

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 29th January, 2014

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 27 - 37)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 14 - 18)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 32 - 36)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 35 - 43)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 17 - 22)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 39 - 48)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 6 - 16)
8. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 4 - 5)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
5th December, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Dalton, Goulty, Hoddinott, Kaye, Middleton, Roche, Sims, Watson and Wootton; together with co-opted members Victoria Farnsworth (Speak Up), Peter Scholey and Russell Wells (National Autism Society).

Also in attendance: Councillor Wyatt (Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing) for items 48 and 49.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Havenhand and from co-opted member Robert Parkin.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

45. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

A member of the public spoke about the work of the 'Speak up for Autism' Group which, in association with the Sheffield Hallam University, was undertaking a study of the stress levels experienced by people who suffer Autism.

46. COMMUNICATIONS

Members noted that the agenda item about Children's Continuing Healthcare has been deferred from the next meeting of the Health Select Commission (23rd January 2014) and will be considered at a later date.

47. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on Thursday 24th October, 2013.

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

48. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 16th October, 2013.

The Select Commission noted that:-

: (Minute S44) - the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment continues to be a priority for consideration by the Health and Wellbeing Board. New information is being suggested for inclusion, for example, the impact of domestic abuse, as a recommendation from the recent scrutiny review.

: (Minute S45) – the Health and Wellbeing Board had not yet expressed a definitive view concerning the presence of fast-food outlets near schools and within deprived areas – officers within the Planning Service and the Public Health Service are developing a policy on this matter for consideration by Elected Members.

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

49. HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY

Councillor Wyatt (Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing) presented a progress report about the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which was twelve months into implementation. The six strategic priorities of the Strategy were being delivered through a set of workstreams, each with an identified lead officer who had attended the Health and Wellbeing Board to present their action plan. The new outcomes framework to measure progress on the priorities is being developed, linked to the national Public Health Outcomes Framework.

The workstreams and progress to date were as follows:-

Workstream 1: Prevention and Early Intervention

- Individual commissioning plans for the locally determined priorities (smoking, alcohol and obesity) being developed ensuring they had a focus on Prevention and Early Intervention;
- An increase in the number of adults screened and offered brief intervention within Primary Care in relation to alcohol;
- The Clinical Commissioning Group's Strategy was delivering more alternatives to hospital admission, treating people with the same needs more consistently and dealing with more problems by offering care at home or close to home;
- Remained 1 of the best performing Health Check Programmes, with 57% of people in Rotherham having completed a first Health Check since 2006. There will need to be a step change in performance to achieve the 20% annual target of eligible people screened;
- The 'Making Every Contact Count' model had been agreed in principle at the previous Health and Wellbeing Board;
- The Suicide Review Group had been established and had reviewed all suicide deaths and looked to support actions to improve mental health and wellbeing, including the development of active bereavement support to reduce the risk of suicide in family members.

Workstream 2: Expectations and Aspirations

- Development of a customer pledge which was currently proceeding through the final agreement stage, but not progressing as well as hoped;
- Complaints baselines had been collated to enable monitoring of performance against numbers and types of complaints in relation to Customer Service;
- Practitioner Information Sharing events had taken place for a number of the deprived areas, with the purpose of looking at how to tackle some of the challenges in relation to poverty and deprivation;
- A single set of Customer Standards had been consulted upon at the Rotherham Show in September and was now being developed by the Council with the intention of rolling out further and seeking sign-up from other partners.

Workstream 3: Dependence to Independence

- Formal review process being undertaken - to validate that this element of the Strategy was embedded and resulted in effective outcomes;
- Workforce Strategy Group established and a draft Workforce Strategy now in place;
- Risk Strategy Task and Finish Group, Terms of Reference and action plan are in place;
- Shared decision making framework has been agreed;
- Presentation made to Shaping the Future Provider Forum on 9th July 2013, with presentations to be made to future Crossroads and Age UK Annual General Meetings;
- Voluntary sector representation on workstream group;
- Joint Telehealth Strategy agreed;
- Progress made towards Personal Health Budgets – will be in place by 31st March, 2014;
- Netherfield Court staff tasked with developing an approach that looked beyond people's physical rehabilitation, to a more holistic approach.

Workstream 4: Healthy Lifestyles

- Strong focus on delivery of health behaviour change activity across the Borough, focussing specifically on deprived neighbourhoods and attendance at community events by Services to raise awareness and referrals;
- Adoption of the Smokefree Charter, followed by roll-out and promotion through voluntary and community organisations, businesses and educational establishments;
- Commissioned training for agencies providing support to members of the public affected by Welfare Reform, with particular focus on mental health and support services;
- the 'Making Every Contact Count' workshop has been held;
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FVeUHT1s714> and forward plan in development;

- Refresh of Rotherham Active Partnership and engagement of Elected Member as Chair;
- Work had continued on the review of number of Behaviour Change Services and development of new Service specifications, prior to re-tendering or transfer of commissioning responsibility to the Council;
- Weight management providers actively seeking to extend their reach into Children's Centres, Schools and Colleges;
- Obesity and Tobacco Control programme activity presented to the Public Health England Conference in September 2013.

Workstream 5: Long-term Conditions

- Plans in place to extend personal health budgets to a wider cohort of patients during pilot period, working in partnership with the Council to 1st April, 2014; Sub-groups formed with agreed Terms of Reference;
- Self-management strategy agreed by the Urgent Care Management Committee;
- the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group had developed a practitioner skills programme on self-management and is currently trying to identify GP practices willing to utilise the programme;
- Intermediate care facilities fully operational and Winter-ready, providing an alternative level of care for people with long term conditions who could not remain at home;
- Joint Commissioning Team identified high intensity users of Social Care Services with the next step being to match them against high users of health services and establishing whether there was a correlation;
- Specialist psychological support was now being provided to all stroke survivors as part of the Integrated Stroke Care Pathway. This process now needed to be rolled out to other care pathways
- Winter Plan included the process for identifying those with long term conditions who were vulnerable.

Workstream 6: Poverty

- Nine of the eleven deprived neighbourhoods had identified health as a key priority area and actions to address it were embedded into Neighbourhood Plans, where appropriate;
- Actions included learning about healthy lifestyles, improving access to Health Support Services and reducing alcohol consumption on the streets;
- Adult Skills had been identified as a key priority in eight of the eleven deprived neighbourhoods, therefore, actions had been included in plans to address this issue;
- Workshop planned for Service providers with the objective to determine what a strategy would look like to get those people, who are away from the labour market, 'work ready';
- Mapping exercises completed to ascertain the extent of poverty alleviation work currently being undertaken in Rotherham and also to capture national best practice in anti-poverty work; discussions taking place to map out what a building resilience strategy would look like;

- Limited capacity to achieve the Priority around actively working with every household in deprived areas to maximise benefit take-up; a Corporate review was being considered which would examine the appropriateness of Welfare Advice Services.

After the presentation, Members raised the following questions:-

: the key aims and the expected impact of the 'Customer Pledge' – the starting point is that the Pledge should be an expression of basic standards of health and social care to be provided for customers and patients;

: involvement of people who have learning disabilities in projects such as the 'quit smoking' and the 'stop smoking in pregnancy' campaigns; it was noted that there are specialist support services, including specialist midwifery and tailored support for women who are trying to stop smoking;

: the wide-ranging nature and contents of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy; it was noted that the Strategy is in place for a period of three years and intends to encompass all life stages (and age ranges); an explanation was provided of the monitoring arrangements for the Strategy's workstreams and actions (via the multi-agency Health and Wellbeing Steering Group); it was acknowledged that local and national priorities may change over time;

: issues concerning mental health and the waiting lists for assessment;

: funding for Winter pressures;

: the transfer of funding for Public Health services, from NHS England and from NHS Rotherham to this Council;

: progress with the actions to reduce the incidence of people drinking alcohol in the street; the complexity and seriousness of problems concerning alcohol were acknowledged;

: the incidence of obesity in young children – Rotherham is recognised nationally for its creation of the 'Healthy Weight' framework;

: auditing and monitoring of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy; one of the functions of the Health and Wellbeing Board is to hold the Council and partner organisations to account in the delivery of the services in accordance with the Strategy's priorities;

: poverty and the impact upon the Rotherham economy of the coalition Government's welfare reforms;

: the role and impact of the Deprived Neighbourhood Co-ordinators.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the progress of each of the workstreams be noted.

(2) That a progress report be submitted to a meeting of the Health Select Commission, in six months' time, detailing the progress of two of the workstreams of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of this Select Commission shall choose the two workstreams.

50. SCRUTINY REVIEW - AUTISTIC SPECTRUM DISORDER

Further to Minute No. 19 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 11th July, 2013, Steve Mulligan (Principal Educational Psychologist) gave a presentation about the progress of the implementation of the actions arising from the scrutiny review of autistic spectrum disorder (ASD). The various issues highlighted were:-

Scrutiny Review: September-November, 2012

Objectives of the Review

- The reasons for the higher diagnosis rates
- Services required at diagnosis stage and after
- 16plus (pupils leaving school) support and transition
- Budget implications

Final Recommendations

- That the Autism Communication Team (ACT) continue to co-ordinate the monitoring and intelligence of ASD rates of diagnosis in Rotherham and partner agencies be requested to share information to facilitate this being done accurately. ACT should also ensure that partner agencies have access to this compiled information; Local and regional data continued to be collected and shared across Education and Health. CAMHS and the Local Authority have improved their dialogue via regular meetings during the past four months. The most recent figures, collated to October, 2013, were:-

Mainstream	1,015
Special	192
Total	1,207

- That the Rotherham Child Development Centre (CDC) and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) bring forward proposals to streamline their assessment processes and reduce waiting lists. In particular, transition referrals at age 5 years should be the subject of a clearly documented care plan that is shared with all partners and the family
CDC/CAMHS are physically located in the same building and complied with Diagnostic and Statistical Manual version 5. Waiting times are being reviewed and both CDC/CAMHS were examining pathways for the Autism Spectrum conditions, working with the Education Psychology Service.

- That the Special Educational Needs reform project group is being asked to implement a pilot project for the development of Education, Health and Care plans for children with a diagnosis of ASD with a view to ensuring that in the future all children with a diagnosis will have a multi-agency care plan with a lead worker allocated
Education, Health and Care plans were being developed by the Local Authority group looking at Support and Aspiration under strategic leadership within the Council. Pilot Education, Health and Care plans were being formulated in compliance with the new Code of Practice and the Children and Families Bill 2013
- That proposals are brought forward to develop more wrap around family support to assist with the transition between different services (particularly post-5) and at different life stages. This Service should recognise the vital role that parents and carers need to play in working with and influencing Service providers and should be developed in line with the commitments in the Partner and Child Charter
Continued work regarding the development and understanding of multi-element planning. The principles of the Parent and Child Charter continue to be implemented and rolled out. Development of the Early Years Charter
- That the hierarchy of support within a mainstream setting with ACT and Educational Psychology concentrating on children with more complex needs, be formalised and further developed, including exploring the potential role of special schools to support mainstream schools with support for children with less complex needs
The ACT Team has been aligned to the Learning Support Service. The funding of all the targeted Services was under a four-way review – High Needs Block, Learners First Review, Development of Integrated Pupil Services and Service Transformation; proposal to appoint a staff member to build capacity as part of Service Transformation and a commissioning process to meet need, should enable progress to be made quickly.
- That the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment include a detailed and thorough assessment of the needs of children and adults with autism including the identification of any gap in services
The ASC Scrutiny report would form the basis of the JSNA around autism. Discussions at CAMHS planning meetings and a meeting to discuss joint commissioning on 19th December, 2013.
- In line with the JSNA, that commissioners consider the commissioning of Rotherham-based service for young people (16+) with ASD over the next 5 years, building on the good practice that already exists. This would result in a reduction of out-of-authority placements
Continued work regarding post-16 provision included building capacity at local college, bespoke packages and joint venture partnerships with

independent service providers. The Director of Safeguarding was leading on work regarding out-of-authority placements

- That a local care pathway for the management of ASD in adults should be developed in line with appropriate NICE guidelines
Discussions had taken place with Adult Services regarding Autism with Adults paper/pathways linked to the ASC Strategy Group
- That RMBC identifies a 'senior leader' for the autism agenda who is able to challenge provision and raise the status of the condition. The work should then be channelled through the Autism Strategy Group
Appropriate senior staff of the Council now fulfil these roles.
- That commissioners should look at how a pathway of care can be resourced effectively and the CCG specifically whether a single diagnostic route would be more appropriate
Children and young people were diagnosed at different stages of their development. All systems must be NICE compliant. Joint work EPS/CAMHS continued around pathways to reduce "noise" in the system.

As a consequence of the scrutiny review and the work of the local Autism Society, there is now greater awareness in Rotherham, improved communications and increased confidence in schools and services.

After the presentation, Members asked questions about the following matters:-

: the impact of CAMHS services (Members requested additional information about this matter);

: post-diagnosis treatment;

: 5 to 7 years age group;

: post-diagnostic support for families – the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group will ultimately be asked to provide funding for such support services;

: support for pupils with high functioning Asperger syndrome in schools.

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

(2) That a further progress report explaining the implementation of the actions arising from the scrutiny review of autistic spectrum disorder be submitted to a meeting of this Select Commission in six months' time.

51. YORKSHIRE AMBULANCE SERVICE QUALITY ACCOUNTS 2013-14

Further to Minute No. 42 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 24th October, 2013, Members welcomed Hester Rowell, David Bannister, Steve Rendi and Amanda Best (representing the Yorkshire Ambulance Service)

Hester Rowell, Head of Quality and Patient Experience, Yorkshire Ambulance Service, and Steve Rendi, Locality Manager (Rotherham), reported on the Quality Accounts which would be published in June, 2014 and would provide information on Service performance in the period between April, 2013 and March, 2014. The Service was inviting comments from partner organisations and from the public on the contents of the Quality Accounts report, with a deadline for submission of responses of 31st December, 2013.

Members received a presentation which highlighted the following issues:-

Clinical Quality Strategy

- Key part of the Integrated Business Plan
- Sets out key clinical quality priorities for 2012-2015
- Focus on evidence based practice and national priorities
- Focus on most important issues for the people who use the service

What influences the Yorkshire Ambulance Service Clinical Quality Strategy?

- Learning from the outcome of the Inquiry by Lord Francis into care failings at the Mid-Staffordshire NHS Trust

Quality Accounts 2012-13

- Accountability
- Transparency
- Consultation

Current Priorities

- Improving the experience and outcomes for patients in rural areas
- Working with care and residential homes
- Achieving a reduction in harm to patients (when being transported by ambulance) through the implementation of a safety thermometer tool
 - it was acknowledged that the incidence of such harm was extremely rare
- Public education
- Patient Transport Service improvement

Progress

- NHS safety thermometer
 - Increased awareness raising across staff on safety thermometer and harms
 - Review of Patient Transport Service booking process

Review of dynamic risk assessments
 Audit of equipment on vehicles
 Standardisation of procedures
 Education and training review
 Regional Falls Network

- Public Education
 Choose well
 : Accident and Emergency (A&E) and the '999' ambulance services are intended for people with life-threatening or serious conditions which need immediate attention, such as heart attacks, strokes, breathing problems or severe bleeding
 : if someone needs treatment or advice for a minor illness, ailment or injury, there are a number of services available – self-care, pharmacy, NHS Direct, GPs, walk-in centre, minor injuries unit;
 : Pharmacists provide an easily accessible service on the high street and at many supermarkets and can give confidential, expert, free advice;
 : by choosing the most appropriate service, people can help to ensure that emergency services such as A&E and '999' are available for those who really need them.
- Working with care and residential homes
 Working in partnership to ascertain reasons for '999' emergency calls, because a high percentage are received from care homes.
- Patient Transport Service for routine appointments
 Patient Transport Service and recruitment
 Restructuring the management team
 Reviewing how the communication function operates
 Re-assessing how work is planned and scheduled
 Reviewing rotas to ensure better links between the service and patient needs
 Improving how the Service listens and responds to patient and staff feedback
 Reviewing fleet and estate requirements
- The Yorkshire Ambulance Service may not achieve Foundation Trust status until 2015, although the Service continues to act, report and engage with communities as a Foundation Trust.
- Next steps
 Roadshow launch – “Spring into Safety”
 Multiple communication channels – Yorkshire Ambulance Service television, social media sites, face to face;
 Steering Group to sustain improvements
 Review structure of clinical supervision
 Review of education and training
 Patient safety culture work

Consultation

- Listening to members, communities and staff

Rotherham Accident and Emergency (A&E)

- Preparing for Winter
- A&E operational re-design
- Incidence of priority 'red' emergency calls and response times
- Collaborative working in Yorkshire and the clinical leadership framework were highlighted.

After the presentation, Members asked questions about the following matters:-

: financial savings to be made by the Yorkshire Ambulance Service, during the next five years and the public consultation process concerning the budget reductions and service targets; it was noted that the Service is recruiting staff throughout Yorkshire;

: service performance targets and whether there is any impact on mortality rates;

: provision of specialist responses with different vehicles to different types of patient (eg: bariatric (obese) patients);

: ambulance 'turn-around' times at hospital A&E departments;

: the possible impact (eg: on ambulance journey distances and times) of the coalition Government's proposed reform of A&E services.

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

(2) That the Health Select Commission shall provide a response to the Yorkshire Ambulance Service Quality Accounts report 2013/2014, as now indicated and the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman shall approve the details of the response.

52. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- (1) That a special meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 9th January, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

(2) That the next scheduled meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 23rd January, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
9th January, 2014

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

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Vines and Watson.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

45. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

46. COMMUNICATIONS

There had been no communications received.

47. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH DECEMBER, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 19th December, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

48. 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).

49. BUDGET 2014/15

Further to Minute No. 32 of the meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 21st November, 2013, Karl Battersby, Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services, and Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, gave a presentation on the budget consultation and budget process, the opportunities for members of the public to have their say and the various questions that were asked.

The presentation referred to:-

- Money Matters and the Council Priorities.
- The Methodology.

- Questions for the Money Matters Consultation Process 2014-16.
- Online Forum.
- Headline Matters.
- Consultation Events covering:-
 - Universal – v – Targeted.
 - Empowering communities to help themselves.
 - Stop or reduce.
 - Which services should be delivered differently.
 - Making money go further.

The Director of Finance made reference to the current budget position, the individual savings proposals now being put forward by Directorates and the revisions that had already been made arising from discussions with Elected Members.

Discussion ensued about the use of staff forums for suggested efficiency savings and how these could feed into the budget process.

The Strategic Directors were invited to explain each of their savings proposals in detail and the rationale behind each suggestion.

Karl Battersby, Strategic Director for Environment and Development Services, reported on a further two savings proposals.

The Select Commission asked a number of questions about Parking Services and whether this affected the contract in out of centre areas and the proposals for the exit payments at Wellgate Multi-Storey Car Park.

Shona McFarlane, representing the Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods and Adult Services, accompanied by Councillor Rose McNeely, Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods, Councillor John Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, and Councillor Ken Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, reported on the various savings proposals from within the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate.

The Select Commission asked a number of questions about the re-commissioning of services and terms of conditions for staff and the degree of monitoring of such contracts and the fact that predominantly women staff were affected.

Reference was also made to the accounting arrangements for furnished homes and the previous inflexibility around public sector to public sector collaboration.

Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, accompanied by the Chief Executive and Councillor Jahangir Akhtar, Deputy Leader, reported on the various savings proposals from within the Resources Directorate.

The Select Commission asked a range of questions about the expectations for attracting external funding and the confidence this could be achieved, flexibility of the savings proposals, number of voluntary redundancies, DWP's suspension of benefits and optimistic support from Trades Unions for staff savings proposals.

Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services, accompanied by Councillor Paul Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families Services, had not further savings proposals to put forward, but were present to answer questions should they be asked.

The Select Commission also welcomed the opportunity to put forward their views and comments about the budget setting process and requested that further information be provided on what services were statutory and non-statutory and suggested that the written proposals be provided in a more timely manner.

Resolved:- (1) That Stuart Booth, Shona McFarlane, Karl Battersby and Joyce Thacker, and the relevant Cabinet Members that accompanied them, be thanked for their input.

(2) That the information as presented be noted.

50. HOUSING RENT INCREASE 2014/15

Further to Minute No. 62 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods held on 6th January, 2014, consideration was given to a presented by Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, setting out the proposed housing rent, new build rents, garage rent and communal facilities increases for 2014/15.

The report set out in detail the proposed housing rent, new build rents, garage rent and communal facilities increases for 2014/15. The rents had been calculated in accordance with the national rent setting regime requiring all authorities to use the prescribed formula and apply annual increases to actual rents to achieve the Formula Rent. The Government expected that all similar properties in the same local area would have similar rent levels even if owned by different social landlords (rent convergence). The Government had set a target for authorities to achieve rent convergence by 2015/16.

For the 132 new Council properties built in 2011/12, the funding model assumed that rents would be aligned to the Council's existing rent structure based on them having a higher property value and greater thermal efficiency than existing stock. These properties had already reached convergence and, as such, the rental increase could be less than other properties.

The report also contained at Appendix A the 2014/15 draft Housing Revenue Account budget for consideration.

It was noted that the report was to be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on the 15th January, 2014.

Discussion ensued about the Right to Buy Scheme and thirty year business plan remodelling, the raft of assumptions, the impact on void properties and the devastating effect this could have on the Council being unable to offer people housing. Clarification was sought on whether or not new build properties received some protection from the Right to Buy Scheme, the current plans for property acquisition and repairs and maintenance budgets.

It was also suggested that a watching brief be placed on the borough's remaining garage sites to prevent them slipping into disrepair.

Resolved:- That the request for Cabinet to recommend to Council the following be noted:-

- An average rent increase of 6.57%, in accordance with the Central Government (DCLG) Rent Formula which results in an average weekly increase of £4.54 when collected over 52 weeks.
- An average rent of £94.47 on new build (energy efficient) Council properties.
- In line with the Retail Price Index, Garage Rents and Communal Facility charges (including where there were applicable laundry charges and cooking gas charge) be increased by 3.2%.
- The draft Housing Revenue Account budget for 2014/15.

(Councillors Atkin, Currie, Ellis, J. Hamilton and McNeely declared personal interests in this item on the basis that they were or had relatives who were Council house tenants)

51. DISTRICT HEATING SCHEME CHARGES 2014/15

Further to Minute No. 63 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods held on 6th January, 2014 consideration was given to a report presented by Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, setting out the proposed increases for District Heating for 2014/15.

In general, District Heating charges were made up of two components i.e. a weekly charge and a metered charge per kilowatt hour of heating used. It was proposed that there be no increase in the weekly charges but an increase in kilowatt hour charges to more accurately reflect true costs.

Pooled metered schemes had a weekly pre-payment flat rate charge collected through the rent system applied to all properties dependent upon the size of the property. The actual costs of each property's heating was determined by meter readings of the amount of kilowatt hours of heating actually used.

Reference was made to the three heating schemes in operation and the need to ensure full cost recovery where stipulated and convergence requirements to increase costs on a phased basis.

The Select Commission were mindful of some tenants slipping into fuel poverty and asked that some kind of basic advice be provided for tenants.

Resolved:- That the request for Cabinet to recommend to Council the following be noted:-

- The weekly district heating charges be not increased.
- The various proposed increases to the kilowatt hour charges, as outlined in the report submitted, be approved as a means of achieving full cost recovery.
- To assist some tenants, increases in the kilowatt hour charge be phased as agreed at Cabinet on 16th January, 2013 (Minute No. C131(3) refers) with full cost recovery to be achieved by 2016/17.

52. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 20th February, 2014, at 3.30 p.m.

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

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley, Burton, Clark, J. Hamilton, Lelliott, Read, Roddison and Sharman and Co-opted members Mrs. A. Clough (ROPES) and Mr. M. Smith (Safe@Last).

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ali, Astbury and Kaye and Co-opted member Ms. J. Jones.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

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

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

38. COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing was raised under this item.

39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 6TH NOVEMBER, 2013.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 6th November, 2013, were considered.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission be approved as an accurate record for signature by the Chairperson.

40. SCHOOL ORGANISATION - UPDATE.

Further to Minute No. 29 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 24th October, 2012, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Principal Officer – School Organisation, describing the provision of school places throughout the Rotherham Borough area, in response to the increasing pupil numbers and pressure on school places, especially in the primary school phase.

The report provided details of the way in which additional school places would be made available, most often by the expansion of existing schools and also by the construction of a number of new primary schools. These details were provided in respect of each of the Borough's learning communities of schools. The report referred to proposals to build new primary schools at Eastwood (central Rotherham), at Bassingthorpe Farm (Greasbrough) and within the developing community at Waverley, near Catcliffe. Funding for the capital cost of school building projects would be met from the 'Basic Need' allocation to the Council from the Government's

Department for Education. Some additional funding was also available from agreements made in accordance with the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The Principal Officer outlined that, in addition to the school expansions detailed in the report, other areas of the Borough were considered under a watching brief and their school place capacity would be monitored.

If all of the school expansions currently undergoing consultation were approved, a total of 945 additional permanent primary school places and 195 additional temporary primary school places would have been created.

The submitted report outlined the total new arrivals to the Borough during the academic years 2007/2008 to 2011/2012 and the numbers of families who had been admitted to school. For the school year 2012/2013 data was currently unavailable. The report noted the mobility of the newly arrived families. The Local Authority had secured temporary external funding for the role of EU Migrant Community Engagement Officer to support the families in attending educational provision.

It was noted that the data for new arrivals to the Borough during the 2012/2013 academic year had not been made available. The Chairperson wished to record that she felt this was unfair on the Local Authority as it made scrutiny of service planning, including capacity planning, and subsequent evaluation, difficult.

The report noted the number of applications that had been processed relating to the 2013/2014 school year, relating to the transfer groups and in-year transfers.

The Fair Access Protocol that the Local Authority was administering to place vulnerable children in a school was also considered.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised by members of the Improving Lives Select Commission: -

- **The Waverley housing development was planned over three-decades. Was the school place strategy flexible?** – Yes. Meetings and communications were on-going and all stakeholders were welcome to contribute to these.
- **How were the proposed additional seventeen classrooms at Wickersley School and Sports College being funded?** – Through the Targeted Need funding bid made to the Department for Education.
- **In Rotherham's rural villages, a family failing to get a school place could have long-term implications for the community integration, especially for the child/children involved.**
- **How were working relationships with Academies shaping up?** – All Schools in Rotherham remained signed-up to the principles of Transforming Rotherham Learning. Centrally provided services

could be bought-back by Academies and would be subject to Service Level Agreements.

- **Was the Service confident that there was sufficient school places where they were required?** – As far as possible, yes the Service was confident. The Service's plans had been judged to be sound by external assessors.
- **Was staffing in schools a consideration when they were being expanded?** – The provisions of the Infant Class Size Legislation were considered for all classes up to the end of Year Two, and classes were usually expanded in multiples of 15 to ensure that classes operated with a maximum of thirty children in them. When schools did expand they usually had to apply to the Rotherham Schools' Forum to cover all of the staffing costs in the period before the school generated its own budget based on pupil numbers.
- **Cases had been reported where siblings had not been offered places in the same school. This had negative effects on families.** – Four schools had not been able to accommodate the siblings applying to the reception class of children already in school in the 2013/2014 academic year. The catchment areas of these schools had been analysed to try to avoid similar situations in future academic years.
- **What impact were new arrivals having on school places?** – Although the numbers and movement of newly arrived families was hard to predict, increasing levels of data was helping the planning process. Rotherham also participated in regional forums. Targeted Needs funding bids were being utilised to ensure that sufficient places existed in the right areas.
- **The possible uses of Section 106 funding.**
- **Academies were their own admission authorities, how did this impact on the planning of the Local Authority?** - All academies were currently working with the Local Authority in Rotherham.
- **Children who had attended a Nursery school were not guaranteed a place in the school's reception class which seemed unfair.** – Advice had been taken from the Department for Education on this matter and whether it would be possible to make attendance in the Nursery provision (Foundation Stage One) criteria for admission to the reception class (Foundation Stage Two). The Department for Education had advised that this could lead to unfairness in the system as not all schools had nursery provision and this could impact on children who were not able to attend their catchment area school.

Councillor Russell thanked the Officer for attending and their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

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

(2) That an update in one year's time in relation to school organisation be presented to the Improving Lives Select Commission.

41. SAFEGUARDING ADULTS - ANNUAL REPORT 2012-2013.

Further to Minute No. 38 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member and Advisers for Adult Social Care held on 21st October, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Safeguarding Service Manager – Safeguarding Adults, stating that the Rotherham Safeguarding Adults Board produced an Annual Report of safeguarding adult's activity. The Board has ratified this report for publication to all partner agencies and for publication on the Council's website.

Consideration was given to the contents of the Rotherham Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2012/2013.

Discussion ensued on the presentation of the annual report. The following points were raised about the content: -

- Was there enough representatives of voluntary sector groups on the Board's constitution and were all areas of the voluntary sector represented?
- Was there one common definition of 'abuse' that was shared and understood by all agencies?
- Warden Service – information sharing and communication.
- Was there a sufficient workforce across all sectors to deliver what was needed to protect vulnerable adults?
- Was the need to achieve efficiency savings likely to negatively impact on the ability of all services to adequately protect people from preventable harm?
 - All Agencies had measurements that would provide alerts to monitor performance. Multiple alerts would trigger that something was wrong. The Contract Compliance Officers were charged with ensuring that the Care Quality Commission's standards were met and had the ability to end placements and close provisions where necessary and they had used these powers in the past.
- The report should make reference to the numbers of people who had been supported over the year and how many people were safe.
 - A victim-led investigation process followed all reports of safeguarding concerns. Victims were visited and assessed within twenty-four hours, although this was often immediately after a concern had been reported.
- Was the profile of who reported concerns reflective of the ethnic make-up of the Borough?
 - No. The vast majority of reports were made by the White British community. An advertisement campaign had been undertaken aimed towards the British Asian community and was beginning to see results.
- How were the best interests of people with learning difficulties and mental health issues represented?
 - Even if individuals did not have the capacity to make

decisions about their care they were always at the centre of the care planning process.

- Were all staff adequately trained?
 - It was a contractual requirement that all staff were trained at all times. Training records were maintained and the Council provided electronic-learning packages that were mandatory requirements across all posts within the Neighbourhood and Adult Service's Directorate and recommended training across the other Council Directorates.
- Would CCTV be placed in residential homes?
 - Not usually, as there were legislative issues. However, if somebody was a victim of anti-social behaviour, for example, they may be installed in their home for their own protection and the evidence gathering process. This would be in conjunction with the Safer Rotherham Partnership.

Councillor Russell thanked the Officers for attending and their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

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

(2) That each Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report be considered by the Improving Lives Select Commission.

42. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE.

Further to Minute No. 5 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 12th June, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Senior Scrutiny Adviser, providing details of the progress with implementation of this Select Commission's work programme for 2013/2014.

The report included the progress against the 2013/2014 work programme, including the areas that had been covered and those still to be undertaken.

Discussion was undertaken about the following meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission to be held in the New Year.

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

43. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 22nd January, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
13th December, 2013

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

Apologies for absence had been received from:- Councillors Currie and Gilding.

80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest were made.

81. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

82. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE ROTHERHAM BOROUGH AREA

Councillor G. Whelbourn, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, welcomed the Neighbourhood Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager (Housing and Neighbourhood Services, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate) to the meeting to give an overview on the occurrence and incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour across the Rotherham Borough area.

The submitted presentation included the following issues: -

- South Yorkshire wide 'Total Anti-Social Behaviour' rates, showing current performance and the direction of travel: -
 - The most recent figure for Rotherham was a 5.2% reduction since 2013. Barnsley had seen a 7.7% reduction.
- Rotherham Borough area 'Total Anti-Social Behaviour' rates by each area, showing current performance and the direction of travel: -
 - North Rotherham – reduction in 10.5% (Green rated performance);
 - South Rotherham – reduction in 10.7% (Green rated performance);
 - Central Rotherham – reduction in 4.8% (Red rated performance).
- 'Total Anti-Social Behaviour' in each of Rotherham's seven Area Assemblies;
- 'Total Anti-Social Behaviour' rate per 1000 of population in each of Rotherham's seven Area Assemblies;
- A Borough-wide breakdown of the incidences of distinct type of anti-social behaviour, including twelve categories and the three overall categories of: -
 - Nuisance;
 - Personal;
 - Environmental.

- A breakdown of the twelve anti-social behaviour categories in each of the North, Central and South Safer Neighbourhood Areas (SNAs);
 - Including the crimes that had been identified as having recent increases in their incidence.
- Monthly trends over 2013 to date across South Yorkshire;
- Monthly trends over 2013 to date across the Rotherham Borough area;
- The structure of the legislation affecting anti-social behaviour encompassed in the Crime and Policing Bill;
- The role and purpose of the Vulnerable Persons' Unit was outlined. The Unit was relatively newly established in Rotherham and was unique across the country. The Unit was involved in the: -
 - Development, co-ordination and delivery of an effective operational response to tackle hate crime, anti-social behaviour and support for vulnerable persons;
 - Effective deployment of resources and a reduction in demand on all Services;
 - Provision of better outcomes by working together;
 - Early identification of vulnerable people involving necessary organisations;
 - Address the under-reporting of hate crime and increase the identification of hate crime victims;
 - Draw information and referrals from the Police and other Partner Organisations to identify the level of vulnerability using a Risk and Threat Assessment;
 - Identify the single point of contact at each Agency who could identify the most appropriate person to work on each individual case;
 - Collate and share information between Agencies on people identified as vulnerable;
 - Formulate an agreed Action Plan for each high and medium risk assessed case;
 - Monitor progress against each Action Plan and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions;
 - Identify and report on any community tension issues;
 - Co-ordinate the work of the Police Young Peoples' Partnership Officers to assist the Safer Rotherham Partnership and Partner Agencies to deliver a common agreed-framework to schools and young people.

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

- **Barnsley's Anti-Social Behaviour reduction over 2013 was greater than Rotherham's – what were Barnsley doing differently/better?** – There was no difference in the approaches taken by each local authority. There could be a myriad of reasons leading to the marked reduction, including a higher benchmark figure from a previous year of high crime.

- **Could a breakdown of activity in the areas of the Barnsley Borough be obtained and applied to Rotherham?** – The South Yorkshire Forces met weekly at their ‘Gold’ meeting and benchmarking was provided to the Rotherham Safer Rotherham Partnership and the Crime and Community Tasking Units.
- **Some areas with relatively low rates of crime were seeing ‘abstractions’ of their Police and Police and Community Support Officers to other areas of Rotherham with higher crime levels. This was concerning and could be counter-productive in the longer-term** – The Police Force had finite levels of resources and had to deploy them where there was most need. A Force review on Neighbourhood Policing had been scheduled for the New Year.
- **There appeared to be an annual spike of crime in December and January** – This was seen on an annual basis. All Partners contributed to and maintained a crime and anti-social behaviour calendar in order that they would be prepared for annual increases.
- **What criterion was used to identify an individual as a Vulnerable Person?** – Different Agencies used different criteria. The issue of needing increased support for vulnerable people became apparent following the tragic death of Fiona Pilkington, when it was identified nationally that there was no attempt made by agencies to create an overview of reports of anti-social behaviour and hate crimes, or to identify a theme.
- **Where there any links between the Vulnerable Persons’ Unit and the Child Sexual Exploitation Unit?** – The two Units were separate but they did work closely together and undertook cross-matching of intelligence.
- **How could people be referred to the Vulnerable Persons’ Unit?** – By a communication with the local Safer Neighbourhood Team. The Unit undertook a formal risk assessment against all referrals, cross-matched intelligence from victims and other emerging information and planned and monitored interventions.
- **It would be a useful exercise for Elected Members to be invited to visit the Vulnerable Persons’ Unit and the Child Sexual Exploitation Unit to learn more about the role of each.**
- **In communities the causes of anti-social behaviour could be very complex in that victims could also be perpetrators.**

The Neighbourhood Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager shared the most recent (un-audited) statistics relating to crime in the Rotherham Borough. Reductions in crime was up overall by 4.8%. Reductions in criminal damage and arson (down 4.9%), violent crime (down 8.2%) and anti-social behaviour (down 5.2%) had been recorded. Increases in other crimes had been identified: burglary dwelling (increased by 24.9%), other burglaries (increased 11.9%), vehicle crime (increased 9.1%) and shoplifting (increased by 24.8%). The South Yorkshire Police Force’s current focus was on acquisitive crime.

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

(2) That the Directorate give further consideration to the allocation of resources across the Rotherham Borough and the wider South Yorkshire region to determine lessons learned in terms of improved outcomes.

(3) That the issue of resource allocation across the Rotherham Borough be raised with the Chief Superintendent and at a future meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

(4) That a presentation on the Vulnerable Persons' Unit be given at a future meeting.

(5) That it be noted that the January 2014 meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission will accept a presentation in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation.

(6) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board receive twice-yearly updates in relation to anti-social behaviour in the Rotherham Borough area, including regional comparison and benchmarking data.

83. CHILDREN'S COMMISSIONER'S TAKE-OVER DAY 2014

Councillor G. Whelbourn welcomed the Public Health Specialist for Mental Health (Public Health, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate), the Clinical Lead, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber), and the Voice and Influence Officer (Integrated Youth Support Service, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate). The Officers had attended the meeting to give a presentation relating to self-harm. This issue had been agreed in conjunction with the Youth Cabinet as the theme for the 2014 'Children's Commissioner Take-over Day'.

Self-harm was defined by the National Institute of Clinical Excellence (2004) as: -

An expression of personal distress, usually made in private, by an individual who hurts him or herself. The nature and meaning of self-harm, however, vary greatly from person to person. In addition, the reason a person harms him or herself may be different on each occasion, and should not be presumed to be the same.

The UK had one of the highest rates of self-harm in Europe at 400 per 100,000 of the population. ChildLine had reported a 59% increase in the number of self-harm related counselling interactions in 2010/2011 compared to the previous year. Locally, self-harm tended to be more prevalent amongst girls with the use of pencil sharpener blades and paracetamol overdose being the main methods of self-harm.

The ways that young people self-harm included: -

- Cutting – 72%;
- Burning – 35%;
- Self-hitting or head banging – 30%;
- Interference with wound healing – 22%;
- Hair pulling – 20%;
- Bone breaking – 8%;
- Multiple methods of the above – 78%.

The reasons why young people self-harm included: -

- To release tension caused by anxiety, grief or anger;
- As a means of communication to tell themselves and others they needed help;
- To feel as though they had control over something in their lives;
- To make 'real' emotional pain they were unable to express.

There were annual increases in the rates of self-harming around the times of exams. It was believed that the economic climate was also responsible for increases, including issues relating to unemployment.

Reports from young people suggested that the top ten reasons/ problems included: -

1. Schoolwork;
2. Fights with parents;
3. Friend's deliberate self-harm;
4. Boyfriend/girlfriend problems;
5. Fights with friends;
6. Parents fighting (including domestic abuse issues);
7. Family deliberate self-harm;
8. Family illness;
9. Death of someone close;
10. Making friends.

Young people were not categorised to just one group but research showed that the main groups identified to be at risk included: -

- Young men in prison;
- Some ethnic groups;
- Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender young people;
- Young people in rural communities;
- Young people in local authority care;
- Young people with a mental health problem.

Adults and older people could also self-harm.

The presentation included information about: -

- What can help young people to reduce self-harming;
- Who can help, including universal services and Tier 2 and 3 services;
- Current and future work in Rotherham: -
 - Training for universal workers;
 - Self-harm guidance and pathway for frontline workers;
 - Information for parents on warning signs to look out for, advice and guidance on how to talk to their children. Directory of Services to be available for all stakeholders in early 2014 detailing support services for young people with emotional/mental health problems;
 - Self-referrals for 14-18 year olds currently undertaken between CAMHS and Youth Start.

Discussion ensued and the following items were raised: -

- **How had the statistics and information around this information been gathered? Some of the information has been gathered at a national level.** The information had been gathered between partner agencies who sat on the Rotherham Suicide Prevention and Self-Harm Group.
- **Could useful information around support and prevention be provided on the internet when someone searched for this subject?** – Yes, this has been raised and is being looked into using the same approach that had been taken with regards to pay day loans.
- **Had self-harm always taken place, or was it a more recent occurrence?** – The full extent of this was unknown, however, the changing nature of childhood was a likely cause of the increased prevalence. Some evidence suggested that some young people were self-harming in more superficial ways to fit-in with friends who self-harmed. It may have been prevalent in the past but was hidden and stigmatised.
- **What role could school buddies/mentors take to support their peers, and what other information sharing/joint working could take place?** – Support networks did exist, however, sometimes information sharing and possible support networks were not always appropriate.
- **What information was available via social media?**
- **The role and importance of schools;**
- **The Healthy School Conference in Rotherham;**
- **Prevention and early intervention work through the youth service and voluntary services;**
- **Partnership working with Families for Change;**
- **How was it made sure that no-one fell through the gaps?**
- **A one page directory of services that could help would be useful for Councillors.**

An update was provided by the Voice and Influence Youth Worker in relation to the discussions that had been undertaken at Youth Cabinet relating to the 2014 theme. A working-group of the Youth Cabinet had requested that case studies be sought in relation to the range of experiences relating to self-harm. The Youth Cabinet had highlighted that there was a wide-range of reported experiences. Some of the individuals in Rotherham's rural areas were not aware of the support networks available, the range of support and recognition available from schools varied. Access to and awareness of school nurses differed too, as did after care support.

Consideration of the case studies by the Youth Cabinet and a working-group of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would take place on either 16th or 30th January, 2014. All agencies would be represented to discuss the theme. It was agreed that Councillors Falvey, Steele and Currie (Beck as substitute) would represent the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

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

(2) That the theme of self-harm be accepted as the 2014 joint review topic between the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the Youth Cabinet.

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board receive and consider the recommendations of the Youth Cabinet and working-group of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Councillors Falvey, Steele and Currie (substitute = Beck) relating to the case studies considered in January, and the recommendations also be forwarded to all Councillors for their information.

(4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board escalate to a national level their feelings relating to the omission of important support relating to self-harm in Ofsted's Inspection Framework.

(5) That consideration be given to the involvement of the voluntary and community sector, parent representatives and Families for Change representatives in the scoping discussion stage of the scrutiny review.

(6) That work be undertaken to create a concise directory of services and support networks for the reference of Councillors and stakeholders.

(7) That the issue of self-harm be referred to the Health Select Commission.

84. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

This issue was addressed in Item 83.

85. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15TH NOVEMBER, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 15th November, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

86. WORK IN PROGRESS

An update was provided by representatives from each of the Select Commissions.

Self-Regulation Select Commission: -

Councillor D. Beck, Vice-Chair of the Self-Regulation Select Commission, reported on the Scrutiny Reviews that the Commission were undertaking:

-

- Procurement;
- Budget
- Corporate Priorities

A recent meeting of the Commission had considered the initial budget proposals, and the January meeting of the Commission would consider the final budget proposals. An additional meeting would take place on 19th December, 2013, to consider the items relating to revenue budget monitoring and performance.

The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would be invited to attend the January meeting of the Commission.

Improving Places Select Commission: -

Councillor J. Falvey, Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission, reported on the previous meeting of the Commission. Update reports had been received on the community infrastructure levy, housing repairs (including voids) and grounds maintenance. Improving Places had requested regular updates on these areas. The meeting had also considered local planning and tourism areas. The Scrutiny Review report relating to the homelessness review would be drafted during January.

Improving Lives Select Commission: -

Councillor G. A. Russell, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, reported on the forthcoming meeting of the Commission. In addition, the report into the Scrutiny Review of bullying was being written up.

Health Select Commission: - Friday 24 January 2014 at 9.00 am

Councillor B. Steele, Chair of the Health Select Commission, reported on the continuing work of the Commission. The current work programme included healthy lifestyles, long-term conditions and poverty. This would be monitored over the year. Other issues included the air ambulance, and parking facilities at the Rotherham District General Hospital. An update on the Autism Spectrum Condition review had been requested, including barriers being faced. The Scrutiny Review into carers was under completion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

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

There had been no requests for any decisions to be Called In.

88. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday 24th January, 2014, to start at 9.00 a.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
27th November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Johnston, Pickering, Read, Sims, Swift, Vines and Whysall; together with Councillor R. S. Russell (Cabinet Member for Waste and Emergency Planning).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dodson, Ellis, Roche and P. A. Russell and from co-opted members Mrs. P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

31. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

32. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

33. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 16TH OCTOBER, 2013

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 16th October, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to item 25 (Planning Obligations, Section 106 Agreements, Updated Accounts Information), a further report be submitted to the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, to be held on 26th March, 2014, detailing the financial transactions of the corporate Section 106 account.

34. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY VIABILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

Further to Minute No. 12 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 24th July, 2013, consideration was given to a presentation from the Senior Planner concerning the Rotherham Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability and Infrastructure Study.

The presentation included the following salient issues:-

- : definition and application of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- : legislative changes and the CIL being the replacement for Section 106 agreements;

- : implementation of legislative changes with effect from April 2015;
- : the requirement to avoid 'double dipping', so that developers must not be charged both for the CIL and for the terms of a Section 106 agreement affecting a single new development;
- : plans showing the CIL charging zones within the Rotherham Borough area;
- : projections of revenue from the CIL, for the duration of the Rotherham Local Plan to 2028;
- : the effect of the CIL upon neighbourhood plans and parishes;
- : details of the CIL (Amendment) Regulations 2013;
- : consultation about the Borough Council's infrastructure priorities during 2014 and also on the draft charging schedule;
- : the various comments received during the initial consultation (Autumn 2013) about the draft charging schedule;
- : the infrastructure delivery mechanism.

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

- : the implications for existing developments which have already received planning permission (eg: the Waverley development); it was noted that the CIL would not be applied to any such development;
- : charging zones and the possibility of sub-divisions within these zones; further sub-division would need to reflect availability or viability evidence – at present neither circumstance exists;
- : review of the CIL charging and delivery mechanism; there would have to be public consultation and examination prior to any changes being approved;
- : the likelihood that the revenue from the CIL will not be sufficient to fund all of the Borough's infrastructure priorities; the public consultation process, taking place during 2014, will include details of the proposed infrastructure priorities; other funding sources will be required, in addition to the CIL;
- : a request for differential charges for greenfield sites and for brownfield sites can be investigated, but would need to rely on the availability of supporting viability evidence;
- : a request that the CIL for large developments (such as Bassingthorpe Farm) be increased;
- : concern that schemes known to be coming forward are demonstrating viability and could warrant higher CIL rates (eg: in the eastern area of Rotherham).

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

(2) That a further progress report about the Rotherham Community Infrastructure Levy be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission during February or March 2014.

35. HOUSING REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 41 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 28th November, 2012, consideration was given to a report presented by the Contract and Service Development Manager, describing the progress of the repairs and maintenance service provided for this Council's Housing Stock during the last twelve months. The report stated that the service is provided by the Willmott Dixon Partnership and by Morrison Facility Services. During the past year, the Mears company has taken over ownership of Morrison Facility Services.

Members noted that, subject to there being continuing satisfactory performance, the contracts with both companies will be extended until 31st March, 2017. Any possible extensions of the contract, in the future, will be subject to review. Contained within the report were details of:-

- : shared financial savings and value for money
- : customer volunteer inspections and mystery shopper exercises
- : key performance indicators and performance management
- : learning from complaints
- : responsive repairs
- : void properties (the 'turn-around time' of these properties for re-letting)
- : gas and cyclical works
- : gas responsive repairs
- : planned and capital works
- : aids and adaptations
- : quality assurance (ie: assessment of the quality of work undertaken)
- : the contractors' corporate and social responsibility.

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

- : void properties being repaired and available for re-letting within 28 days;
- : ensuring that repairs are completed in a timely manner;
- : servicing of gas boilers as part of a planned programme of maintenance (including: (i) the replacement of older boilers for which spare parts are no longer available; (ii) repairs to condensing boilers affected by freezing temperatures; (iii) provision of instructions to tenants about the operation of boilers and (iv) annual gas servicing and certification);
- : ensuring effective communication with housing tenants, when carrying out repairs to their properties;
- : issues concerning planned maintenance and responsive repairs – specifying the trade(s) required for each repair;
- : the 'decent homes' initiative and its emphasis upon the internal refurbishment of properties, rather than external repairs;
- : the use of temporary repairs, in advance of a planned maintenance scheme in a housing area;

- : health and safety issues;
- : selection of contractors for specific projects, such as re-roofing schemes.

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

(2) That a further report about the progress of the housing repairs and maintenance service be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, during the Spring 2014 and such report include details of issues concerning the repair of void properties prior to their being available for re-letting.

**36. GROUND MAINTENANCE REVIEW: MONITORING
REPORT/UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 53 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 27th March, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Director of Streetpride, concerning progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services. A copy of the updated action plan was included with the submitted report.

The report stated that the main areas of progress are:-

- : the adaptation of machinery and equipment (e.g.: the introduction of different mowing machines and street cleansing vehicles);
- : changes to operative working hours (e.g.: trialling of more flexible working hours);
- : changes to methods of operation (e.g.: introduction of wild flower schemes, areas of relaxed maintenance, and alternative approaches to scheduled work);
- : the identification of additional resources to provide a greater number of grass cuts on certain housing sites (nb: the sustainability of this action is uncertain due to budget constraints); and
- : the identification of a budget partially to support employee absences due to leave (nb: this budget will be introduced in 2014/15).

Members noted the following continuing challenges faced by these services:-

- : the capacity to adapt to the impact of weather conditions (e.g.: during times of severe weather, or of fast vegetation growth);
- : the impact of cost increases (e.g.: of fuel and equipment); and
- : the impact of worsening attitudes to littering, fly tipping, etc.

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

- : the use of urban gardening (eg: planting of vegetables) as an alternative to shrub-bed areas – community groups and organisations

such as 'Rotherham in Root' are invited to suggested suitable, safe areas for this initiative; an early example exists at the 'walled garden' in Clifton Park, Rotherham;

- : the efficient and effective use of limited resources – (i) the trial scheme of street cleansing undertaken in the Clifton area of Rotherham and (ii) the trial of alternative methods of street cleansing undertaken throughout the Borough area, both during 2013; the outcomes of these trials are currently being evaluated;
- : involving volunteers in the community in street cleansing and litter-picking schemes (eg: at Wath upon Dearne);
- : completion of street cleansing schedules after temporary delays, for example, due to the breakdown of machinery; it was acknowledged that these schedules and priorities were sometimes altered for specific reasons;
- : the current review of the method of removing detritus from the highway (a report is soon to be considered by the Cabinet Member and Advisers for Waste and Emergency Planning);
- : the forthcoming replacement of the street cleansing machinery for use within the Rotherham town centre and in some outlying areas of the Borough; the new machines to be purchased will be capable of being transported to different areas;
- : the arrangements for the collection of green waste, from households, at intervals of four weeks during the Winter months;
- : the impact of budget reductions on service delivery (eg: affecting the removal of weeds from the highway);
- : improvements made to the appearance of certain areas of highway within the Borough (eg: the roundabout at the entrance to Retail World at Parkgate);
- : the comparative expense of replacing soft ground areas (which require regular and frequent maintenance) with low-maintenance, decorative asphalt;
- : grass retardant spraying – and ensuring that the products used are effective, but are not harmful to the environment; the need to adhere to regulations issued by the Environment Agency;
- : the identification of Council-owned sites which may be declared surplus to requirements and eventually offered for sale;
- : the promotion of the grounds maintenance services to schools;

- : the use of 'Billy-Goat' machines for street cleansing around the Borough area, although because of noise issues, not in the Rotherham town centre;
- : engaging with the community and supporting community groups in the organisation of volunteer street cleansing and litter-picking (eg: via the Area Assemblies (there are good practices in the Greasbrough/Rockingham area) and with funding from the Councillors' Community Leadership Fund); the role of the volunteer Streetpride champions;
- : Councillors and Council employees being 'ears and eyes' in the community and reporting issues which require attention from the Streetpride service;
- : this Council spends a relatively low amount, per head of population, on street cleansing and grounds maintenance services, in comparison to Rotherham's statistical neighbour local authorities.

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

(2) That a further progress report be submitted to this Select Commission, in twelve months' time, on the progress of the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
10th December, 2013**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Atkin, Beck, Buckley, Burton, Clark, Currie, Dalton, Dodson, Gilding, Goulty, Hoddinott, Kaye, Lakin, Pickering, Read, Roddison, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, Sangster, Sims, Steele, Watson, Swift, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Jepson and Smith.

STRATEGIC COMMISSIONING FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES.

Councillor P. Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, introduced Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services Directorate, and Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioning Manager, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate. Joyce and Chrissy had prepared a presentation for Elected Members informing them of how commissioning for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) worked.

As background to the issues, Joyce outlined the following: -

- There was a statutory obligation to annually consult with all stakeholders on the commissioning plan;
- Ofsted inspections of services included scrutiny of the service's commissioning framework;
- The differences between commissioning and procurement;
- The role of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment in commissioning framework would provide a 'golden thread' between need and commissioning of services.

Chrissy provided an overview of the position of commissioning for Children and Young Peoples' Services in the Council and its functions: -

- Directorate-wide commissioning was located in the Neighbourhood and Adult Services (NAS) Directorate;
- Commissioning's functions were: -
 - Not limited to buying things, although procurement was part of the process;
 - Learning the views of all stakeholders to determine need and address through the commissioning process;
 - Aligning corporate strategies and policies;
 - Maintaining links with the provider market;
 - Directing local resources to ensure the best outcomes for children and young people.

The Commissioning Team: -

- Commissioned Social Care on behalf of CYPS and the Health and Wellbeing Board by utilising revenue and grant allocations;
- Decommissioned to recommission for Early Intervention and Prevention to deliver efficiencies;
- Managed contract quality, performance and value for money on external contracts for the CYPS Directorate;
- Ensured compliance with statutory national standards and external inspection regimes including the CQC and Ofsted;
- Identified and realised budget savings, for example, the regional commissioning authority, the White Rose Consortium, delivered efficiencies on commissioning of placements for looked after children;
- Ensured Safeguarding was commissioned and delivered without compromise in all instances.

Recent achievements of the Commissioning Team: -

- Achieved significant levels of financial savings since 2011, without adverse customer impact;
- Contributed to and led regional and sub-regional commissioning frameworks for looked after children and Fostering Service (a similar approach for special educational needs was ongoing);
- Introduced the Contracting Concerns database that allowed stakeholders to report safeguarding concerns and the Council to manage, investigate and respond/ take appropriate action;
- “Transformed CYPS commissioning”;
- Introduced a range of customer-focused service improvements.

CYPS Commissioning was driven by reference to the Four Big Things (keeping children and young people safe, prevention and early intervention, tackling inequality and transforming Rotherham learning) and optimising efficiencies. CYPS’ current commissioning priorities were: -

- Special Educational Needs reforms;
- Commissioning of in-house services;
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services;
- Maternity and Children’s service – with a focus on prevention and early intervention;
- CHC;
- Market position statement;
- Commissioning in partnership with health partners.

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

- The role and importance of prevention and early intervention activities for cost avoidance in the long run. For example, 75% of hospital admissions relating to asthma could be avoided with better management in the community;

- The importance of ensuring the CYPS commissioning remained a priority when considered against Adult Services and Health commissioning;
- The position of commissioning in the Council's organisational structure. Would the Service's placement in NAS's structure mean that CYPS commissioning would not be as prominent?
- No. The Strategic Manager was a champion for childrens' commissioning and was working with Council Directorates and partners to ensure that it remained a high priority. The revised JSNA document was also in place to ensure that CYPS had an adequate commissioning framework and would be updated on a quarterly.
- A number of recent and continuing Scrutiny Reviews were looking at commissioning's role in the Council, including the completed Domestic Abuse Scrutiny Review undertaken by the Improving Lives Select Commission and the ongoing Self-Regulation Select Commission Scrutiny Review into Commissioning and Procurement.
 - One area of the scope of the continuing Scrutiny Review was the role for local authority commissioning in using and championing local providers and the local economy, providing local added value and encouraging smaller companies to bid for contracts. In addition to performance management and governance of the commissioning process and voice and influence role for stakeholders.
 - The Strategic Commissioning Manager confirmed that the Commissioning Team did see their role as a contributor to the local economy in conjunction with the provisions relating to EU Commissioning Regulations. This already happened, for example, a stipulation for a local base had been written into the contract for Health Watch Rotherham.
 - Were the Commissioning Team close enough to the front-line to know and understand their needs, how were they ensuring that quality remained high in a time of reducing resources and how were personal budgets affecting service planning?
 - All members of the Commissioning Team had operational backgrounds in social care and additional qualifications in business, consultation and negotiation. They operated closely with Directorates and front line workers. All members of the Team saw their ultimate customer as children, young people and families, and worked hard to ensure that they got the best outcomes. The Team conducted open book accounting exercises and had positioned itself to support individuals utilise their personal budgets. The Connect to Support service that currently provided a database for adult services would be rolled-out to include a directory of services for children and young people.
 - Concerns existed around ensuring that private providers were fully meeting contract obligations around expectations, customer care requirements and staff terms and conditions, including payment of the minimum wage and certain minimum terms and conditions.

- The Council had the ability to default from contracts where it felt that basic needs and standards were not being met. Within CYPS an independent Review Team worked with service users to ensure that their needs were being met and they were satisfied with the levels of care provided. When provision was not considered to be adequate, or had received an inadequate inspection outcome from Ofsted, careful consideration was given to the placement to ensure that a managed move to better quality provision worked in the best interests of the child/young person involved.
- Financial savings could be achieved through commissioning without directly affecting the quality of the front-line services. For example, regional commissioning meant that management fees for contracts could be shared between all of the local authorities rather than stood by each local authority individually. In addition, bringing services in-house removed management and accommodation fees, which could be absorbed by existing structures and resources in the Council, without impacting negatively on the quality of provision directly accessed by children and young people.
- Concerns existed that external providers have been known to pay their workers less than the minimum wage and not honour expenses. Could Rotherham guarantee that they would not use providers where this was the case?
 - The Council was considering the implications of the living wage. There were safeguards in place so that commissioners could determine the amount paid to workers. Through commissioning to reduce costs, including management fees, the Council aimed to achieve efficiencies.

Councillor Lakin thanked Joyce and Chrissy for their informative presentation, which was echoed by Members present, and contribution to the discussion. Councillor Lakin also thanked the Members present for their robust questions of the Officers present.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
31st December, 2013

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

**CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) - METZ BAR,
6 MAIN STREET, ROTHERHAM**

The Sub-Committee considered an application and certificate, submitted by South Yorkshire Police, for the interim steps which could be taken pending the full review hearing on Friday 24th January, 2014 for the premises licence in respect of the premises known as the Metz Bar, 6 Main Street, Rotherham. It was noted that the Licensing Act 2003 had been amended by the Violent Crime Reduction Act, 2006, with the insertion of Section 53A and Section 53B, which enabled the Police to instigate a fast track review of a premises licence where the Police considered that licensed premises may be associated with serious crime, or serious disorder, or both.

Accordingly, the Licensing Authority received representations from the South Yorkshire Police which were not withdrawn and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Sub-Committee heard representations from Detective Inspector Hobson, Inspector Bentley and the Licensing Manager, Mrs. Mumby, on behalf of South Yorkshire Police and also from Stephen Metcalfe, the owner and designated premises supervisor of the Metz Bar and from several of his employees.

Members heard that the Metz Bar premises had been a cause for concern for the South Yorkshire Police because a serious incident occurred when a patron/customer of the premises received injuries on the premises, an incident witnessed by other customers early on Christmas morning, Wednesday 25th December, 2013.

The premises owner, Mr. Metcalfe, responded to questions from the Sub-Committee and from the South Yorkshire Police representatives.

The Sub-Committee gave due consideration to this expedited review of the Metz Bar premises licence, with specific reference to these licensing objectives: public safety; the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.

Resolved:- That, after due consideration of the application for expedited review and to the representations submitted, the following interim measures shall apply to the premises licence in respect of the Metz Bar, 6 Main Street, Rotherham, until the full review of the premises licence has been determined in accordance with the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003:-

- (i) On New Year's Day, Wednesday 1st January 2014, the licensed hours will cease at 01.00 a.m.;
- (ii) Door staff will be employed and on duty whenever members of the public are on the premises;
- (iii) Door staff will use a metal detector wand on every person seeking entry to the premises;
- (iv) Notices shall be displayed advising customers that searches will be conducted using the metal detector wand;
- (v) The last person to leave the premises each day/night shall be the Designated Premises Supervisor or other nominated paid member of staff; and
- (vi) Door staff will conduct searches of all areas of the premises, including toilet areas and a written record of such activity shall be maintained.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
7th January, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Atkin, Beck, Dalton, Dodson, Ellis, Gosling, Goult, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, Kaye, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Rushforth, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, R. S. Russell, Sangster, Sharman, Sims, Smith, Watson, Swift, Vines, Wallis, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Barron, Clark, Hoddinott and Jepson.

**THE NEW UK VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM AND HOW
INDIVIDUAL ELECTORAL REGISTRATION WILL IMPACT ON
ROTHERHAM.**

Councillor J. Akhtar, Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced Mags Evers, Electoral Services Manager, Michelle Mellor, Senior Electoral Services Officer and Jacqueline Collins, Director of Legal and Democratic Services to the Seminar. A presentation had been prepared in relation to the New UK voter registration system that was due to come into effect on 10th June, 2014. The presentation also included an assessment of the likely impact of the changes in Rotherham.

The presentation included: -

- An overview of the current 'dual system' in operation, including how canvassing worked;
- The new individual system was designed to enable everyone eligible to vote to have control over their registration and take more ownership of the process;
- Under the new system, individuals would be required to provide identifying information when they registered (date of birth and National Insurance number) to allow their identity to be verified before they were added to the register;
- The aims of the new system were to: -
 - Reduce electoral fraud and increase the public's confidence in the system;
 - Make individuals responsible for their own registration;
 - Modernise electoral registration by allowing individuals to register on-line.

The 'key dates' leading up to implementation were considered. From 10th June, 2014, all new applications would be required to produce personal identifiers. On 1st December, 2014, the new register would be published. Transitional arrangements would mean that most people already registered would be automatically transferred to the new system. In addition a carry forward provision would ensure that no existing elector would lose their vote at the 2015 elections, the next elections following transition.

- A prescribed exemptions process would exist for people who could not provide their NI number or date of birth;
- Signatures would not be required;
- Verification process for the personal identifiers.

An exercise had been undertaken whereby the existing electoral register was matched against the Department for Work and Pensions' records and local data. A trial-run had been completed and the average match rate across the nation was 78%. Rotherham's match rate was 85.47%, and this increased to 91.76% when matched against local data.

The match rate for each of Rotherham's Wards was shared. All of the Wards were above the national average match rate.

The transitional arrangements that would be in place included: -

- Confirmation letters would be sent between July and November 2014 along with Invitations to Register (ITR) to any existing electors who could not be automatically transferred (confirmed);
- By law the ITR had to be followed up by two reminders and at least one follow-up visit;
- Household Enquiry Forms (HEF) to properties where no-one was registered – also followed up by reminders and visit(s);
- There was the potential for a small number of proxy and postal voters to lose their preference to vote and they would have to attend a polling station to vote;
- A process of public engagement planned after the 2014 election;
- Autumn 2015 would be the first full canvass undertaken using Individual Electoral Registration with a Household Enquiry Form (HEF) being sent to each property with an Invitation to Register (ITR) sent to each new individual identified by the HEF;
- The system brought about the need for year-round reminders and personal canvassing outside the annual canvass period;
- Government funding of £108 million had been committed to funding the additional burdens caused through Individual Electoral Registration transition period, with approximately £64k coming to Rotherham in 2013/14 on top of the existing allocation;
- A recent announcement had stated that forms would have to be in a standard prescribed A3 size and funds for the additional costs caused by this decision would be announced separately.

The impact of Individual Electoral Registration in Rotherham: -

- Electors – the vast majority would transfer to the new system and new applicants would be able to apply on-line for the first time;
- Finance – under watching brief;
- Staffing – an emerging picture was being gathered relating to increased work-loads. A requirement may arise for some year-round posts which had previously existed on a casual, short-term

basis;

- Registers - would be more secure and some of the new requirements should help keep them more up-to-date all year round;
- Elections – for the 2014 election there would be no impact, for the 2015 election some absent people could lose their proxy/postal vote and by 2016 the Individual Electoral System would be the norm and all registers should be accurate and up-to-date.

Discussion ensued on the following points were raised: -

- **Would there be penalties for deliberate non-registration?** – Yes, the Electoral Registration Officer would have the power, subject to following certain prescribed procedures, to impose a fixed penalty in certain cases.
- **Specific household circumstances were raised:** -
 - Would multiple forms be received by each individual eligible to vote in a household
 - Registering young people who were due to become eligible to vote;
 - Sharing information between different agencies, including Council Tax;
 - Requirement to issue an invitation to register (ITR) within 28 days of the Electoral Registration Officer becoming aware of the changed circumstance;
 - The developments required in the software systems used by Electoral Services to track registrations and ensure statutory reminders and follow ups at the right time.
- **Were there any changes to students' rights to vote at home and their University address or students' registration process?** – No changes to their right to register at both addresses. Electoral Registration Officers in towns/cities with student populations were developing processes to ensure students have the opportunity to register at their term-time address.
- **The registration of other potentially vulnerable groups, including people living in residential homes and people in the Armed Forces, especially those posted abroad** – In its public engagement strategy Electoral Services has identified people in residential homes as one of the groups that may need additional support and was developing the appropriate services. People in the Armed Forces would not be affected until the expiry of their current 5 year registration period. Electoral Services would contact them by post and by email in good time to allow them to reapply. The availability of online registration was likely to be particularly welcomed by this group.
- **The ability to opt-out of the edited register that was published** - This option was to remain available under the new system and it was likely that there would be a change to the rules so that once an individual had opted-out, they would remain opted-out unless they should actively choose to opt in to the edited register.

- **Potential for fraudulent activity to be detected under the new system, including identity theft** – The new requirement that personal identifiers must be verified before an application may be granted would significantly reduce the opportunity to register fraudulently as a step towards identity theft.
- **Registration of postal votes.**
- **Government funding model to reflect the new system** – Rotherham was in a good position following their high match rate in the trial run and the anticipated outcome of the real exercise. This meant that less follow-up work would have to be undertaken in Rotherham. Councils that had lower match rates would have more work to do to ensure that all non-matches were followed-up and rectified.
- **Registration levels compared to Population figures** - The population aged 17+ in 2012 was 205,526 of which 196,396 were registered so 9,130 were not on register (4.4%).

Councillor Akhtar thanked the Officers for their attendance and informative presentation and contribution to the discussion. The Elected Members present were also thanked for their attendance and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
2nd December, 2013

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor R. Sixsmith

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar

Councillor T. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor R. Davison

Councillor H. Harpham

Councillor T. Hussain

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. D. Carter

Apologies for Absence were received from:-

Councillor M. Dyson (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council)

Mayor R. Jones (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Councillor P. Bartlett (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Mr. K. Walayat, Co-opted Member.

J16. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Councillor Harry Harpham be elected Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel for the remaining part of the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

(Councillor Harpham in the Chair)

Councillor Harpham wished to thank Councillor Mirfin-Boukouris for her work and the breadth of experience she brought to the Panel.

J17. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A member of the public referred to the lack of road safety measures in the Police and Crime Plan and asked now A.C.P.O. had recently issued revised guidelines to all Police Forces, how would this influence the Police and Crime Plan for South Yorkshire?

The Chairman confirmed that this was not a question for the Police and Crime Panel to answer, but on this occasion this had been forwarded to the Office of the Police Crime Commissioner who would issue the response.

J18. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 2nd September, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 2nd September, 2013 be agreed as a true record.

J19. CENTRE FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY SUPPORT SESSION - 18TH NOVEMBER, 2013

Further to Minute No. J13 (Introduction of the CFPS Expert Adviser) consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided the Panel with a summary of key issues arising from the support session, facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny, held on 18th November, 2013.

The session addressed a number of issues, which included:-

- Scrutiny of budgets was important and needed to be more detailed by the Panel. This would require earlier and regular sight of information from the Police and Crime Commissioner and access to financial/accountancy advice by the Panel.
- Performance management still needed to improve. The Panel would like to develop a performance management framework with the Police and Crime Commissioner. This would include clear, measurable targets, including targets from the District Community Safety Partnerships.
- To request a breakdown of information by Local Authority from the Police and Crime Commissioner, for example, the number of Police Officers in each and movement between them.
- Support for the Panel was important, in addition to the finance issue. Other areas identified included understanding of the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner, partnerships to work with (Community Safety Partnerships, Local Authority Scrutiny panels and the Criminal Justice Board).
- Task and Finish Groups should be established to facilitate this inter-agency working and sharing of information. It was suggested that this could be piloted with Domestic Abuse.
- A clear understanding of roles and responsibilities between the partners was required and agreed through protocols.
- Local Authority Scrutiny Panels should share work programmes with the Police and Crime Panel to help with the development of South Yorkshire wide priorities

- The Panel needed a work plan based on the priorities within the Police and Crime Plan.
- Pre-meetings, briefings and triangulation of information should be used to make meetings more effective.

Moving forward from the development session a number of next steps were proposed. These included:-

- A request to the Police and Crime Commissioner for timely and regular financial information, including early discussions around the proposed precept
- Setting up of a task and finish group to look at a performance management framework for the Police and Crime Commissioner. Officer support from both the Panel's and the Commissioner's perspective to be incorporated.
- Information sheets on key partner agencies to be provided (Jo Sykes already actioning)
- Establishment of a Task and Finish Group to look at Domestic Abuse.
- Development of protocols in conjunction with the Commissioner, Community Safety Partnerships, Local Authority Scrutiny Panels and Criminal Justice Board
- Development and approval of a work plan. First draft to be available for the meeting.

Those that attended from the Panel found the event a source of valuable information and believed that it enriched their knowledge going forward.

It was suggested that Task and Finish Groups be set up and nominations be sought accordingly.

Resolved:- (1) That the key issues as summarised in this report be noted.

(2) That the next steps for the Panel as set out in the report be approved.

(3) That volunteers be sought for a Task and Finish Group to look at Domestic Abuse.

J20. UPDATE ON THE OPERATION OF THE COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Consideration was given to a report presented by Stuart Fletcher, Deputy Monitoring Officer, which provided an update for the Panel with regard to the nature and level of complaints received and to consider the operation of the complaints procedure.

There have been a total of ten complaints received. Those complaints have been processed with:-

- One being considered by the Panel.
- Four not proceeded with (decision of the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.
- Two not accepted as falling within the Complaints Procedure.
- One considered by a Sub-Committee of the Panel
- One referred to the Independent Complaints Commission.
- One still under consideration.

The details of all of the complaints, other than the one currently being considered, have been reported to the Panel.

At its meeting of the 28th January, 2013, the Panel agreed to review its Complaints Procedure after its initial period of operation, which had been drafted in accordance with the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012. To ensure the appropriate balance of the proper overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the consideration of only those matters which were of sufficient significance to be resolved by the Panel, the following minor amendments (in bold) were suggested to the Complaints Procedure, which would assist with the proper administration:-

“Circumstances when the Panel does not need to deal with a complaint

22. The Monitoring Officer can decide, having consulted the Chair and Vice Chair, not to refer the complaint for resolution, or to take no action at all, in the following circumstances:-
 - A complaint by a member of the Commissioner’s staff, arising from their work
 - A complaint that is more than 12 months old where there is no good reason for the delay or the delay would be likely to cause injustice
 - A complaint about conduct that is already the subject of another complaint
 - An anonymous complaint
 - A complaint which is vexatious, oppressive, trivial or otherwise an abuse of process for dealing with complaints
 - A repetitious complaint
 - A premature complaint
23. The complainant will be notified if the decision is taken not to deal with a complaint.”

Resolved:- (1) That the update regarding the operation of the Complaints Procedure be noted.

(2) That the amendments to the Complaints Procedure, as proposed, be approved.

J21. POLICING IN AUSTERITY: RISING TO THE CHALLENGE

Further to Minute No. J11 of the meeting of the Panel held on 2nd September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by Shaun Wright, the Police and Crime Commissioner, which provided the Panel with information in relation to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) report "Policing in Austerity: Rising to the Challenge" and the response by the Police and Crime Commissioner to the South Yorkshire Police's response to the funding challenge report.

In October 2010, the Government announced that central funding to the Police Service in England and Wales would reduce by 20% in the four years between March, 2011 and March, 2015.

HMIC's Valuing the Police Programme had tracked how forces were planning to make savings to meet this budget demand each year since the Summer of 2011. The South Yorkshire Police's response to the funding challenge report, published in July, 2013, identified what HMIC found in the third year.

The inspection focused on three questions:-

1. How is the force responding to the budget reduction?
2. What is the impact for the workforce and the public?
3. How is the force managing current and future risks?

To answer these questions, HMIC collected data and plans from forces, surveyed the public to see if they had noticed any changes in the service they received from the Police as a result of the cuts and conducted in-force inspections. HMIC also interviewed the Chief Constable, Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Officer Leads for finance, change, human resources and performance in each force as well as holding focus groups with staff and other officers.

The Police and Crime Commissioner reported that South Yorkshire Police faced a more difficult challenge than some other forces. Although spending on policing was lower than in most forces and staff costs higher, South Yorkshire had not embraced the level of change or achieved the savings seen elsewhere.

The Force still had £9.6m to find by March, 2015, but the HMIC had expressed concern that this outstanding financial gap meant that South Yorkshire Police would find it very hard to make any further savings required in the future.

South Yorkshire Police had identified that it needed to save £49.3m over the four years of the spending) and had planned how it would save £39.6m.

To reduce its expenditure South Yorkshire Police planned to reduce Police Officer numbers by limiting recruitment and holding vacancies as it was planned there would be 256 fewer Police Officers in the South Yorkshire Police. This meant the number of Police Officers was planned to reduce by 9% between March, 2013 and March, 2015.

The force had also made some Police staff redundant and not replaced others as they have left (e.g. through retirements and resignations); as a result, by the end of the spending review period, it was planned there would be 555 fewer Police staff in the South Yorkshire Police.

It was noted that HMIC expected forces to make savings without damaging the service provided to the public. This was being monitored by the examination of crime rates and the results of the victim satisfaction surveys which all forces conduct.

A number of options were being explored, such as shared I.T., fleet and facilities management, raising the precept and looking to volunteers for assistance.

Unfortunately, the force also faced the additional financial challenges and special circumstances posed by Hillsborough over the next few years. Unless these significant costs were supported by the Home Office, it was likely the impact on the public of South Yorkshire would be even more severe than that already highlighted.

Detailed discussions with the Chief Constable and his Command Team colleagues were ongoing with a view to addressing cost reduction requirements for 2014/15 and establishing a 'strategic vision' to guide budget and resourcing considerations in the medium term.

These matters would be the subject of further reports to the Panel in due course.

Discussion ensued and the Panel asked a number of questions relating to:-

- The use of organisations such as Neighbourhood Watch and other partners and the plans to increase the number of volunteers.
- Collaborations with other forces, such as Humberside.
- The use of legal aid for ex-Police Officers.
- Indemnity Insurance.
- Numbers of Police Community Support Officers and the plans for these to increase.

The Police and Crime Commissioner referred to the importance of such organisations and the framework of volunteers accessed by the Police. He also made reference to the plans to release officers under voluntary early retirement options and the reductions in the road safety figures.

It was also noted that discussions with other Police Forces had been undertaken, but there was no intention to make the Police Service nationally run.

In terms of Hillsborough and the legal aid for ex-Police Officers it was thought any advice should be paid for. The insurance previously held by the Police for any indemnity had since expired and there were no plans for this to be renewed.

In terms of the Police Community Support Officers it was noted that there were roughly around 1,000 Police Officers to be lost over the next three years, so how this differentiated into positions was yet to be determined.

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

J22. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONERS: REGISTER OF INTERESTS UPDATE

Further to Minute No. J12 of the meeting of the Panel held on 2nd September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by Shaun Wright, the Police and Crime Commissioner, which provided the Panel with a progress update in relation to the report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee on Police and Crime Commissioners' Register of Interests.

The aim of the report was to show that regular, national comparisons were important for public confidence and draw together the first register of Police and Crime Commissioners' interests.

The report considered the following areas:-

- The Scrutiny of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs).
- Who are the Police and Crime Commissioners .
- Salaries and Offices.
- Police and Crime Commissioners Profile.

The Panel were informed that Police and Crime Commissioners were required to publish the information that they considered necessary to enable the local public to assess their performance and that of the Chief Constable. In addition, they were required to publish particular information specified by the Home Secretary in regulations issued under Section 11 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act, 2011. The current regulations were the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specific Information) Order 2011.

The report identified that on 19th April, 2013 only ten Police and Crime Commissioners had met their statutory obligations and published the full financial data required (South Yorkshire was not included in this list). However, it was acknowledged that this was rectified before 3rd May, 2013.

The full financial data was published on the Police and Crime Commissioner's website on 26th April, 2013. The Commissioner was also compliant with the requirements of the Specified Information Order.

The report identified the staff in the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) along with the salaries of their deputies and senior staff members.

It identified that the overall force budget for South Yorkshire was (£m) 252.728,773 with the budget for 2013/14 for the South Yorkshire Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner being (£m) 3.144,717. The percentage of the budget utilised by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner in South Yorkshire was 1.24%.

The House of Commons Committee also identified the force areas where the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner budget was more than the Police Authority budget 2012/13 and South Yorkshire was included in this list.

On 22nd May, 2013 the Commissioner wrote to the Home Affairs Committee clarifying the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner budget for 2013/14 as being £2.035m, which was marginally below the equivalent budget for the former Police Authority.

On the day the report was published the Commissioner also issued a press release which stated that the report was incorrect and that his office was not given the opportunity to validate the figures prior to the report being published.

A detailed analysis of the errors in the Report was sent to appropriate officials by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and subsequently published on the Select Committee's website.

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

J23.

DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- that the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel take place on Monday, 20th January, 2014 at the slightly earlier time of 12.00 Noon.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
2nd December, 2013

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor R. Sixsmith

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar

Councillor T. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor R. Davison

Councillor H. Harpham

Councillor T. Hussain

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. D. Carter

Apologies for Absence were received from:-

Councillor M. Dyson (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council)

Mayor R. Jones (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Councillor P. Bartlett (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Mr. K. Walayat, Co-opted Member.

J24. CONFIRMATION HEARING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Head of Human Resources and Business Support of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office, which detailed under Schedule 1, Paragraph 6(a), of the Act, how the Police and Crime Commissioner must notify the Police and Crime Panel of his proposed appointment to the post of 'Head of the Commissioner's Staff' (referred to in this Part as the Commissioner's Chief Executive).

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced Ms. Michelle BATTERY to the Panel and outlined that he considered she had suitable experience and understanding of the community of South Yorkshire and the role of Chief Executive and Solicitor to which it was proposed she be appointed.

The Panel asked a range of questions and listened carefully to the answers provided by Ms. Buttery before coming to a decision.

Resolved:- That the proposed appointment of Ms. Michelle Buttery as Chief Executive and Solicitor for South Yorkshire be approved.

**BARNLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
13th December, 2013**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors R. S. Russell.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillor Ali.

K22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

K23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 7TH OCTOBER 2013

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 7th October, 2013.

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.

K24. 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 – including applications for planning permission for working to take place on Sundays and also to discharge certain planning conditions;

(b) the waste treatment site at Ferrybridge – the new cricket pavilion and the car parking area have been completed;

(c) financial issues and the projection of a balanced budget for the current, 2013/2014 financial year;

(d) appointment to the post of Project Support Officer;

(e) the Open4Business transpenine local event, organised in conjunction with Local Business Development and Procurement Officers from the three Councils and held on 15th October 2013 had been well attended;

(f) Doncaster MBC has begun consultation about the development of a new waste transfer station to be located at Kirk Sandall.

Discussion took place on the need for a site inspection of the Bolton Road

waste treatment site at Wath upon Dearne.

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

(2) That arrangements be made for all Members and officers of this Joint Waste Board to attend a site inspection of the Bolton Road waste treatment site at Wath upon Dearne, on a date to be arranged early in 2014.

K25. RISK REGISTER - STATUS REPORT

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.

K26. 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)).

K27. BDR PFI - BUDGET UPDATE 2013/2014

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

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

K28. 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, 14th March, 2014, 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, 27th June, 2014, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.