

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

**Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.**

Date: Wednesday, 5th March, 2014

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 38A – 48A)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 37C – 43C)
3. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 44D – 50D)
4. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 23E – 27E)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 49G – 60G)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 17J – 24J)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
9th January, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Dalton, Goult, Hoddinott, Roche, Wootton, Watson and Beaumont, Victoria Farnsworth (Speak Up), Robert Parkin (Speak Up) and Peter Scholey.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barron, Kaye, Havenhand, Middleton and Sims; Richard Wells (National Autistic Society).

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

54. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

55. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved: - That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Council)).

56. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST - UPDATE ON FUTURE PLANS

Louise Barnett, Interim Chief Executive, and Christopher Langley, Interim Chairman, Rotherham Foundation Trust, gave a powerpoint presentation setting out:-

- The background
- NHS financial challenge
- Key strategic principles
- The 3 Strategic options
- The preferred option, its financial challenge and clinical sustainability
- Delivering the preferred option
- Summary of forthcoming actions

The following additional information, incorporating questions by Select Commission Members, was given:-

Monitor

- 5 year financial plan and strategic options submitted by the 31st December, 2013, deadline
- The proposals had not been considered by the Trust's Governors as yet
- The next step was to set the detail of the vision in conjunction with commissioners and the community

Financial Situation

- Challenges and risks faced by the Trust
- Organisation now on a more stable footing
- Clarification with regard to the Trust's forecasted financial position at the end of 2013/14 financial year and the 2014/15 budget
- Inflationary pressures and continuing reduction in Government funding

Transformation Programme

- Financial situation improved by Bolt Partners through reduced corporate functions
- Involvement of workforce in finding efficiencies – key staff identified to lead on change
- Set of priorities agreed with commissioners to look at opportunities to work together across the region i.e. procurement for any potential efficiencies through economies of scale
- Need to ensure the best interests of the patient
- Clinically led systematic speciality based reviews would commence to understand what services were being provided and how
- Assessment of clinics and whether they were meeting patients' needs
- Important that through general partnership working, there was a shared view with regard to the way forward – there was support for the preferred option

Workforce

- There were a number of vacancies where high cost locum and agency staff were used
- Assessment of clinics and whether they were meeting patients' needs
- 7 day working would have implications for staffing
- Smarter use of rotas to anticipate absences and reduce the need for agency staff
- Continued commitment to recruit the extra nurses identified previously
- Important to have the right skills mix of staff such as qualified nurses and health care assistants

Governance

- Interviews for the position of Board Chair would be held shortly
- The recruitment process was to start for the Chief Executive Officer

Communication

- There would be a series of communications issued
- Patient groups would be targeted
- Communications Strategy being drawn up

Louise and Christopher were thanked for their attendance.

Resolved:- (1) That the Chief Executive Officer and Chair of the Rotherham Foundation Trust attend the 14th April meeting of the Health Select Commission to give a further update.

(2) That, once known, the Health Select Commission be informed of any comments by Monitor on the 5 year financial plan and strategic options.

57. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 23rd January, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
23rd January, 2014

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Doyle, Dalton, Goulty, Hoddinott, Kaye, Middleton, Roche, Wootton, Havenhand, Sims and Beaumont.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Wyatt, Barron and Watson.

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

59. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

60. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) With regard to the proposed Urgent Care Centre the Vice Chair had received a response from NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to the issues raised by the review group. It was noted that design work has now commenced in respect of the proposed building which is scheduled for completion during 2015.

(2) The Chairman clarified the issues which are included in the 2013/14 Work Programme of the Health Select Commission : priority has been given to the scrutiny reviews of (i) support for carers in Rotherham; (ii) services provided by GPs in Rotherham; and (iii) the provision of Incontinence Services. Members also noted that the scrutiny review of Mental Health Services was to take place during the 2014/2015 Municipal Year.

61. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on Thursday 5th December, 2013.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 5th December, 2013, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 50 (Scrutiny Review – Autistic Spectrum Disorder), the requested details of the impact of the CAMHS services be reported to the next meeting of the Health Select Commission.

62. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on (i) 27th November, 2013 and (ii) 18th December, 2013.

The Select Commission referred to the following items:-

- (Minute S53 and Minute S62) Integration Transformation Fund (Better Care Fund) – the Health Select Commission requested that a report on this matter, detailing the financial resources, the terms of reference and the operational plan be submitted to the next meeting, to be held on 13th March 2014.
- (Minute S54) – the Public Health Outcomes Framework has been approved by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 15th January 2014.
- (Minute S55) Flu Vaccination Programme – Members noted that no new national guidance had yet been issued.
- (Minute S60) Communications – Members requested details of the bids for funding considered and approved by the Urgent Care Board.
- (Minute S61) Joint Strategic Needs Assessment – Refresh – the consultation process on the draft, revised document has begun and there will be a seminar for all Members of the Council, scheduled to take place on Tuesday 18th February, 2014.

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

63. SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES

Consideration was given to a report presented by Public Health Specialist Gill Harrison, summarising the Sexual Health Services' commissioning responsibilities of local authorities in relation to the expected delivery measures, as outlined in the Public Health Outcomes Framework for England, 2013-2016. The report also outlined the responsibility which local authorities had in relation to the Health Protection of the population, by the development of local plans and capacity to monitor and manage acute incidents to help prevent the transmission of sexually transmitted infections and to foster improvements in sexual health.

The submitted report also summarised the most recent sexual health data from the Health Protection Report tables, published by Public Health England on 5th June 2013

(http://www.hpa.org.uk/Topics/InfectiousDiseases/InfectionsAZ/STIs/STIs/AnnualDataTables/#1.STI_Report)

and outlined the implications for Rotherham. This data was now being used in the development of a new strategy for Sexual Health in

Rotherham, taking into account the statutory duty of local authorities to ensure open access to Sexual Health Services for the population.

Members were informed that there were three outcome delivery measures for local authorities, in relation to sexual health, outlined in the Public Health Outcomes Framework for England, 2013-2016. These measures had been included as markers to give an overall picture of the level of sexual infection, unprotected sexual activity and general sexual health within the population. The delivery measures were:-

- to work towards achieving a diagnosis rate for Chlamydia of 2,400 – 3,000 cases per 100,000 population (adults aged 15-24 years);
- to work towards a reduction in the proportion of persons presenting with HIV at a late stage of infection (based on a CD4 count of less than 350 cells/mm³); and
- to work towards a reduction in teenage conceptions.

Specific reference was made to:-

- commissioning and reporting arrangements for sexual health services – enabling the assessment of the effectiveness and value for money of these services;
- the effectiveness of sexual health screening programmes and the management of patient contacts;
- the funding of 'out-of-area' services, as patients may themselves choose where they accessed treatment services;
- comparisons of the incidence of sexually transmitted infections in Rotherham and around the country;
- the role and function of the Rotherham Sexual Health Strategy Group;
- the provision of sexual health education in schools;
- specific treatments e.g. contraception services;
- the measures in place to reduce the incidence of teenage pregnancy;
- safeguarding and protocols;
- examination of trends, over many years, in respect of sexually transmitted infections e.g. rates of Chlamydia are relatively high, but are reducing;
- the need for early intervention and prevention of infection (e.g. the Chlamydia screening programme, work with schools, colleges and VCS groups);

- the overall use of the finance and resources available for Sexual Health Services, including the commissioning of services;
- ensuring that adequate advice about the prevention of infection was provided to patients;
- local Public Health services provided by GPs.

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

(2) That the statutory responsibilities of this Council in the commissioning of Sexual Health Services be noted.

(3) That the Health Select Commission supports the development of a new strategy for Sexual Health Services in Rotherham.

64. SCRUTINY REVIEW - INFORMATION FOR CARERS

Further to Minute No. 30 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 12th September, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager setting out the main findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of support for carers in Rotherham. The draft review report was submitted for consideration by the Health Select Commission.

The report and discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- the recommendations for future actions, arising from this scrutiny review; Members noted that some of the issues raised are resource-intensive and their implementation may depend upon the allocation of limited resources;
- the review of performance targets;
- partnership working with GPs in the provision of services;
- the importance of providing emotional support for carers – including the creation of a multi-agency ‘carers’ pathway’;
- the availability of the Better Care Fund, which ultimately did not provide additional funding for the delivery of local authority services (details of this Fund are to be reported to the next meeting of this Select Commission).

Members placed on record their appreciation of the work undertaken by the scrutiny review group.

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

(2) That, subject to appropriate amendments being made to the review report and its recommendations, as now discussed, the Health Select Commission endorses the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of support for carers in Rotherham.

(3) That the report and recommendations of this scrutiny review, as amended in accordance with resolution (2) above, be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and to the Cabinet for further consideration.

65. PUBLIC HEALTH OUTCOMES FRAMEWORK

Further to Minute No. 165 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th January, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Public Health concerning the Council's statutory functions for health protection and health improvement. Public Health England monitored the responsibilities through the Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF). Members were informed of arrangements for monitoring of the Framework and the action being taken to address the outcomes.

The Council's wider responsibilities for population health required a co-ordinated approach, involving all partner organisations. The PHOF focused on the causes of premature mortality. The Rotherham Health and Wellbeing Strategy supported early intervention and prevention as part of improving performance against the PHOF and the key lifestyle factors that influenced avoidable mortality. The Outcomes Framework had to be reviewed quarterly to monitor improvements in performance. Public Health would lead this agenda and report to Cabinet by exception. Priority measures included those for avoidable mortality, which also featured as a key outcome for the Integrated Transformation Fund.

Public Health would agree with partner's action plans to address under-performance and complete a report card on each indicator. Where the Indicator was an outlier, the report card would be submitted to the appropriate planning or commissioning group.

It was noted that agreement needed to be reached on which performance measures were regularly reported to the Health and Wellbeing Board. These should be indicators which were closely linked to the six locally determined priorities which followed the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. If these high level indicators showed no improvement or were significantly underperforming, the Health and Wellbeing Board would agree actions to be taken or hold a performance clinic with partners to develop a remedial action plan to engage action. Where a performance clinic was held, the issue would be reported to Cabinet. The emphasis of the performance clinics would be on innovation and doing things differently, to facilitate improvement and change.

The Indicators not included in the top six strategic issues would be addressed elsewhere within the local performance framework. The actions would re-focus activity on the early intervention and prevention agenda for long term and sustainable impact. The submitted report provided a framework for this process and summarised the early progress being made.

Specific reference was made to:-

- life expectancy and healthy life expectancy – causes of mortality and disability:
- reward grant in 2015-16 to local authorities being most successful regarding health inequalities, based on the outcomes framework

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

(2) That the proposed framework and reporting structures to address performance on the Public Health Outcomes Framework, as described in the report now submitted, be noted.

(3) That the use of the Public Health Outcomes Framework as a mechanism to deliver the Health and Wellbeing Strategy's aim of moving services to prevention and early intervention be noted.

66. RESIDENTIAL CARE SCRUTINY REVIEW - MONITORING REPORT

Further to Minute No. 64 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th September 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Health and Wellbeing describing the progress being made by Senior Management, Residential Managers and Human Resources Business Partner in line with recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of the Council's residential homes. The report included details of progress with the proposed restructure of the homes and service, in accordance with the budget savings and proposals for 2013/2014.

Reference was made to the following salient issues:-

- value for money, the use of limited resources and the requirement for financial savings; Members noted that the recruitment of staff was continuing and there had also been issues relating to the level of staff sickness absence;
- efficiencies made in respect of specific budgets (eg: revised procurement for the food budget, facilitating individual choice of meals from a wider-ranging menu);
- the quality of care services being provided.

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

67. INTEGRATED HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CARE SERVICE FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND THEIR FAMILIES

Consideration was given to a joint report presented by the Director of Schools and Lifelong Learning describing the proposal to integrate services across Social Care, Education and Health for children with a Special Educational Need or Disability (SEND) in Rotherham. This proposal was in line with Government requirements for reforms in commissioning and provision for SEND across Education, Health, Social Care and wider partners as set out in the Department of Health's SEN Green Paper 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability and with joint commissioning as set out in the Children and Families Bill 2013.

The submitted report described the improved outcomes for children and their families, legislative requirements for the Council, key principles, benefits and potential risks of this integrated approach. Members noted that the proposal was in line with the joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Starting Well, Developing Well and Living and Working Well. The Strategy stated that changes would take place in services to meet the reductions in revenue as demanded by the coalition Government.

The SEN Green Paper 'Support and Aspirations; a New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability set out the following vision:-

- Early Identification – streamlining assessment processes and development of the Education, Health and Care Plan;
- Giving Parents Control – Creation of a 'Local Offer' covering including the choice for families to opt for a "Personal Budget";
- Improved Learning and Achieving – improved outcomes for children and young people across schools and colleges;
- Preparing for Adulthood – Seamless service from birth to 25 years, with smooth transition;
- Services Working Together for Families – development and expansion of joint commissioning arrangements.

The official timeline required the reforms to be in place by September 2014.

The report also outlined current service provision (including SEND services), the proposed integrated approach and the importance of improving outcomes for children, young people and their families.

It was noted that the Cabinet had endorsed the proposal for consultation, which would last for the maximum required period of 45 days. This action would enable the reconfigured joint approach service and the required revenue spending reductions to be implemented from April 2014 (Minute No. 168 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th January 2014 refers).

Members referred to the following salient issues:-

- the pooled budget arrangements (local authority and health services) and the need to ensure value for money;
- the development of a project plan, for eventual submission to Members;
- the role and function of the Young Adult Transition Team;
- the provision of equipment for children and young people with Special Educational Needs (e.g. Rotherham Equipment Store);
- the process of consultation in respect of the new arrangements, which would be the subject of future reports to Elected Members;
- the requirement to achieve reductions in revenue spending on the integrated health, education and social care services.

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

(2) That the proposals to integrate services across Social Care, Education and Health for children with a Special Educational Need or Disability, as detailed in the report now submitted, be noted.

(3) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Health Select Commission, during the Autumn 2014, detailing the proposals for the new arrangements for integrated health, education and social care services for children, young people and their families.

68. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 13th March, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
22nd January, 2014

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Clark, Dodson, J. Hamilton, Kaye, Pitchley, Read, Roddison and Sharman.

Councillors Dalton, Hoddinott, P. A. Russell, Havenhand, Wallis, Sims, Roche, Beaumont, Godfrey, Ellis, Currie, Pickering, Beck and Whelbourn were also in attendance.

Agencies represented: - J. Thacker (Children and Young People's Services), Councillor P. Lakin (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services), S. Ashley (Rotherham LSCB), Chief Supt J. Harwin, K. Goddard (Barnardos), D. Johnson (CYPS Performance), J. Abbott (Public Health), S. Parry (Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate), C. Edgar (Team Manager, Sexual Exploitation Unit), K. White (Duty and Early Help), S. Gittins (School Nurse Partnership).

Apologies were received from Councillors Ali and Falvey and Co-opted Members Mrs. A. Clough (ROPES), Mrs. J. Jones (GROW) and Mr. M. Smith (Safe@Last).

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

No members of the public or the press were in attendance.

46. COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing was raised under this item.

47. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH DECEMBER, 2013

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 18th December, 2013, were considered.

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

48. SCRUTINY OF CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS TO COUNTER CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION IN ROTHERHAM.

The Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission welcomed all representatives of Rotherham's agencies working to counter Child Sexual Exploitation in the Borough.

Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission, along with the members of the Select Commissions, had read a number of documents that outlined previous and continuing work to counter Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham. The documents had been circulated with the agenda and included: -

- A précis of recent CSE reviews and inspection reports and a summary of their recommendations;
- The review of the response to CSE in Rotherham conducted by Steve Ashley, Independent Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Board;
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary South Yorkshire Police's response to CSE – findings of an inspection commissioned by the Police and Crime Commissioner;
- Barnardo's Rotherham Practice Report;
- "If only someone had listened" Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into CSE in Gangs and Groups;
- The report to Rotherham's Cabinet outlining the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board CSE Action Plan – Six-month progress report.

The Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services gave a presentation that provided an overview on how all agencies were working together to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

The presentation covered: -

- **National Context: -**
 - Recognised as one of the most important challenges;
 - Intelligence and practice was continuing to develop and local differences in approach existed;
 - There was currently no national performance measures for benchmarking purposes available;
 - The presentation outlined the large number of national reports and reviews that had taken place/been published in the past few years;
 - **All of the documents had been fed into the development of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board's Action Plan, the forthcoming document refresh would take account of the Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into CSE in Gangs and Groups' Final Report.**
- **Definition and summary of CSE: -**
 - Was found in the 'Statutory Guidance on Safeguarding Children and Young People from Child Sexual Exploitation' document, 2009;
 - The range of the different types of CSE were considered;
 - The networks and different types of CSE structure/organisations was also considered;

- Common CSE myths were shared.
- **The Local Profile: -**
 - Data for 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 (to December) showed that, of the total contacts to social services, the number of contacts, and the relative overall percentage, relating to reports of CSE was relatively low;
 - The local profile of CSE reports in Rotherham was shared, along with the most common model of CSE seen;
 - This data was informing the targeting of services to geographical hotspots to prevent future exploitation, disrupt potential risky behaviours and identify and pursue offenders.
- **The CSE Team and Partnership: -**
 - The organisation of Rotherham's Countering CSE team was shown. The team was made up of Social Care professionals, Police and other partners, including Barnardos, GROW, nurse practitioners and Safe@Last;
 - An additional detective was due to join the team to further increase capacity;
 - External funding had been secured for some aspects of the Partners' work to 2016;
 - The wide-range of agencies within the CSE partnership included many professionals and organisations;
 - Leadership structure of the CSE Team and Partnership was the role of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board's Sub-group (known as Gold), for strategic leadership, and the Multi-agency Operational Managers' Group (known as Silver), for operational leadership. Other regional and national structures were in place. Rotherham's Children, Young People and Families' Partnership also monitored this.
- **CSE Strategy in summary: -**
 - Overarching priorities: - Prevent, Protect and Pursue;
 - Seven strategic actions: -
 1. Governance and leadership;
 2. Training and awareness;
 3. Communication;
 4. Protection of children;
 5. Protection and support for victims;
 6. Disrupting and stopping CSE-linked activity;
 7. Bringing perpetrators to justice and preventing re-offending.
 - A named person was linked to each of the seven strategic actions;
 - The Performance and Quality Team was providing regular updates.

- **Key achievements of the CSE Strategy (Leadership and Governance, Prevent, Protect and Pursue themes), and**
- **Achievements and progress in 2013/2014 to counter CSE: -**
 - 2,800 staff, Councillors, young people and members of the public attended a training or awareness event between April, 2012, - December, 2013;
 - All secondary schools were engaged with CSE prevention;
 - In 2012/2013 911 pupils had participated in workshops, in 2013/2014 to date it was 1150 pupils;
 - 1587 informal curriculum sessions had been delivered by the Integrated Youth Support Services on CSE related topics;
 - 'Train the Trainer' programme being rolled out across the Partnership;
 - Communication strategy in place to include communications with the public, local communities, faith groups, LGBT groups and migrant families;
 - Leaflets for parents/carers and young people had been developed and were widely available;
 - Event held for local hoteliers to raise awareness;
 - The launch of the 'See Something, Say Something' campaign would take place in February, 2014;
 - Funding bids were continuing to further develop this work;
 - The CSE Team had been expanded to include members from the Voluntary and Community and Health Sectors;
 - The regional CSE risk assessment tool was being utilised;
 - Licensing Services was engaged;
 - Social Care cases being led by the CSE team was increasing, along with other social care teams' support;
 - Joint investigations had increased from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014;
 - Safe@Last were receiving referrals for support following runaway incidents;
 - A new initiative had been launched to provide confidential services to young witnesses and victims of crime. This was continuing to imbed;
 - Increased disruption activity was taking place. At November, 2013, there had been seven attrition activities, compared to 3 during 2012-2013;
 - Abduction Notices were being continuing to increase compared to previous years;
 - One successful conviction and a number of cases were awaiting court;
 - Local and Regional Operations were taking place;
 - Perpetrators in custody and in the community under the supervision of probation had robust Risk Management Plans in place;
 - A CSE Police Analyst had been recruited;
 - Changes to the Crown Prosecution Service had been initiated;

- Changing practices were being explored to seek prosecution without victim co-operation.
- **Areas for improvement: -**
 - The Action Plan would be refreshed and refined to ensure that it incorporated recommendations from the Reviews and the OCC report. This was planned for February, 2014;
 - The location and organisation of teams to create a full Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in Riverside House;
 - Review of pathways between health services and CSE Teams (following the recruitment of a nurse practitioner);
 - Improved analysis of intelligence.

Questions followed from the Strategic Director's presentation and the following issues were raised that followed a number of themes/areas of the documents: -

- **Prevent: education and training interventions and their efficacy, engagement by all partners and community groups, engaging with young people, understanding and analysis of intelligence and hot spots, reporting mechanisms and communication and media strategies: -**
 - Were all agencies prioritising training?;
 - Was there equity of coverage for all schools? Were all schools engaging in the information and training support available?;
 - Was Personal, Social and Health Education within the curriculum being 'swamped', and was it given sufficient teaching time? How is this issue being addressed in schools?.
- **Protect: risk assessment tools, information sharing between partners, referral pathways and staffing: -**
 - Were staffing resources adequate to respond to the Action Plans?;
 - Frontline workers were a key arm to countering and eradicating CSE, were they being adequately supported and did they have manageable caseloads?;
 - What role could school governors play in countering CSE, given their training, knowledge and local intelligence?;
 - Was the risk assessment tool in use the most relevant and did it allow information sharing with other authorities/responsible bodies;
 - The Multi-Agency Support Hub (MASH) would be a positive development and enable information sharing to take place;
 - Operational Manager for the multi-agency team – were they able to ensure that different agencies' had shared priorities?;
 - Did silo working take place amongst the agencies' working relationships. If so, what strategies were in place to address

- these?;
- Who was in overall control of what information was shared? Different agencies operated different thresholds for sharing information. What work was taking place to ensure consistency?.
- **Pursue: including support for victims, learning lessons, offender management and prosecutions: -**
 - Was enough being done to ensure that the voice of the child was being represented in the Action Plans and the work of all partners?;
 - Given the focus on CSE nationally, how is learning shared across other Local Authorities and agencies?;
 - What was being done to challenge the attitudes that existed amongst perpetrators that CSE was acceptable?;
 - How do you ensure that resources across social care were directed proportionately to ensure that issues such as domestic abuse or neglect remain a high priority?;
 - Current police priorities had a focus on acquisitive crime; how do agencies ensure that countering CSE remains a priority?;
 - Working with victims and winning their trust and confidence – was enough being done to support the victims?.
 - **General areas: including leadership, location, culture, information sharing within Rotherham and beyond, resources and Governance: -**
 - Were there tight timescales around all of the Action Plans responding to CSE issues for when reviews would take place?;
 - Were there clear lines of accountability relating to the Action Plans' action points?;
 - Were all Partners operationally involved and did all Partners have the same strategic buy-in?;
 - Public confidence in the public sector agencies;
 - Gender profiles of victims and perpetrators, were all vulnerable groups supported?;
 - Cultural messages given via the media relating to body image pressure, the sexualisation of childhood and the availability of pornography – how do these impact on the prevalence of CSE and attitudes towards it?.

The Chairperson thanked all agencies for attending, and all of the Elected Members in attendance for the questions that they had asked and the thoughts that they had shared.

The Chairperson stated her belief that Rotherham was moving forward in terms of countering CSE and actively delivering child protection. The Improving Lives Select Commission would continue to monitor this area. There was clear evidence that commitment to multi-agency working

existed and this was something that all Partners shared and that the Local Safeguarding Children Board also prioritised and expected. The Chairperson was also mindful of the context of decreasing resources and urged that the best use be made of the available budgets and resources. Children's safeguarding remained everyone's business and all agencies needed to ensure that they worked to the best of their ability to ensure this was done.

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

(2) That an update be provided to the Improving Lives Select Commission in one year's time to follow-up the progress of the Action Plan.

49. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 12th March, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
24th January, 2014

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

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Dalton and Read.

89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Currie declared a personal interest in Minute No. 92 (Scrutiny Review of Support to Carers) on the grounds that he was a carer in Rotherham.

90. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

91. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF CHILDHOOD OBESITY

Further to Minute No. 160 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th January, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, containing an update of action being taken on the recommendations of the scrutiny review of childhood obesity.

The majority of the recommendations focused on the prevention of overweight and obesity within the community and the promotion of weight management programmes to support children locally.

The re-commissioning of weight management services was ongoing and would be subject to approval by Cabinet during 2014.

The two deferred recommendations had been accepted in principle, but were subject to further discussion.

Discussion ensued on the deferred recommendation relating to Rothercard and it was noted that this would be reported back to the Health Select Commission following the review.

It was suggested that, as a result of the changes to the Ofsted Framework, that collaborative arrangements within schools be considered under the auspices of School Nurses and that this be included in the update in six months' time.

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

92. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SUPPORT TO CARERS

Further to Minute No. 64 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 23rd January, 2014 consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor Brian Steele, Chair of the Review Group, which set out the main findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of support for carers in Rotherham. The full text of the draft review report was also submitted for consideration by Members.

The aim of the review was to ensure carers have access to the right information to enable them to access the support and services they required to assist them in the caring role and to maintain their own quality of life and health and wellbeing. As such it was very important to consider this from the perspective of carers, especially adult carers of adults with long term conditions and to establish:-

- If carers generally identify themselves as carers in line with the carer definition.
- The degree to which carers accessed support or considered they needed support to assist them in their caring role.
- Who carers go to for initial support when they first become a carer.
- Where carers usually go for ongoing support.
- Key factors necessary for ensuring carers received good and timely information.
- Any areas for improvement in current information provision.

Members also wished to complement and add value to the review carried out by Neighbourhoods and Adult Services of current support services for carers, which focused on how support was currently provided to carers and how this may be improved.

A spotlight review was carried out and evidence gathering commenced in October, 2013, concluding in December 2013. This comprised an on-line survey for carers supplemented by direct engagement with carers at two events, followed by two small discussion groups. Further evidence was provided by Council officers and witnesses from partner agencies in health and the voluntary and community sector.

Members recognised the large number of "hidden" carers in Rotherham, who were key to the effective provision of social care. There was a very strong case, both morally and financially, to ensure that carers were provided with the most effective support possible as it was estimated that nationally, carers saved the country an estimated £119 billion in care costs. The review group considered that any resources invested within the carers community in Rotherham, therefore, represented an invest to save opportunity, particularly with the demographic pressures created by an ageing population.

The review group made ten recommendations which focused on:-

- Increasing the number of people recognising themselves as carers and willing to seek support for the vital role they carried out.
- Ensuring that support for carers adequately included emotional support and counselling.
- Providing a multi-agency “carers pathway” that recognised the journey that carers were on and provided them with the correct support and information at the right time and in the right place on that journey.
- Increasing the number of carers receiving a fit for purpose carers assessment, which was reviewed on an annual basis.

Immediately following the meeting of the Health Select Commission on the 23rd January, 2014, a number of appropriate amendments were agreed in terms of the limited availability of finance and resources for service provision and the revised recommendations arising from these discussions were circulated and considered each in turn. There was also some suggestion that this report be referred to the Health and Wellbeing Board as soon as practically possible and there be some relaxation as to the timescales.

Discussion ensued on the scope of the review, the various partnership links, the role of G.P.'s and the newly presented recommendations as listed below:-

1. That NHS England, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and Rotherham Council work with GPs to ensure that the first line of support aims to increase the number of carers identified and seeking support.
2. In looking at recommendation 1 above, the partners consider whether professionals should work on the presumption that the close family member or friend is a carer and ask questions to determine if this is the case, and therefore what information resources are required to back this up.
3. That Rotherham Council investigates further with the Advice in Rotherham Partnership (AiR) and the Department of Work and Pensions, what specific information carers need to access benefits that are available to them. This may also help to identify more carers.
4. That NHS England, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and Rotherham Council, work with their VCS and other partners to create the carers pathway of support; an integrated, multi-agency response to the needs of carers, using carers assessments and crucially the allocation of a “buddy” or “lead worker” to champion their individual needs. This lead worker should, where possible, come from the most appropriate agency identified for individual needs.

5. That Rotherham Council considers via its review of services to carers, and in light of the new requirements imposed by the Care Bill, reconfiguring its advice and information offer for Carers including; Assessment Direct, Connect 2 Support, Carers Corner and outreach services, to ensure that flexible support is offered within existing resources.
6. That the “triangle of care” presented by RDaSH be considered as part of this process as something that could be adapted and rolled out to all partners providing support to carers.
7. That Rotherham Council reviews its carers assessment tool in the light of the Care Bill to ensure it is fit for purpose. This should involve considering whether it could be less onerous. The correct title of the document “Carer’s needs form and care plan” should be used by partners to reflect that it is an enabling process rather than an “assessment”.
8. That Rotherham Council looks to set more stretching targets for carers assessments and regular (annual) reviews.
9. That steps are taken to ensure that the Joint Action Plan for Carers meets the recommendations of this review and is more accountable in terms of its delivery, seeking to influence external partners accordingly.
10. Whilst the review group has sought to make recommendations that can be accommodated within existing resources it also recognises that there is a strong case for further investment in this sector, in line with the prevention and early intervention agenda. It therefore recommends that the allocation of resources to carers (including the Better Care Fund) is reviewed to demonstrate how the changes to services proposed within this review are to be achieved.
11. Although outside the original scope, the review group recognised the important role public, private and third sector employers, play in providing flexible employment conditions for carers and therefore recommend that the findings of this review are shared with partners as widely as possible. In addition they reaffirmed the commitment in the Carer’s Charter to actively promote flexible and supportive employment policies that benefit carers.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board wished to place on record their appreciation of the work undertaken by this Scrutiny Review Group.

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

(2) That the findings and recommendations of the report of the scrutiny review of support for carers, as now submitted, be endorsed.

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

(4) That the Cabinet be asked to submit its response to this scrutiny review, to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, within two months.

93. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/2014

Consideration was given to the work programme for 2013/14 presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided progress on the delivery of the work programme at the half way point. It summarised achievements, changes and requests decisions regarding flexing the programme in the remaining half of the year.

The Board considered how to progress its two reviews currently outstanding; one on MKember structures and one on deprived communities. The Cabinet had informally requested that, as a result of issues emerging from the budget, the Board consider prioritising Member structures as their next review and a small group of Board Members look to approving the scope of the review.

It was suggested that as the deprived communities and poverty reviews overlapped with economic and regeneration, this did not just sit with Improving Lives. As the Community First meetings were coming up to their third year, it was suggested that this all encompassed under one umbrella and possibly be considered by all the Vice-Chairs, within current staffing constraints.

Each of the Select Commissions via their Chairpersons gave their current status and progress of their reviews.

Self Regulation:-

- Commissioning Review was underway with Councillor Beck taking the lead.
- Community Plan Outcomes was underway and was being chaired by Councillor Atkin.
- Council House Rents was awaiting the outcome of the review of Neighbourhood Centres.

Health:-

All reviews were on target apart from possible deferment of Mental Health Services to next year.

Improving Places:-

- Improving Places work programme was on target.
- The Homelessness Strategy was almost complete.
- The Customer Service Centre and Libraries was now complete.

Improving Lives:-

- Poverty review is merging with Deprived Communities and moving to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board work programme.
- The review of the Integrated Youth Support Services was delayed due to the proposed changes.

Resolved:- (1) That the achievements so far be noted.

(2) That the changes to the work programme be approved.

(3) That the recommendations to merge the deprived communities and poverty reviews and allocate to Improving Lives and the Member Structures as the next priority for this Board (to be scoped) be approved.

(4) That Councillors Falvey, Steele and Whelbourn consider the scope of the Member structure review.

94. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, reported on the involvement of the Youth Cabinet with the Self Harming Review, which was really valuable and informative.

95. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13TH DECEMBER, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 13th December, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Reference was made to Minute No. 82 (Anti-Social Behaviour in Rotherham) and the suggestion that the crime statistics be referred to the Police and Crime Panel, which the Scrutiny Manager agreed to raise.

It was also noted under the same Minute that a visit to the Vulnerable Persons' Unit had not yet been arranged. It was suggested, however, that a presentation be made to a future meeting and consideration then given as to the value of a visit.

It was also pointed out that the status of the recommendations would be established, particularly around the circulation of recommendations and the escalation of concerns to a national level.

96. WORK IN PROGRESS

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

Self Regulation:-

- The final tranche of the budget proposals, rent increase and district heating charges had been presented for consideration at the last meeting.
- The scope had now been agreed for the procurement/commissioning review and targets around local support chains.

Improving Places:-

- The issue of the Parking Van was to be considered
- The Customer Service Centres/Libraries was complete.
- The proposed 60 mph speed limit on the M1 was to be included as an agenda item during February, 2014, along with a review of the local plan in February/March, 2014.

Improving Lives:-

- An update into CSE had been well received at the last meeting and was well attended and received.

Health:-

- Two meetings had been held recently specifically looking at proposals for the hospital (in closed session), sexual health, trends and STI's and HIV.
- Dorothy Smith had also been in attendance for the item relating to the proposed Integrated Health, Education and SEN Service.
- The Carers' Review had been debated at length.

Resolved:- That the information shared be noted.

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

There were no call-in requests to report.

98. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday, 21st February, 2014 at 9.00 a.m.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
15th January, 2014

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Astbury, Dodson, Ellis, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Johnston, Read, Roche, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift, Vines and Wallis; and co-opted member Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Pickering and Whysall and from co-opted member Mrs. P. Copnell.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

39. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

40. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 27TH NOVEMBER 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 27th November, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

41. PROPOSED RESPONSE TO HM GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON PARKING

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Parking Services Manager, concerning the Department for Communities and Local Government consultation process about the intention to change the law and either prohibit or restrict the use of closed circuit television (CCTV) systems for parking enforcement and also to introduce other changes to parking enforcement law.

The Select Commission noted that the primary function of the CCTV enforcement vehicle owned by this Council is enforcement in areas where there are concerns about road safety and the prevention of traffic congestion. The effective management of vehicle parking in these locations also results in the generation of income. Members noted that the use of the enforcement vehicle had produced positive results, in terms of road safety, in respect of reducing the problem of incorrect/illegal parking at these locations:-

- improving road safety on roads outside schools;
- prevention of parking in bus lay-bys;
- prevention of parking on the 'zig-zag' lines near to pelican crossings;
- preventing private hire vehicles parking in the taxi ranks intended for hackney carriages.

The list of questions from the consultation document, together with this Council's suggested responses, were appended to the submitted report.

The Select Commission's discussion of this item included the following salient points:-

- discounts for prompt payment of parking fines in cases where motorists lose their appeals at a parking tribunal;
- a number of textual amendments were suggested to the responses;
- the parking of heavy vehicles on the footway, which may cause damage to the highway surface structure – and whether the costs of subsequent repair and maintenance could be re-charged to the vehicle drivers;
- the powers of the Police to issue penalty notices to motorists whenever there is parking which causes unsafe and/or dangerous obstruction of the highway;
- the initial procurement of the enforcement vehicle, funded by the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership and the continuing operating costs of the vehicle;
- the recording of film footage of parked vehicles, utilising a system based on the 'Google Earth' maps – for eventual use in the issuing of penalty notices;
- the reviewing of individual cases of illegally parked vehicles, prior to the issuing of penalty notices;
- the Council's methods of reviewing the need for parking restrictions (yellow lines, etc.) by the Traffic and Transportation Section;
- the legislation concerning the prohibition of parking near to road junctions;
- Members referred to specific areas and highways, throughout the Rotherham Borough, to highlight parking problems;
- Parking Services and its customer focus;

- emphasis that parking enforcement is not used for income generation by local authorities, but is correctly used to improve road safety;
- the design of new residential areas, in which there is sometimes limited space only for vehicle parking;
- reviewing the effectiveness of the use of the enforcement vehicle, especially in areas close to schools;
- the possible impact of the coalition Government's intended changes to parking enforcement law.

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

(2) That a further report be submitted to a meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, in twelve months' time, describing the effectiveness of the use of the CCTV parking enforcement vehicle.

42. CUSTOMER AND LIBRARY SERVICES - REVIEW OF CHANGES TO SERVICES

Further to Minute No. 199 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Customer and Cultural Services Manager, concerning the changes which have been implemented during the past two years within Customer and Library Services. The submitted report summarised the changes and provided an initial review of the impact of changes to opening hours and the implementation of the joint library and customer service model. The various sections of the report dealt with:-

- service changes and the increasing take-up of on-line services;
- closure of the community library at Kimberworth Park;
- closure of the Service Centres at Swinton and at Dinnington;
- changes to the opening hours in 13 of the 15 libraries across the Borough area;
- reductions in spending and the achievement of budget savings targets;
- implementation of a new mobile library timetable;
- launch of the e-book borrowing service, in response to customer demand;
- details of the joint library and customer service model;
- the impact of the changes upon service delivery;
- a summary of the feedback received from customers;
- making libraries and service centres the 'hub' of their communities and localities (e.g.: Mowbray Gardens).

Reference was made to the following salient issues:-

- the availability and use of the mobile library service – one vehicle visiting villages and towns in the Rotherham Borough area; the other vehicle visiting facilities such as sheltered housing schemes; Members noted that customers visiting Council premises often wish to access a variety of Council services, not only a single one such as a library; Members requested details of the routes of the mobile library vehicles;
- the availability and usage of the payment machine facilities at the service centres; the reliability of these machines;
- the provision of a variety of services for local communities (eg: at Mowbray Gardens – language classes for people for whom English is their second language; education classes);
- the system of lending e-books, which has begun to attract new members to the library service;
- the consultation process prior to the closure of the Kimberworth Park community library and the provision of the mobile library in that location;
- the continuing pressures upon service delivery of the reductions in local authority budgets; in terms of the review of customer services and libraries, Members welcomed the use of a clear rationale and consultation process; the shared use of premises for service delivery was also beneficial to customers;
- the importance of the availability and delivery of services in deprived communities;
- the availability of volunteers to assist with service delivery;
- Members referred to specific issues affecting the individual customer service centres (eg: computer access for customers; dealing with customers at busy times; availability of rooms where customers may discuss issues in private);
- the trends relating to the migration of customers to alternative facilities, as a consequence of the service changes (eg: people who previously used locality services now preferring to visit the Council's Riverside House building);
- publicity and marketing – in relation to the facilities/services on offer and for changes to opening hours;
- the effective use of ICT facilities to improve customer service (eg: the availability of wi-fi services).

Members placed on record their appreciation of the work of the staff of Libraries and Customer Services.

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

(2) That the example of the provision of services from the Mowbray Gardens centre be used as a template for centres throughout the Rotherham Borough area.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
23rd January, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Clark, Dalton, Falvey, Goulty, J. Hamilton, Jepson, Kaye, Pickering, G. A. Russell, Sharman, Sims, Swift, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Dodson, Hoddinott, P. A. Russell, R. S. Russell, Smith and Stone.

**PROJECTS TO ADDRESS THE IMPACT OF WELFARE REFORM ON
ROTHERHAM RESIDENTS.**

The Deputy Leader introduced Carole Haywood, Jenny Lingrell and Miles Crompton (of the Policy and Performance Team), who gave a presentation about the impact of the coalition Government's welfare reforms upon residents of the Rotherham Borough area, especially vulnerable families.

The presentation included information on:-

- the role of the Rotherham Partnership Welfare Steering Group and Task Group (including the involvement of the Council's partner organisations);
- background to the Welfare Reform Act 2012;
- continued pressure for further reductions in welfare benefits;
- the impact of benefit reductions impacts upon people of working age;
- statistics relating to the number of benefits' claimants and the financial impact;
- the potential impact of the welfare reforms upon vulnerable people (e.g. stress and illness; fuel poverty; increasing use of food banks);
- the Local Council Tax Support Scheme;
- crisis loans delivered through the Laser Credit Union;
- Funds for Change – central Government funding which may last only until 2015;
- the Benefits Cap – support for vulnerable families;
- specific assistance provided during the 2013 and 2014 festive period;
- Benefits Sanctions – a scrutiny review by the Council;

- the High Cost Lending Task Group – recently established by the Rotherham Partnership to address the rising concern about high interest lending which traps people in spiralling debt problems;
- support for families affected by the Benefits Cap – adopting an integrated approach which will involve officers which are already known to the families (e.g. staff of children’s centres; helping people to apply for discretionary housing payments);
- the presentation included details of a number of case studies;
- funding secured for the employment of an outreach worker, who will provide further support families;
- the community food hub – a partnership model is now in operation, involving the distribution of food to food banks and organisations in the Rotherham Borough area; as part of this arrangement, data is collected about this service provision, facilitating targeted support to areas of the Borough;
- proposed use of volunteers in service provision and the provision of training for volunteers;
- development of the Universal Credit Support Services Framework, with partner organisations, to support people affected by the implementation of Universal Credit.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

- although food banks are beneficial to families, some have difficulty in preparing hot meals as a consequence of fuel poverty; it was noted that food supplies are being tailored by some organisations, such as GROW and the Gate Surgery;
- the local welfare provision : Fund for Change funding from the coalition Government was time-limited for two years, ending on 31 March 2015;
- the number of people who gained access to the Festive Food Fund, who subsequently continued their membership of a Credit Union;
- Members referred to (i) issues raised by the public at their surgeries; and (ii) specific examples from their own electoral Wards;
- the average loss of income for Rotherham families was £556 (per year) per working age adult, compared to a figure of £470 nationally;

- employment prospects in the Rotherham Borough area (e.g. temporary, short term, part-time and unskilled work; zero-hours contracts of employment); rates of claimant unemployment in the Rotherham Borough area have reduced during the past twelve months;
- Members noted the study by the Sheffield Hallam University on Tax Credits, showing the impact of the welfare reforms upon people in employment;
- the possibility of increasing the availability of Credit Unions throughout the Borough area;
- persons accessing the food banks who are awaiting decisions on their applications for asylum or refugee status;
- the impact of the welfare reforms upon individuals' receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance and Council Tax/Housing Benefit; there is a significant impact upon young, single people.

The officers were thanked for their informative presentation.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
24th January, 2014

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

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

Further to a minute of the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 31st December, 2013, consideration was given to an application for the review of a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as the Metz Bar, 6 Main Street, Rotherham.

The Licensing Authority received representations made by the South Yorkshire Police, which had not been withdrawn, and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Sub-Committee heard representations from Chief Inspector Womersley and Inspector Bentley, on behalf of South Yorkshire Police, supported by Mrs. Mumby, Licensing Manager, Mrs. Cooper, Licensing Enforcement Officer, and Mr. Ainsworth, Enforcement Officer. Representations were also received from Mr. Metcalfe, the owner and Designated Premise Supervisor (DPS) of the Metz Bar, and from Mr. Rowland, his representative.

The representations made by the South Yorkshire Police to the Members of the Licensing Sub-Committee were in relation to a serious injury received by a man in the building early on Christmas morning on Wednesday 25th December, 2013, and the facial injuries of his associate. The Police's representation included their concerns about Mr Metcalfe's ability to be a fit and proper Designated Premises Supervisor at the current time following the incident and seventeen previous incidents at the premises since September 2012 (detailed in a chronology of events), involving allegations of drug use, violence, disorder and offensive weapons in the premises. The Police also referred to another ongoing criminal investigation.

Reference was made to the Closed-Circuit Television footage obtained from the front of the premises on Main Street and the disturbance that had occurred there, and to footage obtained to the rear of the property.

The Licensing Sub-Committee and other parties present asked questions to the South Yorkshire Police Representatives on the information they had submitted. Topics raised included the Voluntary Action Plan that existed between the South Yorkshire Police Licensing Department and the Designated Premise Supervisor, the timescale/chronology of the specific incident in the early hours of Christmas Day, the shared use by different premises of the rear yard, and the relevance of the alleged incidents at

the Metz Bar that had taken place before the current Designated Premises Supervisor took up post in May 2013.

Consideration was given to the representations made by Mr. Metcalfe and his representative. The issues raised here included how the Mr. Metcalfe had worked with the Police in relation to the main event under consideration, the degree of his involvement in the running of the business before becoming Designated Premise Supervisor and the chronology of events relating to the Metz Bar, and in particular, the seriousness of one incident recorded and how Mr. Metcalfe disputed the police recording of it. The Designated Premise Supervisor's representative disputed that the chronology of incidents that the Police had provided highlighted any particular problem since his client had been in post; there was evidence to support that Mr. Metcalfe was working with all Partners to reduce and eliminate all areas of concern.

The Licensing Sub-Committee and other parties present asked questions to the Designated Premise Supervisor and his representative on the information that they had submitted. Topics covered included the content of the CCTV footage displayed, the chronology of events on Christmas Day morning and the number of people who were in the area at the time (inside and/or outside the premises) and involved or not involved in the disturbance.

Both parties were asked to sum-up their representations before retiring. Following these representations, the Licensing Sub-Committee gave consideration to the review of the Metz Bar's Premise Licence giving consideration to the licensing objectives relating to public safety, the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.

Resolved: - (1) That, after due consideration of the application for review, and to all the representations received, the following additional conditions shall apply to the premises licence in respect of the Metz Bar, 6 Main Street, Rotherham, in accordance with the provisions of the Licensing Act, 2003: -

- (i) The premises' opening hours will be 8.00 p.m. – 12.30 a.m. with a 1.00 a.m. closing time on Sunday to Thursday and 8.00 p.m. – 1.30 a.m. with a 2.00 p.m. closing time on Friday and Saturdays;
- (ii) Door staff will be employed and on duty whenever members of the public are on the premises;
- (iii) Door staff will use a metal detector wand on every person seeking entry to the premises;
- (iv) Notices shall be displayed advising customers that searches will be conducted using the metal detector wand;
- (v) The last person to leave the premises each day/night shall be the Designated Premise Supervisor or other nominated paid member of staff, and they will also ensure closure of the premises;

- (vi) Door staff will conduct searches of all areas of the premises, including toilet areas and a written record of such activity shall be maintained.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
28th January, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Clark, Currie, Dalton, Dodson, Doyle, Godfrey, Gosling, Goulty, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, Kaye, McNeely, Pickering, G. A. Russell, Sims, Smith, Stone, Swift, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jepson.

BUDGET.

Councillor J. Akhtar, Deputy Leader, introduced the Chief Finance Manager (Financial Services, Resources Directorate), to the seminar to give a presentation to Elected Members about the 2014/2015 Budget. An invitation had been extended to all Elected Members to attend the meeting; it was noted that no Opposition Members were present, and only one Opposition Member had submitted their apologies.

The Chief Finance Manager recalled the Budget Seminar that had taken place in September, 2013. This Seminar had covered the funding outlook, old and new budget principles, inflation assumptions and the financial impact of the June spending round and the July technical consultation.

Rotherham's savings/cuts history and projected saving/cuts requirements between 2010/2011 to 2015/2016 was outlined. From 2016/2017, it was expected that there would be a 9% year-on-year funding reduction required to at least 2020.

A public consultation process had formed part of the budget setting for the 2014/2015 financial year. The promotional events and information sources had included reference to the proposed revised Council's Corporate Priorities: -

- The Rotherham Show;
- For the first time, an on-line forum that ran alongside a suggestion scheme;
- Area Assemblies and Parish Council meetings;
- Fairs Fayre and Carers' Rights Day;
- Consultation event at the New York Stadium on 13th November, 2013, hosted by Councillor R. Stone, Leader of the Council, with over 100 individuals in attendance;
- Media campaign promoting events and on-line consultation availability.

The Autumn Statement, 2013, had included a number of announcements relevant to Rotherham: -

- Further public spending cuts were due, but Local Government spending would be exempt;
- There would be a 2% cap on the Business Rates Multiplier (there would be no RPI increase);
- The 100% Small Business Rates Relief would be extended for a further year to cover 2014/2015;
- Retail Relief in the form of a special discount of up to £1,000 would be made available for up to two-years for occupied retail and food and drinks premises that had a rateable value of up to £50,000;
- Plans to top-slice the New Homes Bonus and transfer to Local Economic Partnerships were withdrawn (apart from London Authorities);
- Free School Meals would be available for all children in the Reception, Year One and Year Two age-groups from September, 2014.

There were no obvious initial changes to the provisional 2014/2015 Settlement for Rotherham. It was announced that a £108 million Grant would be available nationally to fund the 2% cap on Business Rates Multiplier. Subsequent to the publication of the Provisional Settlement, fifteen papers had been published. Examination of these identified the following implications for Rotherham: -

- Refund of the New Homes Bonus - £800,000;
- Capitalisation Application Outcomes - £152,000.

The Final Settlement was expected in February, 2014, along with Council Tax Referenda Principles and Methodology.

Rotherham's 2014/2015 Budget Challenge was considered. It was now estimated that there would be a funding gap of £23 million. The savings proposals to meet the £23 million pressure were also summarised.

The remaining dates in the budget setting timetable were shared, the Council Annual Budget and Council Tax level and Capital Programme for 2014/2017 would be agreed at the Council meeting of 5th March, 2014.

Discussion ensued on the presentation, and the following questions were raised: -

- The savings proposals had been considered by the Self-Regulation Select Commission. It was noted that this presentation was the forum for all Elected Members to hear the budget proposals and influence the process.
- Which indicator of inflation was being funded via the Government given the 2% Cap announced on the Business Rates Multiplier?
 - RPI.
- The terms of the 'Better Care Fund' were still awaited and the funding stream was expected to do a lot. The Fund would not be

'new' money and would be a complex system. A briefing for all Members had been requested.

- Terms of Reference around potential council tax referenda.
- Where would the universal Free School Meals for Infant-aged school children be funded from?
 - Funding had been ring fenced and the Central Government would provide it directly to schools.
- When would the expected tri-ennial revaluation of pensions be settled?
 - This was unlikely to be agreed until after the budget had been finalised and future budgets would need to be adjusted accordingly.

Councillor Akhtar thanked the Chief Finance Manager for his informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

APPEAL PANEL
Tuesday, 8th January, 2013

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

11. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

12. APPEAL - G1/01/13 - RESOURCES

The Panel considered a grievance appeal by G1/01/13.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**APPEAL PANEL
13th February, 2014**

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

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

APPEAL - D1/02/02 - ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/02/02 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**APPEAL PANEL
13th February, 2014**

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

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

APPEAL - D1/02/01 - ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/02/01 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**APPEAL PANEL
13th February, 2014**

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

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

APPEAL - D1/02/03 - ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/02/03 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
31st January, 2014

Present:- Councillor Harpham (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Bartlett, Councillor Roger Davison, McHale, Sharman, Sixsmith, Walayat and Carter.

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

J25. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) A member of the public referred to Item 7 (Website) on the agenda and asked, if the report was approved, how could the public become more involved in this website development to ensure it was user-friendly?

The Chairman confirmed that the development of the website for the Police and Crime Panel was a key objective as part of the process to engage the public in its work. As part of Item 7 it was proposed that a small working group be convened to consider the design and development of the website with members of community groups being invited to participate.

(2) A member of the public asked could the Police and Crime Commissioner give some clarification on how he sees the changes he wants for the future Pact meetings working and why does he feel they should be chaired by a Councillor or member of the public?

The Chairman advised that this was a question for the Police and Crime Commissioner and was not something the Panel could consider. The question was to be forwarded to the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office for a response.

J26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meetings held on 2nd December, 2013.

With regards to Minute No. J19 (Support Session) Councillor Akhtar made reference to the numbers of religiously motivated attacks and asked the Police and Crime Commissioner if appropriate performance monitoring could be collated to include religion.

The Police and Crime Commissioner gave his assurance that this request would be taken away and looked into further.

Clarification was also sought under this minute on the progress to date on the roles of Local Authority Scrutiny Panels and it was noted that plans were in hand to extend an invitation to Chairpersons of Scrutiny Panels and for this to commence as early as the next meeting.

Reference was also made to Minute No. J20 (Complaints Procedure) and clarification sought on the rules and procedures surrounding an anonymous complaint.

With regards to Minute No. 21 (Policing in Austerity) it was suggested that further information be provided from the Police and Crime Commissioner about the management of future risks.

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

J27. PRECEPT PROPOSAL FOR THE YEAR TO 31ST MARCH, 2015

Consideration was given to a report and presentation made by Shaun Wright, Police and Crime Commissioner, and supported by Steve Pick, Treasurer, which detailed his ongoing determination to reduce crime levels and maintain/increase policing visibility.

In accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 5 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, the Police and Crime Commissioner introduced his proposed precept for the financial year 2014/15 set at a level which increased the annual Band D Council Tax amount by 2%, equivalent to an annual increase of £2.85 (6p per week).

Several factors were taken into account in reaching this position including:-

- The likelihood of future Grant reductions.
- An on-going determination to reduce crime levels and maintain/increase policing visibility.
- The need to dedicate additional resources to particular specialist areas.
- A continuing commitment to invest in Reducing Re-offending, Restorative Justice, Victim Support and Community Safety Initiatives.
- An increased commitment to the protection of vulnerable people.

The general question of 'affordability' had also played into the proposal and in particular the impact on Council Tax payers of increasing the precept by the proposed amount.

The provisional proposal for 2014/15 was that the Precept be increased by £2.85 at Band D.

The Government's 2014/15 Referendum Criteria was still yet to be announced and the proposal presented in this report was consequently provisional and assumed that there would be a 2% limit on Police and Crime Commissioner Precept increases. However, in the event that a higher limit was imposed, the Panel's agreement to a higher Precept increase (max 2.9%; equivalent to £4.13 per annum/8p per week) would

be sought in order to accelerate the planned investment in the Protection of Vulnerable People. If on the other hand the limit was set at a level below the 2% assumption, further net cost reductions would be identified in order to protect the proposed investment in that important area of activity.

The Police and Crime Commissioner explained in more detail as to what would be provided via the proposed budget and his plans to set challenging savings/efficiency targets for the Force during 2014/15.

It was pointed out that the level of Grant from Central Government had been further reduced. On a like for like comparison this reduction amounted to £9.4 million (4.5%) for 2014/15. Approximately £3 million resulted from a 'top slicing' of the National Police Grant to fund National initiatives, including £50 million to establish a 'Police Innovation Fund'; £18 million to build up the capacity of the IPCC; £9 million to increase the frequency of HMIC inspections, £3 million for the College of Policing and £2 million for the National Police Co-ordination Centre.

The Government appeared to remain committed to a Police Funding Review. The possibility that such a Review would produce a detrimental outcome in respect of South Yorkshire had been factored into the consideration of Reserves and the strategy for their future use. Pending the outcome of any Funding Review and using available Home Office indications, including the prospect of greater 'top slicing', it was currently assumed that the Grant would reduce by a further £10 million in 2015/16.

Further information was provided on the precept proposal being predicated on a 2014/15 budget allocation to the Chief Constable of £243.725 million, some £4.264 million of which would be funded from Specific Grants and Contributions initially payable to the Police and Crime Commissioner leaving a Force net budget requirement of £239.461m.

The budget allocation provided funding for the Chief Constable to continue to maintain PCSO numbers at the current level of 328 and also to increase the capacity within the Force to respond to emerging Crime types with a particular emphasis on Public Protection issues. In particular, the proposal allocated more than £2 million for additional activity in this area with an intention to increase this further in 2015/16. Furthermore, if the Precept rules allowed a higher increase this would be used to accelerate this proposal in 2014/15.

The additional efficiency savings target which was allocated to the Force for 2013/14 was on course to be successfully delivered. It was not proposed to impose any further efficiency target for 2014/15, although an overtime reduction target had been agreed with the Chief Constable. In addition, the Force has been asked to seek to accommodate the costs of any necessary Voluntary Early Retirements/Redundancies within the budget amount allocated for 2014/15.

For 2013/14 the overall the Police and Crime Commissioner budget was set at the same level as had been in place for the former Police Authority in 2012/13. For 2014/15 it was intended to seek to operate within a reduced level of budget including a budget for the 'Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner' which was reduced broadly in line with the 2014/15 reduction applicable to the Force.

The Panel recalled that an integral part of the 2013/14 budget decision was the allocation of £4.5m (over 3 years) from Reserves to Partner Organisations to fund their priority initiatives. 2014/15 would be the second year of this three year funding plan. The funding allocations underpinning that budgetary decision were set out in detail as part of the report.

In spite of the Government removing specific funding for Community Safety activities (the Community Safety Fund), the intention was to continue the funding of such activities at the broadly the same level in 2014/15.

In terms of the Reserves Strategy, a minimum working balance had been set aside for unforeseen/unquantifiable threats and/or events. Significant earmarking/commitment of Reserves had now been attached to a number of capital projects which would produce future revenue savings and avoid additional capital financing charges. A further amount was provisionally earmarked to provide future support to the Force budget to allow effective and well planned responses to further grant reductions with a particular emphasis on minimising impacts on front-line policing.

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

- The complication for the Police and Crime Commissioner setting his precept proposal when the Government's Referendum Criteria had not been set.
- Affordability and the plans for a 2-2.9% in the Council Tax charge to taxpayers.
- Reasons for increasing the pressure on taxpayers for less than £400,00 extra income.
- Accuracy of the figures presented.
- The impact of voluntary severance on police officer and support staff numbers when the budget protects PCSO numbers.
- Opportunity for further efficiencies to avoid an increase in the precept.
- The further net cost reductions to protect investments.
- Overall level of reserves.
- Details of investments and service developments.
- Public Protection activity and what this entails.
- Measures to align the spending with similar forces.

- Budget reductions for the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office and the Force budget which seem disproportionate at 2% and 2.6% respectively.
- Reasons for increases in commissioning and partnership activities.
- Uses of the planned capital allocation from the Government.
- Funded capital schemes from reserves and the savings expected to be generated.
- Details of the capital schemes.
- Fluidation of reserves with no indication from the Home Office regarding the costs associated with Hillsborough.
- Referendum threshold and avoidance in South Yorkshire.

The Panel considered all options open to them having listened to the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposals and in his answers to the questions raised.

The Panel were satisfied with the proposals as long as the Police and Crime Commissioner recognised that the eventual precept should not be at such a level as to trigger a referendum once the referendum threshold was known.

Resolved:- (1) That should the maximum Precept increase for Police and Crime Commissioners be 2%, the proposals within the report and the proposed precept increase for 2014/15 at £2.85 per annum (Band D) be endorsed.

(2) That in the event that the maximum Precept increase for Police and Crime Commissioners is greater than 2%, consideration be given to an alternative proposal involving an increase of more than 2% (max 2.9%) with the additional income (max £400k approx.) being matched by an increased investment to accelerate new activity in the Protection of Vulnerable People.

(3) That in the event that the maximum Precept increase for Police and Crime Commissioners is below the current 2% assumption, consideration be given to a Precept increase at that maximum level with the reduced income being matched by net cost reductions not affecting the proposed South Yorkshire Police Budget for 2014/15

(4) That in any event the Panel endorses and reinforces the proposals of the Police and Crime Commissioner and that in making these recommendations the result shall be that the eventual precept shall not be at such a level as to trigger a referendum.

(5) That the Police and Crime Commissioner shall publish his response to these recommendations by forwarding it to the Panel (which will publish the response on its website) and by publishing it on the Commissioner's website.

J28. WEBSITE

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which set out two options with regard to developing a more effective website presence for the Police and Crime Panel, as part of its approach to increase public engagement in its work.

It was agreed that whilst the Panel was becoming established, developing its ways of working and becoming familiar with its duties and responsibilities, there was little to be gained from seeking community engagement in its formal meetings. It was concluded that the best opportunities to promote its work to the general public were through mechanisms such as its website. The current website for the Panel was a page within the Rotherham Council's website, with limited information about the Panel.

There were two main options that included developing the current web page or to create a "galaxy" web page; effectively a website within the Rotherham website.

It was suggested that the best means of taking this forward was for a small sub-group of the Police and Crime Panel to consider the report in detail and explore the options.

Resolved:- That the report be considered by a small sub-group to be led by Mr. A. Carter, assist by Councillor Sixsmith and that Panel Members be contacted to see who else would like to take this forward.

J29. DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which presented a draft work programme for consideration, in light of decisions taken at the last meeting in December 2013, which included:-

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

The work plan as submitted recognised the need for the scheduling of further meetings at an agreed time of 1.00 p.m, with the first being held on Monday, 31st March, 2014.

Resolved:- That the draft work plan be approved.

J30. UPDATE ON THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS

Consideration was given to a report presented by Jacqueline Collins, Monitoring Officer, which updated the Panel with regard to the nature and level of complaints that have been received and the action taken.

The following complaints have been received:-

- A complaint that the Police and Crime Commissioner had failed to act in relation to a complaint that had been referred to him and complaints in respect of two members of the staff of the Police and Crime Commissioner

As the complaint against the Police and Crime Commissioner related to the administration of justice, which was not a matter for which the Police and Crime Commissioner had responsibility, it was determined by the Monitoring Officer that the complaint did not fall within the Panel's complaints procedure.

With regard to the complaints relating to the Police and Crime Commissioner's staff, these were not matters that fell to be considered by the Panel and the complainant was referred to the procedures operated by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Monitoring Officer consulted the Chair and the Deputy Chair regarding these matters, who both endorsed the proposed course of action.

- A complaint that the Police and Crime Commissioner had been derogatory in his public comments regarding South Yorkshire Police officers.

The complaint was considered by the Monitoring Officer to be a personal comment which did not fall to be considered under the complaints procedure. The Deputy Chair was consulted and agreed with the proposed course of action. The Chair was not consulted as this complaint was dealt with in the period between the previous and current Chairman being appointed.

- Two further complaints have been received, neither of which had any supporting evidence. Whilst extensive detail was not required it was the responsibility of complainants to provide sufficient

information to enable a preliminary consideration of the complaint to be undertaken. The Panel had no power to conduct its own investigation.

This position had been explained to the complainants who may, if they wish, submit further details.

As a result of a query by a member of the public consideration was to be given to developing guidance for the public as to which complaints should be directed to the Police and Crime Panel, the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable.

Resolved:- That the level of complaints and how they have been considered be noted.

J31. DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Consideration was given to the dates and times of future meeting.

It was suggested that this be considered in more detail, but that the next meeting would take place on Monday, 31st March, 2014.

Resolved:- That the next meeting take place at Rotherham Town Hall on Monday, 31st March, 2014 at 1.00 p.m.