of memory, mood changes and may suffer depression and have less control of inappropriate behaviour;

- some medical and physiological details of dementia were described (e.g.: the sufferer being confused between night and day);
- the importance of early diagnosis of dementia and sufferers being able to seek help, support and treatment at an early stage;
- the importance of sufferers having useful activities to perform (e.g.: certain sports and leisure activities, including walking groups);
- the availability of schemes such as memory cafes and 'singing for the brain' (music is very therapeutic for dementia sufferers);
- the use of the Alzheimer's help-line telephone service;
- the attempt to sign up one million volunteers as dementia friends by 2015.

#### (b) Local Services

- local dementia services, for Rotherham and Doncaster, are based in Mexborough;
- the team of Dementia Support Workers;
- there are four memory cafes in the Rotherham area (eg: Wesley Centre, Maltby and at Davis Court, Dinnington);
- provision of 'singing for the brain' groups – which have more than fifty referrals per month;
- pressures on the service contract, as demand increases and there is a continual search for new sources of funding;
- referrals of people by telephone and from GP practices; and occasionally there are self-referrals;
- the nomination of the Rotherham care team for the National Care Awards;
- education programme for carers (funded by the Borough Council);
- the majority of referrals are from the south of the Rotherham Borough area;
- information displays at local events such as the Rotherham Show.

#### (c) Dementia Champions and Dementia Friends

- the commitment required of volunteers;
- awareness raising sessions for dementia friends;
- training courses available for dementia champions, who will ultimately encourage people to become dementia friends;
- the development of the Rotherham Dementia Action Alliance – and the need for representation from amongst the Borough Councillors;
- the desirability of shops and public services displaying their information signs in a style which will help to minimise the confusion of dementia sufferers;
- identifying people who may be suffering from dementia;
- Dementia sufferers often provide peer support for each other, including fund-raising for specific events.

Various information leaflets published by the Alzheimer's Society were provided for Members.



During discussion and questions, Members raised the following issues:-

: certain Borough Council staff (e.g.: Housing Neighbourhood Teams and reception staff) have received awareness training about dementia;

: the support and care provided by relatives of dementia sufferers, often reducing the cost to public services;

: the role the Borough Council's Safeguarding Adults Team and the provision of support for the carers of dementia sufferers;

: dementia is not considered to be an hereditary condition, although medical research is continuing.

Mrs. Rawling and Mrs. Hopkinson were thanked for their interesting and informative presentation.

**LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE  
1st October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Barron (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley and J. Hamilton.

**CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) -  
MARANTO'S, 23 HIGH STREET, SWALLOWNEST**

Further to a Minute of the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> August, 2013, consideration was given to an application for a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as Maranto's, 23 High Street, Swallownest.

The Licensing Authority received representations from the Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council and from two local Ward Councillors, which were not withdrawn and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant had agreed to amend the finishing time for each relevant part of the application, as follows:- the finishing time for "Late Night Refreshment" and for the "Supply of Alcohol" and the "Hours Premises Open to the Public" were amended to read : Monday to Saturday to midnight and Sunday to 23:00 hours.

The Sub-Committee heard that the applicant currently opened the premises until 11.00 pm, without the need to be licensed. The applicant proposed, due to a business and customer demand, to open the premises for the addition of supply of alcohol and also to extend the current hours for hot food sales and for the premises' opening hours. It was noted that the applicant had experience of owning and running similar premises and held a personal licence. The premises also had the benefit of coverage by twelve closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras, fitted on and about the premises, with the recordings being retained for forty-two days. The business makes deliveries of hot food within a radius of three miles from the premises and the deliveries would also be covered by mobile CCTV camera devices. The majority of alcohol sales were expected to be via the delivery system. All alcohol sales would only be made when hot food was ordered to a value of £10.00 or more.

Members noted the contents of the written representations received and heard from the objectors present, who expressed their concerns about disorderly behaviour particularly by young persons on the nearby estate and in the general area of Swallownest. The objectors stated that they were concerned about the number of hot food take-aways and shops selling alcohol in Swallownest and that should another premises be allowed to open for alcohol sales in the area, there might be an increase in the amount of disorderly behaviour. Members were sympathetic with the concerns raised by the objectors, but are aware that "demand" and

“planning” are not factors that could be taken into consideration when determining licensing applications.

Resolved:- (1) That the application, as now amended, be approved and a premises licence, under the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003, be granted in respect of the premises known as Maranto’s, 23 High Street, Swallownest.

(2) That the following times be approved and included as part of the licence:-

(a) Late night refreshment: Monday to Saturday from 23:00 hours to midnight;

(b) Supply of Alcohol: Monday to Saturday from 17:00 hours to midnight;

(c) Supply of Alcohol: Sunday from 17:00 hours to 23:00 hours;

(d) Hours Open to Public: Monday to Saturday from 16:00 hours to midnight and Sunday from 16:00 hours to 23:00 hours.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**  
**2nd September, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Mirfin-Boukouris (in the Chair); Councillors Councillor Roger Davison, Councillor M. Dyson, Bartlett, Harpham, Hussain, Councillor Ros Jones and Sharman.

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

**J8. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A member of the public, who was unable to attend today's meeting, had submitted a question in writing:-

"The Police and Crime Plan stressed the importance of value for money. HMIC published a detailed report on the 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 – Response to the Funding Challenge (see website). This criticised several Police Forces, including South Yorkshire. Was the Panel aware of this report and how did they plan to respond?"

The Chairman confirmed that this report had been made available to Members of the Police and Crime Panel and would be formally writing to the Police and Crime Commissioner on the Panel's behalf to ask how he proposed to respond to this report.

**J9. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH JUNE, 2013**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 17<sup>th</sup> June, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 be agreed as a true record.

**J10. UPDATE FROM THE LEGAL ADVISER REGARDING REFERRALS UNDER THE COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Stuart Fletcher, Deputy 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. Complaint that the Commissioner failed to take appropriate action regarding comments made by the Chief Constable.

As this matter concerned personnel issues the Panel decided, in accordance with the Complaint Procedure, to refer it for consideration by a Sub-Committee made up from three Members of the Police and Crime Panel.

2. Complaint that the Commissioner failed to respond to a matter reported to him.

Following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman it was clear that the complaint regarded an administrative failure and was not a complaint as envisaged by The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012. Therefore, the matter was not further considered under the procedure.

3. Complaint that the Commissioner failed to declare an interest upon his register of interests.

Following clarification from the Commissioner it was clear that he did not hold the interest that it was alleged should have been declared. Therefore, the matter did not fall to be considered further under the procedure.

4. Complaint that the Commissioner had failed to register as a data controller, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. As this allegation, if true, would constitute a criminal offence the matter had to be referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC).

The IPCC referred the matter back to the Panel and confirmed that, in accordance with transitional regulations, the previous data protection registration of the Police Authority transferred to the Police Commissioner.

Accordingly the complaint did not require further consideration by the Panel.

5. A complaint of poor service by South Yorkshire Police.

This was referred to the Commissioner for consideration.

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

#### **J11. UPDATE AND FUTURE WORK OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, on issues that have arisen during the Summer period and suggested that the Panel discuss how it would like to take its work forward, now that its statutory commitments for the first year have been fulfilled.

Developments that have taken place considered as part of this report included:-

- Report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee on Police and Crime Commissioners Register of Interests (Printed 16th May, 2013).
- HMRC Policing in Austerity Report.
- Police and Crime Panel conference in Leeds, July 2013.
- Centre for Public Scrutiny are carrying out research assessing the impact of the first year's work of Police and Crime Panels.
- Expert Adviser support being offered through LGA and Centre for Public Scrutiny.

During July, a meeting was also held with support officers across South Yorkshire from both the Community Safety Partnerships and the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny functions. The purpose of this was to determine how best to support the work of the Police and Crime Panel going forward. As a result it was proposed that:-

- That appropriate officers from each authority ensure that their individual members of the Police and Crime Panel receive the necessary briefing support with locality Scrutiny Officers and Community Safety Partnership Officers potentially carrying out a key role.
- To hold a development or training session with the Panel Members to discuss work planning - following the priorities outlined in the Police and Crime Plan and any other emerging local issues. This could be supported by officers as outlined above.
- South Yorkshire's Police and Crime Panel to consider adopting a similar process to West Yorkshire who hold quarterly meetings with reports from all of the Community Safety Partnerships and invite Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Chairs to attend this also.
- Priorities to consider for working with the Expert Adviser around gathering and triangulating evidence and operating with constrained resources.

Discussion ensued on the issues that had arisen since the last meeting and it was suggested that, with the support of officers, all relevant community groups be kept informed of developments and that an invitation be extended to Crimestoppers to update the Panel on their work, alongside that of the developments of the Community Safety Partnerships with the appropriate arrangements being made.

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to develop a training session to discuss work planning.

It was also suggested that to aid forward planning, specific dates be identified for when information should be provided to the Panel by the Police and Crime Commissioner, specifically around the HMRC Policing in Austerity Report, which should be provided for the next meeting in December, 2013.

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

(2) That the response by the Police and Crime Commissioner to the HMRC Policing in Austerity report be submitted to the next meeting of this Panel in December, 2013.

(3) That arrangements be made to invite Crime and Disorder Partnerships to report on a quarterly basis to the Police and Crime Panel.

(4) That a training session be developed with relevant supporting officers in due course.

**J12. REPORT OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONERS REGISTER OF INTERESTS**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided a briefing, focusing on the outcomes and implications for South Yorkshire.

The Local Government Association advised that there was likely to be a further hearing of the Home Affairs Select Committee before the end of the year which was likely to focus on the powers of Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime Panels.

Recent comments from Keith Vaz MP who chaired the Committee indicated that this may have been triggered at least in part by the recent involuntary resignation of the Chief Constable in Gwent. This gave the impression that the operation of Police and Crime Commissioners and Panels and the balance of power between them needed to be looked at, particularly in relation to the dismissal of Chief Constables.

To help develop a wider position on the adequacy of powers available to Panels, the Local Government Association would like to gather any views from officers and Panel Members.

The Panel were mindful of its own role and holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account, but believed that an update on progress and projections for the year by the Police and Crime Commissioner would be helpful and suggested that this be provided for the meeting in December, 2013.

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

(2) That a progress report by the Police and Crime Commissioner be submitted to the next meeting of this Panel in December, 2013.

**J13. INTRODUCTION TO THE CFPS EXPERT ADVISOR**

The Chairman offered a warm welcome to the newly appointed Centre for Public Scrutiny Expert Advisor, Cath Saltis, who gave a brief resume about her background, her current role and how best she could provide assistance with work programming and priorities, gathering and triangulating evidence from a variety of different sources, carrying out work within significant resource constraints and in the engagement with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel looked forward to working with the Expert Adviser in the future.

**J14. INDEPENDENT CO-OPTEE**

The Chairman reported that, due to a clash of responsibilities, Mrs Maureen Tennison had had to tender her resignation from the Police and Crime Panel.

With this in mind and, due to the resources and time constraints, it was suggested that the third candidate who originally applied to be an Independent Co-optee be contacted to ascertain his willingness to participate.

Resolved:- (1) That a letter of thanks be forwarded to Mrs. Tennison for her work and involvement with the Police and Crime Panel.

(2) That arrangements be made to contact the third candidate to ascertain whether or not he still wished to be an Independent Co-opted Member of the Police and Crime Panel.

**J15. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel take place on Monday, 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2013 at 1.00 p.m.



**BARNLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD**  
**7th October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor C. Mills (Doncaster MBC – in the Chair); Councillors R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and R. S. Russell (Rotherham MBC).

Beth Clarke	BDR Joint Waste Project Manager
David Burton	Rotherham MBC
David Finnegan	Barnsley MBC
Matt Gladstone	Barnsley MBC
Gill Gillies	Doncaster MBC
Steve Noble	DEFRA

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S. Ali (Rotherham MBC) and from Mr. K. Battersby (Rotherham MBC).

**K1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**K1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH JUNE, 2013**

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 14th June, 2013. A correction was made to the list of persons present, as Mr. P. Dale is an officer of Doncaster MBC.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**K1. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report updating the progress of the following issues:-

- (a) Bolton Road waste treatment site at Wath upon Dearne;
- (b) the waste treatment site at Ferrybridge;
- (c) community liaison;
- (d) financial issues and conclusion of the audit of accounts 2012/2013;
- (e) recruitment to the post of Project Support Officer.

Discussion took place on the actions taken to control the spread of flies on waste disposal sites.

Resolved:- That the BDR Manager's report be received and its contents

noted.

**K1. BDR RISK STATUS**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI transition phase risk register.

Resolved:- That the updated information on the risk register be received.

**K1. ROTHERHAM INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE - 15 OCTOBER 2013 EVENT - PRESS RELEASE**

Members of the Joint Waste Board received a copy of the press release concerning the launch by the SSE of a new Open4Business Internet web portal which gives local firms details of contract opportunities available, similar to a scheme used at the London 2012 Olympic Games.

It was noted that a free event is being held in Rotherham on Tuesday 15th October 2013 which will enable local companies to learn more about how the web portal works and the contact opportunities which are available with SSE and local authorities in respect of waste treatment.

Members emphasised that the event and the opportunities for local companies must acknowledge the contribution from and the impact upon all three of the constituent local authorities of the Joint Waste PFI.

Resolved:- That the contents of the press release be noted.

**K1. 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 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 Waste Board)).

**K1. BDR PFI BUDGET UPDATE 2013/14**

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at September 2013, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI).

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

**K1. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That the next following meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2014, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.