

CABINET

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

Date: Wednesday, 6 August 2014

Time: 10.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To consider questions from Members of the Public.
2. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
3. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
4. Declarations of Interest.
5. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 9th July 2014 (copy supplied separately)
6. Revenue Budget Monitoring 2014/15 (report herewith) (Pages 2 - 15)
 - Director of Finance to report.
7. Scrutiny Review of the Sanctions and Conditionality Regime (report herewith) (Pages 16 - 22)
 - Chief Executive to report.
8. CSE 2013/14 Annual Report and 2014/15 Action Plan (report herewith) (Pages 23 - 53)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
9. Children's Centre Budget Options to Achieve Required Savings (report herewith) (Pages 54 - 60)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
10. Priority Schools Building Programme (2) (report herewith) (Pages 61 - 66)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
11. Review of Neighbourhood Centres- Phase Two (report herewith) (Pages 67 - 81)
 - Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services to report.

12. YORbuild2 Construction Framework (report herewith) (Pages 82 - 86)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
13. Business Rates Relief for the new KP Nuts Development at Hellaby (report herewith) (Pages 87 - 89)
 - Director of Finance to report.
14. Nos. 25 - 29 High Street, 'The Three Cranes', and No. 29a High Street (report herewith) (Pages 90 - 93)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
15. Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 (Pages 94 - 99)
16. Exclusion of the Press and Public
Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council)).
17. Applications for Hardship Relief (advance notice given) (report herewith) (Pages 100 - 103)
 - Director of Finance to report.
18. New Discretionary Rate Relief Top Up Applications (report herewith) (advance notice given) (Pages 104 - 108)
 - Director of Finance to report.
19. Community Right to Bid (report herewith) (advance notice given) (Pages 109 - 138)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
20. Former Library and Neighbourhood Office, Rawmarsh Hill, Rawmarsh (report herewith) (advance notice given) (Pages 139 - 151)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
21. Disposal of land at Pithouse West* (report herewith) (Pages 152 - 156)
 - Chief Executive to report.

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

Cabinet Meeting – 6th August, 2014

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

- **Disposal of Pithouse West**

An exemption under Paragraph 3 (information in respect of information relating to finance and business affairs) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is requested, as this report contains commercially sensitive information.

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

Jacqueline Collins
Director of Legal and Democratic Services
25th July, 2014

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET
--

1	Meeting:	CABINET
2	Date:	6th August 2014
3	Title:	Revenue Budget Monitoring for the period ending 30th June 2014
4	Directorate:	Resources

5 Summary

This report provides details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2014/15 based on performance for the first 3 months of the financial year. It is currently forecast that the Council will overspend against its Budget by £6.752m (+3.2%).

Members will recall that when we set the 2014/15 Budget there was recognition that there was the potential for this to be a challenging year with the need to manage service demands very closely and that the level of balances reflects this potential increase in financial risk in the system.

The main reasons for the forecast overspend are:

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough;
- Cost pressures arising from some schools converting to academies;
- Income pressures within Environment and Development Services and ICT;
- Demand pressures for Direct Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients;
- Additional, property costs from the continued rationalisation of the Council's buildings as part of the efficiency drive to reduce operational costs; and
- Some savings targets are currently pending delivery in full in 2014/15.

Cabinet has agreed the implementation of the opportunity for staff to apply for Voluntary Severance/Voluntary Early Retirement and where this can be supported these savings will help to reduce the in-year financial pressure and also contribute to closing the budget funding gap for 2015/16 and beyond.

As the current forecast outturn is significantly different to budget, Cabinet is asked to support the implementation of the same successful 3 stage strategy (section 7.4 of this report) used in 2013/14 to bring spend in line with budget by the end of 2014/15.

The above actions will mitigate the current level of forecast overspend and assist the Council to deliver a balanced outturn and preserve its successful track record in managing both its in year financial performance and its overall financial resilience.

Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

- **Note the current forecast outturn and significant financial challenge presented for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2014/15;**
- **Approve the three Stage strategy to address the forecast overspend as detailed in this report, to bring spend in line with budget by 31st March 2015 and:**
- **Agree that MP's are notified of concerns relating to budget pressures falling on the Council as a result of some Academy Conversions and implementing the requirements of the Care Bill.**

7.1 Proposals and Details

This report presents details of spending against budget by Directorate covering the first 3 months of the 2014/15 financial year – April 2014 to June 2014 – and forecast costs and income to 31st March 2015.

7.2 The Overall Position

Directorate/Service	Annual Budget 2014/15 £'000	Projected Outturn 2014/15 £'000	Forecast Variance after Actions (over(+)/under(-) spend) £'000	%
Children & Young People Services	43,163	45,873	+2,710	+6.3
Academy Conversions (Deficit)	0	167	+167	+100.0
Neighbourhoods & Adult Services	73,838	75,505	+1,667	+2.3
Environment and Development Services	45,757	46,579	+822	+1.8
ICT	2,409	3,574	+1,165	+48.4
Resources	11,169	11,163	-6	-
Central Services	32,549	32,776	+227	+0.7
TOTAL	208,885	215,637	+6,752	+3.2
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	82,509	82,463	-46	-0.1

Appendix 1 to this report provides a detailed explanation of the key areas of forecast over / underspend by Directorate. The summarised position for each Directorate is described below.

Children & Young People's Directorate (+£2.877m forecast overspend)

The forecast overspend for Children's Services is largely due to pressures within the Children & Families Safeguarding Service. A further pressure (+£167k) relates to schools whose finances are in deficit when they convert to academies leaving the Council responsible for funding their accrued deficit.

The number of looked after children requiring placements at the end of June 2014 was 395, a reduction of 5 since the end of March 2014.

Pressures on budgets for provision of Out of Authority Residential placements (+£2.254m) and the provision of independent Foster Care placements (+£114k) are the main service pressures. The cost of placements has increased as children are presenting with more complex needs. The service is looking at how

they can find suitable, alternative, increased value for money placements to meet the needs of these young people.

Children's Social Care services remain under pressure despite the services' proactive approach to drive down costs including:

- Continued operation and challenge by the Multi-Agency Support Panel
- Successful work undertaken by the Commissioning Team which has resulted in the commissioning and re-commissioning of service provider contracts with significant cost reductions/cost avoidance (£321k) to date in 2014/15.

Children's services continue to look for ways to reduce spend.

Environment & Development Services including Internal Audit, Asset Management, Communications & Marketing and Policy & Planning (+£822k forecast overspend)

The Directorate is currently forecasting an overspend of +£822k due to pressures in Streetpride (+£340k), Planning, Regeneration and Customer Services (+£195k) Asset Management (+£259k) and Communications (+£28k). The Business Unit is reporting a balanced budget at this stage in the financial year.

The forecast overspend assumes that the Winter Pressures budget is sufficient to contain costs incurred over the Winter months (2014/15). It should however be noted this budget overspent by +£139k in the mild Winter of 2013/14.

Neighbourhoods and Adult Services including Public Health, Commissioning, Procurement, Performance & Quality and Cohesion (+£1.667m forecast overspend)

Overall the Directorate (including ring-fenced Public Health funded services) is forecasting an overspend of +£1.667m. Within this, Adult Services are forecasting an overspend (+£1.291m) and Neighbourhood services a forecast underspend of -£24k. Commissioning, Procurement, Performance & Quality and Cohesion services are forecasting a collective overspend of (+£400k). Key Directorate pressures include budget savings from previous years not fully achieved in respect of additional continuing health care (CHC) funding plus recurrent pressures on demand for Direct Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients.

There is also a recurrent budget pressure within Commissioning in respect of a savings target from previous years which is pending full delivery.

Public Health Services are currently forecasting a balanced Outturn. (Ring-fenced funding).

The forecast position for Neighbourhoods and Adult Services is made up of a number of under and overspends, detailed in Appendix 1.

Resources Directorate (+£1.159m forecast overspend)

Overall the Directorate is forecasting an overspend of +£1.159m. This is predominantly in respect of income pressures within the ICT service.

Central Services (+£227k forecast overspend)

There are currently two key pressures within Central Services. Rotherham's share of the pension deficit in respect of winding down Local Government Yorkshire & Humber (LGYH) (£80k) and Rotherham's share of the costs for the Economic Regeneration Team within the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority (£147k).

7.3 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) (Forecast underspend -£46k)

The Housing Revenue Account is forecasting a £46k reduction in the transfer from reserves compared with the agreed budget. The HRA had budgeted to use £1.440m from reserves but current forecasts only require £2.110m, a reduction of £46k.

7.4 Strategy to address the forecast overspend

Cabinet will recall that when we were faced with a significant forecast overspend in the first quarter of last year (2013/14) a 3 Stage strategy to address the forecast overspend was implemented as below:

Stage 1 – Directorates should consider appropriate actions which could be implemented to address the forecast overspend. This should include exploring all opportunities to generate additional income and where it may be possible to downsize staffing complements, where it is possible and appropriate to do so. It is proposed that this is undertaken before the end of the Council's summer recess when the impact on the forecast outturn position will be reassessed.

Stage 2 – In the event that Stage 1 does not effectively address the forecast overspend, Directorates should consider what non-essential planned expenditure could be 'slipped' into the next financial year.

Stage 3 – If Stage 2 does not fully address any residual forecast pressure, a moratorium on all non-essential spend should be implemented. The criteria for essential spend being consistent with that applied in previous years:

- Is contractually committed
- Essential for the safeguarding of vulnerable children and adults;
- Required to meet health and safety requirements;
- Spend is required to avoid a false economy;
- Spend which is highly sensitive to local Members or local communities

This strategy was successful in 2013/14 and the Council delivered an outturn slightly under budget.

Cabinet is asked to note that Stage 1 of the strategy has been implemented and to agree that the Chief Executive implements Stages 2 and 3, if necessary, at the appropriate time.

7.5 Stage 1 – Management Actions

In line with Stage 1 of the above strategy, Directorates are currently reviewing opportunities to mitigate the forecast overspend. These include:

- Continued close scrutiny of spend across all Directorates
- Finance clinic arranged to agree further management actions (NAS)
- Ongoing review of high cost care packages to ensure essential spend only (NAS)
- Pursuing Continuing Health Care actively on behalf of customers
- Placement panels continue to scrutinise planned care packages to ensure VFM
- De-LAC-ing children placed at home on care orders (they either need to be home and safe, not on orders) or in care with contact
- Agreeing Special Guardianship residence orders with support and carrying out properly agreed matches with long term foster carers
- Work with children and young people on the edge of care so that we can reduce the teenage population in care
- Look at what we've learnt from the intensive work that Family Recovery Programme (FRP) and Families for Change (FFC) have done
- Consider extending the use of Multi-systemic therapy (CYPS)
- Look at the support we provide to adopters, foster carers and special guardians; and children's relatives and friends.
- Work with team managers and service managers (and partners) to look at how we better provide packages of effective care, and maintain our gatekeeping (CYPS).
- Heritage Services restructure
- Additional income generating opportunities via Business Centres, Markets, Theatre, Libraries and Museum
- Bring forward the planned investment in LED lighting to reduce energy costs
- Renegotiate waste disposal rates
- Increased income generation through improving the all-day parking offer at Sheffield Road car park
- Generate additional Country Park income through invest to save measures
- Wider selling of Insurance expertise
- Selling of valuation services to Academies across South Yorkshire
- Continue the programme of property rationalisation
- Options report being prepared regarding ICT services.

7.6 Agency, Consultancy and Non-Contractual Overtime Costs

It is proposed that details of spend on Agency, Consultancy and Non-Contractual overtime costs will now be included in revenue monitoring reports every 6 months.

7.7 Collection Fund

At this early stage of the financial year it is forecast that the budgeted level of Council Tax and Business Rates will both be achieved.

8. Finance

The financial issues are discussed in section 7 above.

Management actions need to be identified and implemented across all Directorates to bring projected spend in line with Budget limits by the end of March 2015.

9 Risks and Uncertainties

At a time of economic difficulty and tight financial constraints, managing spend in line with the Council's Budget is paramount. Careful scrutiny of expenditure and income across all services and close budget monitoring therefore remain a top priority if the Council is to deliver both its annual and medium term financial plans while sustaining its overall financial resilience.

Although both Council Tax and Business Rates collection levels are currently on target there remains a risk that this could change during the remaining months of the year.

The current forecast assumes that costs associated with the Winter Pressures will be contained within budget. In 2013/14 these costs exceeded budget by £139k.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The delivery of the Council's Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan within the parameters agreed at the start of the current financial year is essential if the objectives of the Council's Policy agenda are to be achieved. Financial performance is a key element within the assessment of the Council's overall performance framework.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2014/15 Report to Council 5th March 2014.
- Strategic Directors and Service Directors of the Council

Contact Name: Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services, ext. 22034
Stuart.Booth@Rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Key reasons for forecast over / underspends

Children & Young People's Services (+£2.877m forecast overspend)

The key factors contributing to the forecast overspend are:

Academy Conversions - Deficits (+£167k)

The forecast over spend is due to provisions for the forecast deficit positions on the following schools when they convert to academies in 2014/15:

Rawmarsh School: a Sports College - £100k (This is in addition to the £300k provided for in the 2013/14 accounts)

Swinton Brookfield - £47k (This is in addition to the £39k provided for in the 2013/14 accounts)

Rawmarsh Monkwood - £20k

Special Education Provision (+£45k)

The forecast overspend is partially due to the projected number of placements in SEN Complex Needs placements (£27k) - 25 current placements & 4 potential new ones. This also includes a forecast overspend on supplies in the Children in Public Care Team (£5k) & a forecast under-recovery of income in the Education Welfare Team due to a change in legislation which no longer allows them to charge Academies (£34k). These forecast overspends are partially offset by forecast underspends (-£21k) on staffing due to vacancies in the Education Psychology Team and Learning Support & Autism Team.

Safeguarding, Children and Families Service Wide (+£36k)

The forecast overspend is mainly on legal fees (+£62k) which is due to an increase in the number of cases going to court and agency costs for the Director of Safeguarding post (+£28k). These forecast overspends are partially offset by forecast underspends in Business Support teams due to income from NHS & some staff not being in the pension scheme (-£54k).

Child Protection Teams (+£1k)

This forecast overspend is due to a slight over spend on staffing in the Safeguarding Unit.

Children in Need Social Work Teams (+£50k)

This forecast overspend is due to Agency staff costs & additional staff appointments over establishment within the Children in Need teams to better maintain business continuity rather than having to recruit expensive agency staff to cover periods between staff leaving and new staff commencing employment in post.

Looked After Children - LAC (+£2,611k)

The service is forecasting an overspend mainly due to out of authority residential placements (+£2,254k) and independent fostering placements (+£114k). This is partially offset by a forecast underspend on the Remand placements budget (-£34k).

The Adoption Reform Grant that was first received in 2013/14 was reduced by £746K in

2014/15. This grant significantly mitigated LAC budget pressures in 2013/14 on a temporary basis.

Further details of placements are below:

Placement Type	2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15 as at 30th June		Actual Number of placements as at 30 June 2014
	Average No. of placements	Average Cost of Placement £ per week	Average No. of placements	Average Cost of Placement £ per week	Average No. of placements	Average Cost of Placement £ per week	Average No. of placements	Average Cost of Placement £ per week	
Out of Authority Residential	18	3,022	21.1	3,206	25	3,245	30.7	3,081	31
<i>R1 Accommodation only</i>	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	11.2	1,659	11
<i>R2 Accommodation & therapy</i>	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	9.3	2,693	9
<i>R3 Accommodation, therapy & education</i>	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	7.6	3,900	9
<i>R4 Parent & Baby</i>	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	0	0	0
<i>Secure</i>	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	2.5	2,698	2
Remand	U/A	U/A	U/A	U/A	1.6	3,154	1.3	287	1
Independent Fostering Agencies	125	887	121	874	107	879	104.3	854	98
<i>Standard</i>	U/A	U/A	74.8	745	66.1	759	60.6	744	56
<i>Complex</i>	U/A	U/A	27.2	938	24	1,105	30.2	976	30
<i>Specialist</i>	U/A	U/A	19	1,287	16.9	998	13.5	1,098	12
In-house Fostering	158.8	230	162	246	165.2	261	171.5	270	177
Note: U/A - This detailed breakdown was unavailable in past years									

Out of Authority Residential

- The number of children in residential out of authority placements as at end of June 2014 is 31 (no change since 31 March 2014 but an increase of 6 since 31 March 2013).
- The average number of placements has increased from 25 in 2013/14 to 30.7 in 2014/15, so far, which is an increase of 5.7 (22.8%). At an average cost of £3,081 per week this 5.7 increase equates to a cost of £913k per annum.
- Due to the increasing complexity of children's needs that are going into residential out of authority placements & despite successful negotiations by the Commissioning team to minimise the cost of these placements, the average cost per week of these placements has increased from £3,022 in 2011/12 to £3,081 currently – an increase of 2%. However, as shown in the table above, the current average cost per placement is less than the 2013/14 average of £3,245 – a reduction of -5%.
- The average number of placements in the same period has risen by 12.7 (70.6%) from 18 to 30.7.
- From 1 April 2013 children's remand placements were fully funded by the Local Authority & RMBC was provided with a national grant of £78k in 2013/14 to cover these additional costs. The allocation for 2014/15 has been reduced to £53k. The cost of these placements in 2014/15 so far is £19k. At the end of June 2014 there was 1 remand placement (a reduction of 1 since 31 March 2014).

Independent Fostering Agencies

- The number of children in Independent foster Care as at end June 2014 is 98 (a reduction of 4 since the end of March 2014 & a reduction of 20 since 31st March 2013).
- The average cost of a placement has reduced by £33 or 3.7% since 2011/12.
- The average number of placements during the same period has decreased by 20.7 (16.7%).

In-house Fostering

- The number of children in in-house fostering placements as at end of June 2014 is 177 (an increase of 10 since the end of March 2014).
- The cost of a placement has risen by an average of £40 or 17.4% since 2011/12.
- The average number of placements during the same period has increased by 12.7 (8%)

The number of looked after children was 395 at end of June, a reduction of 5 since the end of March 2014.

Fostering Services are forecasting an overspend on Fostering allowances (£172k) & Residence Orders (£21k) due to having more children placed than planned (see table below) & also due to some placements costing more than the budgeted average. This is partially offset by a forecast staff cost underspend in the Fostering team (-£39k).

Adoption Services are forecasting an overspend on Special Guardianship Orders (£44k) due to having more children placed than planned (see table below) & a small overspend on allowances (£6k) & also due to some placements costing more than the budgeted average. These are offset with slight forecast underspends on the LAAC Team (-£1k), Adoption Team (-£2k) & Inter Agency costs (-£2k).

The table below shows the current placements numbers compared to the plan used when budget setting for 2014/15:

Placement Type	Actual No. of placements as at 30 June 14	Planned No. by this stage of the year	No. of placements above plan	Average Cost per week used for budget setting £	Total Approximate Additional Cost for the next 9 months £'000	Cost Avoided for the next 9 months - assuming an IFA placement would have been used (£854 Per week) £'000
In-House Fostering	177	168	9	264	93	207
Adoption - with means tested allowance	92	92	0	167	0	0
Residence Orders	132	129	3	129	15	85
Special Guardianship	84	78	6	118	28	172
					135	464

Although these additional placements are contributing to the service overspend, the table shows that if these placements had instead resulted in Independent Fostering placements, this would have cost RMBC an additional £464k for a 9 month period.

Other forecast overspends within this service are (£55k) in the LAC Service due to Agency costs of £47k & a Care package £21k offset by staff vacancies -£21k & (£23k) within in-house Residential homes due to Regulation 33 requiring us to use an independent reviewer £19k & £4k on the use of agency staff cover.

Disability Services (-£33K)

This service is forecasting an underspend due to delays in recruitment for 2 posts within the outreach team (-£20k) & reduced use of the cover budgets at Cherry Tree & Liberty residential homes (-£13k).

Environment & Development Services (+£822k forecast overspend)

The above forecast overspend assumes that the Winter Pressures budget is sufficient to contain costs incurred over the Winter period – in the mild Winter last year the costs exceeded budget by +£139k.

Asset Management (+£259k)

The main pressure within the Asset Management Services is an unbudgeted pressure +£200k within Land and Property Bank, with +£52k overspend Community Buildings. Other smaller pressures are +£8k unfunded costs for the barriers for the English Defence League and +£23k within facilities services due staffing costs and a forecast under-recovery of income, also, some staffing related costs are creating a pressure +£18k within Internal Audit.

Some small savings, -£42k across the wider service are partially mitigating the pressure.

Business Unit (£0k)

The Business Unit is currently forecasting a balanced outturn.

Communications (+£28k)

The forecast pressures within this service are from staffing within the Communications Team +£21k and +£8k on marketing events.

Regeneration, Planning, Customer and Cultural Services (+£195k forecast overspend)

Customer Services is showing a net pressure **+£218k** mainly due to some historical savings not yet being achieved and the need to retain staff to meet service demands. This is being reviewed on an ongoing basis and there are some staff savings which have helped to reduce the pressure.

Cultural Services are showing a small forecast underspend **-£17k** from Theatres, Boston Castle and Museums, and these are able to mitigate some pressures on the Arts budget.

Regeneration and Planning are reporting a small forecast underspend **-£6k**. The Business Centres are showing a forecast underspend due to increased occupancy levels, -£40k. Planning are reporting a -£31k forecast underspend due to reducing consultancy costs, other smaller forecast underspends are reported from Building Control and Partnerships, totalling -£9k. However, some forecast pressures across the service are also being reported, Markets +£29k due to planned repairs due to the deteriorating state of existing buildings. RIDO is funding a replacement IT package, and has a staff cost pressure +£43k.

Streetpride (+£340k forecast overspend)

Network Management are reporting a pressure **+£343k**, of which +£384k is related to Parking due to reduced forecast income from parking permits, based on previous years income levels that receipts will be less than budget, and furthermore, the impact of Tesco opening later this year.

Waste Services are reporting a forecast underspend **-£66k**. Waste collection is forecasting an underspend of -£119k, in the main due to WEEE rebate income, whereas waste disposal is reporting a forecast pressure +£55k due to waste arisings running at a 3% increase rather than the 1% budgeted increase, the waste PFI is expected to be slightly underspent -£2k.

Leisure and Green Spaces are reporting a forecast pressure of **+£28k**, mainly due to an under-recovery of income from allotments +£31k, other smaller pressures and small savings are mitigating this with some staff savings -£3k

Community Services are reporting a pressure of **+£56k**, due to an expected overspend on cleansing highways +£30k, staffing costs +£15k and +£11k pressure due to a new kennel contract.

Corporate Transport Unit is showing a forecast underspend due to changes in transport provision **-£21k**.

Neighbourhoods & Adult Services (+£1.667m forecast overspend)

Adult Services are currently forecasting an overspend of **+£1.291m**. The key underlying budget pressures include:

Older People (+£928k)

Forecast increase in Direct Payments (+21 clients) over budget (+£259k) and overall forecast overspends on Domiciliary care (+£22k) plus independent sector residential and nursing care (+£1.066m) due to recurrent pressure on meeting savings target from previous years in respect of additional continuing health care income, this is after additional income from property charges is being received. These forecast pressures are being partially reduced by a number of forecast underspends including: Savings on maintenance contracts and energy costs in the Rothercare service (-£58k), higher than anticipated staff turnover within Assessment & Care Management and community support, plus additional non-recurrent income from Health (-£361k).

Learning Disabilities (+£406k)

There is a forecast overspend on Day Care (+£178k) due to specialist provision required for 6 unfunded transitional placements from Children's services (demographic pressure) plus a recurrent budget pressure on the provision of transport (+£204k). There is also a delay in meeting an agreed budget saving for employment and leisure services (+£111k) and additional costs due to staff cover within In House Residential care (+£79k). These forecast overspends are partially mitigated by additional client discharges in excess of budget last month from residential care (-£145k) and an overall underspend on Supported Living schemes due to receipt of additional funding from health (-£21k).

Mental Health (-£176k)

There is a projected underspend on the residential care budget due to 6 client discharges greater than budget since April (-£142k) plus additional underspends within mental health day care, community support and direct payments (-£34k).

Physical & Sensory Disabilities (+£179k)

Recurrent cost pressure on Direct Payments (+£307k / 16 clients) is reduced by forecast underspends within residential and domiciliary care (-£108k) and savings within the advocacy contracts (-£20k).

Supporting People (-£46k)

Efficiency savings on subsidy contracts have already been identified against budget (-£46k).

Neighbourhoods General Fund (-£24k)

The projected year end outturn position for Neighbourhoods shows a forecast under spend of (-£24k).

The main reason for the forecast underspend is higher than expected staff turnover within Trading Standards and Furnished Homes.

Commissioning, Policy & Performance and Procurement services are forecasting an overall overspend of +£400k due to a recurrent budget saving target for commissioning which is currently pending delivery in full.

Public Health (Forecast Balanced outturn)

This service is funded by a ring fenced specific grant from the Department of Health. For Rotherham this is £14.176m for 2014/15. The service is currently forecasting a balanced outturn.

Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

The overall forecast as at end June 2014 is that the HRA will outturn with a use of its working balance (reserves) of £1.394m a slight reduction of -£46k from the original (planned) budget.

Currently forecasts show a slight underspend on Supervision and Management due to staff vacancies.

Resources Directorate (+1.159m forecast overspend)

ICT – The service is currently forecasting a pressure of +£1.165m. This relates to a forecast under-recovery of income due to reduced spend across the Council. The Director of Audit and Asset Management is preparing a paper for SLT to consider the options available to

mitigate this forecast pressure.

Legal Services – A forecast overspend of +£83k due to staff cost pressures.

Human Resources & Payroll are forecasting an underspend of -£66k largely in respect of additional income generation.

Financial Services (including Revenues & Benefits) is currently forecasting a balanced outturn.

Management savings are also forecast across the service amounting to -£23k.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1. Meeting:	Cabinet
2. Date:	6th August 2014
3. Title:	Scrutiny review of the sanctions and conditionality regime
4. Directorate:	EDS

5. Summary

The scrutiny review of the sanctions and conditionality regime was established in response to evidence suggesting that potentially unfair implementation of sanctions was taking place, and making the most vulnerable families within the Borough more vulnerable. The purpose of the review was to ensure the Department for Work and Pensions conditionality and sanctions regime is implemented fairly, consistently and flexibly, reflecting the needs and circumstances of claimants, with increased transparency and more effective partnership working.

The key findings of the review were grouped under four headings: Communication, Flexibility and Discretion, Vulnerable Claimants and Local Working Protocol. There is one main recommendation of the scrutiny review, directed to the partners on the Welfare Reform Steering Group, which is to establish a local working protocol with the aim of ensuring complete fairness in the process of implementing sanctions in Rotherham.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet:

- a) Support the scrutiny recommendation to establish a local working protocol around the DWP sanctions and conditionality regime; and**
- b) Comment on the detailed considerations and make recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, and partners as appropriate.**

7. Proposals and Details

The outcome of scrutiny review of the sanctions and conditionality regime includes key findings grouped under four headings: Communication, Flexibility and Discretion, Vulnerable Claimants and Local Working Protocol and one single overarching recommendation: that the partners within the welfare reform steering group, via Rotherham Partnership, aim to establish a local working protocol. The overall aim of this is to ensure complete fairness in the process of implementing sanctions in Rotherham. Within this framework, partners are specifically asked to consider six elements.

At their meeting on 20th May 2014, on receipt of the findings of the review, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board resolved the following:

1. That the report be received and the contents and findings of this scrutiny review be noted.
2. That the report of the scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' (DWP) sanctions and conditionality regime, as now submitted, be referred to the Cabinet for further consideration.
3. That the Cabinet's response to this scrutiny review be reported to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.
4. That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board shall continue its scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions and conditionality regime.

8. Finance

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations, however, the increased application of sanctions along with other welfare reforms are adding to demand on existing advice services resources, and other services supporting people affected.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

As is demonstrated in the analysis of the scrutiny recommendations, it is unlikely that DWP will implement some of the recommendations applicable to them, and that the local Jobcentre Plus will not have the management flexibility required.

The failure of the Work Programme providers to participate in the scrutiny review together the DWP support for their non-participation suggests that they will not participate in the proposed protocol. This is a significant risk to achieving the "fairness" outcome given the number of sanction referrals from these providers.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Whilst conditionality and sanctions are not new, their increased use since October 2012 has been a contentious part of the Government's welfare reform agenda. According to national figures published, between October 2012 and December 2013 just over 1 million people have been subject to an adverse sanction. However, 633,000 were allowed to keep their benefit after a referral and 580,273 had a referral cancelled, leading to claims that many sanctions are being unfairly applied.

The policy objective of the scrutiny recommendations seeks to ensure complete fairness in the applications of the regime through a partnership agreement protocol between local partners including the Council and advice agencies and Jobcentre Plus.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The scrutiny review document and covering report are appended to this report.

Contact Name:

Karl Battersby, Strategic Director,
Environment and Development Services
ext 23815

karl.battersby@rotherham.gov.uk

Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review: Sanctions and conditionality regime

Recommendation	Cabinet Decision (Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)	Cabinet Response (detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)	Officer Responsible	Action by (Date)
Single overarching recommendation: that the partners within the welfare reform steering group, via Rotherham Partnership, aim to establish a local working protocol. Within this framework, partners are specifically asked to consider the following	Accept	Detailed responses are set out to specific recommendations that sit under the overarching recommendation.	Carole Haywood	July 2014
Recommendation 1: How advice agencies can be included in this protocol and the potential role they could play – some suggestions from the review group include a potential presence for them in the job centre itself to pick up instant referrals; cross referrals through the IT systems of the AiR (Advice in Rotherham) partnership; and advocacy and one to one support for more vulnerable clients. They should also consider the potential to carry out awareness raising for claimants on the	Accept	The idea of a local protocol could help deal with people affected but Jobcentre Plus would have to be an active part of it to have greatest effect. There may be limits to their discretion around some issues and processes but this should not be seen as reason to not proceed. It should be noted that nationally figures show that half of sanctions are applied via Work Programme providers and not the local JCP. Data shared between DWP and the Council will include people sanctioned who are in	Carole Haywood	July 2014

<p>expectations and responsibilities they have within the system.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The importance of including all partners - therefore it is essential for Work Programme providers to be included in this protocol. The review group stresses its extreme disappointment with the providers for their lack of engagement in the review and hopes that they will take the opportunity to rectify the situation by taking part in the protocol.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: How clear and consistent communication mechanisms can be implemented and/or improved across all of the partners, with the aim of making the process as simple and easy to understand as possible for claimants. Some quality standards around this should be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation 4: In line with 3 above, again some clear and consistent standards around referral to other support such as the hardship fund, food banks, credit unions and other sources of assistance.</p>		<p>receipt of Housing Benefit. This will not include everyone sanctioned, but it is reasonable to assume that most will be in receipt of HB.</p>		
	Accept	<p>It is clear that the Work Programme providers are not going to participate in this and that DWP supported this. The Council and partners could raise concerns around this with members of parliament and the Local Government Association.</p>	Carole Haywood	July 2014
	Accept	<p>This provides an opportunity to explore better communication across agencies for all advice and benefits, not just sanctions.</p>	Carole Haywood	July 2014
	Accept	<p>The Hardship Fund is the first line of support for those who have been sanctioned. This is applied for at JCP. The key question in relation to Hardship Fund is how quickly applications are being processed. Whilst application for families with children applications may be processed quite quickly, for single people it</p>	Carole Haywood	July 2014

<p>Recommendation 5: Rotherham MBC should review its eligibility criteria for the “Fund for Change”, as sanctioned claimants are currently not eligible to apply on the basis that they are not in receipt of benefits. The review group notes that since the review concluded, the government have announced their decision to remove the funding for this scheme, which will remove another source of assistance for the most destitute people in the borough. Methods of lobbying the government on this should also be considered.</p>	Accept	<p>may take up to two weeks where people are without money. This could be raised with JCP. Clearly the quicker Hardship payments are awarded, so the less the need for other support.</p> <p>The current eligibility criteria restricts support through “Fund for Change” to those in receipt of prescribed benefits, except support paid by the fund to food banks. The criteria could be changed but careful consideration would be need to be given to what levels of support could be provided as it would not be possible to “fill the gap” left by sanctions within the resources available.</p> <p>The end of the funding for “Fund for change” has to be a consideration. As things stand the funding will cease at the end of March 2015. Members will need to consider what they wish to do in the future, including the use of loans money repaid.</p>	Carole Haywood	July 2014
<p>Recommendation 6: Finally, DWP partners should consider whether it is possible to have the mandatory reconsideration process carried out locally instead of via the decision-making centre in Hanley. The review group request that this be referred</p>	Accept	Realistically, it is unlikely that DWP will change the national approach to dealing with sanctions including the processes carried out at Hanley irrespective of what benefits would be realised from a local solution.	Carole Haywood	July 2014

as high within the DWP as it needs to go to be given due consideration.				
---	--	--	--	--

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6 th August, 2014
3.	Title:	RLSCB Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan 12 Month Annual Report <i>Appendix A – CSE Annual Report 2013/14</i> <i>(All Wards)</i>
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary

This report provides a summary of some of the key achievements in the first year of the CSE Strategy against each of the seven strategic objectives and provides the next steps for 2014-15.

6. Recommendations

- For Cabinet to note progress and endorse the further development areas

7. Proposals and Details

Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) is recognised nationally as one of the most important challenges facing agencies today. It has a serious long term and lasting impact on every aspect of a child or young person's life including their health, physical and emotional wellbeing, educational attainment, personal safety, relationships, and future life opportunities.

Rotherham's Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Strategy is a three year plan published in April 2013 accompanied by a multi-agency delivery action plan.

This action plan is structured under six strategic objectives aligned to the three CSE Priorities of 'Prevent', 'Protect' and 'Pursue' plus one strategic objective of 'Leadership' which is cross cutting across all three priorities.

The content within the action plan has continued to evolve and develop over the year in response to emerging local needs, national research and outcomes from independent reviews and inspections.

The attached report provides cabinet with details of the partnerships achievements against the seven strategic objectives in the first year of the strategy incorporating case studies, areas of developed good practice and data. Details are also given of planned next steps for 2014/15.

Please note when reviewing the data tables contained within the report caution be taken when considering the direction of travel. There have been significant changes in practice and recording procedures over the course of the year as part of the service development and improvement programme. Therefore some statistics, although similar in definition, will not be 'like for like' comparisons.

The Independent Inquiry of historic CSE in Rotherham commissioned by the RMBC Chief Executive is drawing to its conclusion and will be published in September.

In addition, we are awaiting the report from the recent HMIC child protection inspection of South Yorkshire Police, which incorporated the follow-up of the 2013 thematic CSE review.

Once published the findings from both these reports and associated recommendations will be incorporated into the multi-agency delivery action plan as appropriate

To aid Members the executive summary of the report has been extracted and included below.

Executive Summary of Achievements and Next Steps for 2014/15

Strong leadership and clear governance is at the heart of our multi-agency approach, and over the course of this last year we have made significant progress to strengthen how we work together. This is at the very heart of the achievements set out in this report.

Additional resources have been invested in our multi-agency CSE team which now includes staff from health, voluntary and community sector agencies and a Police data analyst.

Information sharing and data management across agencies has been key. Through our working groups we are able to share intelligence about our community, identify risks and opportunities in a way which was previously difficult.

This includes a robust performance monitoring system which takes account of work across organisations – allowing us to understand and demonstrate the impact and outcome of our partnership approach, and identify areas for future improvement.

This strong foundation has laid the foundation for progress against our three priorities: **Prevent**, **Protect** and **Pursue**.

Prevent

The exploitation of children is a devastating feature of communities up and down the country – but together we are making it more difficult for offenders to be able to abuse young people in this way.

We are building a Borough-wide ‘eyes and ears’ approach – educating our communities, and our staff, to recognise the signs of CSE, and how to report it.

One example outlined in the following pages shows we have doubled the number of people taking part in CSE training and awareness-raising – including almost 3,500 staff, councillors, Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators and members of the public.

Extensive work has also been carried out directly with our young people, to empower them to recognise the signs and risks of CSE.

Protect

We have streamlined processes across agencies to allow us to better identify and safeguard children who are at risk of CSE. This includes common tools for staff to assess their concerns about a young person and understand what

course of action they must take and the implementation of a South Yorkshire-wide risk assessment tool.

Some of the case studies that follow demonstrate the impact that these system improvements are having on frontline child protection in Rotherham and the difference they are making to people's lives.

Pursue

We are working together to identify offenders, to disrupt and stop their activity – and ultimately bring them to justice.

Through our working groups, a monthly CSE tactical assessment is shared with all partners to highlight and act upon local intelligence, risks and ongoing operations.

The number of staff dedicated to this work in the CSE team has increased, to allow an improved analysis and tracking of the data which can ultimately lead to the disruption of CSE activity, and prosecution of the perpetrators.

A number of high profile prosecutions over the course of the year is testament to this work, and serves to show the community that this kind of abuse does not and will not remain hidden, or unpunished, in Rotherham.

Next Steps for 2014/15

Much has been achieved in the first year of this strategy, but we will not be complacent and will continue to work towards a service which operates across agencies and without boundaries to protect our young people against CSE. At the time of writing we are awaiting the outcome of the independent inquiry into historic CSE cases, commissioned by Rotherham Borough Council's Chief Executive. Together with other local, regional and national reviews, this will further inform the development of our multi-agency approach.

Central to these developments is the creation of a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (known as a MASH). Due to be launched in August 2014, the co-located service will bring together key officers to not only tackle CSE, but also domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and the wider safeguarding children agenda.

In addition, we will build stronger links with local communities, including EU migrants. We will review our procedures to make sure looked after children placed outside our area are protected in line with our local plans.

We will also ensure that our young people are listened to and are developing a participation strategy to ensure their voice helps shape their own support and informs our future improvements.

We will carry out research to better understand the motivations of offenders, and we will continue to raise awareness as part of the South Yorkshire-wide 'Say Something If You See Something' campaign, while developing ways of communicating that specifically benefit our communities here in Rotherham.

8. Finance

Summary of Direct Costs of Partner Financial Contributions in support of CSE Services in Rotherham

Services with identifiable direct costs	ACTUAL 2013/14	PROPOSED 2014/15
Rotherham MBC - Child Sexual Exploitation Team	274	276
Rotherham MBC - Integrated Youth Support Service*	810	759
South Yorkshire Police*	1,190	1,305
Rotherham Foundation Trust	2	-
Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber (RDASH) NHS Foundation Trust*	-	12
TOTAL	2,276	2,352

**These costs are a best estimate of the direct cost and proposed costs of services directly supporting Rotherham CSE*

Other Indirect Contributions in support of CSE Service for which it is not possible to determine exact costs as they are part of a wider team and service

Rotherham Hospital Foundation Trust	<p>Assessing all elements of potential risks posed to children/young people who access SARC or Children's ISVA services and putting preventative actions in place as a result. There is representation and commitment from the Trust at both the CSE Sub Group and Multi Agency Operational Managers Group.</p> <p>SARC Operational staff work closely with the CSE Team and the Children's Independent Sexual Violence Advisor is a member of the Group Assessment and Progress meetings where discussions are held on high risk cases and any cases where there are concerns that the level of risk is increasing.</p>
NHS England	<p>NHS England does not offer direct financial support to Local Safeguarding Boards, but does offer other forms of support. NHS England is well represented and involved within the CSE and children's safeguarding agenda both locally and regionally. The Director of Nursing & Quality is the health representative on the SY CSE Group, the Assistant Director of Nursing represents NHS England on the CSE Sub Group and the Patient Experience Manager represents NHS England on RSCB.</p> <p>In addition the South Yorkshire & Bassetlaw Safeguarding Forum which brings together Designated Nurses/ Dr's and CSE is a standing agenda item for this meeting.</p> <p>The above involvement ensures an increased awareness in relation to CSE issues and enables the messages to get out to frontline staff. It is also a vehicle for carrying out pieces of work across the SY footprint and sharing good practice.</p>

NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	<p>NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) is committed to supporting the Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) agenda from the perspective of a commissioner of health services. Rotherham CCG includes CSE within its contracts with providers, embedded within the training requirements of the safeguarding standards, which are monitored via the contract review process. Senior CCG staff have attended multi-agency CSE awareness sessions and a SYP event. The CCG Chief Nurse attends the CSE sub group and the CCG Head of Safeguarding attends the CSE Silver Group. The CCG Chief Nurse, Head of Safeguarding and Named GPs attend the Rotherham Safeguarding Boards (RLSCB & RSAB).</p> <p>The CCG together with other safeguarding professional across South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw have developed a GP Safeguarding Vulnerable People Policy which has been circulated to GP practices, this includes the Child Sexual Exploitation Warning Signs Vulnerabilities Check List.</p> <p>During May 2014 Rotherham CCG organised and facilitated an away day for all Rotherham senior safeguarding professionals, the CSE action plan was updated as part of this event and a short term, task and finish group set up to identify health service gaps in relation to CSE. In November 2014 a Protected Learning Time event for GP practice staff is dedicated to safeguarding and includes CSE as one of the topics to be covered. Rotherham CCG, together with NHS England and other safeguarding professional across South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw, are facilitating a National CSE event in September 2014.</p>
--	---

9. Risks and Uncertainties

CSE, has had extensive national media attention. Rotherham has featured in this from both positive and negative perspectives.

Ofsted have introduced a new framework for inspection. There will be a strand of this inspection looking at CSE. In addition, HIMC have undertaken a follow-up inspection to their recent thematic CSE review of South Yorkshire Police and we await the findings.

The Independent Inquiry of historic CSE in Rotherham commissioned by RMBC's Chief Executive is nearing completion however the findings will not be published until September.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Keeping children and young people safe and therefore the eradication of CSE is one of the highest priorities in the key strategies of the Council, the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board (RLSCB), the Safer Rotherham Partnership and the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

There remains no national performance framework for CSE. In its absence the local multi-agency Performance Framework which accompanies the CSE

Strategy and Action Plan will continue to develop to ensure that accurate, timely and meaningful information about key aspects of CSE and safeguarding children and young people is collated and used to inform practice.

If new government guidance on the collection of data relating to CSE it will be incorporated in the performance data; which will be presented to members as part of the regular updates on performance.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- RLSCB Chair Review of Rotherham's response to CSE (December 2013)
- OCC Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups Final Report (November 2013)
- Barnardo's Rotherham Practice Review (November 2013)
- HMIC Review of South Yorkshire Police Response to CSE 2013
- RLSCB Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan 6 Month Progress Report (presented to members 6th November)
- Reports to Cabinet on 28th June, 3rd July, 18th September and 5th February
- LGA publication, June 2013 'How councils are raising awareness of child sexual exploitation'
- RLSCB CSE Strategy 2013-2016

Contact Name:

Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services, RMBC

Joyce.thacker@rotherham.gov.uk

Jason Harwin, Chief Superintendent, South Yorkshire Police

jason.harwin@southyorks.pnn.police.uk

Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham

Annual Report 2013-14



INTRODUCTION

Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) is recognised nationally as one of the most important challenges facing agencies today. It has a serious and lasting impact on every aspect of a child or young person's life, including their health, physical and emotional wellbeing, educational attainment, personal safety, relationships, and future life opportunities.

To tackle this vile form of child abuse, effective multi-agency partnership working is essential, where partners work to the principle that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility, and that each are clear on their respective roles and responsibilities.

In April 2013 the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) published its three-year single multi-agency strategy and accompanying action plan, outlining how the Council and its partners continue to take real action to tackle the issues relating to CSE,. This action plan is structured under six headings - strategic objectives aligned to Rotherham's three CSE priorities of 'Prevent', 'Protect' and 'Pursue' plus a further objective around Leadership, which supports all three of these priority areas.

The details within the action plan continue to develop over time to ensure they are focused on current issues and will incorporate the findings of any current or future reviews, enquiries and inspections.

This report provides a summary of some of the key achievements in the first year of the CSE Strategy against each of the seven strategic objectives and provides the next steps for 2014-15.

Steve Ashley
Local Safeguarding Children Board Independent Chair
July 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Strong leadership and clear governance is at the heart of our multi-agency approach, and over the course of this last year we have made significant progress to strengthen how we work together. This is at the very heart of the achievements set out in this report.

Additional resources have been invested in our multi-agency CSE team which now includes staff from health, voluntary and community sector agencies and a Police data analyst.

Information sharing and data management across agencies has been key. Through our working groups we are able to share intelligence about our community, identify risks and opportunities in a way which was previously difficult.

This includes a robust performance monitoring system which takes account of work across organisations – allowing us to understand and demonstrate the impact and outcome of our partnership approach, and identify areas for future improvement.

This strong foundation has laid the foundation for progress against our three priorities: **Prevent**, **Protect** and **Pursue**.

Prevent

The exploitation of children is a devastating feature of communities up and down the country – but together we are making it more difficult for offenders to be able to abuse young people in this way.

We are building a Borough-wide ‘eyes and ears’ approach – educating our communities, and our staff, to recognise the signs of CSE, and how to report it.

One example outlined in the following pages shows we have doubled the number of people taking part in CSE training and awareness-raising – including almost 3,500 staff, councillors, Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators and members of the public.

Extensive work has also been carried out directly with our young people, to empower them to recognise the signs and risks of CSE.

Protect

We have streamlined processes across agencies to allow us to better identify and safeguard children who are at risk of CSE. This includes common tools for staff to assess their concerns about a young person and understand what course of action they must take and the implementation of a South Yorkshire-wide risk assessment tool.

Some of the case studies that follow demonstrate the impact that these system improvements are having on frontline child protection in Rotherham and the difference they are making to people’s lives.

Pursue

We are working together to identify offenders, to disrupt and stop their activity – and ultimately bring them to justice.

Through our working groups, a monthly CSE tactical assessment is shared with all partners to highlight and act upon local intelligence, risks and ongoing operations.

The number of staff dedicated to this work in the CSE team has increased, to allow an improved analysis and tracking of the data which can ultimately lead to the disruption of CSE activity, and prosecution of the perpetrators.

A number of high profile prosecutions over the course of the year is testament to this work, and serves to show the community that this kind of abuse does not and will not remain hidden, or unpunished, in Rotherham.

Next Steps for 2014/15

Much has been achieved in the first year of this strategy, but we will not be complacent and will continue to work towards a service which operates across agencies and without boundaries to protect our young people against CSE. At the time of writing we are awaiting the outcome of the independent inquiry into historic CSE cases, commissioned by Rotherham Borough Council's Chief Executive. Together with other local, regional and national reviews, this will further inform the development of our multi-agency approach.

Central to these developments is the creation of a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (known as a MASH). Due to be launched in August 2014, the co-located service will bring together key officers to not only tackle CSE, but also domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and the wider safeguarding children agenda.

In addition, we will build stronger links with local communities, including EU migrants. We will review our procedures to make sure looked after children placed outside our area are protected in line with our local plans.

We will also ensure that our young people are listened to and are developing a participation strategy to ensure their voice helps shape their own support and informs our future improvements.

We will carry out research to better understand the motivations of offenders, and we will continue to raise awareness as part of the South Yorkshire-wide 'Say Something If You See Something' campaign, while developing ways of communicating that specifically benefit our communities here in Rotherham.

LEADERSHIP

Supporting Our Work To Prevent, Protect and Pursue

Strategic Objective 1: We will improve the clarity of governance and strengthen leadership arrangements to ensure an effective multi-agency response to CSE

Achievements

Rotherham has continued its commitment to putting in place strong governance arrangements and the necessary structures to involve and engage key agencies, partners and lay members. The Rotherham LSCB devolved its strategic responsibilities to a specific CSE sub-group (formerly the Gold Group) with further support from a multi-agency operational managers group (known as Silver Group), who can determine how best to put the plans into action.



This strength and commitment shown by organisations across Rotherham to tackling CSE has been recognised by Rotherham LSCB receiving the NWG award in 2014 for the “Longest Journey Under Challenging Conditions”. NWG is a charitable organisation formed as a UK network of over 2500 practitioners who disseminate information to professionals working on issues of CSE and trafficking in the UK

Performance and quality management arrangements were put in place with regular operational updates to the CSE sub-group and the full Safeguarding Board, and regular reports to the Council's Cabinet as well as briefings to all elected members. Accurate and meaningful data is critical to determining the impact of services, and the recruitment of a dedicated police data analyst based in the CSE team has been an important development.

This has enabled the delivery of a confidential monthly tactical briefing document which is used and shared at both the CSE sub-group and operational managers group.

Within the document, data is presented alongside narrative on current police operations, details of children deemed the high risk to determine any actions required, and case studies highlighting successful interventions or prosecutions. From this the groups discuss, challenge and jointly address any issues arising either in the service or within individual cases. The narrative around the children, young people and perpetrators also gives the team an opportunity to describe 'impact' and provide a context which the data alone cannot do.

An action plan sets out how partners will deliver the priorities of the local CSE Strategy and improve services for children, young people and their families. It continues to evolve and develop, informed by publication of related national reports (e.g. Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups) and a number of independent reviews of local CSE services undertaken by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), Barnardo's and the Independent Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board.

Each of these reports includes a number of recommendations and highlights areas for improvement. Work has started to address these and feature within the new 2014-15 action plan.

The key themes emerging across the reviews for Rotherham include;

- Clarity and communication of governance arrangements
- Further strengthening performance management arrangements
- Reviewing team resources, structures and location
- Increased use of intelligence and analysis to aid pursuit of offenders
- Improving communication with staff and the community

Central to a number of the improvements is the creation of a central Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (known as a MASH) for children and young people, which is due to launch in August 2014..

This will involve bringing together the existing CSE team, Public Protection Unit police officers, children's health, voluntary and community service colleagues, and the social care contact and referral team (CART) at a single location - Riverside House , the Council's central Rotherham base. The MASH will improve joint working not only around CSE but also around domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and the wider safeguarding children agenda.

Services provided directly to young people will also move to central Rotherham and be based alongside Integrated Youth Support Services in the Council's Eric Manns Building.

This review and co-location of services will help to break down any barriers to the sharing of information across organisations, and a specific information sharing protocol is being put in place.

Next Steps for 2014-15

The CSE action plan was refreshed in February 2014 in preparation for the new monitoring year. The new plan retains the structure of the 'three P' priorities of Prevent, Protect and Pursue with the seven strategic objectives. It is now focused on strategic improvements and partnership developments rather than operational day-to-day business.

PREVENT

Making it more difficult to exploit children

Strategic Objective 2: We will deliver an effective co-ordinated training, community and schools awareness programme

Achievements

Our aim is to build a boroughwide 'eyes and ears' approach so that as many people as possible - members of staff across the partnership, members of the public and young people - know the risks and signs of CSE, and how to report them.

A CSE competency framework has been developed by the Council and agreed by the Safeguarding Board to enhance the effectiveness of the training and awareness programme that has been delivered to staff and young people over a number of years. In addition a number of existing related training courses and informal learning opportunities for young people also now feature CSE awareness elements.

Over the course of the last year almost 3,500 staff, councillors, young people, Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators and members of the public have attended a CSE training or awareness event. This is an increase on the previous year of almost 1500 people. Work is now underway to ensure that this awareness is available to all staff, with more specialised training available for those working directly with children and young people.

"Excellent session – logical and easy to follow format in terms of understanding CSE and how it is managed."

– Health Practitioner (GU Medicine)

Rotherham schools are more actively involved than ever before in protecting children against CSE through more effective training and awareness raising.

In 2012/13 the CSE team worked with 13 of our 16 secondary schools, reaching 911 pupils through awareness workshops. This year that total has increased to 1,955 and all secondary schools in Rotherham are now engaged through their Year 8 curriculum for 2014/2015, with support from Rotherham's Healthy Schools consultant and the education project officer within the CSE team.

In addition to this, preventative work continues with Rotherham's pupil referral units (PRUs), including the Rowan Centre (education provision for young mums) and with special schools and colleges.

This work will ensure that all Year 8 students in Rotherham education settings have a basic awareness of CSE.

Education Welfare links with Social Care have been reviewed and strengthened, particularly around the tracking of missing children and information sharing with the "front door" of social care, the contact and referral team (CART).

Good practice and resources are being shared with frontline staff to raise awareness of what is available to young people e.g. Zipit App to better respond if they receive inappropriate requests for indecent images.

Promoting Positive Relationships is another important element of age-appropriate work in schools, delivered through PSHE leads, and focusing on helping young people to understand issues around risk; the imbalance of power in relationships; grooming; sexting, and internet safety – making appropriate use of the resources available from the Child Exploitation and Online Protection service. The ‘This is Abuse’ campaign and the issue of consent has been a particular focus for secondary schools in 2013-14.

Further support is provided through the Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS), which offers young people the opportunity to access one-to-one support, group work and a wide range of developmental learning opportunities and positive activities. Over the past year they have undertaken informal curriculum sessions on CSE and related issues with 2,326 young people.

To ensure more specialist training reaches all staff who work directly with children and young people, a ‘Train the Trainer’ approach was agreed by the CSE sub-group, which began in *November 2013*. Further support is planned to utilise this group of individuals, and to support their further development.

A specifically-developed training session for school governors and safeguarding leads was delivered during the autumn term.

GOOD PRACTICE: RAISING AWARENESS AMONGST YOUNG WOMEN

Raising awareness of CSE amongst our communities – including vulnerable groups of people who may fall victim to this crime – has been a key strand of our work over the past year. An example of this targeted work includes a residential course which was held at RMBC's Habershon House.

Held over six weeks, more than 30 young women took part in the awareness-raising course. The sessions brought together a number of young women's groups to share experiences of what it is to be a young woman in today's world – including the challenges and potential abuse which they may face, and the many forms that this can take. The group also took part on a self-defence session and talked about personal safety on the street.

Together they were encouraged to discuss the nature of CSE, the forms it could take and to understand the potential devastation this kind of abuse has on people's lives. Feedback from the young women showed they felt that they had benefitted from the programme, and these kinds of sessions will be repeated in the future.

Next Steps for 2014-15

Lead responsibility for the Prevent element of the work programme now rests with the Safeguarding Board's Learning and Improvement sub-group, and the associated training activity is now being incorporated into the LSCB training and development prospectus and framework.

Plans are in place to utilise the National College e-academy CSE e-learning package across the partnership to ensure quality and consistency across organisations. This follows an early demonstration and consultation exercise at the CSE Sub-Group by NWG representatives at the end of 2013. The rollout is now planned for July 2014.

Training specifically tailored to the health community has been developed with specific focus on health provision for this vulnerable group, supporting victims and raising awareness around the recognition of perpetrators.

Strategic Objective 3: We will develop a multi-agency media and communication strategy to ensure consistent and accurate messages are shared with all, in support of public awareness and improved confidence in delivery

Achievements

All organisations have pledged their support for a South Yorkshire-wide communications strategy, agreed by the South Yorkshire CSE Forum in October 2013. Its aims are to:

- Raise awareness of the public in South Yorkshire and key stakeholders of CSE and the warning signs in order to increase reporting
- Raise the awareness and active support of the public and key stakeholders in the work being done by the partner agencies to protect children and to combat child sexual exploitation
- Aid accurate, informed and balanced reporting of CSE issues
- Encourage accurate, informed and balanced media coverage for the actions being taken by the partner agencies in combating and preventing CSE
- To raise the awareness and understanding of the staff of all partner agencies of the definition of CSE and the work being undertaken to combat and prevent such crime

An important element of this is a sub-regional awareness-raising campaign, with associated billboard advertising, leaflets and flyers, launched at Rotherham's New York Stadium in February 2014, under the banner 'Say Something If You See Something'. The campaign received the high profile endorsement of the Police and Crime Commissioner; the Chief Constable of South Yorkshire; the Leader of Rotherham Borough Council; the Chief Crown Prosecutor for Yorkshire and Humberside; the national NWG Network, and Crimestoppers Chair, who all delivered key messages at the event, which received extensive print and broadcast media coverage.

In spring/early summer 2014, Rotherham agencies participated in a six-week, single issue social media "blast" using Twitter and Facebook as primary channels to reinforce a number of key generic messages during that period. Images from the campaign material were also used, along with the hashtag #ssiyss.

The intended audience was the wider South Yorkshire-based social media community but particularly those in a position to identify CSE indicators with improved awareness. The call to action was for individuals to contact Crimestoppers if they are aware of potential/suspected CSE activity.

Rotherham agencies were instrumental in the development of a range of information leaflets for parents and carers, and also for children and young people. They have been distributed widely, adopted by other areas and remain available for downloading on the RMBC and Safeguarding Board websites.

Targeted awareness raising has been extended into local communities, with presentations to parish councils, Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators and a workshop for school governors. Significant work has also been undertaken to build relationships with social

landlords and other businesses, including owners, managers and staff of local guesthouses and hotels, who were invited to a workshop in October 2013 as part of Operation Makesafe. The positive impact of this work is already being seen, as demonstrated by the following case study.

GOOD PRACTICE:

EDUCATING BUSINESSES AS A KEY COMMUNITY PARTNER

Businesses and employees form a key part of our 'eyes and ears' network – the example below shows how local people are being trained to see the signs of CSE, and feel empowered to take effective action.

A general manager of a Rotherham hotel attended a CSE awareness-raising session, and shared his learning with all of his staff. One afternoon, an adult male arrived at the venue, booking a room in his name. Paying in cash and without any photo ID, he only gave his bank card details and car registration number. Two young teenage girls then joined the man and accompanied him back to his room – an unusual situation which staff quickly responded to.

Acting on suspicions, the receptionist alerted the duty manager. He went up to the room and made excuses to enter the man's room, concerned for the young people. The girls were present – they said they were OK and that there was nothing wrong. However, within minutes of the manager making this approach, the group left the hotel.

Increasingly worried by the situation, the duty manager alerted police via the 101 line. Officers attended the hotel and secured the room for potential evidence. Further investigation followed, leading to one of the young girls disclosing that she was in a sexual relationship with the man. Police traced the man later that day. He was arrested and bailed, pending further investigation.

Staff have shared their experiences of this case with others in the industry, and highlighted the benefit the awareness-raising training they received in helping them respond to an unusual situation. The venue has also changed its processes as a result of the case – it no longer accepts cash payments for rooms from someone without photo ID.

Next Steps for 2014-15

Subsequent SY-wide elements of the campaign include a CSE drama competition for secondary schools; a good practice seminar for representatives of the taxi, licensed and hospitality trades, and the development of a wider social media campaign targeting young people.

The Rotherham Voluntary Sector Children, Young People and Families Consortium (CYP&F Consortium) has been commissioned by the Safer Rotherham Partnership to design and run a community awareness raising programme which targets parents, carers and community members. The CYP&F Consortium comprises around 30 of the main voluntary sector providers in Rotherham who have come together to achieve the best possible outcomes for children, young people and families.

In addition greater links with the EU Migrant and Roma strategy group are also being formed and this will continue to strengthen over the next 12 months to build on targeted work which has taken place previously with families and girls from these communities.

Data Summary - PREVENT			
MEASURE	2012/13	2013/14	Direction of Travel since last yr
Numbers attending training and/or awareness raising Events			
Police Supervising Officers trained in CSE	110	-	monitoring has changed to demonstrate agencies attending therefore comparison not possible at this level
Ward Members trained in CSE	45	15	
Senior Managers trained in CSE	19	2	
Staff undertaken multi-agency training on CSE	171	48	
Multi-agency staff trained on the lessons learned from the Child 'S' Serious Case Review	175	37	
Ward Members attended 'one off' Local Government Yorkshire and the Humber conference	36	N/A	
Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators trained	-	24	
Parish Councillors trained	-	11	
RMBC - CYPS Staff	-	48	
RDASH	-	1	
NHS Rotherham / TRFT (Hospital)	-	40	
Schools Staff and Governors	-	71	
Voluntary or independent organisations	-	29	
Health Other	-	4	
RMBC Other	-	2	
Local Business representatives	-	58	
Early Years (children's centres, childminders etc)	-	6	
TOTAL	556	394	↓ 162
Number attending 'Train the Trainer' courses	0	8	↑ 8
CSE Team - Training and awareness of Children and Young People			
Number of under 18 college or 6th Form students engaged in CSE awareness raising	-	1127	↑ 1127
Number of secondary schools engaged in CSE awareness raising with pupils	13	16	↑ 3
Number of other learning settings engaged in CSE awareness raising with pupils	-	17	↑ 17
Number of pupils involved in CSE awareness raising (through the above schools)	911	1955	↑ 1044
IYSS Awareness Raising via Informal Curriculum sessions			
Number of sessions with young people on 'Relationships'	-	1510	new measure for 13/14
Number of sessions with young people on 'Sexual Health'	-	598	
Number of sessions with young people on 'CSE'	-	218	
Youth Start attendances by young people for;			
Sexual Health	-	1181	new measure for 13/14
Sex and Relationship Education	-	1239	

The contents of the data and performances will continue to be developed and therefore measures may change/expand in the future.

PROTECT

Identifying and safeguarding children who are at risk

Strategic Objective 4: We will ensure single and multi-agency processes and procedures are effective, efficient and fit for purpose to support the protection of children and young people from the risks and impact of CSE

Achievements

In 2013-14 the Multi Agency CSE Team expanded to include representatives of the voluntary and community sectors and also health services. GROW – a Rotherham agency supporting women to make informed choices – are commissioned to deliver a project called “INVOLVE”, a support package to families and young women up to the age of 25 who are victims of CSE. A Public Health-funded nurse specialist supports young people to identify any health needs whilst developing appropriate pathways within the health community. The team also includes a worker funded by Barnardo’s to provide a specific focus on encouraging access to support for those who are reluctant to engage with statutory services and/or those who do not perceive themselves to be at risk.

GOOD PRACTICE: SUPPORTING YOUNG PEOPLE TO STAY SAFE ONLINE

Seemingly innocent acts can leave young people vulnerable to abuse. Working with partners we aim to educate young people about the risks of social media, and work together to provide support – and take action – when they are subjected to abuse.

In one example, the Barnardo’s worker within the CSE team worked with a young person who shared inappropriate images of herself to an older male online. He went on to distribute these pictures on social media. The young person reported the images to the police and managed to get them removed. However, the incident had such an impact, she took an overdose and was admitted to hospital. The young person was later referred to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) for support with her mental health concerns.

Initially the girl was reluctant to engage with the Barnardo’s service, reporting that she felt ashamed and embarrassed by the incident. However, the worker persisted in trying to help the young person open up, and slowly developed a relationship, enabling her to share how she was feeling. Using various interactive resources – including DVDs showing CSE scenarios – the worker was able to increase the young person’s awareness and understanding of online risks and safety, explore her knowledge of healthy and unhealthy relationships and complete work around positive sexual health. The resources helped the worker and young person focus on ‘third party’ examples rather than her own experiences to help reduce anxiety and embarrassment about what happened to her directly.

This example shows the value of the multi-agency approach. The Barnardo’s worker regularly liaised with a CAMHS colleague to share any concerns about the young person’s mental health and to ensure that the work being undertaken was considered appropriate given her vulnerability in terms of her mental health following the incident. The work was successfully completed – the young person engaged well, and showed a clear understanding of how to protect herself on and offline; ultimately reducing the risk of further exploitation.

The key tools the CSE Team use to assess and support children and young people have been reviewed over the year and improvements made. These include:-

- Creation of specific multi-agency threshold descriptors for CSE providing a simple and easy to understand reference document which allows external partner agencies to assess their concerns for a child and identify the appropriate course of action based on the Continuum of Need.
- The implementation of a regional CSE risk assessment tool across South Yorkshire which enables a consistent appraisal of children and young people's risk levels and helps professionals identify the right support at the right level for them.
- A new local single assessment framework has been introduced across Rotherham's children's social care teams. This enables workers to have greater flexibility in timescales to ensure the individual needs of the child are properly considered. The new format also promotes the capture of the child or young person's voice and influence within the assessment
- A revised care plan template which is SMARTer and based on the nationally recognised 'Signs of Safety' model
- Regular fortnightly multi-agency 'GAP' (group assessment and progress) meetings to discuss tactics for high risk cases and any cases where there are concerns that the level of risk is increasing. Alongside the CSE Team attendees also include the CISVA (children's independent sexual violence advisor) and a SAFE@LAST worker
- Following the revised national guidelines and policies the local procedure for children missing from home, care and education was refreshed.
- Where thresholds for CSE team interventions are not met but some concerns are still present the young person will be referred to the Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS) for early intervention and support. IYSS, where appropriate, also provide a step-down and exit strategy support to the CSE Team.

GOOD PRACTICE: WORKING TOGETHER TO SUPPORT YOUNG PEOPLE TO REPORT ABUSE – AND SECURE CONVICTIONS

Following an allegation of sexual abuse by a family member, a young person came into contact with services through the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, after making a disclosure of rape and sexual assault. The young person had been supported by the Rotherham CSE team before making the disclosure. Support was offered to the family via the Children's Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (CISVA) and a multi-agency care plan was put together in partnership with the CISVA, CSE team and other relevant services.

By working together in this way across agencies a support plan was put in place, which focussed on the needs of the child primarily. The CISVA brokered appropriate specialist support where needed in order to reduce the likelihood of the child and family disengaging with the criminal justice process, as well as increasing their chances of recovery following such trauma.

The Children's Independent Sexual Violence Advisor supported the whole family throughout the course of the daunting legal process, which culminated in a guilty verdict and conviction.

The importance of building relationships within the CSE team has been recognised, and in response to recommendations from recent reviews by Barnardo's and the independent chair of the Safeguarding Board, a two-day team building was held, using Myers Briggs and other established tools to gain a greater understanding of team members and their contributions to the team as a multi-agency partnership.

The way we have recorded CSE contacts and referrals in the last 12 months has changed. Due to improved recording procedures within social care which removed the requirement to record the primary contact reason for the family against **all** siblings rather than just the subject child. This means professionals keep focused on the child who is at risk of CSE and not siblings who may not.

Improvements in practice and recording have also contributed to an increase in social care assessments of individual child's needs from 17 in 2012/13 to 145 in 2013/14.

Next Steps for 2014-15

Following the recent publication of the multi-agency threshold descriptors referenced earlier, work has begun to clarify pathways and transfer procedures between agencies. These are already in place but need to be formalised and documented in a format which is clear and understood by staff outside the specialist CSE team. This needs to also include key partner agencies such as CAMHS, Know the Score and other health services.

Listening to young people and their families to ensure their voices help shape the support they receive and inform future service improvements remains a priority, and the Young Persons' Participation Strategy for CSE is therefore a key piece of work, which is supported by the Integrated Youth Support Service.

GOOD PRACTICE: EARLY INTERVENTION TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL CSE VICTIMS

Youth clinics are delivered in partnership by a range of professionals, including contraception and sexual health nurses and youth support workers. The assessment of potential CSE issues is part of the protocol of responding to each young person attending youth clinics, illustrated in this brief case study.

During discussion with youth workers, a 14 year old - attending youth clinic for the first time - spoke of her new 17 year old boyfriend. She was reluctant to share much information, but the detail she did give alerted workers to the possibility that she was vulnerable to CSE.

This information was shared with the CaSH (Conception and Sexual Health Service) nurse who confirmed similar potential concerns. Although the young woman would share no further relevant information on this visit, the team had gained sufficient trust for the young woman to feel able to return to the youth clinic.

Subsequently she spoke a little more easily and talked of telling mum that she was going shopping with friends, when she was actually meeting her boyfriend. Discussions gave clues to the fact that her boyfriend had a house - she had visited and that several other men had also been present during her visit.

Following a conversation with the young woman around CSE, a referral was made to RMBC's Contact and Referral Team, and the young woman was put in touch with relevant officers qualified to discuss CSE and give advice. The young woman explained that she now intended to end the relationship.

At a later clinic she expressed how helpful the discussion had been when thinking about her relationship, and how her understanding of CSE had increased. She also confirmed that the relationship had ended. The youth clinic team have been able to maintain a relationship with the young woman and consequently continue discreet monitoring of the situation.

Multi-systemic therapy is being piloted using Troubled Families grant funding, and dependent on the outcomes of the pilot, may be commissioned as a responsive intervention in some CSE cases.

The CSE data analyst has a critical role to play in using risk assessments to demonstrate the impact of services on the individual young person, but also to help evaluate the service overall.

Barnardo's is appointing a team manager for their satellite service (four workers based within South Yorkshire CSE teams), with dedicated time to work with partners to develop the service and enhance their existing contribution. Priority will be given to improving access to support for those children and families who are willing to self-refer where they may be reluctant to do so to statutory agencies. Barnardo's will work with partners and young people to agree how to promote accessibility and develop referral pathways for those who do access Barnardo's directly; ensuring effective multi-agency communication about vulnerable children coming forward.

Strategic Objective 5: We will ensure that there is effective protection, support and guidance for victims and potential victims of Child Sexual Exploitation

Achievements

During the year the social care 'front door' process, and support specifically for CSE, has been clarified and strengthened. Any child who is referred to, or already involved with, children's social care services and is at potential risk of CSE undergoes a screening process using the CSE multi-agency threshold descriptors. Where issues are identified the specialised CSE team will then lead on the assessment of new cases or, if the child already has social care involvement and is allocated to another key team, they will advise, and if needed work with, their current social worker to ensure the child receives appropriate support.

The number of social care cases recorded as being led by the CSE team has fallen from 69 at the end of March 2013 to 57 at the end of March 2014. However in addition the team's parenting officer also had an additional 6 cases and the team were supporting 44 children already open to other social care teams (these statistics were not available in 2013).

National research has shown that due to their personal circumstance certain groups of young people are at more risk of CSE than their peers. This includes young offenders; looked after children; those living where there is substance misuse in their household and those from BME communities. These groups are receiving a range of targeted preventative support incorporated within existing support packages or events - for example, LAC reviews, the IYSS support pathway and the new arrival family induction day. Appropriate training in CSE issues and the importance of supporting victims and witnesses of all ages has been provided to police officers in a broad range of roles (eg operation, police community support officers, call handlers).

During court procedures, all child witnesses have the opportunity to access technology and other 'special measures', such as giving evidence from another building rather than be in the Court room, to reduce their anxiety when dealing with unfamiliar environments and legal procedures, and to increase their confidence to when giving evidence.

CASE STUDY: MELISSA

Melissa is 17 years old. She came into the CSE Team in 2012 following a referral from A & E, where she had been admitted to hospital after a period of serious self-harm where she had cut her neck and arms.

Although the referral did not specifically indicate CSE, it was evident from further contact with the referrer, the use of the indicator checklist and a CSE risk assessment that there were concerns relating to CSE. These included staying overnight with unknown males, alcohol misuse, changes in behaviour at home and at school.

From the basic referral information, Melissa's case was due to be closed to social care as there were no child protection concerns relating to mother's ability to protect. However, the CSE team can work with young people without meeting this specific threshold and could open the case from an early help perspective. The case was allocated to a qualified social worker to begin the process. Through the course of this work, further concerns came to light and a core assessment was considered appropriate.

Melissa then left the family home due to a complete breakdown in her relationship with her mother. During this time, Melissa was supported by the social worker in the CSE team and her mum was supported by the parent worker.

The CSE risks remained for a period of time whilst Melissa lived in semi-independent living accommodation. Throughout 2013 work was done to build family relationships including referrals to Remedi and ongoing requests for support from CAMHS.

At the beginning of 2014 Melissa was able to make a disclosure regarding a relationship with a male she had under the age of 16 years old and requested support from the police officers in the team.

Melissa also spoke to her mum about the relationships and how she had not wanted to be in the family home as she felt pushed out by her younger siblings. As a result of this work and ongoing support Melissa has returned home to the care of her mother and further work continues with them to help rebuild their relationship.

Melissa has received consistent support by the same workers throughout her 18 months with the team and in the next few months she will be introduced to a Grow worker from the Involve Project who will provide ongoing continued support.

In addition this year, through funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner, Victim Support launched a Vulnerable Victims Project to work across South Yorkshire, providing support to the most vulnerable victims and witnesses, with a special emphasis on those affected by CSE.

"This investigation is the most complex CSE investigation the force has ever undertaken and is attracting large scale national media interest. Can I thank you for the excellent victim support your staff have provided so far, it has made a real difference"

– Senior Investigating Officer in an email to Victim Support

The project provides emotional and practical support to victims, witnesses and their families and carers. This includes assisting in the preparation of their court appearance via direct face to face contact; pre-trial visits; accompanying those called to give evidence at court, including additional support through the use of special measures and post-court support, including work around CICA (Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority) via community-based victim support teams.

Over the year there were 416 reported incidents of children and young people running away or going missing from home, involving a total of 131 children. This is an increase on 2012/13, when there were 338 reported incidents involving 121 children or young people.

The charity SAFE@LAST are commissioned to deliver return to home interviews with young people to try to identify and address the reason for the run-away incident and to help the young person to understand the potential risks they face. They also provide an emergency bed facility for homeless young people, and an awareness raising service for primary school children through their Crucial Crew project.

Over the year there were 378 referrals to SAFE@LAST for a total of 137 children and young people. Of these, 74 young people engaged in a return interview. In addition a further 105 children and young people have had some involvement with SAFE@LAST project workers; 29 children and young people from Rotherham are known to have contacted the SAFE@LAST helpline/text or webchat. The actual figure is likely to be higher but some young people prefer not to disclose their location.

CASE STUDY: LUCY

Lucy is 13 years old and has been a regular missing person for the last year and was working with a large number of professionals. She has been a victim of sexual exploitation, three sexual assaults, self-harms, has significant behaviour issues and regularly truant from school.

She has accessed the SAFE@LAST refuge in the past, but then she was taken into care and had no ongoing support from SAFE@LAST due to other support being put in place. A SAFE@LAST project worker did a return interview with Lucy in January after another referral from the police and she said that she would like some 1:1 support.

Lucy accessed the refuge again and used the night's stay to collect her thoughts and feelings and then she returned to her grandparents' care. The project worker has provided Lucy with some craft activities and she has been using these to try and occupy her mind when she is stressed, instead of self harming. Lucy has been using the online diary on the SAFE@LAST website to record her thoughts and feelings.

Support is still ongoing for Lucy and she still has a SAFE@LAST project worker, as she still has periods where she goes missing, as this seems to be the coping mechanism that she has developed to cope with stressful times in her life. She is on a Child Protection plan, so support will continue for as long as she is at risk and is going missing.

Next Steps for 2014-15

The impact of CSE can be far-reaching and long-term, affecting the entire lives of those affected, and resulting in a disproportionate number being involved with statutory services later on in life. In 2014-15 the Rotherham CSE sub-group are now working with partners in health to commission the development and delivery of a pathway of long-term recovery and therapeutic support for victims post abuse and in transition to adulthood.

It is important that children in care placed outside the borough are not disadvantaged or at higher risk of CSE due these arrangements. A review will be undertaken of CSE support for children on commissioned placements and improvements made where necessary.

A new missing person's protocol for children and young people has now been developed and will be promoted and embedded during 2014/15.

The Police Young People's Partnership Officers (PYPPOs) are embedded within the IYSS locality teams and work closely with them and schools around crime and disorder. Through this work they build up positive relationships with young people – particularly valuable when young people require support around reporting or making statements. The police and IYSS are currently reviewing the role of the PYPPO to further strengthen joint working arrangements.

Data Summary - PROTECT			
Please note that there has been a number of changes in practice and recording procedures over the last 12 months therefore caution should be taken when considering direction of travel from previous years			
MEASURE	2012/13	2013/14	Direction of Travel since last yr
CSE Team			
Cases open to social care CSE Team	69*	57*	↓ 8
Number of the above who are boys	-	4*	-
Cases open to parenting officer linked to CSE	-	6*	Was within overall case numbers
Number of the above who are boys	-	2*	-
Number of other open social care cases the CSE Team also co-work or support	n/a	44*	Not previously recorded
Number of contacts made to social services regarding CSE	437	162	not comparable **
Number of children the above contacts relate to	212	157	↓ 55
Number of contacts leading to a referral	129	89	↓ 40
Number of children the above referrals relate to	119	88	↓ 31
Number of Initial Assessments completed by the CSE Team	13	59	↑ 46
Number of Core Assessments completed by the CSE Team	4	46	↑ 42
Barnardo's			
Number of cases currently open to Barnardo's outreach work (Rotherham only)	n/a	11*	new project worker
New referrals	n/a	15	
Closed cases	n/a	4	
Runaways			
Number of reported incidences of children running away from home or care (U18's)	338	416	↑ 78
Number of children the above runaway incidences relate to (U18's)	121	131	↑ 10
Number of reported incidences of children running away from home or care (Between age 10 & 16)	-	265	New for 13/14
Number of reported incidences of children running away from home or care (16+)	-	55	
SAFE@LAST			
Referrals to SAFE@LAST	-	378	Data not available for 12/13
Number of children in the above referrals to SAFE@LAST	-	137	
Return interviews following 'runaway'	-	74	
SAFE@LAST follow up visits	-	325	
Number of children involved in the above follow up visits	-	105	
GROW			
Young People referred to the project	Projects were not running in 2012/13	17	Data not available for 12/13
Young People engaged in the project		17	
Young People currently receiving support		16*	
Families referred to the project		12	
Families engaged in the project		8	
Families currently receiving support		5*	

*as at end of March

***Contacts are now only recorded against the child subject to the concern previously, where this was the greatest concern within the family, the issue would have been recorded against all siblings
The contents of the data and performances will continue to be developed and therefore measures may change/expand in the future.*

PURSUE

Identifying offenders, disrupting and stopping their activity

Strategic Objective 6: We will proactively identify and disrupt places of CSE activity

Achievements

Significant changes in practice by the police and other agencies has led to major improvements in how services to tackle CSE are delivered.

For example, to support the local CSE sub-group meetings, a monthly tactical assessment is now produced which informs all relevant agencies in relation to risk, intelligence and current operations. This in turn enables these agencies to better respond to current issues from their own perspective.

Rotherham Police have a robust risk assessment process in place, which enables a rapid multi-agency response to any high-risk CSE missing person cases. This has been used to good effect on four occasions over the last year, resulting in the safe recovery of the child and the implementation of preventative action.

This year has also seen an increase in staffing within the CSE team, including the recruitment of two police analysts for South Yorkshire – one of which is based in the Rotherham team.

This has enabled improved analysis of intelligence to help partners further understand the problem profile and support the identification of needs, impact and outcomes for young people in relation to CSE. This will then feed into the RMBC Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA) and the police led Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment (JSIA).

Police intelligence systems have been reviewed and a new improved framework put in place which is linked to the police briefing systems. These improvements and on-going developments in information and intelligence gathering are enabling Police and the CSE Team to respond quickly and appropriately.

GOOD PRACTICE: MULTI-AGENCY RESPONSE

Child A - a 15-year-old Slovakian female - was persistently going missing from home with Slovakian males much older than her. Following one such episode, her risk level was escalated to High and she became a priority for the police and local authority.

Following a week of intense investigation, she was located and the male she was with was arrested for various sexual offences involving a child.

Child A was taken from her family following a safeguarding multi-agency meeting and placed in secure accommodation, pending the formulation of a long-term care plan, involving the family. In this case all lead agencies acted quickly and decisively to eliminate a clear and present risk, arresting the offender and working with the family to ensure the future safety and well-being of the child.

Next Steps for 2014-15

We will continue to review and improve CSE intelligence gathering processes as this is critical for any successful disruption or prosecution activity.

A CSE needs analysis, which will include both victim and perpetrator profiles, is being completed to further inform the work of the partnership and ensure we are effectively targeting resources.

Strategic Objective 7: We will ensure perpetrators are brought to justice

Achievements

Robust investigation in relation to the disclosure of CSE offences, current or historic, has resulted in the successful prosecution of offenders. During 2013-14 police investigations into CSE-related offences have led to 41 interviews under caution, 23 arrests and five successful prosecutions.

In addition to case level work, Rotherham Police were also involved in a number of operations, some of which are still live and some of which are being led by neighbouring authorities. A summary of the operations over the course of 2013-14 is shared below. More detailed information remains confidential.

Summary of 2013-14 Police CSE related operations

- Operation K ALPHABET – This was a two year investigation regarding the Sexual Exploitation of girls in Rotherham and Sheffield between 2004 and 2011. A 23 year old woman was jailed for 12 years, after being found guilty of a string of crimes against children, including arranging or facilitating child prostitution. And a 68 year old man was sentenced to 14 years after being found guilty of three counts of sexual assault against two girls aged 13 and 14 and a woman. The man was also subject to an earlier unrelated trial in January where he was found guilty of 12 charged relating to sex offences against children.
- Operation Klan –two Doncaster men sentenced to life imprisonment following pleading guilty to 55 child sex offences against 11 boys from across the country, some of which lived in Rotherham.
- Conviction of a local teaching assistant. He pleaded guilty to charges of sexual activity with a child between 2011 and 2012; three counts of making indecent image; two counts of sexual activity with a child while in a position of trust, and two of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity. He received a three-year sentence, must sign the sex offenders' register and is banned from working with children.
- Operation Clover – Ongoing. This is a joint investigation linked to a story in the Times and allegations of abuse from 1994 to 2005.
- Operation Carriage – Annual operation targeting concerns around child safeguarding during the school prom season. Working with legal to identify appropriate action against any businesses of concern.
- Operation Coral – Investigation into CSE-related prostitution. Relatively new operation which is at the intelligence gathering stage.
- Operation Clasp - Intelligence received that girls were being taken to a small local hotel and being exploited. Police held two nights of observations followed by the execution of a warrant. All rooms searched and intelligence was gained. The owner has been interviewed under caution and further enquiries ongoing
- Operation Guardhouse – Child trafficking case involving a Rotherham child. This was led by Nottinghamshire police
- Operation Kolo – This is being led by Sheffield and relates to girls being picked up in Rotherham and taken back to location in Sheffield where there are allegations of sexual activity and assault
- Operation Courteous - A High Risk missing person operation. The girl was found safe and well, with her mother in Rotherham, and is now in out of area authority care.
- Operation Cuttlefish - A High Risk missing person operation. The girl was found safe and well in Ireland and has returned to the Rotherham area. Extradition proceedings are ongoing in relation to the male who took her to Ireland. The file is currently with CPS for consideration of charges, but this may be affected as the victim has indicated that she wishes to withdraw her complaints
- Operation Makesafe – An ongoing national operation in relation to hotels and gives training to hotel staff to help them identify incidents of CSE.

All perpetrators in custody and in the community who are under the supervision of the Probation Services have a robust risk management plan. Probation services are represented on the CSE sub-group.

Next Steps for 2014-15

Research opportunities are being explored and commissioned to better understand the motivation and behaviour of perpetrators and to identify the common indicators of those considered likely to commit CSE.

Once published the findings, recommendations and lessons learnt from the independent inquiry will inform further practice improvement.

CASE STUDY: OPERATION K ALPHABET

Operation Alphabet was one of the most complicated and lengthy investigations of its kind for South Yorkshire Police. It focused on the sexual exploitation and abuse of young girls and women from Rotherham and Sheffield and required the force to work closely with other agencies to bring those responsible to justice. The investigation involved:

- 1,067 actions for officers and staff
- 1,473 documents
- 416 reports
- 528 statements were taken
- 286 people were interviewed
- 133 interviews were carried out
- 68 technical downloads (phones, SIM cards, computers etc)
- 660 exhibits submitted to for forensic testing
- 18 officers worked on the investigation at its height

The team included a wide range of officers and experts, including analysts who examined phone records. Two Detective Constables acted as family liaison officers during the course of the investigation and trial and provided constant support to each of the nine victims, providing everything from emotional support to financial advice and helping them with housing or health problems. Through regular contact with the victims, they were able to build relationships with them and earn their trust.

One of the victims said the support provided by the family liaison officers gave her the strength to go through with a long and intensive investigation. She said:

***“They have been great. There have been times where I have not wanted to go through with this. It has been a huge relief to know that when I feel like I can’t do it, I can ring them and talk to them as they know everything I’m going through.*”**

“The day I had to do the ID parade was the worst. I didn’t think I could go through with it but they talked me through it and supported me and genuinely cared – I couldn’t have done this without them and they gave me the confidence to carry on.”

The team worked with a wide range of agencies over the course of the investigations, including the Crown Prosecution Service, Social Services, the Probation Service, the NHS, Sheffield City Council and several different police forces. Officers also worked closely with a range of children’s homes, Connections and Turning Point, a national health and social care provider.

In May 2014 the trial concluded with the conviction of a 23-year-old, jailed for 12 years, and a 68-year-old man was sentenced to 14 years.

Data Summary - PURSUE

Please note that following the appointment of a police analyst the 'Pursue' data set was reviewed, quality assured and completely revised. Robust collection systems specifically for CSE data were not in place prior to this review therefore retrospective data is not available for comparison

MEASURE	2013/14
<u>Current</u> High Risk Children / Young People	6*
<u>Current</u> Open Referrals on CATS	44*
New Referrals on CATS	48
Referrals completed/finalised	105
Arrests	23
Interviews under caution	41
Victim / Witness interviews	16
Forensic submissions	24
<u>Currently</u> on police bail	3*
<u>Currently</u> on remand	1*
Charges with on offence	5
Prosecutions	5
Abduction notices served	17
Joint visits	32
Risk Assessments	37

*as at end of March

The contents of the data and performances will continue to be developed and therefore measures may change/expand in the future.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6th August 2014
3.	Title:	Children's Centre budget options to achieve required savings
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young Peoples Services

5. Summary

On 18th June 2014 Cabinet approved the retention of three additional Children Centre buildings Wath Victoria Children's Centre (Wentworth North); Dinnington Children's Centre (Rother Valley South) and Park View Children's Centre (Rotherham North). This increase in the number of Children's Centres from the proposed nine to twelve would cost an additional £350K.

This report assesses the options for budget adjustment, service re-configuration and possible income generation to address the £350K shortfall whilst continuing to achieve the required 2.2m savings.

6. Recommendations

That members note the content of this report and approve the following options to address the 350k shortfall:

**To approach Health partners for a 230k contribution.
Proposal to achieve 120k from a further Children's Centres service reconfiguration.**

7. Proposals and Details

On 18th June 2014 Cabinet approved the retention of three additional children centre buildings; Wath Victoria Children's Centre (Wentworth North); Dinnington Children's Centre (Rother Valley South) and Park View Children's Centre (Rotherham North) in addition to the original proposal for nine children centre buildings (Central Children's Centre, Coleridge Children's Centre, Valley Children's Centre, Arnold Centre, Aughton Early Years, Rawmarsh Children's Centre, Thrybergh/Dalton Children's Centre, Stepping Stones Children's Centre, Swinton Brookfield Children's Centre).

An increase in the number of centres from nine to twelve would cost an additional £350K. This report assesses the options for budget adjustment, service re-configuration and possible income generation to address the £350K shortfall whilst continuing to achieve the required 2.2m savings.

- **Budget Adjustment Option (particularly in relation to children's centres health delivery)**

It is important to note that the "core purpose" of Children's Centres is to improve outcomes for young children and their families and reduce inequalities between families in greatest need and their peers in:

- Child development and school readiness
- Child and family health and life chances
- Parenting aspirations and parenting skills

In addition to the local authority, this involves a range of partners, particularly health working together to deliver early years services in an integrated way. Children's centres are a significant contributor to the improvement of child and family health outcomes to ensure the best start for our youngest children from prebirth to 5. This is recognised within Rotherham's Health and Wellbeing Strategy under "starting well".

The Childcare Act 2006 (Sections 4 and 5) also places a duty on local authorities to work with relevant partners such as local commissioners of health services to consider the provision of services through a children's centre. Health partners and children centres share the same targets in relation to improving sustaining breastfeeding rates, increasing smoking cessation, reducing obesity, increasing childhood immunisation, improving mental health and emotional well being, improving speech and language.

Children's centres also contribute towards pre and postnatal services either through providing universal activities or targeted support for example to mothers experiencing maternal health issues, teenage parents, lone parents, Dads and other groups that may need additional support before or after the birth of their child. Centres provide breastfeeding advice and support, weaning parties, parenting programmes and individual family support through home visits. Health Visitors also run baby clinics and other health activities from children's centres. This supports joint working with children's centre staff to

provide health services for parents and children in an integrated manner. Data for the period 1st April 2013 - 31st March 2014 shows that 47% of all activities delivered by children's centres staff were related to Health activities and target outcomes. (12,328 out of a total 26,180 activities).

Policy documents relating to "Maternity Matters" 2007 (which has not been revised so is still the most current policy document) and the "Healthy Child Programme" highlight the importance and benefits of health partners working closely with children's centres to improve health outcomes for children and families.

On the 14th July the Department of Health produced "The Early Years High Impact Area" documents to support the transition of the commissioning of health visiting to Local Authorities and to help inform decisions around the commissioning of the health visiting service and integrated children's early years services. The documents identify six areas where health visitors have the most impact on the health and wellbeing of children up to five years and highlight the importance of working in close partnership with children's centres to improve health outcomes for children aged 0-5 and their families. The six high impact areas are:

- Transition to Parenthood and the Early Weeks Maternal Mental Health (Perinatal Depression)
- Breastfeeding (Initiation and Duration)
- Healthy Weight, Healthy Nutrition (to include Physical Activity)
- Managing Minor Illness and Reducing Accidents (Reducing Hospital Attendance/Admissions)
- Health, Wellbeing and Development of the Child Age 2 – Two year old review (integrated review) and support to be 'ready for school'

Children's Centres and early years service providers also play a key role in these areas. As part of the early years service transformation a new Foundation Years Service will be created across health, early education, early help and children's centres to deliver integrated early years services within local communities and children's centre buildings. Health is a key partner in ensuring that the Foundation Years Service is established as 50% of the service delivery will relate to health services, targets and outcomes. This is particularly important when one considers Rotherham's current Child Health Profile.

Currently health partners do not contribute to the costs of Rotherham children's centres, with the exception of a £23K contribution from Public Health which pays for breastfeeding peer supporters to work with children's centres to support mothers to continue to breastfeed. In light of the current local authority budget pressures, serious consideration should be given to how other partners contribute funding towards children's centre buildings costs and service delivery, particularly health. This would increase ownership and accountability of health partners in committing and delivering on the creation of a new Foundation Years Service but more significantly the

delivery of integrated early years services which benefit parents and improve outcomes for children.

In view of the important contribution that children's centres make to improving health outcomes **we would request that health partners are approached for a 230K contribution towards the 350k shortfall**. This would equate to a 10% budget contribution from health based on the 2015/16 total children's centres budget.

If Health are unable to contribute financially to the shortfall, the local authority would have to lose children's centre front-line staff who currently deliver services and meet health outcomes as part of the children's centre core purpose. Under these circumstances, we would be requesting that health are approached to agree to taking on the responsibility for meeting all health outcomes under the children's centre ofsted framework. This would enable the local authority to refocus and prioritise the remaining frontline centre staff to meet the child development, school readiness, parenting elements of the children's centre "core purpose".

If Health does not contribute the 230k, the risk of finding the 230k shortfall from the remaining children's centres budget in addition to the 120k identified in this report, would mean a further loss of a already reduced frontline service based on the original proposal for nine buildings. This risk also impacts on the ability of the local authority to meet its statutory duties to improves outcomes for children and families and reduce inequalities.

Exploration of the service budgets across Children and Young People's Services shows that there is no potential to contribute to the 350K shortfall in light of the significant budget savings to be achieved in 2015-16 and beyond. These services have already had significant budget reductions to achieve the council's required savings.

- **Service Reconfiguration**

It is important to be aware that the Early Years and Childcare Services including Children's Centres has experienced significant year on year budget reductions.

In 2012-13 the early years service budget was £2,355,610. This will reduce to £678,013 in 2015-16 which is a reduction of £1,677,597 which equates to 71% over a 4 year period.

In 2012-13 the children's centres budget was £4,053,529. This will reduce to £2,145,789 in 2015-16 which is a reduction of £1,907,740 which equates to 53% over a 4 year period.

This means that a total of £4.1m has been lost from the early years and childcare (which includes children's centres) budget which equates to 66% over a 4 year period.

It is important to note that to achieve the required £2.2m required savings for the original nine proposed buildings will involve significant management and staffing changes. These has been further stretched to cover the additional 3 centre buildings.

On the basis of funding 12 centre buildings instead of the original nine proposed, we have reviewed centre opening times, running costs and staffing structures to identify how the 350K shortfall could be addressed.

- By adjusting the opening times of children's centre buildings from the current model of 8am – 6pm to a proposal to open from 9am - 4pm to deliver children centre activities. This would not apply to daycare services which would continue to operate under their current opening times.
- In addition to adjust some staff contracts in line with the opening times 9am -4pm.

This will realise £120K contribution towards the £350k shortfall.

Further service reconfiguration to achieve additional savings to further contribute to the shortfall would have a high risk of compromising the children's centre delivery to a point where it is no longer viable.

Consideration has also been given to term time children's centre opening times and service delivery. We have also looked at building opening times and service delivery over 4 days per week. However both of these approaches would significantly impact on access to services particularly for the most vulnerable families and therefore we would not be recommend this option as a way forward.

• **Income Generation Option**

Children's centres serve some of Rotherham's most socio-economically disadvantaged children and families. For many of these families there is a significant risk that the cost of having to pay for services could act as a barrier to children and families accessing centre services, particularly those most in need of the services.

Legislation (s3(2) and s5A of the Childcare Act 2006) requires local authorities to secure early childhood services (including children's centres) in an integrated manner which facilitates access and maximises the benefit for parents, prospective parents and young children. When considering whether to impose charges and the compatibility with this duty, the risk of children and families not accessing services would be greater than any financial benefit received. Any income generation is likely to be very low and would probably be best used by centres to contribute towards sustaining provision or providing resources to support individual families needs. Therefore we would advise that charging for services is done at a local level and that any income is reinvested back into the centre to support local needs rather than contributing to meeting the 350k shortfall as this income cannot be guaranteed.

8. Finance

The budget for Children's Centre from April, 2015/16 = £2,145,789

Budget adjustment

Request that Health services are approached to contribute £230k towards the £350K shortfall

Service Reconfiguration

Propose to achieve 120K from changing building opening times to 9am – 4pm and adjusting some staff contracts in line with these opening times.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

- The health and service reconfiguration contributions to the 350k shortfall are not achieved therefore putting further pressure on the achievement of the required 2.2m savings. If this happened we would have to undertake further service reconfiguration of the children centre budgets.
- The reduction in staffing and resources and stretching it across 12 centres could impact on the level of service delivery and the ability to achieve improved outcomes for children and families, especially the most vulnerable. This will be addressed through the creation of the Foundation Years Service, particularly through integrated working between health practitioners and children's centre staff.
- Further funding reductions could put at risk the creation of the Foundation Years Service if there is not sufficient resources/staffing to deliver children centre services.
- If we do not receive the full commitment and sign up by partners, particularly health the creation and implementation of the Foundation Years Service will be significantly put at risk due to barriers in information sharing and a consistent approach to service delivery across the borough.
- There is a risk to the local authority of not meeting its statutory duties if there is not sufficient resources to deliver children centre services.
- There is a risk of poorer Ofsted performance for all Children Centres, when the new Ofsted cycle begins July 2015, if there is not sufficient resources to reach the number of children and families required and improve outcomes, particularly for the most vulnerable. This would impact on the local authority rating.
- There is a high risk that unless the issue of the shortfall is resolved before September 2014, we will not be in a position to properly consult with staff in September on the final proposals for the Children's Centre staffing structure.
- The Equality Impact Analysis has been reviewed to consider the impact of the funding options for the 3 additional buildings plus the nine originally proposed. The provision of an additional 3 children centre buildings would improve:
 - local access to services by the protected characteristic groups,
 - the geographical spread of children centre buildings across the borough
 - alignment with health and area assembly boundaries.

As part of a further service reconfiguration it is proposed to reduce the opening times of the buildings and align some staff contracts to these opening times. This would mean that all twelve buildings receive a staffing level based on the levels of need within the children centre reach areas. This would impact equally across protected and non protected characteristic groups. However the impact should be minimal as the majority of children's centre services are used between 9am until 4pm. No change in opening times is proposed for daycare services. Therefore there should be minimal/no impact for protected groups.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

- LSP Community Strategy
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Children and Young Peoples Plan
- LA Ofsted inspection ratings

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- 18th June 2014 Cabinet Report and associated papers
- Healthy Child Programme
- Maternity Matters
- Early Years High Impact Area" documents
- Sure Start Children's Centres Statutory Guidance – April 2013

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

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6th August 2014
3.	Title:	Priority School Building Programme 2
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary:

The Department for Education (DfE) announced on the 1st May 2014 that the Government would fund a further phase of the Priority School Building Programme (PSBP). The new phase known as PSBP 2, will follow on from the original PSBP launched in 2011 in which Rotherham were successful in their bid to replace Oakwood High School and Wath Victoria Primary School.

PSBP 2 will be a five year programme operating between 2015 and 2021 and will undertake major rebuilding and refurbishment projects in schools and sixth form colleges in the very worst condition.

The Local Authority (LA) is responsible for co-ordinating and submitting applications from all maintained schools and voluntary aided and controlled schools. Academies can either be included in the LA submission or apply on their own behalf.

Expressions of interest must be submitted online by the 21st July 2014. A decision on applications is expected in December 2014.

6. Recommendations:

- **That support is given for the inclusion of Swinton Community School, St. Pius X Catholic High School, Badsley Moor Lane Junior School, Harthill Primary School, Wales Primary School, Laughton Junior and Infant School and Newman School in the submission to the DfE for the PSBP 2**

7. Proposals and Details:

The PSBP 2 will target schools in the very worst condition. PSBP 2 will not use private finance but will be entirely capital-based.

It is intended to submit expressions of interest for a small number of high priority projects. Lower priority projects will be funded from the regular local authority maintenance allocations and local authority voluntary-aided programme (LCVAP).

Eligibility

Schools put forward for PSBP 2 will be:

- Priority projects where the costs of addressing the need would be the hardest for the LA to fund through their capital maintenance programme. This is where the need is very significant and would necessitate a complete rebuild or major refurbishment of the school buildings.
- Priority projects where the cost of continuing to maintain the site or the buildings are so high that it makes better economic sense to address the need wholesale, either by rebuilding or complete refurbishment.
- Projects will be tested against the DfE's knowledge of long term pupil demand from the school capacity data collection. This will need to be evidenced of sustained demand for pupil places.
- Where there is a good case for increasing the size of the school at the same time as addressing the condition the DfE will work with the LA to bring funding together with basic need funding so this can be done.
- PSBP 2 will not fund schools which have recently received significant investment.
- PSBP 2 will not address the suitability of schools buildings which relates to the tailoring of a building to meet certain education needs. PSBP 2 is about building condition where a building is in a poor state of repair.
- Projects may qualify for whole school rebuilds or major refurbishments projects. The DfE will assess projects they consider it is more economical to rebuild the whole school rather than continuing to patch or repair the existing structure.

- Projects may be selected where significant condition need is isolated to specific buildings rather than the entire school site. Under these circumstances' rebuild or refurbishment of specific buildings will be considered as opposed the entire school.

Conditions for inclusion in PSBP 2

Inclusion within PSBP 2 will be subject to acceptance by the LA that:

- The contract will be procured and managed by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The schools chosen will be batched with other schools not necessarily in the geographical location.
- Procurement is based upon baseline designs which have successfully been used on the original PSBP.
- LA will be required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding and Back to Back Agreements
- Any associated off site works as a result of the project e.g. Section 278, the LA will be liable for these costs.
- The LA will be required to register the title of the site and associated legal costs will need to be borne by the LA.

Determination of schools for consideration

In the original PSBP, schools had to demonstrate they were in a poor condition and whether the cost of addressing the condition exceeded 30% of the notional rebuilding cost.

In PSBP 2 the DfE will use the information from the Property Data Survey¹ (PDS) to assess the scale and severity of condition need of the schools put forward by the LA. The DfE have also requested the LA identify significant issues that will have a material impact on the condition of the buildings but which may not have been captured by the PDS.

The LA have received very limited information from the PDS due to the DfE only recently sharing this with the LA and this has been limited to small batches of schools at a time. The DfE have advised that the dissemination of the PDS for all schools will be by the end of September 2014.

¹ The Property Data Survey Programme has been undertaken by the Education Funding Agency an executive agency of the Department of Education to provide a consistent view of the condition of England's school estate. Some 19,000 schools will have had Property Data Surveys (PDS) by the end of the programme in September 2014.

Because the expressions of interest for the PSBP need to be with the DfE by the 21st July 2014, the LA has used the knowledge gained through Building Schools for the Future (BSF) and the Primary Capital Programme, the Asset Management Plan (AMP) and in liaison with the school admissions team to establish which schools would form the basis of an expression of interest from the LA to the DfE for inclusion within the PSBP 2.

The Schools chosen were:

Badsley Moor Lane Junior School – Replace Junior School

The junior school building has its original windows which forms the curtain walling. This all requires replacement to meet modern standards and maintain the integrity of the building. It also requires a re-wire.

Laughton Junior and Infant School – Replace with new school

The building was constructed around 1911 and is need of investment to bring it up to standard. It has not had any significant investment on the electrical or mechanical installations and both would benefit from complete renewal.

The external classrooms were constructed in the 1960's and are of modular construction with ply panel sections. The building has come to the end of its useful life. The windows are original and roof has to be constantly patched repaired. The thermal properties of the building are also poor and it suffers from damp.

Harthill Primary School - Replace temporary classrooms

This external classroom has significant condition needs. It is classed as a modular/temporary building which was erected in the 1970's and has reached the end of its useful life. The roof has had many temporary repairs and has needed to be propped on occasion and suffers from constant leaks. The windows are original and the cladding is in a poor state of repair.

Wales Primary School – part new build/refurbishment

This is a Victorian building which is in need of a re-wire and replacement distribution pipework. The roof is the original roof which needs replacing; this includes the timbers within the roof structure.

The junior school building was built in the 1970's is now in need of a replacement roof, windows and doors, heating distribution pipework and a re-wire.

The main hall is a 1920's building and requires a re-wire and heating distribution pipework.

Swinton Community School

Sixth Form block - The windows are in poor condition as is the roof. It also requires significant work to its mechanical and electrical systems.

Main Buildings - condition items are the roofing (most of the roofs had a single layer felt to prevent the numerous leaks as a short term solution) the heating

boilers are at the end of their life and all the heating distribution pipework / radiators need replacement, Windows mostly single glazed are in poor condition, class rooms are very hot and due to condition some windows do not open causing extreme temperatures in warm weather. The Lightning protection system needs replacing. Doors both internal and external need replacement and there are still some hanging plaster block ceilings that need replacement. The electrical system is in need of major overhaul possibly a rewire in the next five years. Floors are starting to show signs of age with some classrooms requiring re-boarding this summer prior to new floorcoverings. Asbestos is present in most areas of the school; therefore any refurbishment work is extremely costly.

St Pius X RC High School.

ROSLA block - The external windows and doors need replacing as they are in poor condition. The heating pipework is original and needs replacing as is the wiring which also needs replacing. The ceilings throughout are also in poor condition.

Main building - the roof is in poor condition and regularly has to be repaired. The windows and external doors are also in poor condition. The heating and electrical systems both need replacing which is a considerable cost (estimated at £700k).

Newman School

The building is Grade 1 listed and has classrooms of which 3 sides are glazed. This glazing needs replacing due to its age, but must be of similar design and type. It has been estimated that this could cost approximately £1m. The roof constantly has to be repaired and would benefit from replacement. The internal doors need also need replacing. The toilet areas are looking worn and would benefit from refurbishment. It is also in need of a rewire.

Therapy Pool - This is a timber clad building which is in poor condition, both the cladding and roof need replacing. The boiler also needs replacement.

Higher Education block - Although this building is not in poor condition, it located at the extremities of the site and due to the nature of the students' access it poses significant problems.

8. Finance:

All the condition work detailed in the above schools except Harthill, is contained within the CYPS Capital Strategy (what the LA would like to do but do not have the available funding). An allowance of £800k has been made within the CYPS Capital Programme for the replacement of the external classrooms at Harthill. If this project is accepted as part of the PSBP 2 this will return the funding for use on other projects with the CYPS capital programme.

Any associated off site works as a result of the project e.g. Section 278, the LA will be liable for these costs. There is currently no allowance for these costs within the CYPS Capital Programme.

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

The DfE have set a high bar for inclusion and will take forward a relatively small number of projects at schools shown to be in the very worst condition where that condition necessitates a complete rebuild or major refurbishment. The limited nature of the programme will mean that the Rotherham bids are considered against other Local Authority bids across England.

If Rotherham were unsuccessful in its bid to the PSBP 2, the schools would continue to be maintained by the Local Authority and any outstanding condition priority work will be prioritised and included within the capital programme over the coming years.

The DfE will use information from the Property Data Survey (PDS) to assess the scale and severity of the condition need. The DfE are in the early stages of sharing this information with the LA and are issuing this information in batches. To date the LA has only received a limited number of PDS's for the Rotherham Schools and none of these are for the schools put forward by the LA for the PSBP 2. There is a risk that the LA Assets management survey does not align with the DfE Property Data Survey and therefore varies the ranking of schools in relation to condition to that considered by the DfE.

Any associated off site works as a result of the project e.g. Section 278, the LA will be liable for these costs. There is currently no allowance for these costs with the CYPS Capital Programme.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

The capital programme is consistent with the Children and Young People's Services priority of Transforming Rotherham Learning.

Pupils will benefit from state of the art teaching and learning facilities enabling children and young people to enjoy and achieve in suitable accommodation.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

Background Papers include:

- Children & Young People's Plan on a page
- Transforming Rotherham Learning Plan

**Contact Name: Robert Holsey, CYPS Capital Projects Manager.
Environmental and Development Services.**

Tel: 823723

Email: robert.holsey@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:-	Cabinet
2.	Date:-	6th August 2014
3.	Title:-	Review of Neighbourhood Centres- Phase Two
4.	Directorate:-	Neighbourhoods & Adult Services

5. Summary

On the 7th April 2014, Min No: 77 refers, the Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods received a report which detailed recommendations to retain 37 of the 60 neighbourhood centres.

It was agreed that further work be undertaken to enable proposals to be finalised for the remaining 23 neighbourhood centres which were considered as unsustainable.

This report details recommendations for 14 of the 23 neighbourhood centres and emerging proposals for the laundry facilities. Recommendations for the remaining 9 neighbourhood centres, laundry and guest bedroom facilities will be submitted to a future meeting.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet;

- Approve the decommissioning and alternative use of 10 neighbourhood centres (including communal lounge, laundry and guest bedroom facilities) as identified in Appendix 1
- Approve the retention of a further 4 neighbourhood centres as identified in Appendix 1
- Support the rationale for the laundry facilities as detailed in 7.3 and approve the recommended consultation in relation to the proposed increased charge
- Note the proposed next steps identified in 7.6

7. Proposals and Details

7.1. Background

There are 60 Neighbourhood Centres located within an aged persons housing complex across the borough which consist of a communal lounge with kitchen and toilet facilities. Some centres also offer a guest bedroom and laundry facility.

Tenants residing on a scheme with access to a centre have to pay a mandatory communal facility charge (CFC) which is currently set at £4.77 per property per week as agreed within their tenancy agreement for use and access to the neighbourhood centre. This charge provides income for the centres to support the associated running costs.

A review of the centres was initiated following customer requests in relation to the potential to opt out of the CFC and declining usage of the facilities by residents.

In addition, increasing management costs due to rises in utility costs and repairs and maintenance requirements, has resulted in the centres operating at an overall financial deficit and consequently creating budgetary pressures.

A thorough consultation exercise for each of the neighbourhood centres, including communal lounge areas, guest bedrooms and laundry facilities has been undertaken, to determine proposals relating to future use. This included:

- Sending postal surveys to all tenants with follow up calls to non-respondents - Overall a 71% response rate
- Seeking feedback from Ward Members- a response was received from 37 (59%) ward members and at least one ward member attended each consultation meeting
- Community groups and TARA's who utilise the centres have been consulted where applicable
- Holding open meetings at Centres with tenants and Ward Members where centres were identified as unsustainable based on usage, survey results and Ward Member feedback.

A summary of the consultation outcome per centre is attached as Appendix 2.

This exercise enabled recommendations to be finalised for the majority of neighbourhood centres with 37 approved for retention by the Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods on 7th April 2014; minute number 77 refers. It was agreed that further work be undertaken to enable proposals to be finalised for the remaining 23 neighbourhood centres and borough wide laundry and guest bedroom facilities.

The emerging proposals and associated rationale for the guest bedroom and laundry facilities is detailed in sections 7.3 and 7.4. These facilities are integral to the neighbourhood centres. Accordingly, approval for removal of the under used guest bedrooms and laundries within the unsustainable centres (identified in Appendix 1) is requested ahead of final recommendations for these facilities at other locations.

This report details recommendations for 14 of the remaining neighbourhood centres. Recommendations for the final 9 centres will be submitted at a future date following conclusion of recommendations for laundry and guest bedroom facilities.

A programme of investment will be undertaken to improve the service offer within retained centres including both decoration and new furniture as required to encourage further use of neighbourhood centres. This will support the council's wider emerging older peoples housing strategy objectives in relation to maintaining independence, preventing social isolation and promoting health and wellbeing, and will provide suitable facilities for what is hoped will be a wider range of health and social activities.

7.2. Communal Lounge Facilities

The remaining 23 centres were identified as having poor usage and demand and therefore tenants and Ward Members were advised during open consultation meetings in November/December 2013 that usage would need to be increased within the subsequent six months to demonstrate their sustainability for continued use as a communal facility.

During meetings, tenants were offered advice and referral to Age UK Rotherham and Rotherfed in order to support increased activities within the centres.

A desktop analysis of usage has recently been undertaken which identified an increase in activities in 4 of the 23 centres. Accordingly, they are now being recommended for retention with a further review in 12 months.

7.3 Laundry Facilities

There are 52 laundry facilities within the 60 centres across the borough.

Tenants who pay the CFC may use the laundry facility for an additional optional charge at £0.85 per week. The current income does not provide sufficient resources to support the associated running costs. Accordingly, the laundry facilities are not financially viable as they are heavily subsidised by the CFC.

If retained, the laundry facilities will require significant investment to replace the majority of washing and drying machines which are reaching the end of their useful life.

Usage of the laundry varies significantly per scheme. The consultation process identified the following:

- The majority of tenants who use the facilities are keen for them to be retained
- A number of tenants are not adverse to an increase in the current charge
- Some tenants would be willing to consider having their kitchens altered to accommodate their own washing facilities.

Due to the significant deficit associated with the laundry facilities, it is considered that we should set a minimum threshold of 16 tenants or more per scheme as well as an increase in the current charge to justify sustaining the facilities borough wide.

Based upon the proposed minimum threshold and the current average running costs the charge would have to be set at £6.34 per tenant per week to achieve full cost recovery. However this is not considered to be a realistic increase therefore a proposed increase to £3.17 per tenant per week is considered to be reasonable in order to achieve recovery of 50% of the average running costs. We would then phase an increase over the forthcoming years in order to achieve full cost recovery.

Further consultation is required to determine the number of tenants per scheme who would continue to opt into the laundry facility at the proposed charge prior to concluding recommendations. However, a number of laundry facilities within the neighbourhood centres identified as unsustainable already fall below the proposed minimum threshold. As they are integral to the centres, they therefore need to be removed and included in the proposals for alternative use and submitted ahead of final recommendations borough wide.

Tenants affected by the removal of the laundry facility will be offered alterations to their kitchen area to accommodate their own washing machines or the potential to opt into a nearby neighbourhood centre laundry facility. Assistance will also be offered to acquire a washer/dryer if required.

Alternatively, tenants may utilise 3 commercial laundry and dry cleaning premises or 10 laundry collection services which currently operate within the Rotherham area.

7.4 Guest Bedroom Facilities

There are 52 guest bedroom facilities within the 60 centres across the borough.

All guest bedrooms are considered to be unsustainable based on usage and financial information and they also present a management issue in relation to the distribution of keys, collection of money and cleaning.

However, some tenants and Ward Members have asked to retain the facilities.

Recommendations for future use are being concluded.

However, the guest bedroom facilities within the neighbourhood centres identified for decommissioning and alternative use are integral to the units. They are therefore being submitted for decommissioning ahead of final recommendations borough wide.

It is proposed that they are included within conversion/asset transfer proposals where they are located within a one storey unit. Alternatively, guest bedrooms located on the first floor within a two storey building are recommended for decommissioning. They would then be offered to the adjacent residential tenant for an increased weekly rent.

If the tenant is not interested in pursuing this option, it is recommended that we investigate the potential conversion into two units (where feasible) when the adjacent flat becomes vacant.

7.5 Recommendations

Based on a range of parameters including usage, financial information, Ward Member feedback and consultation responses from tenants our recommendations for the remaining 23 neighbourhood centres are as follows:

- Retain 4 neighbourhood centres which are considered to be sustainable
- 10 neighbourhood centres (including communal lounge, laundry and guest bedroom facilities) are considered to be unsustainable, of these it is proposed to:
 - Convert 8 centres to residential units; the centres would be converted and re-let as council homes to support housing need and demand
 - Asset transfer 2 centres; expressions of interest have been received which comply with the relevant policy. This will allow management of the centres and the associated costs to be transferred to the identified group (including removal of the communal facility charge) as well as retaining a community facility. The proposed asset transfer of the 2 units identified will transfer full management and maintenance responsibilities to the lessee. However, if asset transfer does not go ahead then the units will be converted to residential units
- 5 neighbourhood centres have been identified as unsustainable however current usage of the laundry facility is above the proposed minimum threshold. Recommendations will therefore be deferred until the laundry consultation has been concluded
- 4 neighbourhood centres are being deferred pending further analysis

It is recommended that further consultation in relation to the proposed laundry charge is undertaken to enable recommendations to be concluded.

Further information including consultation results, financial information and usage is detailed in Appendix 1.

7.6 Next Steps

Subject to approval, the following steps are proposed;

- 1 Write to tenants and ward members with details of the decision and proposed timescales
- 2 Undertake further consultation in relation to the proposed increased laundry charge to inform recommendations
- 3 Submit final recommendations for the remaining 9 communal facilities, laundry and guest bedroom facilities in the Autumn

8. Finance

The majority of centres operate at a deficit and in 2013/14 there was an overall £83k deficit across the portfolio.

The estimated savings generated from the 10 centres proposed for an alternative use is £34k (based on 2013/14 actual expenditure).

The centres will be surveyed to determine a programme of future investment. An £100k capital investment programme is allocated within 2014/15 to invest in retained centres.

A further £50k revenue budget is allocated within 2014/15 for refurbishment of retained centres which will help to encourage and promote further usage.

The estimated costs associated with the 8 units identified for residential conversion (based on the two centres that have previously been converted) is £400k which would be funded from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and there are sufficient resources to facilitate works within 2014/15 Housing Capital Investment Programme. We have received confirmation that the works can be completed during 2014/15. However, the programme of work will be further refined and if necessary provision made within the 2015/16 capital programme as required, to complete the works.

Following conversion and re-letting, the properties will generate a rental income stream.

The average cost of operating a laundry facility is approximately £4875 per annum and the total estimated deficit for laundry facilities within 2013/14 was approximately £217k borough wide.

In addition, the majority of the washing and drying machines are 20-30 years old and will require replacement at around £2k per unit at a total cost of approximately £220k if retained. This is unbudgeted and would create a revenue pressure.

The estimated costs associated with altering kitchen areas in individual properties is approximately £500 per unit. We are looking into the potential to offer washing machines through the furnished homes scheme which would be paid back on a weekly rent. The potential cost to adapt properties that it is proposed will lose their communal laundry facility is approximately £62k.

We have had to put in place weekly cleaning of the guest bedroom facilities at a cost of £16k per annum regardless of whether they are used in order to ensure compliance with health and safety regulations such as legionella prevention.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

A timely decision is required to ensure that the required planning submission for change of use and the completion of construction works can be achieved within the current financial year. Discussions have been held with the Planning Service regarding the proposed conversion. It is not anticipated that there will be an issue with obtaining planning permission based upon the two units which were previously converted.

Whilst we have received initial confirmation that the capital works associated with the proposed conversions can be achieved during 2014/15, we will ensure a finalised programme is developed and make financial provision in 2015/16 as necessary.

The units are located within older persons housing schemes and therefore lettings would have to be sensitive towards the nature of the scheme with a relevant local lettings policy being applied similar to lettings of former warden flats above centres.

It may be necessary to change the terms of the tenancy agreements if the communal facility is to be no longer available or changed to a nearby site. Also if the alternative facility is too far from the site or shared with properties of a different status there may be a danger that they will lose their immunity from right to buy claims.

The usage identified was based on a standard week's activities in each centre which therefore may increase/decrease subject to changes in occupancy.

The proposed recommendations may meet resistance from tenants and ward members.

The centres are currently operating at a deficit and there is no certainty that appropriate funding will be available to subsidise the units in future.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The proposals support the following 'Plan on a page' corporate priorities and achievements:

- Ensuring care and protection is available to those that need it the most
 - People in need of care and support have more choice and control to help them live at home
- Helping to create safe and healthy communities
 - People feel safe and happy where they live
 - More people are physically active and have a healthy way of life
 - People from different backgrounds get on well together

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Cabinet Member for Safe & Attractive Neighbourhoods – 22nd April 2013 - Neighbourhood Centres Review - Initial Recommendations
- Cabinet Member for Safe & Attractive Neighbourhoods – 7th April 2014 – Review of Neighbourhood Centres Phase One

Contact Names:

Lynsey Skidmore, Housing Services Officer, Housing and Communities Service, Housing and Neighbourhood Services, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate. Telephone: (3)34950 or lynsey.skidmore@rotherham.gov.uk

Lindsey Gibson, Housing Projects Coordinator, Housing and Neighbourhood Services, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate. Telephone: (2)55043 or lindsey.gibson@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1
Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Recommendations Rationale			Total number of Tenants	Change in activities since review	Laundry Facility			Gu
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage; Hours Per Week	Financial Information 2013/14	Consultation Summary- Tenants			Facility Available	Above/below threshold	Recommendation	Facility available
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Caperns Road	North Anston	Anston and Woodsetts	62 Woodland Drive (Community Building) 343 meters	2	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	46	Nil changes	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Scouts received) or conversion.	Chapel Walk	Catcliffe	Brinsworth and Catcliffe	Merebrow (within 225 metres)	2.5	-£	Even split between tenants	24	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Baptist Church received) or conversion.	Cliff Hills	Maltby	Hellaby	The Grange (within 1200 metres)	5 tenants and 3non tenants	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	22	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Mission Field	Brampton Bierlow	Hoover	Cortonwood Comeback Centre (within 230 metres) Ann Rhodes (Sheltered Centre) 663 meters and Hurley Croft (Sheltered Centre) 686 meters	4	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	15	Nil changes	No	N/A	N/A	No
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Ann Rhodes	Brampton Bierlow	Hoover	Mission Field (Sheltered Centre) 663 meters and Hurley Croft (Sheltered Centre) 1000m	6 hours MFS Respite and 6 hours tenants	-£	Even split between tenants	48	Tenants attempted to increase usage however there was no interest in additional activities therefore nil changes since consultation	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Retain & review in 12 months	Bevan Crescent	Maltby	Maltby	Maltby CSC (within 680 metres)	10	-£	Majority tenants support retention	23	tenants have been pro-active in organising additional activities and are currently working with Age UK to deliver further activities therefore there has been an increase in 6 hours per week since consultation	No	N/A	N/A	No
Retain & review in 12 months	Tickhill Road /Glencairn Court	Maltby	Maltby	Edward Dunn Memorial Hall (within 545 metres) and Tickhill Road (within 1000 metres)	12.5 hours tenants/ TARA plus 10 hours WDP respite	-£	Majority tenants support retention	17		Yes	Below	Consultation required	Yes
Retain & review in 12 months	Foljambe Street	Parkgate	Rawmarsh	Marshall Close (Sheltered Centre) 127 meters and Turner Close (Sheltered Centre) 360 meters	13	+£	Majority tenants support retention	32	Tenants have organised various activities resulting in a 13 hour per week increase in use	Yes	Below	Consultation required	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Greenfields	Rawmarsh	Rawmarsh	Pottery Close (Sheltered Centre) 274 meters and Dale Road Peoples Centre (Community Building) 420 metres	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	29	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Arbour Drive	Thurcroft	Rother Vale	Rotherwood (within 100 metres)	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	36	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes

Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Recommendations Rationale			Total number of Tenants	Change in activities since review	Laundry Facility			Gu
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage; Hours Per Week	Financial Information 2013/14	Consultation Summary- Tenants			Facility Available	Above/below threshold	Recommendation	Facility available
Defer pending further analysis	Station Road	Treeton	Rother Vale	Treeton Reading Rooms (within 130 metres)	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	29	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Alternative use- conversion	College Road	Masbrough	Rotherham West	Robert Street/Victoria Street (Sheltered Centre) 284 meters and Masbrough and Thornhill Community Centre (Community Building) 64 meters	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	22	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Robert Street/Victoria Street	Masbrough	Rotherham West	College Road (Sheltered Centre)284 meters and Masbrough and Thornhill Community Centre (Community Building) 162 meters	2	-£	Even split between tenants	44	Nil changes	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Sorrel Sykes	Whiston	Sitwell	Whiston community centre (within 120 metres) and Francis Howlett (within 1500 centres)	3	-£	Majority tenants support retention	24	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Francis Howlett	Whiston	Sitwell	Sorrel Sykes (within 1500 metres)	4	-£	Even split between tenants	31	Tenants have attempted to increase usage however there was no demand for additional activities therefore nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Dorothy Taylor	Dalton	Valley	Wootton Court (within 770 metres)and Mousehole Close (within 250 metres)	0	+£	Majority tenants support alternative use	38	Nil changes	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Alternative use- conversion	Durham Place	Herringthorpe	Valley	Bakersfield (Sheltered Centre) 874 meters and Swinburne Place (Sheltered Centre) 654 meters	3.5	+£	Even split between tenants	53	Nil changes	No	N/A	N/A	No
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Victoria Court	Kiveton Park	Wales	Viking Way (within 1200 metres)	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	26	Nil changes	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Alternative use- conversion.	Campsall Field Close	Wath	Wath	Montgomery Hall (within 1000 metres)	2	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	30	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Defer pending further analysis	Normanville	Sunnyside	Wickersley	Mark Grove (Sheltered Centre) 613 meters	4.5	-£	Majority tenants support retention	20	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Defer pending further analysis	Ash Grove	Bramley	Wickersley	The Lings (within 930 metres) and Wickersley Library (within 480 metres)	0	-£	Majority tenants support alternative use	24	Nil changes	Yes	Below	Remove	Yes
Defer pending further analysis	Mark Grove	Flanderwell	Wickersley	Normanville (Sheltered Centre) 613 meters	6.5	+£	Majority tenants support retention	44	Additional 0.5 per week	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes

Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Recommendations Rationale			Total number of Tenants		Laundry Facility			Gu
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage; Hours Per Week	Financial Information 2013/14	Consultation Summary- Tenants			Facility Available	Above/below threshold	Recommendation	Facility available
Retain & review in 12 months	St Mary's View	Munsbrough	Wingfield	Fitzwilliam Square (within 790 metres) and Dawson Croft (within 900 metres)	7.5 hours tenants and 10 hours MFS use	+£	Majority tenants support retention	50	Nil changes	Yes	Above	Consultation required	Yes
Total								727					

Appendix 1

Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Best Bedroom Facility	
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage	Recommendation
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Caperns Road	North Anston	Anston and Woodsetts	62 Woodland Drive (Community Building) 343 meters	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Scouts received) or conversion.	Chapel Walk	Catcliffe	Brinsworth and Catcliffe	Merebrow (within 225 metres)	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Baptist Church received) or conversion.	Cliff Hills	Maltby	Hellaby	The Grange (within 1200 metres)	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Alternative use- conversion.	Mission Field	Brampton Bierlow	Hoover	Cortonwood Comeback Centre (within 230 metres) Ann Rhodes (Sheltered Centre) 663 meters and Hurley Croft (Sheltered Centre) 686 meters	N/A	N/A
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Ann Rhodes	Brampton Bierlow	Hoover	Mission Field (Sheltered Centre) 663 meters and Hurley Croft (Sheltered Centre) 1000m	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Retain & review in 12 months	Bevan Crescent	Maltby	Maltby	Maltby CSC (within 680 metres)	N/A	N/A
Retain & review in 12 months	Tickhill Road /Glencairn Court	Maltby	Maltby	Edward Dunn Memorial Hall (within 545 metres) and Tickhill Road (within 1000 metres)	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Retain & review in 12 months	Foljambe Street	Parkgate	Rawmarsh	Marshall Close (Sheltered Centre) 127 meters and Turner Close (Sheltered Centre) 360 meters	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Alternative use- conversion.	Greenfields	Rawmarsh	Rawmarsh	Pottery Close (Sheltered Centre) 274 meters and Dale Road Peoples Centre (Community Building) 420 metres	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Alternative use- conversion.	Arbour Drive	Thurcroft	Rother Vale	Rotherwood (within 100 metres)	None	Remove and offer to adjacent tenant

Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Best Bedroom Facility	
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage	Recommendation
Defer pending further analysis	Station Road	Treeton	Rother Vale	Treeton Reading Rooms (within 130 metres)	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Alternative use- conversion	College Road	Masbrough	Rotherham West	Robert Street/Victoria Street (Sheltered Centre) 284 meters and Masbrough and Thornhill Community Centre (Community Building) 64 meters	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Robert Street/Victoria Street	Masbrough	Rotherham West	College Road (Sheltered Centre)284 meters and Masbrough and Thornhill Community Centre (Community Building) 162 meters	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Alternative use- conversion.	Sorrel Sykes	Whiston	Sitwell	Whiston community centre (within 120 metres) and Francis Howlett (within 1500 centres)	None	Remove and offer to adjacent tenant
Alternative use- conversion.	Francis Howlett	Whiston	Sitwell	Sorrel Sykes (within 1500 metres)	None	Remove and offer to adjacent tenant
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Dorothy Taylor	Dalton	Valley	Wootton Court (within 770 metres)and Mousehole Close (within 250 metres)	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Alternative use- conversion	Durham Place	Herringthorpe	Valley	Bakersfield (Sheltered Centre) 874 meters and Swinburne Place (Sheltered Centre) 654 meters	N/A	N/A
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Victoria Court	Kiveton Park	Wales	Viking Way (within 1200 metres)	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Alternative use- conversion.	Campsall Field Close	Wath	Wath	Montgomery Hall (within 1000 metres)	None	Remove and include in proposals for centre
Defer pending further analysis	Normanville	Sunnyside	Wickersley	Mark Grove (Sheltered Centre) 613 meters	None	Remove and offer to adjacent tenant
Defer pending further analysis	Ash Grove	Bramley	Wickersley	The Lings (within 930 metres) and Wickersley Library (within 480 metres)	None	Remove and offer to adjacent tenant
Defer pending further analysis	Mark Grove	Flanderwell	Wickersley	Normanville (Sheltered Centre) 613 meters	None	Defer pending laundry consultation

Neighbourhood Centres Review - Phase Two

Recommendations Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary					Best Bedroom Facility	
Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Neighbouring Centres and Community Buildings including distance	Usage	Recommendation
Retain & review in 12 months	St Mary's View	Munsbrough	Wingfield	Fitzwilliam Square (within 790 metres) and Dawson Croft (within 900 metres)	None	Defer pending laundry consultation
Total						

Appendix 2
Neighbourhood Centres Review- Phase Two Consultation Summary

Recommendation Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary				Surveys Summary																			Consultation Meeting Outcome
Final Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Total Tenants/ Households	Total Surveys Returned	Total non response	Response Rate	Summary- questionnaire results	Option A- Retain			Option B- Alternative Use			Option C- Opt out			Option D- Other			Blank Surveys		
									HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total			
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Caperns Road	North Anston	Anston and Woodsetts	46	33	13	72%	Alternative Use (39%) and Retain (33%) and majority remove at consultation meeting	10	1	11	8	5	13	2	2	4	0	0	0	5	Well attended meeting by tenants, LG,LG, HT, Cllrs Dalton, Burton and Jepson. Few tenants wanted to retain centre as enjoy bingo and Woodland too far away. Majority supported removal but would like to retain laundry and guest bedroom facility.	
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Scouts received) or conversion.	Chapel Walk	Catcliffe	Brinsworth and Catcliffe	24	19	5	79%	Retain (58%)	9	2	11	3	1	4	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	4 tenants attended meeting plus Catcliffe Parish Council rep and Cllrs Roddison and Buckley. 2 tenants who attend activities would like to retain the centre however there is only two and a half hours use per week. Therefore advised that they will have to increase use if they want to retain	
Alternative use- asset transfer (application from Baptist Church received) or conversion.	Cliff Hills	Maltby	Hellaby	22	17	5	77%	Retain (35%) and Remove (24%) and Opt Out (24%)	5	1	6	3	1	4	3	1	4	1	0	1	3	7 residents (3 pay cfc) plus 3 Maltby Baptist Church, LS,LG and Cllr Andrews in attendance at meeting. Majority support retention and asset transfer to church group subject to bingo sessions being retained	
Alternative use- conversion.	Mission Field	Brampton Bierlow	Hoober	15	14	1	93%	Alternative Use (50%)	4	0	4	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	Four tenants plus Cllr Roche and J Hamilton attended the meeting who supported retention due to attendance at the bingo activities. Advised that we would look into the use of Corton Comeback Centre as an alternative but tenants would prefer to continue to use this centre for convenience due to location	
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Ann Rhodes	Brampton Bierlow	Hoober	48	39	9	81%	Retain (26%)/ Alternative Use (31%)/ Opt Out (26%)	9	1	10	7	5	12	7	3	10	2	0	2	5	17 tenants attended meeting plus Cllr J Hamilton and 13 wanted to retain whilst 4 supported removal. Advised tenants that they would need to use more to warrant retention. Advised that would give them a few months to get something up and running and will review again then as only 5/6 residents attend bingo for 6 hours per week	
Retain & review in 12 months	Bevan Crescent	Maltby	Maltby	23	20	3	87%	Retain (80%)	12	4	16	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7 residents (4 pay cfc) attended meeting, LS,LG, LI and Cllr Beaumont. All support retention of centre and are going to explore increased use	
Retain & review in 12 months	Tickhill Road /Glencairn Court	Maltby	Maltby	17	9	8	53%	Retain (67%)	3	3	6	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11 residents (1 pays CFC) attended meeting, LS,LG, LI and Cllr Beaumont. All support retention of centre and TARA group going to <u>explore increased usage</u>	
Retain & review in 12 months	Foljambe Street	Parkgate	Rawmarsh	32	24	8	75%	Retain (38%) and alternative use (38%) and majority of tenants at meeting supported retention	7	2	9	9	0	9	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	Meeting attended by 13 tenants, Cllrs Hamilton, Whelbourn and Vines plus LG, LS and Chris Lever. Majority of tenants want to retain centre however it is not used. Going to try and increase usage prior to March- will review again prior to concluding recommendations	
Alternative use- conversion.	Greenfields	Rawmarsh	Rawmarsh	29	22	7	76%	Alternative use (45%)	4	1	5	10	0	10	3	4	7	2	0	2	0	Meeting attended by 7 residents, Cllrs Hamilton, Whelbourn and Vines plus LG, LS and WO'S. All residents supportive of alternative use and retention of laundry facility	
Alternative use- conversion.	Arbour Drive	Thurcroft	Rother Vale	36	34	2	94%	Alternative Use (44%)	8	1	9	10	5	15	5	1	6	0	0	0	4	Meeting attended by 7 tenants, Cllrs Lelliott and Swift, Lindsey, Lynsey and Heather. All supported closure of the centre and guest bedroom but retention of the laundry	
Defer pending further analysis	Station Road	Treeton	Rother Vale	29	26	3	90%	Alternative Use (38%)/Opt out (35%)	5	0	5	6	4	10	8	1	9	0	0	0	2	Well attended meeting, majority supportive of alternative use and retention of laundry	
Alternative use- conversion	College Road	Masbrough	Rotherham West	22	16	6	73%	Retain (38%)	3	3	6	3	0	3	0	2	2	1	0	1	4	Meeting attended by 6 tenants, Cllrs Foden and Sims, LS,LG and CV. All tenants supported alternative use and some requested retention <u>of laundry</u>	
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Robert Street/Victoria Street	Masbrough	Rotherham West	44	40	4	91%	Alternative use (35%) and Retain (30%)	11	1	12	10	4	14	2	5	7	1	0	1	6	Meeting attended by 11 tenants plus Cllrs Foden, Sims and Akhtar, LS, LG,NA and HR. 5 tenants want to retain as attend coffee morning weekly and 5 support alternative use as they do not use. 2 tenants use laundry and none use guest bedroom	

Appendix 2
Neighbourhood Centres Review- Phase Two Consultation Summary

Recommendation Key
Alternative Use
Further Review
Retain

Centres Summary				Surveys Summary																		Consultation Meeting Outcome
Final Recommendation	Centre Name	Area	Ward	Total Tenants/ Households	Total Surveys Returned	Total non response	Response Rate	Summary- questionnaire results	Option A- Retain			Option B- Alternative Use			Option C- Opt out			Option D- Other			Blank Surveys	
									HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total	HB	No HB	Total		
Alternative use- conversion.	Sorrel Sykes	Whiston	Sitwell	24	21	3	88%	Retain (52%)	9	2	11	3	3	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	Meeting well attended by tenants, LS, LG and Cllr McNeely (due to no ward member presence). Majority of tenants wanted to retain but only few use for bingo twice per week. Advised that would allow them a few months to try and increase usage prior to considering an alternative use if usage is not increased
Alternative use- conversion.	Francis Howlett	Whiston	Sitwell	31	20	11	65%	Retain (45%) and Alt Use (40%)	9	0	9	7	1	8	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	Meeting well attended by tenants, LS, LG and Cllr McNeely (due to no ward member presence). Four tenants wanted to retain but only one tenant uses for bingo twice per week. Advised that would allow them a few months to try and increase usage prior to considering an alternative use if usage is not increased
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Dorothy Taylor	Dalton	Valley	38	29	9	76%	Alternative Use (62%)	4	0	4	12	6	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	6	Meeting well attended by 20 tenants, Cllr Pickering, Lakin, Claire Hill and Lindsey and Lynsey. All in favour of alt use of centre, retention of laundry and guest bedroom
Alternative use- conversion	Durham Place	Herringthorpe	Valley	53	40	13	75%	Alternative Use (45%)	8	2	10	11	7	18	3	0	3	0	0	0	9	9 tenants attended the consultation meeting plus Cllrs Lakin, Currie and Pickering,LS,LG and CC. There were mixed views in relation to retention and alternative use. Cllrs highlighted a potential issue with the surveys as people in receipt of HB may assume that they will physically CFC charge if the centre is removed. Officers completed a door to door consultation to clarify; no changes to previous results
Defer subject to laundry consultation	Victoria Court	Kiveton Park	Wales	26	16	10	62%	Retain (25%)/ Alternative Use (25%) and majority remove at meeting	3	1	4	3	1	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	4	11 tenants attended meeting plus LS,LG and Cllrs Watson and Beck. All state that the centre has not been used since May for activities therefore are supportive of an alternative use but would like laundry to be retained.
Alternative use- conversion.	Campsall Field Close	Wath	Wath	30	25	5	83%	Retain (40%)/ Alternative Use (40%)	8	2	10	2	8	10	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	18 tenants attended meeting, LS,LG,MA and Cllrs Gosling and Atkin. All supported an alternative use as centre is not well used. Issues raised in relation to use of centre by wardens and non residents
Defer pending further analysis	Normanville	Sunnyside	Wickersley	20	16	4	80%	Retain (50%)	3	5	8	3	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	11 tenants attended meeting plus LS,DT, Cllrs Ellis and Read. All supported retention due to valuable usage and social isolation prevention. Advised that allow a few months to start more activities prior to further reviewing usage.
Defer pending further analysis	Ash Grove	Bramley	Wickersley	24	13	11	54%	Alternative Use (46%)	3	0	3	3	3	6	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	8 tenants attended the meeting plus Cllr Ellis, LS and LG. All were in favour of removal of the CFC and conversion subject to sound proofing and local lettings policy. They also stated that they would prefer the property to be converted to a DPU. Some tenants were concerned about the laundry and whether their kitchens can accommodate washing machines- we will further investigate kitchen adaptations prior to finalising recommendations for the laundry
Defer pending further analysis	Mark Grove	Flanderwell	Wickersley	44	31	13	70%	Retain (35%)/ Alternative use (48%)	9	2	11	10	5	15	1	3	4	1	0	1	0	12 tenants attended the meeting plus Cllrs Ellis and Read, LS,LG,DT and EW.Majority supported retention and increased use but two supported removal. Advised that usage would need to be increased to demonstrate case for retention. Will speak to TARA to establish whether they are able to organise activities
Retain & review in 12 months	St Mary's View	Munsbrough	Wingfield	50	37	13	74%	Retain (27%) Alt use (24%) and opt out (19%)	8	2	10	6	3	9	2	5	7	1	0	1	10	Meeting attended by 9 tenants, LS,LG,NB, Cllrs Goulty and Sharman. All tenants support retention of centre and raised issues in relation to use by Morrison
Total				751	577	174	77%		160	37	197	140	71	211	45	39	84	12	0	12	75	

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6 August 2014
3.	Title:	YORbuild2 Construction Framework
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

This report sets out proposals for the procurement of a YORbuild 2 Construction Framework and for the Council to continue in its lead role within the management of the YORhub frameworks.

The YORbuild1 Construction Framework has been in place since December 2009 and has successfully delivered building projects both in Rotherham and more broadly in the Yorkshire and Humberside Region. The Framework provides for speedy, efficient and inexpensive procurement of construction contracts. It also supports local employment and economy objectives by providing employment and skills opportunities to local residents.

Local contractors will be advised about the opportunities from being involved in the Framework and encouraged to participate in it.

There could be a small unbudgeted cost associated with setting up the Framework, although there is only a small risk of this falling directly on the Council as other funding is expected to be available to cover the costs.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- a) **The Council should continue as the lead authority for the South Area of YORbuild Construction Framework in procuring Yorbuild2 and enter into a partnership agreement with the other lead authorities for the procurement of the Framework.**
- b) **The Council should enter into framework contract agreements with the contractors appointed under the Framework.**
- c) **The Cabinet Member for Planning, Highways and Street Scene Services be authorised to approve recommended lists of contractors for tender and, subsequently, lists of contractors for appointment to the Framework.**
- d) **The Council should continue to participate in the management of the YORhub frameworks including the YORhub Framework Board.**

7. Proposals and Details

- 7.1 The main benefit of the OJEU-compliant YORbuild Construction Framework, and the resulting availability of contractors through the framework, is the avoidance of lengthy and costly contractor procurement exercises. On occasions, the ability to use the Framework also enables the Council to access funding opportunities that have a short response timescale, for example from the Homes and Communities Agency.
- 7.2 Other benefits have included the provision of Employment and Skills opportunities, delivering good numbers of apprentice-weeks, school visits / workshops and of people progressing into full time employment. In Rotherham, over 900 apprentice weeks have been provided; 566 students have participated in site visits and 388 students have attended skills workshops. Most notably, 45 Rotherham people have progressed into employment through the YORbuild framework.
- 7.3 The appointment of contractors to the original YORbuild1 Framework was for a period of 4 years with an option to extend by 2 years subject to satisfactory performance. That option was exercised so that the end date for the YORbuild1 framework is November 2015. Other construction frameworks in the same style have also now been set up for consultants (YORconsult) and civil engineering and highways works (YORcivil). All of the frameworks are now branded under the 'YORhub' banner and have similar end dates.
- 7.4 The benefits of using these frameworks and partnership working remain. In fact, renewal of the arrangement would help protect against rising prices as the private sector construction market begins to recover. The use of frameworks will also result in cheaper project procurement by avoiding the cost of tendering for any construction projects.
- 7.5 A number of lessons have been learned from use of the frameworks and future arrangements will be adjusted to take account of these:
 - The Lotting structure (dividing the framework into pools based on value) will be reviewed to ensure sufficient competition is achieved without making the pool of contractors too large to make it unattractive to bidders.
 - Lower value bands will be set up to encourage involvement by SMEs and local contractors. A suitable advertising strategy will be drawn up to ensure that local contractors are forewarned and kept informed of opportunities.
 - The use of a single form of construction contract (the NEC form) has proved a barrier to use by some organisations and it is proposed to widen the framework to allow other forms of construction contract.
 - Lots could be added for Affordable/social housing, heritage and pre-fabrication (including modular building construction) to extend the opportunities available.

- A number of briefing and help sessions will be held to advise and support contractors, particularly SMEs, in applying for places on the frameworks. Two of these events will be held in Rotherham.
- 7.6 Rotherham MBC has taken a regional lead in the frameworks and retained its reputation in providing construction procurement services to bodies such as South and West Yorkshire Police, charitable bodies and all of the South Yorkshire Councils. The Council has derived income from the framework for providing these procurement services. In addition, our position has led to opportunities to carry out other services to clients such as design, procurement and contact / project management.
- 7.7 Due to the benefits described above it is proposed to continue to be the lead authority (Framework Authority) for a new South Area contractors' framework (YORbuild2). Sheffield City Council is the Framework Authority for YORconsult and Barnsley MBC has that role for YORcivil. If Rotherham MBC decides not to take part in YORbuild2 then it is likely that either of these Councils will step in, denying Rotherham the commercial opportunities that come along with being recognised as Framework Authority and potentially adversely affecting the positive reputation the Council has built up through these services.
- 7.8 In order to comply with EU procurement rules, the Framework will need to be advertised in the OJEU. It is currently proposed to advertise for expressions of interest using a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire, then draw up a shortlist to tender for standard pricing elements. The draft programme requires placing the advert in the OJEU in October 2014. Rotherham MBC, as Framework Authority, would enter into a framework agreement with the appointed contractors. However, the appointment to any individual project contract would remain with the commissioning authority, together with any contractual risk.
- 7.9 As the framework tender process progresses, it is proposed that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Highways and Street Scene Services approves the recommended lists of contractors for tender and subsequently the lists of contractors for appointment to the Framework. The new framework would commence in November 2015.
- 7.10 The YORbuild framework is governed by a Board made of senior Council officers from the framework authorities. Since the formation of the consultants and highways frameworks, this Board has been renamed the YORhub board. If the Council continues to be the Framework Authority for YORbuild 2 then it would still be represented on the YORhub Board.
- 7.11 The Council itself would continue to use the framework for appropriate projects, where this would lead to best value.
- 7.12 It should be noted that the Council is already operating a standing list of contractors work for construction works valued below £150k (Minute 121 of the 7th April 2014 Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development refers),

whereby the scoring mechanism is weighted to support opportunities for local contractors. This standing list will be used for appropriate projects and for those for which the Yorbuild framework is not suitable.

8. Finance

- 8.1 It is estimated that the procurement costs for Yorbuild2 will be in the region of £230k, based on experiences in YORconsult and YORcivil. These costs are predominantly for officer time from the administering authorities.
- 8.2 The Regional LEPs are being asked to contribute to or meet the costs from the Regional Growth funds, in reflection of the benefits to employment and training from the framework. Should that route of funding prove unsuccessful, it is proposed that some or all of the procurement costs could be met from surpluses currently being generated through the YORcivil framework. Other sources of funding are also being investigated.
- 8.3 The fall-back position would be for each of the four framework authorities (Rotherham MBC, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Leeds CC and Scarborough BC) to fund the procurement of Yorbuild2 and recover the costs through framework call-off income. This may mean that the costs may not be recovered within the year expended. The maximum potential total costs to Rotherham MBC would be between £50 and £70k, falling on the Asset Management fee-trading account.
- 8.4 Overall, we see little risk in being able to recover set-up costs through the routes outlined above.
- 8.4 Additionally, it is worth noting that the Council derives approximately £25k income p.a. from acting as Framework Authority and procuring work for other organisations, and there are opportunities to gain further income from additional services offered to Framework users. If necessary, this could be used to offset any costs.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1 There is a risk that the 22 local authorities and other public bodies within the Yorbuild region do not fully support the Framework. If insufficient projects are commissioned through the Framework, there is a risk that operating costs of approximately £167k for the whole framework exceed income. To mitigate against this, the operating model will adopt a prudent estimate of income and operating costs will be reflective of this.
- 9.2 The contractual arrangements for individual commissions will be between the relevant contractor and council / public body. There would be no contractual risk to Rotherham MBC.
- 9.3 There is a risk that the local contractors and SMEs do not apply for or are not successful in getting places on the framework. A suitable advertising strategy

will be drawn up to ensure that local contractors are forewarned and kept informed of opportunities. The Standing List mentioned in 7.12 will continue to provide opportunities if local contractors are unsuccessful in bidding for the Yoebuild2 framework. In addition, the Supply Chain Engagement Programme within the Framework will signpost work package opportunities to interested suppliers and sub-contractors.

- 9.4 There are risks associated with funding described in section 8 above. If any unmet costs materialise, a further report will be produced.
- 9.5 A project risk register will be produced and reviewed / revised as required.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

- 10.1 The use of the YORbuild2 construction framework will contribute to meeting the following policies:

Community Strategy - Priority 1 Help local people and businesses benefit from a growing economy. The use of these construction frameworks can assist this Priority by providing Employment and Skills opportunities.

- 10.2 This project shows the Council taking a regional lead

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- 11.1 Government Construction Strategy Framework Working Group report – 'Effectiveness of Frameworks'

Contact Name: Brian Barrett, Manager, Corporate Projects Team 01709-254063,
brian.barrett@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6th August 2014
3.	Title:	Business Rates Relief for the new KP Nuts Development at Hellaby
4.	Directorate:	EDS & Resources

5. Summary

The purpose of this report is to seek Member approval to support KP Nuts moving in to a new factory on the Hellaby Industrial Estate, by assisting the company with business rates relief. The company are moving from their old building at Eastwood and investing c£15 million in a new facility at Hellaby, safeguarding 144 jobs and creating 62 new jobs by 2016.

Business rates payable for the new building total £198,825.00, however this is based on an estimate that the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) provided on 16 October 2013. A request has been made to the VOA for a formal valuation now that the property is occupied and operational. The final rateable value could be higher or lower than the estimate. This is £85,073 per annum higher than their existing building (based on estimate only). It is proposed to hold rates payable for the new building at the same level as the old building for three years until tax year 2017 – 18 subject to State Aid de minimis limits.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- **The Council support KP Nuts with their business rates payment for three years from the 2014/15 year. The support will enable the company to invest and grow here in Rotherham, safeguarding existing jobs and create new jobs in the future.**

Due to EU State Aid Regulations, this support is limited to 200,000 Euros over the three year period, which equates to £161,290 at 1.24 Euros to the £.

7. Proposals and Details

KP Nuts have been located in Rotherham since the 1930's and have recently been bought by the German Intersnack Group who run a number of nut factories across Europe, including one near Cambridge. Intersnack were looking to invest in a new nut processing facility somewhere in Europe, and KP approached the Council to see if we could assist them in capturing the investment for Rotherham.

The existing factory at Eastwood is no longer fit for purpose, and to capture the investment, KP have had to relocate their business to new premises. The other Intersnack factory at Cambridge is much newer and could take on the extra production, plus there are other group factories in Holland and Germany that could also take on the production capacity of the Rotherham plant. Competition was extremely fierce within the group, and we were keen to see this long standing Rotherham company stay in the town and grow its business in the future.

RiDO assisted KP with a Regional Growth Fund bid to the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership fund and they were successful in securing £1.5 million for the project. The local KP management asked if we could assist them with business rates relief for the new Hellaby property and requested that we limit the rates payable on the new building to what they currently pay on the old building.

The new building is called Hellaby 140 and though of a similar size, it offers a much better layout suited to modern production techniques over the old building. Hellaby 140 covers 13,178 square metres with the Eastwood plant at 14,137 square metres. The new building business rates is estimated at £198,825.00 payable per year, this is £85,073 higher than their existing building (based on estimate only). It is proposed to hold rates payable for the new building at the same level as the old building for three years until tax year 2017 – 18. This is subject to EU State Aid De minimis Regulations which limits the assistance to 200,000 Euros over the three year period.

With Rotherham MBC support, KP will secure the investment from their parent company Intersnack, with the immediate results that 144 jobs here in Rotherham have been safeguarded. KP are investing in new machinery at Hellaby, and that will lead to a further 62 jobs being created over the next two years, and cementing the company here in Rotherham for the foreseeable future. Intersnack have already announced the closure of their Cambridge plant in the UK and moved its production to Rotherham.

8. Finance

The cost of this support will be limited to 200,000 Euros (c£161,290 at 1.24 Euros to the £) due to EU State Aid de minimis rules, for the three year period from 2014 to 2017.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

When securing new investment there is always the potential that the investment / company could move on in the future. However this is usually less likely when substantial investment in plant and equipment (Capital Investment) has been made.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Section 69 of the Localism Act 2011 allows local authorities the discretion to award rate relief to all types of businesses. The Guide to the Act gives details as follows:

“The Localism Act gives councils more freedom to offer business rate discounts - to help attract firms, investment and jobs. Whilst councils would need to meet the cost of any discount from local resources, they may decide that the immediate cost of the discount is outweighed by the long-term benefit of attracting growth and jobs to their area”.

The Localism Act allows the Council to award up to 100% rate relief in any one year for qualifying businesses. Applications under this section will only be considered after consideration of any other forms of rate relief to which the applicant may be eligible (excluding hardship rate relief) and must not transgress any state aid rules.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

N/A

Contact Names:

Andrew Nettleton, Business Investment Manager, RiDO, Environment & Development Services. Tel ext. 54569, Andrew.nettleton@rotherham.gov.uk
Rachel Humphries, Operational Manager, Local Taxation, Resources. Tel ext 55119, rachel.humphries@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6th August 2014
3.	Title:	Grant assistance and long term Capital Loan Finance in support of the redevelopment of Nos. 25 – 29 High Street, ‘The Three Cranes’, and No. 29a High Street
4.	Directorate:	Planning, Regeneration and Culture Resources

5. Summary

To consider a formal request from a local businessman, Mr. Chris Hamby, for

- 1) an additional long term capital finance loan from the Council of £300,000 to bring the re-development of No’s 25 – 29 High Street ‘The Three Cranes’; and No.29a High Street, a former Georgian Town House, to a successful conclusion.
- 2) a grant of £190,000 from the Council to help bridge the funding shortfall which has arisen through the unforeseen delays and additional costs incurred by Mr. Hamby in delivering this complex heritage project.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to :-

- (A) Approve the financial support towards the regeneration of Rotherham High Street buildings as detailed in option 2 of this report being the provision of a capital loan facility of up to £300,000 and the payment of a capital grant of £190,000.**
- (B) Delegate responsibility for drawing up the financial agreement on appropriate terms and conditions to the Director of Financial Services and Responsible Legal Officer.**

7. Background

On 7th September 2011 and 27th November 2013, Cabinet approved long term loan facilities totalling £0.89m over 25 years to a local business man, Mr. Chris Hamby, to restore buildings on the High Street in support of the Council's corporate priority of creating a vibrant Town Centre.

The loan facilities were to facilitate the purchase and subsequent re-development of No's 17,19 and 21 High Street along with the following listed buildings: No's 25 – 29 High Street 'The Three Cranes'; No.29a High Street a former Georgian Town House; and The George Wright Building.

Development by a private sector owner was necessary to lever in Heritage Lottery Funding (HLF) to meet the cost of additional works to the listed buildings.

Mr. Hamby has since drawn down on the loan facility in full and has successfully completed the redevelopment of No's 17, 19 and 21. Work has also commenced on the three Grade 2 Listed buildings, nos 25-29 (Alfonso's and Three Cranes) and the George Wright building and the work on these properties is scheduled to be completed by the end of December 2014.

Case for Further Support

There have however, been significant delays on the redevelopment of the three listed buildings. This has arisen due to delays in securing the HLF funding, the severe winters causing additional damage to the fabric of the building, additional unforeseen structural issues and subsequent additional costs associated with specialist archaeological and architects fees. In addition extra "abnormals" such as unforeseen works to the basement of 29 High Street and the party walls to 25/27 and 29 High Street have led to further costs that were not anticipated at the start of the project. The result is that Mr Hamby is experiencing a funding shortfall in order to complete the full restoration of these important historical buildings.

Options

Option 1 – RMBC do not provide assistance

Without additional support Mr. Hamby will be unable to achieve a "fit out" of these buildings which in turn will hamper his ability to let these units and this in turn will exacerbate his ability to repay his existing loan commitments to the Council. It is therefore deemed prudent for the Council to continue its commitment to this important High Street regeneration project and ensure its ongoing success.

As the Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) programme is brought to a conclusion there are no additional funds available from the Heritage Lottery Fund. As matters stand the property will not be fully completed by the end of the programme in December 2014. The property would still require internal fit

out which would increase the likelihood of it not being let and Mr Hamby being unable to meet his existing commitments to the Council.

Option 2 – RMBC to provide further financial assistance

In order to facilitate the full completion of the regeneration programme and the major project for the High Street, RMBC could consider further financial assistance. This could be in the form of a further loan, a grant or a mixture of the two.

As with the original loan facility, the additional loan facility will be provided by the Council on commercial terms pursuant to the General Power of Competence within the Localism Act 2011. As the loan is on commercial terms, it is not considered to be “State Aid”. Security for the additional loan facility will be in the form of a Loan Agreement secured by a Legal Charge over the existing property assets of Mr Hamby and the properties that have been acquired on the High Street for re-development registered with the Land Registry. Professional valuation advice has been obtained to ensure that the value of the properties is more than sufficient to offer appropriate security for the proposed additional new loan and the remaining outstanding loan debt on those properties. This advice confirmed that position. The repayment of the loan (principal and interest) including the cost of administration and management will be co-terminus with the remaining term on the existing loan, ie 22.5 years.

RMBC could also look to provide grant assistance, due to the following circumstances and requirements:-

- (a) Additional heritage themed space fit out
- (b) The unique, historical and architectural significance of the buildings concerned
- (c) An agreement from the owner to allow RMBC Heritage services to utilise the building to include an option to:-
 - (i) Allow provision for heritage / museum interpretations to be displayed within the buildings
 - (ii) Provision for individuals to visit the buildings
 - (iii) Display and provision of the architectural and historical information of the buildings
- (d) Not over-burden the development with too high repayment costs which in turn could hinder the repayment of the existing loans to RMBC

The recommendation under option 2 is:-

- £300,000 loan
- £190,000 grant

8. Finance

The Council will be making a long term loan facility available of up to £300,000 to Mr. Hamby on an Annuity basis. He will be required to make six monthly payments of principal and interest. The interest charged will be determined by the date the loan facility is drawn down, but it will reflect the Annuity PWLB rate at that time including relevant Arrangement, Management and Administration fees incurred by the Council. Finance Officers have confirmed that these rates of interest will be broadly comparable to commercial market rates.

The Council will make a £190,000 grant to Mr. Hamby to ensure the successful completion of these important Listed buildings including the restoration of their historical features and the full fit out of all the properties, thus ensuring each unit is fit to let. Under the terms of the grant award Mr. Hamby will be required to open up the building to the public, to enable them to view these important historical buildings.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There is always the possibility of not recovering the monies if Mr Hamby becomes unable to repay the loans. To help mitigate that risk, the Council has already entered into a legal charge over existing property assets of Mr Hamby and the properties acquired on the High Street for re-development until such time as the loan is fully repaid. The value of the assets held on legal charge will be more than the total loan debt outstanding.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Regeneration of the Town Centre and High Street is a significant corporate priority to the Council and its ambition to create a vibrant place for people to live, work and visit.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Cabinet report dated 27th November 2013

Consultation with:

- Mr. Hamby
- Heritage Services

Contact Names:

Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services

Paul Woodcock, Director of Planning, Regeneration and Culture

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	6th August 2014
3.	Title:	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014
4.	Directorate:	Resources

5. Summary

A report setting out the changes introduced by the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014. These Regulations introduce major changes to the way in which public Local Authority meetings may be reported, to allow filming and reporting on all forms of Social Media.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet notes the changes introduced by the Regulations.

7. Proposals and Details

Re. The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

Significant changes in the rights of individuals to use modern technology and communications tools and platforms to report on council meetings they are attending come into force on 6th August, through the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014.

Although the Regulations do present a major change to the way in which people can report Council meetings, they also provide an opportunity to those involved to show the relevance and importance of the decisions made by the Council, and the positive and constructive way in which Council business is conducted. They also have a role to play in encouraging greater understanding of, and stimulating greater involvement in, local democracy.

The purpose of this report is to make members aware of the changes arising from the new regulations and the actions which the Council may wish to consider in responding appropriately to the new requirements. The information in this Report (section 2. below) is largely taken directly from the Regulations, as well as the guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), entitled *“Open and Accountable Local Government”*.

1. Questions And Answers From The Regulations/Guidance

i) Why is there new national legislation?

We now live in a modern, digital world where the use of modern communication methods such as filming, tweeting and blogging should be embraced for enhancing the openness and transparency of local government bodies.

ii) Who does this new legislation help?

These rules help any members of the press and public who want to know about, view or report the work of local government bodies. The “press” is defined in the widest terms – including traditional print media, filming crews, hyper-local journalists and bloggers. The new regulations have increased rights to film, audio-record, take photographs, and use social media such as tweeting and blogging to report the proceedings of all local authority meetings that are open to the public.

iii) Can meetings be filmed or audio-recorded?

Councils and other local government bodies are required to allow any member of the public to take photographs, film and audio-record the proceedings, and report on all public meetings. No prior permission is required to carry out this activity. Local government bodies are required to provide “reasonable facilities” for any member of the public to report on meetings.

There is no legal requirement for councils to webcast their meetings, but where councils and other local government bodies webcast any of their public meetings, they should, as a matter of good practice, notify the public.

As previously all meetings are public unless they are held private due to an exemption. These rules have not changed. The Council may choose not to allow filming to take place in private meetings, and refuse for permission for recording or filming equipment to be left in the room when a private meeting is taking place.

iv) Can a council or local government body meeting be tweeted or blogged?

The new legislation allows for reporting of meetings via social media of any kind. Therefore bloggers, tweeters, and for example, Facebook, YouTube users and individuals with their own website, should be able to report meetings.

v) What sort of facilities will the Council or local government body have to provide?

Councils or local government bodies are required to provide “reasonable facilities” to facilitate reporting. This should include space to view and hear the meeting, seats, and ideally a desk.

vi) Are there any limits to what can be said in a tweet or video that is published?

The law of the land applies – including the law of defamation and the law on public order offences.

vii) Are there other limits that the Council should be aware of?

The council or local government body should consider adopting a policy on the filming of members of the public, such as allowing those who actively object to being filmed not to be filmed, without undermining the broader transparency of the meeting.

viii) Can someone be asked to leave a meeting because they are taking photographs, filming or audio-recording the meeting or using social media?

Generally, people attending public meetings must be readily able to film, audio-record, take photographs or use social media. Councils and other local government bodies must take steps to ensure this is the case. However, those undertaking these activities must not act in a disruptive manner, and this could result in expulsion.

ix) How does this sit alongside the Council’s Standing Orders?

It is a legal duty for the Council to follow the new provisions. If a local government body’s existing Standing Orders are not fully in line with the new legislation, the relevant provisions of those old Standing Orders

should be waived, in the short term. Steps should then be taken to update formally the Council's Standing Orders.

2. Actions To Be Taken/For Consideration By RMBC

- i) RMBC's Standing Orders provide that to allow the recording of meetings of the Council, Cabinet, a Committee of the Cabinet or a Committee, it is to be authorised by a majority vote of that body. This is now overtaken by the new regulations. A report will be prepared for the Council meeting on 10th September 2014 recommending amendment to this Standing Order to accord with the new legislation. The Regulations come into force on 6th August 2014 and therefore on that date and for the Cabinet meeting on 3rd September 2014, the Council will need to waive the Standing Orders to enable filming and other recording to take place, if required.
- ii) The guidance states that Councils will wish to consider the provision of "reasonable facilities" to facilitate reporting. As a minimum,, this should include appropriate space to view and hear the meeting, seats and potentially a desk. The council should put in place procedures in place enabling any person wishing to film or audio-record a public meeting to notify the relevant officers beforehand, so that all necessary arrangements can be made. It is recommended that the Communications and Media Team are the lead officers for this.
- iii) The Council may wish to consider the reading of a formal statement at the beginning of each meeting (similar to the standard paragraph on Exemption of Press and Public) advising members of the public of the requirements of the regulations, and providing them with an opportunity to leave the meeting, should they not wish to be filmed or recorded.

It may also be helpful for posters/leaflets to be placed in the chamber and appropriate meeting rooms, reminding anyone present of the regulations and the potential for filming/recording. Relevant information should also be placed on the Council's website.

- iv) Council officers required to attend meetings to support the democratic process will also need to be made aware that they can be filmed/recorded. Information will be included in relevant internal briefings and on the intranet week commencing 28th July 2014.
- v) The opportunities for filming/recording afforded by the new regulations will clearly mean that discussions and presentations given at council meetings will have a far wider public audience than previously, and the importance of clarity and volume of speech of those participating will be heightened – particularly where the acoustics of the meeting room are not conducive to this. The Council may wish to consider the provision of personal presentation training to help both members and officers feel more

confident, and to ensure that any audio/video placed in the public domain is of good quality and accessible.

vi) The Council should consider its position on dealing with individuals whose filming or recording causes disruption. This and issues i) to v) above should be included by a formal policy/procedure to be adopted by the Council covering all aspects of the Council's compliance with the regulations.

vii) The new regulations do not cover the issue of webcasting, and the Council is not obliged to do its own filming of meetings for broadcast on-line. However, the Authority may consider whether it wishes to do so, to ensure that where filming/recording of parts of meetings only are broadcast, anyone wishing to view this in full context can do so. There are a number of issues members may wish to consider in proceeding with this:

- Numbers of people likely to access the webcast – need for effective monitoring
- Webcasting of all or selected meetings (where specific public/media interest in item(s) to be considered)
- Ability and capacity of in-house team to provide the service
- Costs of provision by specialist external webcast provider

8. Finance

None unless there is a decision subsequently for the Council to film and webcast/record its own meetings.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Council Meetings will have a potentially much wider audience, although it is uncertain at this stage what the level of interest will be from the public.

There is a risk that excerpts from recordings could be edited or used out of context, if there is no other recording of a particular meeting.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Transparency and open decision making.

The Regulations are also intended to encourage more people to take an interest in local democracy.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014
Guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) : *"Open and Accountable Local Government"*.

Contact Name : Jacqueline Collins, Director of Legal and Democratic Services,
01709 255768 or jacqueline.collins@rotherham.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted