

## **ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION**

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

**Date: Wednesday, 16th September,  
2015**

**Time: 2.00 p.m.**

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

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 13)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 14 - 33)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 34 - 40)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 41 - 54)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 55 - 63)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 64 - 71)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION  
9th July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Burton, Elliot, Fleming, Godfrey, Hunter, Khan, Mallinder, Price, Rose, Rushforth and M. Vines and Vicky Farnsworth (Rotherham Speakup).

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Smith, Turner and Robert Parkin.

**13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were personal interests declared by Councillors Fleming, Hunter, Parker, Price and Rose, on the range of matters included on this meeting's agenda. All of these Councillors were either employees, or relatives of employees, within the National Health Service. As their interests were of a personal (and not prejudicial) nature, the Members remained in the meeting and spoke and voted on the items.

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

There were no separate questions from members of the public or the press, although a member of the public did attend and asked various questions relating to items 19 to 22 below.

**15. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) Use of 'yellow cards' during debate

The issues being dealt with by this Select Commission were complex and often a lot of jargon used for Adult Social Care and Health. To ensure that everyone was able to participate fully in discussions, the yellow card system used previously at other Scrutiny Panels/Select Commissions was being reintroduced. If any Member of the Commission required clarification on a question or on a term used they should raise the yellow card.

(2) Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC)

Congenital Heart Disease Services would be considered further at a meeting of the Health Select Commission during September, 2015.

(3) Chantry Bridge GP Practice, Greasbrough

Tenders were being invited for the provision of a new Alternative Provider Medical Services (APMS) contract for the delivery of GP services at the Community Health Centre at Greasbrough. The new Service would commence during November, 2015.

(4) Carnson House

The launch of the new Drug and Alcohol Recovery Hub would take place on Wednesday, 15th July 2015 (details previously circulated to Elected Members).

(5) Access to GPs and RDaSH CAMHS Reviews

The response to the RDaSH CAMHS Scrutiny Review would shortly be submitted to Commissioner Newsam's meeting. The Interim Director of Adult Social Care and the Director of Public Health were responding to issues arising from the Scrutiny Review of Access to GPs.

(6) Care Quality Commission - Quality Summit

Consequent upon the inspection of the Rotherham Foundation Trust earlier in 2015, the Care Quality Commission's summit with stakeholders to discuss outcomes and action plans would take place on Monday, 13th July, 2015; the Chair of the Select Commission would be attending the summit.

(7) Publication of the 2015 Health Profiles

The overall local health and child health profiles, 2015, had now been published and would be circulated to Members of the Select Commission, together with links to the appropriate Internet websites.

**16. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2015, be agreed as a correct record, with the clerical correction of the inclusion of Councillor Ahmed in the list of Members who had given their apologies for absence for that meeting.

**17. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The contents of the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2015, were noted. Members were informed that further reports would be submitted, from time to time, to various meetings of Elected Members on the suicide prevention matters which had been considered at that meeting.

Adult Mental Health had also been discussed at that meeting, including support for adults post-diagnosis. The report discussed at the Board's meeting related to children and young people, although the continuing work on suicide prevention considered all ages and there was vigilant monitoring and thorough investigation of any cases.

The Advisory Cabinet Member confirmed the establishment of a new commissioning sub-group, which would begin its work by considering issues concerning adult mental health.

Reference was also made to the most recent meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board which had taken place yesterday, 8th July, 2015. A written report was being prepared in response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Access to GPs. It was also noted that amendments to the process for responses to scrutiny reviews was currently being developed.

## 18. COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Chris Holt, Chief Operating Officer, Rotherham Foundation Trust, gave the following presentation about Transforming Unscheduled Health Care:-

- Community Transformation launched in April 2014;
- Focus on five priorities
  - A Better Community Nursing Service
    - Reconfigured around locality teams
    - Better leadership, clinical supervision and governance
    - Additional nurses (14 whole time equivalent posts) against the 2014/15 establishment
    - New ICT equipment, full connectivity
  - Integrating Services in Health and Social Care (for issues such as falls, respiratory and neurological cases)
    - Developed new Integrated Rapid Response (merging Fast Response, Advanced Nurse Practitioners)
    - Respiratory Care Pathway agreed
    - Investment in Integrated Falls and Bone Health Care Pathway
    - New Service model for Neuro Rehabilitation
  - An Enhanced Care Co-ordination Centre
    - Resourced to provide 24 hours', s7 days per week cover
    - Hub for new supported Discharge and Admit Prevent Pathways
    - Develop single point of access for Community Nursing referrals
  - Utilisation of alternative levels of care
    - Agreed model for Community Unit to target frail/elderly
    - Discharge to Assess beds commissioned at Waterside Grange
    - Three supported Discharge and Admission Prevention Pathways
  - Better Governance and Performance Management
    - Performance Framework established across all Community Teams
    - Reporting mechanisms and indicators agreed with Teams

Bi-monthly meetings held between Clinical Commissioning Group and Community Teams

- ‘Input’ and milestone focus
- Secured successfully – need stage 2, as the initial programme had concluded in March 2015
- Acute was delivering but had struggled during the Winter

Current Situation – an Opportunity

- Provider of Acute and Community Services
- Community Transformation enablers
- A focus to improve within Acute
- Take a 2 to 3 year view
- Address other key enablers (Emergency Centre, 7/7 Services)
- Outcome and performance driven

Origins of the Programme

- Five Year Forward View
- Future Hospital Commission – Future hospital: caring for medical patients

A Future Model of Care

- Generalist Inpatient Pathways  
The Medical Division: unified clinical, operational and financial management  
7 days per week by trained doctors using Standard Operating Procedures
- Specialist Inpatient Pathways  
Specialist procedures, clinics, ambulatory care and community support, specialist education, training and research

The Ambition

- Strengthened acute take and ambulatory care
- Ward reconfiguration and reduced bed base
- 7-day assessment of appropriate patients
- Community physician support for localities
- Reduction in acute length of stay
- Length of stay at home/Usual Point of Residence to be main indicators
- Primary, secondary and community partnerships

Five Key Priorities

- Emergency access and admissions
- Structured and systematic management of in-patient beds (acute and intermediate)
- Embedding Admission Prevention and Supported Discharge Pathways

- Integration of Acute and Community Care Pathways
- Partnerships with social care, mental health, voluntary sector partners

The presentation and subsequent discussion highlighted the following issues:-

: B1 Ward (at the Rotherham hospital) – reorganisation;

: the role of the Carats nurses (Community Assessment, Rehabilitation and Treatment Scheme); the multi-disciplinary team and the co-ordination of care; the multi-disciplinary teams review care plans daily for patients and telephone the Care Co-ordination Centre for advice and to arrange further care/support;

: ‘key enablers’ – examples being the Emergency Centre; providing around-the-clock services; Health Service working alongside the Adult Social Care Teams;

: staffing and national shortages, having an appropriate mix of skills for the changes and the use of agency staff in appropriate positions;

: staff morale and being able to “take people with you” when making changes;

: the national call for more hospital beds (to care for the ageing population) and the increasing pressures on community care; the availability of medical specialists and consultants to provide care in the community;

: reducing delayed transfers of care (DTC) as the longer that people remain in acute wards, the more difficult it becomes for them to return home;

: services for people who have learning disabilities; ensuring that care providers understood the nature of learning disabilities;

: care in the community (and the use of individual care plans) being sufficient to ensure that patients do not have to return to hospital;

: reassurance for the general public that the allocation of hospital care, or of care in the community were dependent upon medical decisions and were not to be ‘target-driven’; it was noted that outcome measures were useful in terms of ensuring quality of service;

: the strategic health care changes being made were consistent with changes being made elsewhere in the country; communication between the various NHS Trusts; ensuring the consistency of quality standards; triangulation of performance data; the availability of specialist care;

: being an integrated Trust for Acute and Community Services was advantageous in controlling patient pathways and ensuring people were only admitted to hospital when they needed to be;

: the future model would result in more of the specialists going to the patient rather than patients being moved round the hospital or being in a specialist bed when they did not need to be;

: the challenge of 7 days' per week services and the involvement of staff in developing services; appropriate use of therapists instead of other medical specialists; use of multi-disciplinary teams in patient care;

: the 3 pathways : integrated rapid response (IRR) pathway; community bed base; intermediate care (therapeutic care).

Resolved:- (1) That the information now presented about Transforming Unscheduled Health Care be noted.

(2) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Health Select Commission as part of its work programme on health and social care integration.

## 19. HOSPITAL DISCHARGES

Chris Holt, Chief Operating Officer, Rotherham Foundation Trust, presented additional information requesting by the Select Commission following the update on the Hospital Discharges Scrutiny Review in October, 2014.

The additional information related to:-

Appendix A – figures for delayed discharges and complaints relating to discharges

Appendix B – details about the work of the Care Co-ordination Centre

Appendix C – information about the SAFER care bundle

Members discussed the following items:-

: targets on the Trust's website and hospital re-admission rates (Members requested further information on this matter);

: the increasing number of delayed discharges, the average waiting time for assessment by a Social Worker (the increased number of patients with complex needs may affect this time); use of agency staff may sometimes cause delays; the efforts being made to reduce the dependency on agency staff;

: improved communication with patients ought to reduce the number of complaints.

The Select Commission thanked Chris Holt for his presentation.

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

(2) That further reports on the specific actions being taken in response to the scrutiny review of Hospital Discharges continue to be submitted to meetings of the Health Select Commission.

**20. SCRUTINY REVIEW MONITORING REPORT - URINARY INCONTINENCE**

Rebecca Atchinson, Public Health Officer, presented a 6 months' progress review of the Health Select Commission's Scrutiny Review recommendations concerning Urinary Incontinence. The updated action plan was appended to the submitted report.

Members noted that progress had been slower than anticipated. The challenges of addressing urinary incontinence in isolation from wider health and wellbeing issues may have resulted in the medical condition not receiving the profile it needed to fully implement the recommendations formulated by the Review. There may also be a need to identify at risk groups for the physical activity recommendations, as it was recognised that their needs may be different.

The Select Commission noted that additional grant money had been obtained to fund more physical activities for people who had long-term conditions (linking activities with pelvic-floor exercises where appropriate). Training had also been provided for Care Home staff on the treatment of people with urinary incontinence (and should be included as part of the service commissioning process). Further dialogue was needed about the information provided by the Community Continence Service (CCS), to avoid duplication and also with regard to alternative ways of providing training for care home staff

Members noted that some of the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review had yet to be implemented (eg; the wider availability of the pelvic-floor exercises at exercise sessions for older people; development of an internet website containing appropriate information about physical exercise).

The Select Commission noted that the 'call-to-action' website would enable people to search for physical/sports activities, available to all throughout the Rotherham Borough area, in which they may participate. It was anticipated that the website would be in use during October 2015. The need for public availability of details of such activities was emphasised.

Public Health staff were working with the Community Continence Service and engaging with their service users to develop the correct messages for the public to be broadcast on PHTV.



Members noted the emphasis upon communication, education and prevention, especially in maternity and parenting classes. It was suggested that partner organisations should also be involved in the provision of appropriate preventative measures. The difficulties for children and young people who had urinary incontinence was also acknowledged.

Members thanked Rebecca Atchinson for her presentation.

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

(2) That the actions being taken on the recommendations and responses to the Scrutiny Review of Urinary Incontinence, as now reported, be noted.

(3) That a further progress report be submitted to a meeting of the Health Select Commission in six months' time.

Footnote – subsequent to the meeting, additional information was obtained from Active Rotherham for inclusion with the minutes:

#### Pelvic Floor Exercises

The Public Health Service had attempted to encourage pelvic floor exercises in the Active Always programme and make links with the Continence Nurses at Rotherham hospital. It had been slow progress, however, the aim was to deliver training to all instructors on the exercise programmes (including leisure centres) to help with providing examples of how people could incorporate suitable exercise into everyday activities and not just when they attended a class. Another aim was to ensure there was evidence to show the measures described had taken place. Active Rotherham was working with colleagues in Public Health on the programme and aimed also to roll it out in the new Sport England Active for Health project.

## 21. HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY REFRESH

Michael Holmes, Policy Officer, and Joanna Saunders, Head of Health Improvement, gave the following presentation on the Rotherham Health and Wellbeing Strategy:-

#### Health and Wellbeing Board

- Established by Health and Social Care Act 2012
- Brings together Council, Clinical Commissioning Group and other key partners including Healthwatch and Service providers
- Produce Joint Strategic Needs Assessment – evidence base for health needs (<http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/jsna/>)
- Develop Strategy to improve health and wellbeing
- Ensure partners' spending plans were geared towards achieving the Strategy's aims and objectives

#### Health and Social Care Integration

- Better Care Fund – pooled funding to transform Health and Social Care Services
- Critically it was about person-centred care
- Rotherham Better Care Fund Plan approved January, 2015; key target to reduce hospital admissions

#### What does the evidence tell us?

- Life expectancy below England average and significant gap between the Borough's most and least deprived areas
- Population changes – ageing population and people living longer with poorer health
- 28.5% of adults were classed as obese, worse than the England average
- Relatively high rate of hospital stays for alcohol-related harm
- Higher than average adult smoking levels and smoking-related deaths
- Rate of sexually transmitted infections was worse than average
- Rates of death from cardiovascular disease and cancer were worse than the England average

#### Key Health Challenges: Children and Young People

- Child poverty was worse than the England average with 22.8% of under 16s living in (relative) poverty
- 9.8% of children aged 4-5 and 23.4% of children aged 10-11 were classified as obese
- The rate of diagnosis of sexually transmitted infections in young people aged 15-24 years was above the England average
- Relatively high rates of smoking in pregnancy, contributing to increased risk of stillbirth, low birth weight and neonatal deaths
- Rotherham's breastfeeding rate was amongst the lowest in the region – contributing to levels of childhood obesity

#### The Strategy (2012 to 2015) – Current Thinking

- Explicit focus on children and young people
- Increased emphasis on mental health
- Help people to take responsibility for their health
- Principles of prevention and early intervention
- Work with communities – asset-based approach
- Build on good practice in Rotherham and elsewhere
- Meaningful indicators to measure progress

#### Feedback from Voluntary and Community Sector

- Increase emphasis on and investment in prevention and early intervention
- Holistic approach to health and Wellbeing Board utilising expertise from a range of organisations
- Recognise key transition points rather than waiting for people to hit crisis

- Real commitment to “asset-based” approach – not just as a cover for cuts
- Make the Health and Wellbeing Board “system” easier for people to access, understand and navigate
- Target the most disadvantaged regardless of age, including a renewed focus on healthy ageing

For September, 2015

- Health and Wellbeing Board approve Strategy including long term strategic outcomes
- Outcomes inform partners’ emerging commissioning plans

After September 2015

- Annual delivery plan, informed by outcomes and indicators, with associated performance measures
- Detailed plans for specific themes/programmes with linkages to wider partnership strategies and objectives
- Further consultation about the strategy

The Health Select Commission Members discussed the following issues:-

: housing need, the availability of appropriate housing and the development of the Older People’s Housing Strategy;

: communication strategy and providing information and services for the most vulnerable people (eg; skills audit, staff training, evidence based quality practice);

: the importance of inter-agency and partnership working, including the voluntary and community sector organisations and service providers;

: the wider determinants of a person’s health (influences include : neighbourhood, housing, employment or lack of employment, lifestyle issues, availability of appropriate services);

: Public Health and Planning working together with regard to housing, infrastructure and provision of activities;

: the availability and impact of services for people (of all ages and in all communities) who experience mental ill health;

: different measures which could be used to help people to stop smoking; it was noted that there had been a reduction in the rate of smoking in pregnancy to 18.3%, which was the lowest it had ever been and the rate of smoking in the general population was 18.9%, also the lowest recorded.

Resolved:- (1) That the presentation on the draft, refreshed Rotherham Health and Wellbeing Strategy, as now submitted, be noted.

(2) That a further report on the final, approved version of the Rotherham Health and Wellbeing Strategy be submitted to the next meeting of the Health Select Commission.

(3) That the Health Select Commission recommends that mental health should be an explicit priority in the refreshed Rotherham Health and Wellbeing Strategy, including the further development of services and support for people of all ages.

## **22. SCRUTINY REVIEW MONITORING REPAIR - CHILDHOOD OBESITY**

Joanna Saunders, Head of Health Improvement, presented an update on the re-procurement of Rotherham's Healthy Weight Framework and the action plan in response to the Scrutiny Review of Childhood Obesity.

The report stated that services in Rotherham's Healthy Weight Framework (tiered weight management services) were re-commissioned with new contracts effective from April 2015. 3 contracts for the delivery of Child Obesity Services had been awarded to two providers. Places for People Leisure would deliver the tier two programme (MoreLife clubs) and MoreLife Ltd will be delivering tier three (MoreLife clubs with 1:1 support) and also tier four (MoreLife residential camp). An explanation was provided of the three tiers of service within the programmes which engaged families and offered healthy eating and dietary advice, increased opportunities for physical activity, including group/team sports and enhanced services for people who had a higher body mass index (specialist input including psychological, dietetic and clinical input as required).

The annual National Child Measuring Programme was discussed which showed variation year-on-year as different cohorts of children were weighed and measured. For the first time, data was now available with 2 measures for the same cohort of children which would help with identifying trends.

The single point of contact had proved very successful and used telephone triage. Internet website and social media access were also in place.

Discussion took place on the availability of information and funding for organisations which provided physical activities within the community (eg: sports; dancing).

Members were informed of the partnership working with schools and academies, especially in terms of guidance on school meals and healthy eating for pupils. Additionally, the Weight Management Programme was being promoted throughout the community. There has been a good take-up of free school meals and "stay on site" policies were being encouraged through the cluster of schools within learning communities.

Information was provided about the success stories of individuals who had benefited from the tiered programme to reduce obesity.

One example was of a young man who had attended the residential camp on two occasions and had continued to reduce his weight through attendance at the club programme, supporting his younger siblings in weight loss as well. He had provided a strong role model for peers and was working at this year's residential camp in a voluntary capacity, thus gaining valuable work experience.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress being made against the recommendations of Rotherham's Healthy Weight Framework, as contained in the report now submitted, be noted.

(2) That the progress being made against the recommendations identified in the original Scrutiny Review and the resources being deployed to reduce levels of childhood obesity, as now reported, be noted.

(3) That the Health Select Commission continue to be informed of progress of Rotherham's Healthy Weight Framework, as it affected all age groups of the Borough's residents.

Footnote : subsequent to the meeting, the information below was obtained in response to a specific question raised and had been included in the minutes:-

#### Sports Club Development

As part of the Children and Young People's group for Sport and Physical Activity in the Borough area, a club development evening would be delivered from Rotherham United Football Club's New York Stadium, probably during October 2015. The purpose of the event was to invite local clubs to an evening (6pm-9pm) with presentations on a number of topics. At present, the planned topics were expected to be:-

- (i) Funding - both the local funding streams available and how to complete a form (what funders were looking for in a bid, key phrases/ buzz words, where local information could be sourced to support a bid; ie: health statistics).
- (ii) Club structure - club requirements, paper work, Disclosure and Barring Service/ welfare; etc
- (iii) Possibly something about facilities;
- (iv) Facilitated session on other club issues raised throughout the evening.

### **23. PROVISIONAL SUB-GROUPS FOR QUALITY ACCOUNTS**

The Scrutiny Officer submitted a report detailing the establishment and provisional membership of the Elected Members' sub-groups which will undertake the scrutiny of health partners' Quality Accounts.

(1) RDaSH – Councillor Sansome (Chair) and Councillors Ahmed, Hunter, Price, Rose and Smith;

(2) Rotherham Hospital – Councillor Mallinder (Chair) and Councillors Burton, Evans, Fleming, Rushforth and R.A.J. Turner;

(3) Yorkshire Ambulance Service - Councillor Alam (Chair) and Councillors Elliot, Godfrey, Khan, Parker and M. Vines.

**24. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

No issues had been raised.

**25. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Resolved:- (1) That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 24th September, 2015, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

(2) That, during the 2015/16 Municipal Year, two meetings of the Health Select Commission shall be scheduled to commence at 3.00 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
10th June, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Pitchley, Ahmed, Burton, Cutts, Hoddinott, Jones, Rose and John Turner.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Councillors Beaumont, Taylor, Tweed and M. Vines.

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

There were no members of the public and press present.

**3. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no communications to report.

**4. NOMINATIONS TO THE HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL**

Resolved:- That Councillor J. Hamilton represent the Improving Lives Select Commission on the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel for the 2015/16 Municipal Year with Councillor Rose as substitute.

**5. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28TH JANUARY, 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2015, were noted.

**6. UPDATE AND BRIEFING ON PLANS TO TACKLE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION (CSE)**

The Chair welcomed Jean Imray, Interim Deputy Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services, to the meeting. Jean gave an overview of the work that had taken place to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation:-

**Redevelopment of the Joint Child Sexual Exploitation Team**

The challenges faced by the original CSE team of the Council were outlined in some detail and it was explained to Members that the Team's remit had been unclear and also the level of expertise in the Team not sufficient due to the complexities it faced

The Service had since been disbanded. A Head of Service had been brought in to take responsibility for the operational level of service and an experienced Team Manager in CSE which was important in Safeguarding

Child protection cases. The Team had been gradually built to ensure the right skill set. Whilst this process had been taking place, other areas of Social Care had been managing the existing CSE work.

The Team was now in a position to take on new work and there was a new Operation involving a number of young people in Rotherham and a number of districts.

It was still in the early stages at present but already the differences that had been made to the conduct of the investigation could be seen. There was a very clear command structure i.e. the Police command structure (Gold Group) which included a Police Superintendent and a Senior Investigating Officer and met on a weekly basis. Under the Gold Group was the Silver Group which was a more operational group on the day-to-day work.

The new Team also had a qualified Social Worker, an unqualified Social Worker post from Barnados and a Health Worker who was really important in terms of engaging young people and giving sexual health/contraception advice and responding to any of the victim's worries and concerns because of the experience they had had. There was also a wide range of work ongoing to identify those young people who were at high risk because of their additional vulnerabilities e.g. children missing from school/care, having access to drugs/alcohol, witnessed in certain places etc.

#### **Barnardos; Assertive Outreach Hub**

Work was taking place with Barnardos to identify funding streams to develop this Service which would assist agencies to access the "high risk" group which was not available currently. The Hub would be very active in terms of leaving the premises and getting onto the streets and finding the young people who were at risk and working with/encouraging them to come into the centre and allow agencies to support them. It would be a very important component to the CSE portfolio that would help agencies get to grips and tackle the problems.

#### **Multi-Agency Risk Panel**

Whilst waiting for the Barnardos' Hub to come on line, this was 1 of the things being used to identify, not just vulnerable individual young people, but also high risk areas where people may be gathering such as the Interchange, train station, parks. Whoever had concerns in the community, either about individual young people or high risk areas, all agencies worked together to make sure the right activity was targeting those areas in terms of observation, targeting particular offenders and diverting people from high risk behaviours. It would consider individual young people such as those that had been missing on repeated occasions and fitted the profile of at risk of CSE.



### **CSE Strategy**

A Strategy entitled "Way Forward" was being developed which set out the way forward for partnership in order to tackle all aspects of CSE from those activities that needed to be undertaken in order to:-

prevent it happening in the first place;  
 activities and services that needed to be available in order to successfully protect children;  
 activities that everyone needed to be involved in to ensure successful prosecutions were secured;  
 support to victims and survivors both current and historical.

Underneath the 4 key areas would be a whole raft of actions, some of which would be quite high level but also some very basic, that needed to be done in order to improve. There would be an action plan which would hopefully capture everything required to have the greatest impact. Each action would have a timeline attached to it, ranging from immediate effect to aspirational.

### **Police Activity**

Recent arrests had been made by South Yorkshire Police. The Council had been involved in the investigations even though they related to historical cases. It was hoped they would lead to successful prosecutions and importantly ensure the public understood that the door was not closed on the pursuit of bringing perpetrators to account.

### **Children's Services**

A lot of work was taking place on all fronts of Children's Services in Rotherham. It had been badly broken and it would take quite a long time to put back together of which CSE was 1 aspect. It was really important that the improvements were made upon solid foundations that avoided the prospect of the Service making progress and then going backwards. The improvement journey took 3-5 years.

Discussion then ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- **Had the recent arrests been a direct result of the intervention work that had gone in recently or from previous work?**  
 The recent arrests represented an Operation that had been in train for 18-24 months and pre-dated the work that had started following publication of the Jay report
- **How do we scrutinise the plans to tackle CSE?**
- **What is the extent of the profile of CSE in our local area now and how do we know that?**  
 Unfortunately CSE was still going on but no more than in any other local authority area. Although there was a lot of awareness raising with regard to victims, there had not been much about raising

awareness of perpetrators. This needed to be tackled as part of the "prevention" arm of the Strategy

- **Were potential victims getting younger than stated in the Jay report? Were we looking at primary school children or still secondary children and was it still a Town Centre issue?**

There was no intelligence to suggest that the profile of victims were getting younger. The hot spots had probably changed because there had been some targeted activity together with the work on Licensing. As the Services developed it would result in better intelligence

- **What work was the Authority doing with Universal Services (Health, Schools, GPs etc.) that were involved with young people? If a young person was frequently absent from school were the services linking together? What was the Authority doing to ensure that young people who did not meet green, amber red and not deemed at risk according to what the Services considered as at risk were not missed?**

The Rotherham Safeguarding Board had conducted an enormous amount of awareness raising and workshops and there had been a series of awareness raising and talking to schools, health colleagues and other agencies about how to access the Multi-Agency Risk Panel which had recently held its first meeting. The Panel was where low level intelligence would be fed into so all the pieces of the jigsaw could be joined up. The Authority received all the information on any child that went missing in Rotherham which was then screened to see whether or not they were at risk. If repeated at a maximum of 2/3 times, the case would be picked up by CSE Services. The current cases had not been as a result of a young person coming forward and revealing what had happened to them but had been as a result of the preventative work. The young people concerned were very resistant and did not see themselves as victims but were now working with agencies to support them and revealing what had happened. The Assertive Outreach Team would provide increased intelligence and development of the work

- **What are the numbers of cases presented to the Multi-Agency Risk Panel?**

It was thought to be approximately 10 but it was not just about individual cases but also about intelligence, the activities of potential perpetrators and hotspots. By identifying those hotspots, sharing the information and looking more closely at an area, you could identify more potential vulnerable young people at risk and then direct them to the right support at whatever level was required

- **What therapeutic support was being provided by RDaSH?**

There was insufficient support in place currently nor a wide enough range. Work was being carried out and RDaSH had suggested how they could increase the provision available

- **Was the funding for the additional Psychotherapist extended beyond March, 2015?**

It was thought that it had

- **Was Riverside House the most suitable location for the Multi-Agency Support Hub given the ethos of hot desking?**

The Multi-Agency Support Hub (MASH) was the Authority's new front door. It was acknowledged that it was less than perfect accommodation and prevented the necessary improvements being made but consideration was being given to alternative accommodation

It was not known where the Assertive Outreach Team would be based but it would not be in Riverside House

- **Would the recently agreed intelligence post be similar to the post in Bradford? Their postholder identified areas and fed reports into the Police**

It had been identified that the building of the cases around the suspects absolutely relied increasingly on the use of the research and intelligence and the Police were committed to that. It would not be possible to secure successful prosecutions without that base

- **Were the information sharing protocols between South Yorkshire Police and the Council working?**

There were no concerns at the moment and the extent of the joint working was improving on a daily basis. It had been difficult for the Police as well as the Council because of the amount of scrutiny they had been under but both parties had reiterated that if you wanted things to be different you had to do things differently or there would be the same results. There was a very clear Command structure which voluntary sector partners were also part of

Recent statements from South Yorkshire Police referred to partnership working with the Council and the language used reflected those statements

- **Now that the staffing levels had been built up, how did we keep those staff members?**

Part of the wider improvement journey had to include a Recruitment and Retention Strategy so that good staff were recruited and stayed. It was normal to lose some staff and it was healthy because it could become very inward looking but you did not want people to leave because they were dissatisfied. It would be difficult for a period of time to recruit, particularly Managers, whilst people waited to see what developments/improvements were made. Managers were on the front line of Safeguarding Children Services and potential employees would be cautious about coming to Rotherham. The Strategy and recruitment campaign had to clearly state what was being done, that

there was access to good training, would be paid a competitive rate, good management etc.

– **Was there a Joint Investigation Team working protocol?**

Since publication of the Jay report, the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub had been developed which was the new front door so when someone contacted Children's Social Care the Multi-Agency Team would deal with the enquiry

Due to the development of the MASH, which included the Police, the processes and procedures had been re-written. In terms of development of CSE Services, because there were joint investigations that took place regarding physical abuse, child abuse etc, the CSE Team did not have a separate joint working protocol but there was a Memorandum of Understanding which sat under the roles and responsibilities of the Police and the Council

– **It was 9 months on from the Jay report, Commissioner Newsam had been in Rotherham for 8 months as had the Interim Strategic Director of Children's and Young Peoples Services, and it was quite frustrating to hear some of the issues that had been raised before e.g. therapeutic support by RDaSH in 2013, MASH in 2012 and being told that might have to wait a little longer**

With regard to the issue of accommodation, in part it was due to the success of the MASH and the additional posts. It was not a question of it not working but that it had outgrown its accommodation

The Multi-Agency Referral Panel had only met last month for the first time and it was having an impact. A report could be submitted showing the first month's activity but it may be better to wait 6 months in order to get a better trajectory and picture of how it was working

The performance data would show that a difference had been made. In January, 2015, there had been a large number of children's assessments out of timescale i.e. 45 days. Currently there were only 9 cases out of time. There was a performance meeting that afternoon where Managers would be expected to account for why their assessments were out of timescale. On a weekly basis every exception was looked at child level. That was really good performance management activity which was significantly different from what happened previously. The tangible evidence of improvement which had had an impact on the work could be demonstrated through the performance data

However, an absolute reassurance could not be given that the quality of the assessments was where it should be because that took longer and was a more complex piece of work

- **There were still concerns that information was not being shared and assurance was sought that that was not the case**

The present CSE Service was not the finished article and there was not enough therapeutic support. Progress had not been made as swiftly as hoped due to not having the right people in place. However, Cambridge Police had seconded a very experienced Officer to support South Yorkshire Police and, together with the CSE Manager, progress would start to be seen

- **Could peer mentoring with other authorities be built into the long term strategy? There was a danger when the Council reached “Good” staff may be headhunted by other authorities facing similar difficulties?**

- **With regard to quality data performance, had there been a thorough assessment with regard to quality? It had been raised previously about Members being involved in the auditing of case files as part of the scrutiny process**

There were 2 auditors to the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Board and 3 dedicated auditors in Children Social Care. A monthly audit system was to be introduced whereby every Manager audited at least 1/2 cases a month including Commissioner Newsam, the Interim Director of Children’s and Young Peoples Services, Interim Deputy Director of Children and Young Peoples Services and the Director of Safeguarding Children and Families. Provided the governance arrangements could be satisfied, Members with the appropriate skills would be welcomed

Checks were made that every child had a Plan and up-to-date assessment. The audit system was then used to gain a greater understanding of the quality of the work

- **What could be learnt from the audit and what actions came out of that?**

The report had not been published as yet. What had been found was the same as stated in the reports by Ofsted, Jay and Casey i.e. there were some good people trying to operate in a very broken system. Between 2008-13 it had been very hard to recognise a straight forward Child Protection pathway; there were no strategy meetings, no assessments, no conferences on time – all illustrating really poor practice. There had been a remarkable absence of senior management oversight in the cases with no involvement of anyone more senior than a Team Manager even if it had been a Looked After Child. The recommendations would reflect the Improvement Plan

- **Was there effective management oversight now in terms of supervision of these cases?**

The CSE Team that was being built had experienced people and experienced managers who were getting the level of supervision they required. The Service was also looking to access some additional

external emotional support for both the Police and Social Workers to ensure they would be looked after and provide good staff care because of the nature of their work

Work was taking place on ensuring everyone received regular supervision in a way they had not previously. Not all Managers were able to deliver that standard of supervision so they would receive training and support. Supervision was part of the audit process and a judgement made on its quality. It should include reflective supervision and not just a record of actions so there was still work to do to raise the quality. It was essential and receiving a lot of attention

- **It was disappointing that the Multi-Agency Risk Panel had only met once. What had happened in the last 9 months?**

It was acknowledged that between September, 2014-January, 2015 it appeared that very little had happened but it took time to get things in motion and to get the right people into positions; things would accelerate now

- **Are you confident that all the Social Work Teams are operating properly? Were there any weak links or Teams further down the road to improvement?**

The Social Work Teams were at different stages of improvement with some working more effectively than others but this was to be addressed

Within the Teams there would be differences due to the mix of skills and expertise. Weekly performance meetings would expose any weak spots as well as daily scrutiny to ascertain which staff members required improvement plans

- **What was the turnover of staff in Children's Social Care?**

There was certainly a much higher degree of agency staff than Rotherham had been accustomed to due to the extra approved posts and agency staff filling them. There had been some turnover of staff for a variety of reasons, however, there had been a lot of interest in the work of the CSE Team and approaches made by professionals elsewhere in the country. Area Team Managers were at a premium and were so hard to find and it would take a long time to recruit the right calibre. The situation in Rotherham was not peculiar

It was the agency market that was preventing local authorities building their workforce in the way they needed to. It was a national problem

Jean was thanked for her attendance and presentation.

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

(2) That a work programme now be devised for Improving Lives, based on the discussions that had taken place and that the next meeting focus on the new CSE Strategy and delivery plan.

**7. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting of the Select Commission be held on Wednesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015, commencing at 1.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
22nd July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Pitchley, Ahmed, Astbury, Beaumont, The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Cutts, Hoddinott, Jones, Rose, Rosling, Taylor, Tweed, M. Vines and Jepson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Jones and Smith.

**8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

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

**10. COMMUNICATIONS.**

Nothing was raised under this item.

**11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10TH JUNE, 2015.**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2015, were considered.

Councillors Currie and Rosling had both submitted their apologies for the meeting but these had not been recorded in the minutes.

Matters arising from the previous meeting would be covered in this meeting's agenda.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission be agreed as an accurate record with the addition of the two apologies for non-attendance.

**12. CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION - THE WAY FORWARD FOR ROTHERHAM.**

Councillor Hamilton welcomed Jean Imray, Interim Deputy Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services Directorate, to the meeting. Jean had been invited to discuss the document of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board entitled 'Child Sexual Exploitation: The Way Forward for Rotherham 2015 – 2018'.

Jean introduced the strategy document which was owned by the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board and had been signed off by them the previous day. The document was Rotherham's strategy for tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) so it was deliberately written in



strong terms. It was intentionally hard-hitting and straightforward about the challenges.

The document took as its starting point a quotation from Louise Casey: -

Louise Casey tells it as it is .....

CSE ..... is the sexual and physical abuse, and the habitual rape of children by (mainly) men who achieve this by manipulating and gaining control over those who cannot consent to sex either by virtue of their age or their capacity.

The strategy recognised and named CSE as rape. The strategy also recognised that CSE was a form of gender based violence because a majority of the cases were male perpetrators against female victims. Rotherham needed to recognise the issues and take the correct steps to counter them.

The strategy was also clear that Rotherham Services had failed Rotherham children. Page two states: -

'We have fallen short of what should be expected in all areas. We have failed to prevent CSE. We have failed to recognise the signs, symptoms and risk factors and we have failed to educate our children, girls and boys, about the nature and benefits of healthy relationships and respect for each other. We have failed to protect children not only by the inadequacies of our responses to the plight of victims, but as adults (parents and professionals) by introducing them to benefits of the internet, mobile technology without insisting that the necessary safeguards are also in place. We have failed to ensure that justice is served, not only by failing to pursue and prosecute criminals, but also by applying processes in our courts that are designed for adults and being complacent when they clearly don't work for vulnerable abused and children.'

Jean explained that child witnesses subject to adult court processes had, at times, collapsed under the pressure of the situation and often described it as a second abuse.

Rotherham was starting to do ground breaking work in tackling CSE. It would be reassuring if, in a year or two, this was recognised when there would hopefully be sufficient evidence of success. Rotherham's Services needed to be honest and change track if the strategies were stopped becoming effective. Jean explained that the Strategy was underpinned by a delivery plan, but if it became clear that some actions were not having the desired affect it would be right to change or adjust them accordingly. Therefore, it would be important to ensure that the objectives set within strategies were monitored.

The Delivery Plan would follow 'The Way Forward' in due course as an addendum to the Strategy.

Jean referred to the information contained within the 'Rotherham CSE Profile'. Some of the data referenced could be misleading and was not telling services what they wanted to know. The data might not show enough distinction between CSE and other forms of sexual offence, for example, intra familial abuse.

Jo Abbott, Public Health Consultant – Health Protection, who was presenting in a supporting capacity alongside Jean, explained that the Strategy was to support victims as well as guide services. There was a wide range of services available for victims and survivors post abuse, and these needed to be analysed for efficiency.

Jo referred to the links between CSE Services within Rotherham to others: - Licensing, School absence, awareness raising within schools, sexual health and relationship education. These all had the aim to 'Prevent, Protect, Pursue and Provide'. Strategy documents produced by all partners needed to dovetail to ensure that victims and survivors were appropriately helped.

The Improving Lives Select Commission had had sight of the document and each section was discussed in turn and questions and comments were made.

**Preface: -**

Councillor Rosling asked whether the significant financial implications relating to CSE for the Council and its partners were yet known?

Jean Imray stated that this was ongoing as demands were continuing to appear. There would come a 'steady state' point when demands and resources were known and this would form a baseline to provide a good quality service in the future. Regarding the numbers of staff, it was not just about this, it needed to be the right people of the right calibre and right skill set. It was very important to have experienced people working with children and young people involved with/at risk of CSE.

Councillor Rosling asked when the steady state would be reached?

Jean was confident that the Services involved would not need any less resourcing than they currently had plus the ability to bring in extra resources when required would be necessary. The work was resource intensive; currently there were 3 continuing operations and there was a possible fourth coming as a result of improved intelligence and identification. This was really positive, but did make it difficult to know amount of resources needed in the future.

Councillor Hoddinott said it was very welcome that Steve Ashley had identified CSE as gender-based violence, mainly perpetuated by older males on young and vulnerable females. Were Schools part of the training and awareness strategy? What thought had been given to relationships and on-line safety?

Jean: - "We want to prevent this from happening in the first place." Recent research had presented worrying trends about the attitudes of young people to issues like hitting within relationships and consent. It was concerning that in 2015 females were not seeing themselves as equal in relationships, or seen by others to be equal. Content was needed from at least Year Six within the PSHE curriculum on the development and definition of healthy relationships.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether all primary and secondary schools were engaged in the delivery plan?

Jean: - "No, not yet as it was not complete." Meetings would be held with Headteachers in the new school year to ask them to buy-in. The Local Authority's influence was limited but resistance was not expected. It should be part of the curriculum for all young people to talk about these issues.

Councillor Hoddinott felt that it was difficult to discuss the matters as Elected Members had not seen the delivery plan. What were the timescales?

Jean explained that the document stipulated that the discussions with schools should begin by October. Lesson timetables needed to be set in advance. It was doubtful whether it would be incorporated in the 2015/2016 school year, although it was hoped that some schools would and show other schools a positive outcomes and examples. It was hoped that the work would be embedded in school timetables from September 2016.

Jo Abbott provided reassurance that there was a lot of work already going on in schools across the Borough.

Councillor Hamilton asked when the delivery plan would be available to be viewed?

Jean explained that it was currently being checked with agencies that they were happy with the identified lead officers and timescales. It would be available within 2/3 weeks.

Councillor M. Vines referred to page 16 that dealt with the expectation on the Corporate Parent to care for their looked after child as if they were their own child. What work was taking place with care providers to ensure that they were picking up on risk?

Jean Imray explained that she would like to think that no LAC was placed anywhere where carers were not very aware of all risks. She was confident that this was the case and carers would be picking up on the signs of risks. Children in care were amongst the most vulnerable and there were children in care in Rotherham due to CSE.

Councillor Beaumont referred to the school roll-out and asked whether parents should be engaged with? Councillor Beaumont outlined an information and education event that had been put on for parents in Maltby to get information. No parents attended this event.

Jean agreed that this was disappointing as it sounded like a perfect opportunity to engage. Work was needed to identify why no-one came and how the approach could be adapted better for next time. Schools normally wrote home to parents who could opt to not engage, or letters were not always delivered by children. There was not a one size fits all answer. Other ideas could include stands at sports days; Services needed to go to where groups of parents congregated. Parents needed to be absolutely involved in awareness raising and information sharing.

Jo Abbott explained that the Rotherham Lifestyle Survey had shown that 60% of children said they were taught about CSE in schools. All secondary schools covered issues relating to CSE. A theatre company was working in Rotherham by providing workshops and sessions addressing CSE through drama and discussion.

Jean explained that, often, children and young people did not realise they were being exploited. A lot was happening right across the community to raise awareness of CSE and of what a good, normal healthy relationship looked like.

Councillor Ahmed referred to the saying that it takes a community to raise a child and School was instrumental in this because it played such a major part in a child's life. Were there primary or secondary schools that were being particularly proactive in identifying and completing early assessments for CSE? Does the Local Authority have the resources in terms of CSE staff?

Jean Imray explained that the caseloads in the CSE Teams were very low to allow for intensive development of relationships compared to other children and young people social work teams. With the efforts that were being put in, the Services really reaped the rewards. Workers were spending hours with the young people involved and at risk of CSE, sometimes visiting them 3-6 times a week according to their needs.

The Local Authority's Early Help Offer was developing and making progress but was not where it was needed to be. Tier Two services should engage those on the periphery of CSE and schools were making referrals. Intelligence was being received and starting to create fuller

pictures, including children missing from home and children missing from education data. There was no resistance from schools in terms of their attendance at strategy meetings. Some schools had more activity due to where they were based. Jean was confident that progress was being made and that things were going in the right direction.

Councillor Pitchley referred to theatre groups working in schools and was aware that they had worked with Year Six pupils in her own area. Feedback had been very positive. Year Eight was quite late to be starting with awareness raising. She had heard positive responses from Year Six children that had taken part.

Councillor Beaumont stated that children were in school for 38 weeks a year / 6 hours a day. The major influences were outside of the school. A previous education psychologist pilot in the East Dene area worked with Year Five pupils and their parents. The group had been selected as potentially being at risk. The learning was good but it was only a small pilot.

Jean agreed that funding and resources were crucial and there were lots of pilots out there. However, the work needed to be year in year out to tackle and defeat CSE. Investment in prevention would be far smaller than the costs of addressing CSE and prosecuting offenders.

#### **Definitions of child Sexual Exploitation: -**

Councillor Rose was aware that the definition was the shared national definition and quoted by Louise Casey. However, survivors were vulnerable way beyond age of 18, often due to special educational needs.

Jean agreed that the national guidance only covered those under the age of 18 but it was true and sad that vulnerable adults were also targeted. Furthermore, vulnerable children often became vulnerable adults.

#### **Our Commitment: -**

Councillor Pitchley asked whether partner agencies were committed. What impact had the very recent HMIC and CQC reports had?

Jean felt that as they had only been released yesterday it was hard to say yet. There had been rapid progress to now. Inspections were always backward looking and the fieldwork that these inspection reports had been based on were not current. It was possible to evidence progress since June, 2015.

Councillor Pitchley asked about the public impact the negative inspection reports were having? The public needed evidence before they could begin to believe that services were decent.

Jean stated that this could come through the completion of the actions identified in the delivery plan and when young people and survivors said that they were happy and that they were supported and their issues were being resolved. Victims and survivors had reported that historically they were fending for themselves. Jean was taking encouragement from the progress that was being made and hoped that the negative publicity from the inspections based on old fieldwork would not disrupt the recent progress that continued to be made.

Councillor Pitchley commended the style of the report; it was accessible and easy to read and should reassure the public. The content was very clear and she thanked the authors for this.

Councillor Hoddinott commented as highlighted in the Casey and Jay Reports that the assurances had been given in the past to Councillors that services and agencies were working well together; following the publication of the critical CQC and HMIC reports, how could Councillors have confidence that partnership working was effective.

Councillor Hoddinott asked how honest and challenging conversations took place between agencies within the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board on issues like performance, capacity and capability?

Jean confirmed that this would happen, but specific instances related to individuals would only be addressed by and within the individual agency. There had been lots of challenging conversations taking place between agencies relating to CSE issues and they would continue to be addressed as they arose. Although meetings could be uncomfortable all agencies were committed to ending with a resolution. The current risk assessment tool was one example of robust multi-agency discussion and, eventual, resolution.

Councillor Pitchley referred to the protocol whereby pharmacists could provide emergency contraception to young people if they made a referral to the Integrated Youth Support Service. A child or young person had to agree to work with the Service. What could be done to make the protocol more robust?

Jo Abbott agreed to discuss this issue outside of the meeting as it did not directly come under the remit of this strategy document. There were different pathways for different ages. Where a child was definitely under-age, pharmacists would make an appropriate referral.

Councillor Ahmed referred to the assessment tools that professionals such as GPs used following reports of self-harming, for example. Was this happening? Universal services were key partners in the work to tackle CSE.

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser and Member Development, asked that this question be made when the operational plans were considered at a future meeting.

**The Rotherham CSE Profile: -**

Councillor Beaumont referred to section 3.6.4 stating that teenage conceptions were at an all-time low. However, she was aware of local spikes and wondered whether this was due to the loss of Early Help facilities lost over two-years ago.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether there would be a current CSE profile that identified hotspots available for the September meeting.

Jean explained that a scorecard was currently being developed and would be available in September. This would enable tracking as the months went on.

Councillor M. Vines asked about the extent of the issues within eastern European communities. Cultural traditions were different and marriages could take place at the age of 14.

Jean Imray explained that as soon as a child entered the UK they became subject to the full application of UK laws. The UK law would not recognise the marriage and Services would become involved where necessary.

**Objectives and key action: -**

Councillor Pitchley asked about how the available help was being raised with victims and survivors.

Jean explained that this document had been to victims and survivors group/s which was one of the reasons why it was circulated late. Currently raising awareness was restricted because there were not sufficient resources to meet needs. The Local Authority was being proactive about creating a commissioning programme with the voice of victims at its heart. It would ensure there was synergy and avoid duplication. Jean explained about the Barnardo's Outreach Hub. Currently there were more support services in place for adults than for children. The Women's Refuge Service was providing services for adults and children affected. The Women's Counselling Service and Rape Crisis was providing support for victims of rape. The Local Authority did not think that there was enough of the correct provision to form a menu of services.

Councillor Pitchley about a timeframe for the setting up of the resources needed?

Jo Abbott referred to the 'Spot the Signs' posters available to raise public awareness. Partner websites existed with useful links to resources. The commissioning needs assessment would influence which services were commissioned.

Councillor Rose knew learning disabled and physically disabled survivors who felt they had fallen through the cracks and were not getting any services.

Jean Imray: - "I won't dispute that". There is currently a national shortage of provision. Linda Harper would be looking at commissioning services for where there were gaps in provision.

Councillor Hoddinott wanted to see victims and survivors at the heart of services and asked whether the mechanisms were in place to get the funding to support this?

Jean spoke about the commissioning strategy which included working with charities and bid writing.

Jo Abbott referred to user forums and the use of victim data to create contracts.

Councillor Hamilton asked about the views of survivors on this report?

Jean confirmed that victims' opinions had been incorporated and changes made in response to their comments. The Service did have to filter these and explained to the individuals involved any reasons why their comments had not been taken on board.

**Governance: -**

Councillor Pitchley referred to the diagram of the people involved in this document and work. So many meetings were taking place to facilitate it: - "how do we prevent this from being a talking shop?"

Jean agreed that the document illustrates how much activity there was. A lot of the same people were on the same groups. Operational grounds represented the command structure largely led by the police. Support to victims was being provided on a weekly, if not daily, basis. The key people were attending.

Councillor Pitchley had counted 14 branches. How often did the meetings happen? Whilst professionals were at a meeting they were not getting work done on the front line. Where and when were the actions happening?

Jean explained that it document represented just one element of the children's social care agenda. The Service would ensure that the meetings and forums were productive and a good use of time. The



current management team and Commissioners were mindful that meetings had to be productive.

Councillor Hoddinott could not find any mention of the Improving Lives Select Commission. "Where is our role in scrutinising and ensuring that important things are being implemented?"

Jean: - "It is crucial that there is robust scrutiny of everything we do towards safeguarding; the more the better." The role of the Improving Lives Select Commission in asking questions was a useful one. "I go away and find out the answer." The Improving Lives Select Commission should continue to ask what was happening and continue to be demanding and robust.

**Conclusion: -**

Councillor Hamilton asked where the Services' pressure points were?

Jean felt that it was in the nature of not knowing what each next week held. Operations took place regularly and brought intense activity for social workers and partner agencies. This could happen again and again and was the nature of any work at the sharp end. The Council had been fantastic in making resources available to ensure work was high quality.

Councillor Hamilton asked which area had seen the most progress?

Jean said that it was the areas below the surface. Rotherham had had a whole other layer of things happening, including the loss of senior staff and the Jay Report and research for the Casey Report in the period August to November, 2014. Since January, 2015, onwards an awful lot of work on setting the foundations right to create a solid base had been happening upon which to build sustained improvement.

Councillor Hamilton thanked Jean and Jo for their attendance and contribution to the discussion and answering the range of questions made.

Caroline Webb, listed the next steps for the Improving Lives Select Commission: -

- To receive and consider the Delivery Plan when it was finalised;
- To consider the 'hot spot' information when it was finalised;
- To consider and contribute to the discussion around the needs assessment and commissioning strategy;
- That the omission of the Improving Lives Select Commission in the governance arrangements of the report considered at this meeting be corrected;
- Further strands that members of the Improving Lives Select Commission wanted to consider at an early meeting were awareness raising in primary schools, support for vulnerable adults

and the transition between Children and Adults' Services between the ages of 18-25.

Resolved: - (1) That the strategy document 'Child Sexual Exploitation – The Way Forward for Rotherham 2015/2018' be received and its content be noted.

(2) That future meetings of the Improving Lives Select Commission continue to monitor the issues reported including the documents due to be published in the coming months.

**13. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -**

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 9th September, 2015, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**1st July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Cutts, Gosling, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, Rosling, C. Vines, Wallis, Whelbourn and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Smith and Wyatt.

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

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

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

**3. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) Pre-Meeting Briefings for the Select Commissions

It was agreed that this Select Commission shall have briefings immediately prior to each scheduled meeting, enabling Members to prepare questions for each agenda item.

(2) Select Commissions' Task and Finish Groups

The Select Commission agreed to the inclusion of Councillor Cowles in some of the Commission's Task and Finish Groups, especially the ones to be established in respect of the Cleaner, Greener agenda.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 25TH FEBRUARY, 2015**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 25th February, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 49(2)(c), of the previous meeting, it was noted that a report about the Council's response to the severe Winter weather conditions during late December 2014 and early January 2015 will be submitted to the Commissioners and to Elected Members during September, 2015.

**5. THE CLEANER - GREENER AGENDA**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Director of Streetpride, outlining details of a range of issues which will have an impact on the 'Cleaner, Greener' agenda. It was noted that this agenda is

a priority subject area for the Improving Places Select Commission, as identified by the Government-appointed Commissioners to this Council. The specific issues identified within the report were:-

- Waste Management (including household waste recycling centres and 'bring' sites; waste collection; recycling rates);
- Leisure and Community Services (including grounds maintenance; street cleansing; fly-tipping and enforcement);
- Network Management (parking services, especially parking in and around the Rotherham town centre);
- Rotherham town centre (the impact of the night-time economy).

Members discussed the following salient matters:-

: waste collection including charging arrangements for elements of the service being considered as part of the 2015/16 budget process;

: waste collection arrangements must be by way of separate collection, where separate collection is Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable – this is known as the TEEP assessment (per the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and in subsequent years);

: collection of recycled material (eg: clothing; shoes) by charitable organisations and whether such organisations should be charged a fee for the siting of their collection bins;

: grass cutting, including green open spaces in Council-owned housing areas (eg: sheltered bungalow schemes) funded from the Housing Revenue Account; positive comments received about the use of wild flowers in some highway verges and central refuges; the practice of cutting only sections of highway verge, adjacent to the carriageway, rather than the whole verge;

: the increasing incidence of fly-tipping, both in the Rotherham Borough area and nationwide; enforcement practices, including the use of (covert) closed circuit television systems and recording; possible devolution of enforcement powers either to Parish and Town Councils or to community and voluntary groups;

: a question about the possible use of private sector contractors of fly-tipping enforcement duties; the 'zero-tolerance' approach of some private contractors (this matter will be discussed further by the Members' Task and Finish group);

: the clearance of weeds, which occurs twice per year and includes the grubbing-out of silt and detritus from the highway (in which the weeds grow);

: the Council does not accept vehicle tyres for disposal (such facilities are available from the private sector); vehicle tyres are classed as notifiable waste and should have consignment notes as evidence of their correct disposal (with an auditable trail; it was noted that this matter is enforced by the Environment Agency rather than local authorities;

: street cleansing and litter enforcement in areas which already have closed circuit television systems (CCTV) in place (eg: Town Hall frontage, Moorgate Street); it was noted that the quality of CCTV recorded footage in these areas is not always good enough for enforcement purposes;

: the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council have proposed changes to the organisational structure which will include the management of the Council's enforcement arrangements;

: the 'responsible retailer' scheme, encouraging the clearing up of litter from outside retail premises (eg: the Tidy Britain Group campaign and the 'tidy business' and 'tidy school' awards schemes).

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

(2) That the Improving Places Select Commission shall establish the following Task and Finish Groups, comprising the Councillors and co-opted members listed below, in order to undertake appropriate scrutiny of this Council's Service delivery in respect of Cleaner, Greener agenda:-

(a) Waste Management (Councillor Godfrey (Chair) with Councillors Reeder, Wallis and Wyatt and co-opted member Mr. P. Cahill);

(b) Leisure and Community Services (Councillor Atkin (Chair) with Councillors Buckley, Cutts, Jepson, Smith, C. Vines and Whysall and co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker – with Councillor Cowles also co-opted);

(c) Network Management, which shall include issues relating to the Rotherham town centre (Councillor Rosling (Chair), with Councillors McNeely, Pickering and Whelbourn and co-opted member Mr. B. Walker).

(3) That, with regard to the establishment of the Task and Finish Groups listed at (2) above, Councillors and co-opted members are invited to inform the Scrutiny Officer of their preference of Groups (one or more preferences are permitted).

**6. GROUND MAINTENANCE AND STREET CLEANSING SERVICES - SCRUTINY REVIEW - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 32 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 15th October, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Director of Streetpride, concerning progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services. A copy of the updated action plan was included with the submitted report.

Members were informed that, since the last update report, there have been two significant actions which have helped to improve the quality of service provision. The Grounds Maintenance Service received two years' funding (2014/15 and 2015/16) from Housing Services (Housing Revenue Account) to enable additional works to be undertaken on older people's complexes. This factor has led to a significant increase in the number of positive comments from residents and a reduced number of complaints and/or requests for service (eg: reduced by 65% in the period to May 2015). Discussions continue in respect of the continuation of this funding. Also, the Street Cleansing Service received an increase of £200,000 to its revenue budget for 2015/16. That Service is in the process of recruiting additional staff, vehicles and equipment and the associated additional work (weed killing, litter picking and litter bin emptying) will commence as soon as those resources are in place. Both services will continue to review operations in order to identify improvements and efficiencies and to contribute to the forthcoming savings targets which are necessary to enable the Council to operate within its budget during the next three years.

The Select Commission's discussion highlighted the following issues:-

: ensuring that the recommendations of the previous scrutiny review of grounds maintenance are being correctly implemented (eg: grass cutting in areas where highway safety is a significant concern);

: possible disposal/sale by the Council of certain open spaces which are considered to be of limited amenity value; Members requested details of such sites;

: recruitment of specific personnel to the Street Cleansing Service; funding for weed killing;

: the enforcement of vehicle parking on highway verges, a matter which is the responsibility of the South Yorkshire Police; it was noted that enforcement action usually occurs whenever there is a significant obstruction of the highway; the Council does not have statutory powers to prohibit parking on verges throughout the whole of the Rotherham Borough area.

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

(2) That the progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services, as now reported, be noted.

## **7. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY SCRUTINY REVIEW - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 60 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 23rd April, 2014 and Minute No. 46 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 17th October, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Housing Options Manager, concerning progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy. A copy of the updated action plan was included with the submitted report.

Members noted that the recommendations of the scrutiny review have been incorporated within the Council's Homelessness Strategy. It was agreed that the Improving Places Select Commission should have the opportunity to comment upon the updated Homelessness Strategy and associated action plan prior to its eventual approval by the Government-appointed Commissioners and the Council.

Resolved:- That the report be received and the progress being made with the actions arising from the recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy be noted.

## **8. SUPPORTING THE LOCAL ECONOMY - SCRUTINY REVIEW - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 23 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 16th September, 2014 and Minute No. 34 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 19th September, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Economic Development Manager, concerning progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of Support for the Local Economy. A copy of the updated action plan was included with the submitted report.

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

: the Economic Growth Plan and the Local Plan will both be reported to the Council meeting scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 16h September, 2015;

: the possible establishment of Task and Finish groups to consider the details of the delivery of the interventions and priorities from the Economic Growth Plan;

: acknowledgement that the Rotherham Borough area has been very successful at accessing money through the Regional Growth Fund;

: review recommendation 2, targets and outcomes for the Economic Growth Plan – ensuring that local people are accessing employment and training (Members requested statistical details of access to apprenticeships);

: review recommendation 8 (maximising access to the Regional Growth Fund) – the need also to access funding from European sources (in the context of more recent changes to the EU funding programme);

: effectiveness of the Growth Hub (eg: the case involving the local KP Nuts factory);

: the role and effectiveness of the Rotherham Investment and Development Office (RiDO);

: review recommendation 9 – the proposed establishment of a multi-disciplinary task force in order to generate investment and economic growth in the Rotherham Borough area;

: review recommendation 11 – the Council's capital investment strategy is currently in the process of development;

: Growth Plan – the desirability of business education being part of the curriculum for both primary and secondary schools;

: the Education and Skills agenda of the Growth Plan (eg: the specific regional role of the Leader of the Council) and continuing discussions about the possible development of a Higher Education campus in Rotherham; Members noted the availability of appropriate buildings within the Dearne and Manvers area;

: the need for continuing scrutiny of this Council's involvement in the Sheffield City Region.

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

(2) That the progress made to date and proposed for the forthcoming year, in respect of the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of Support for the Local Economy, as now reported, be noted.

## **9. REPRESENTATION ON PANELS, SUB-GROUPS ETC 2015 - 2016**

Resolved:- That the following appointments of representatives from the Improving Places Select Commission to the groups and outside bodies listed below, be approved for the 2015/2016 Municipal Year:-



Health, Welfare and Safety Panel - Councillor McNeely (substitute Councillor Buckley);

Rotherham Local Plan Members' Steering Group - Councillor Beck (substitute Councillor Whelbourn);

Environmental Protection (Yorkshire and Humberside Division) – Councillors Atkin, Beck and Wallis;

RUSH House Management Committee - Councillor McNeely.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**26th June, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Cowles, Hamilton, Hughes, Mallinder, Sansome, J. Turner and Whelbourn.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pitchley.

**12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

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

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

**14. FUEL POVERTY SCRUTINY REVIEW - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 103 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 21st February, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by Catherine Homer (Public Health Specialist) and Paul Benson (Private Sector Housing Officer), containing a detailed update of activity contributing to the reduction in fuel poverty across the Borough, in response to the Scrutiny Review of fuel poverty which had taken place during 2012.

The report described the progress being made to reduce fuel poverty, with work completed or underway on the majority of the Scrutiny Review's recommendations. The progress had resulted in levels of fuel poverty in the Rotherham Borough falling. The most up-to-date figures from 2013 for 'low income high cost' measures of fuel poverty indicated that 9% of the population lived in fuel poverty, compared to 10.1% in 2011. This figure was less than the national average of 10.4%. Furthermore, the energy use in domestic households in Rotherham had seen a 9% reduction compared to the previous year. Area-based energy efficiency schemes and improvements to the Council housing stock had been significant contributors to this reduction.

The report stated that, in his post-election spending announcement, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had signified that the Green Deal policy funding would be significantly reduced or removed completely. This action would have a major impact on the offer to improve energy efficiency of properties in Rotherham. Therefore, it would be increasingly challenging to secure external grant funding. The Government had stated in the Energy Bill (2015) that it would ensure that there would be affordable and reliable energy for businesses and families. However, it was not known at present whether assistance and support would be available to ensure that this objective was met.

Members discussion of this item highlighted the following salient issues:-

: levels of excess Winter deaths (ie: mortality rates, especially of elderly persons) in the Rotherham Borough area were reducing (calculated using the additional deaths in the period December to March, compared to the previous and subsequent quarters); better heating schemes/systems in some households may have resulted in this improvement;

: the need for consistent measurement of the low income and high cost definition of fuel poverty;

: the Government's Green Deal – the previous coalition Government's energy policy (loans for equipment and systems which would result in energy efficiency improvements to residential properties); some 2,000 assessments had been undertaken in the Rotherham Borough area, although only sixteen households had ultimately taken a financial loan under this policy;

: National Energy Action and the Department of Energy and the Climate Change funding regimes - grant applications had to be made;

: examples of loft and cavity wall insulation being undertaken to residential properties, including the Council's own housing stock;

: Public Health grant for capital works to support the most vulnerable private sector householders 2015/2016;

: the effect on fuel bills was discussed (eg: financial savings at the Fitzwilliam estate, Swinton - a specific response was to be provided for Ward Councillors);

: the relatively low take-up of the Green Deal, in part because of the risk to householders of having to pay for home assessment themselves which had been off-putting

: the discussion of changes to Central Government's energy policies and further changes to be announced imminently by the Government (Energy Bill 2015);

: Local Energy Policies which may be developed by local authorities within the Sheffield City Region;

: the overall effectiveness of the response to the recommendations of the Fuel Poverty Scrutiny Review;

: further information required about the impact of fuel poverty on troubled families and child poverty (eg: use of pre-paid (coin) electricity and gas meters which may result in disproportionately expensive fuel costs (eg: higher standard rate tariffs being more expensive than fixed-term arrangements available via the Internet); the impact of the Government's

Welfare Reforms on fuel poverty; Members requested further information of the number of households which still used coin meters for fuel/utility payments; it was noted that low income families and elderly people may sometimes prefer the use of pre-payments as part of household budget management; the difficulty of obtaining such information in respect of individual households was acknowledged;

: the impact of arrears on payments for fuel costs and the use of front-loaded payments; Members requested additional information about this issue;

: engagement of the Authority's Housing Service and Housing maintenance contractors with the fuel poverty issue;

: reports which were submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board, for example, on training issues for relevant Authority staff and for the Council's partner organisations;

: assistance to households in the private rented sector, with advice given to private sector landlords, in order to improve the energy efficiency of those households (eg: Little London estate at Maltby);

: the Council's Selective Licensing Scheme would target the less-efficient F and G rated properties, so that improvements may be made to their energy-efficiency prior to any future lettings (subject to legislation being introduced by the Government during 2018);

: discussion of the means of ensuring that households, especially those in the private rented sector and those which required energy efficiency improvements, are able to take advantage of schemes which would help in reducing and minimising fuel costs;

: scheme for the fitting of solar PV panels – after a previous investigation, the costs of the proposed scheme were shown to be prohibitive; however, further investigations to consider possible suitable schemes were continuing, both for domestic properties and for business/commercial premises.

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

(2) That the progress being made against the eleven recommendations identified in the report of the Scrutiny Review of Fuel Poverty and the resources being deployed to tackle fuel poverty in Rotherham, as described in the report now submitted, be noted.

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes that there were to be changes to the National energy agenda which would influence the type and level of work conducted locally.

(4) That the reporting of appropriate issues regularly to meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board, as described in recommendations 9 and 10 of the Fuel Poverty scrutiny review, shall continue.

(5) That a further progress report about the Fuel Poverty Scrutiny Review be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, during October 2015, such report to include information about (i) the Government's Welfare Reforms and the impact upon Child Poverty and the Troubled Families Initiative; and (ii) the arrears of fuel/utilities bills and the rate of increase of such arrears over a relatively short period of time.

(6) That Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be provided with further information about:-

(i) financial savings on fuel bills at the Fitzwilliam estate, Swinton;

(ii) the response from the energy companies and regulatory bodies about the effectiveness of marketing of the new eco-scheme;

(iii) statistical data on the use of pre-paid (coin) meters for gas and electricity payments in households in the Rotherham Borough area.

## **15. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2014/2015**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager concerning the Scrutiny Annual Report for the 2014/2015 Municipal Year. Accordingly, Members considered the contents of the final draft of the Annual Report 2014/15, prior to its submission to the Council meeting on 8th July 2015.

The document included details spanning three Municipal Years: the outcomes and progress of scrutiny during 2013/14, as well as the subject year of the Annual Report, ie: 2014/15. Details of the scrutiny work programme for 2015/2016 were also included in the Annual Report.

Members suggested a number of contextual alterations to the Annual Report.

Members thanked the scrutiny officers for the preparation and quality of this document.

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

(2) That the Scrutiny Annual Report for the 2014/2015 Municipal Year, as now amended, be approved insofar as this Management Board is concerned and forwarded to the Council meeting for further consideration.

(3) That it be noted that the Select Commission membership details for 2015/16 may be subject to change after the Council meeting on 8th July 2015 and any changes would be reflected in the final published version of the Annual Report.

**16. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES**

There were no issues to report.

**17. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES**

An update about the Rotherham Youth Cabinet would be reported to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

**18. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 29TH MAY 2015**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 29th May, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**19. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Improving Lives Select Commission:-**

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

: Child Sexual Exploitation – establishment of the Assertive Outreach Hub (to be managed by the Barnardo's organisation) and also the Multi-Agency Risk Panel;

: Delivery Plan for the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy.

**Improving Places Select Commission:-**

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

: the Panel's priority of assessing the impact of the Cleaner, Greener agenda (waste management, waste collection, recycling rates); leisure and community services (grounds maintenance, street cleansing, fly-tipping enforcement); parking services and Rotherham town centre's night-time economy; use of task and finish groups to consider the detail of these matters;

: update reports on the response to scrutiny reviews review updates (grounds maintenance and street cleansing; homelessness strategy; supporting the local economy).

**Health Select Commission:-**

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

- : Primary Care update (Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group);
- : Overview of Adult Social Care Services;
- : Continuing Health Care scrutiny review – update;
- : use of task and finish groups for specific scrutiny review work.

The Chair thanked all Members involved for their contributions to the various scrutiny reviews.

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-**

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

Training for Councillors on the scrutiny process (a year-long programme)

Scrutiny of policy will feature in the forthcoming year.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**24th July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Hamilton, Hughes, Pitchley, Sansome and J. Turner.

In attendance : Mrs. D. Thomas (Centre for Public Scrutiny).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cowles, Mallinder, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

**20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

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

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

**22. REVISIONS TO THE HOUSING ALLOCATION AND DIRECT HOME POLICY**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Housing Options Manager, concerning the Council's Housing Allocation Policy, which had been approved at the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18th December, 2013 (Minute No. C146 refers) and launched on 29th October, 2014.

The report stated that:-

(i) the Housing Allocation Policy had been revised and updated to take into account the size of the housing register, pressures on the service and the fact that the Council could use the opportunities in the Localism Act 2011 to help local people in housing need;

(ii) six months since the implementation of the Policy, its progress is being reviewed and further amendments to the Policy are being considered;

(iii) a revised Direct Home Policy is being proposed to allocate low demand housing and a revised Transfer Policy is to be introduced, to include both Rotherham Council and Rotherham Housing Association tenants.

The report referred to the revision of the Direct Home Policy, in order to make the Policy more flexible and allow people who are interested to qualify for low demand properties, but still retain some strict eligibility criteria such as no rent arrears or debts and requiring applicants to have a local connection and no history of anti-social behaviour. The "Direct Homes" Policy is to be retitled "Available Now" in which properties will be advertised daily, on a first come first served basis.



Members noted that, during March 2015, the (then) coalition Government had announced the introduction of a “Right to Move” Regulation to ensure local connection requirements do not prevent social tenants from moving into an area to take up work or apprenticeship opportunities or to avoid hardship. The new Regulation came into force on 20th April 2015. The Regulation also state that existing tenants who need to move for work within the local authority area are given priority in the Housing Allocation Scheme and there is an expectation that local authorities set aside a minimum of 1% of lettings for cross-local authority boundary moves for work related reasons and where failure to move area would cause hardship.

Details of the proposals were included within the submitted report.

Members raised the following matters during discussion:-

- as at 1st June 2015, there are 5,333 persons listed on Housing register; (the bandings of the register were listed in the submitted report);
- the priority given to people who are leaving the care of the local authority;
- the ‘right to refuse’ tenancies for people who are unlikely to be able to afford the rent; (although ‘spare room subsidy’ allowances are available in cases of women pregnant with their first child); expectant mothers are supported in applying for appropriate tenancies in the months of the final stages of pregnancy; Members suggested that this period should be extended to eight weeks (refer to resolution (4) below);
- a benchmarking exercise, detailed within the appendix to the submitted report, referred to other local authorities having more flexible policies for their low demand housing and all operate on a “first come first served” basis;
- the inclusion of Council Tax arrears in the debt section of the Housing Allocation Policy; some Members expressed concern about this proposal and officers explained the Council’s approach to corporate debt management (refer to resolution (3) below);
- the Council’s Rent Collection and Arrears Recovery Policy had been considered by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 5th November, 2014 (Minute No. 88 refers);
- use of the Direct Home Policy to allocate low demand properties;

- increasing use of direct debit arrangements for the payment of rent; (50% of the Council's current housing tenants receive full Housing Benefit); the impact of the Universal Credit benefits being introduced by Central Government; the methods used by the Council to collect rent arrears; pilot schemes undertaken by other local authorities (eg: Wakefield MDC);
- the Council's debt enforcement work has been strengthened and evictions from housing tenancies have increased significantly; Members considered that exceptional cases ought to be treated sympathetically.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes that, at her meeting on 6th August 2015, Commissioner Manzie will be recommended to approve:-

(a) the revisions to the Housing Allocation Policy, as detailed in section 7.5 of the submitted report;

(b) the revisions to the Housing Allocation Policy to ensure compliance with the new (Qualifying criteria for Right to Move) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/967), as detailed in section 7.5.14 of the submitted report;

(c) the revisions to the Direct Home Policy to allocate properties that are low demand, as detailed in section 7.7 of the submitted report; and

(d) the revisions to the Transfer Policy to include Rotherham Housing Association tenants with no tenancy breaches in the last two years (currently only includes Rotherham Council tenants), as detailed in section 7.8 of the submitted report.

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board recommends to Commissioner Manzie that the following proposal (as detailed at Sections 7.5.8 and 7.5.9 of the submitted report) shall not be included in the revised Housing Allocation Policy:-

“Include Council Tax arrears in the Allocation Policy Debt Section and tenancy related debt for previous tenancies held in the last two years located outside Rotherham”.

(4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board recommends to Commissioner Manzie that the following proposal (as detailed at Section 7.5.5 of the submitted report and with this Board's suggested amendment) shall be included in the revised Housing Allocation Policy:-

“Pregnant applicants who are claiming benefits or on low incomes, who cannot afford the shortfall with spare room subsidy, shall receive a rent allowance for one bedroom which will be paid for up to 8 weeks (instead of 4 weeks), to assist with their circumstances”.

(5) That a report about the progress of the implementation of the Housing Allocation Policy shall be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board during the early months of 2016.

**23. DEVELOPING A MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2016/17 TO 2018/19**

The Interim Strategic Director of Corporate Services and Finance gave a presentation about the development of the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2018/19.

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

- recent budget announcements by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; some of the financial risks for which Central Government was previously responsible are being transferred to local authorities;
- regional government and fiscal devolution (eg: Cornwall, City of Manchester);
- the impact of welfare benefit reform;
- significant funding reductions for local authorities during the past four years;
- increasing demands upon specific local authority services (eg: children’s social care and also care for elderly and vulnerable people);
- the review of the Council’s capital strategy and the revenue budget implications of the strategy;
- the Council’s good performance in having only low amounts of debts written-off;
- impact of the use of balances and reserves;
- summary of the financial challenges facing the Council (eg: Children’s Services);

- employee costs, including pay award inflation, the ‘living wage’ payments and the triennial pensions valuation; the likelihood of reducing employee numbers overall in future years; Members noted that employee costs comprise a significant proportion of any local authority’s annual revenue spending;
- contract inflation (eg: Adult Social Services residential and domiciliary care; placement of children in care of the local authority, some of which are ‘out-of-authority placements’);
- funding available to support the Council’s budget (eg: setting the level of Council Tax annually; New Homes Bonus (review pending); Revenue Support Grant; Business Rates and the top-up levy);
- key risks – appeals by businesses against the rateable values set for the properties which they own (eg: recent revaluation of the rateable values of GP doctors’ surgeries); the impact of the Tata Steel redundancies from the Company’s premises at Parkgate/Thrybergh;
- Central Government proposals for reductions in the funding available for Public Health;
- other financial risks (eg: Better Care Fund; Sheffield City Region; pensions auto-enrolment);
- the proposed approach (and timetable) to developing a Medium Term Financial Strategy;
- overview of the strategic budget planning process;
- reviews of all Council services and major project reviews (eg: property/asset rationalisation); ensuring that all of the Council’s services make appropriate levels of savings; the requirement to set a balanced budget for the Council;
- savings targets for services not included as a major project);
- savings in management costs;
- service growth and investments;
- involvement of scrutiny in the budget setting process and the development of the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy;
- the Advanced Manufacturing Park and Enterprise Zones (noting that this Council does not benefit directly from any growth in business rates from these areas);

- Council Tax collection fund; the costs of debt collection;
- Universal Credits (to be introduced in the Borough area is not yet known, although the expected impact upon the Rotherham Borough is not yet known);
- the Council historically has a good performance in terms of the collection of business rates;
- the financial impact of the Sheffield City Region Growth Plan.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the presentation be noted.

(2) That the progress with the development of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2018/19 shall continue to be a regular agenda item for each meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

#### **24. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES**

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported on issues concerning the continuing review of the Area Assembly structure, which features at Section 22 of the Council's Improvement Plan prepared by the Government-appointed Commissioners.

The Area Assembly Chairs have expressed a preference to prioritise localised working with communities. The role of Elected Members and of officer support for Area Assemblies is being reviewed.

The review of Area Assemblies is scheduled to be completed by December 2015. Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board emphasised the need for the review to be completed in accordance with the proposed timescale.

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

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

Members noted that the Youth Cabinet is currently making good progress with the consideration of matters relating to: (i) affordable transport for young people; and (ii) mental health and self-harm.

#### **26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH JUNE, 2015**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 26th June, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 14 (Fuel Poverty Scrutiny Review – Update), the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be provided with information about the impact of the forthcoming termination of the Government's Green Deal.

## 27. WORK IN PROGRESS

### **Improving Lives Select Commission:-**

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

- Child Sexual Exploitation – the delivery plan and way forward continues to be afforded close consideration.

### **Improving Places Select Commission:-**

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

- progress of the scrutiny review of the Homelessness Strategy;
- progress of the scrutiny review of Supporting the Local Economy;
- priority consideration of the Cleaner Greener agenda and the establishment of the three task and finish groups (there will be support provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny).

### **Health Select Commission:-**

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

- progress of the scrutiny review of Hospital Discharges;
- Adult Social Care commissioning and operation of the Better Care Fund;
- consideration of matters concerning the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and RDaSH;
- meeting scheduled with the Council's newly-appointed Director of Public Health.

### **Audit Committee**

The Vice-Chair reported on the recent activities concerning the Audit Committee:-

- a productive meeting had been held with representatives of the Council's external auditor, the KPMG Company;
- various issues arising from the Committee's recent meeting are to be raised with Commissioner Sir Derek Myers.

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-**

The Chair reported on the recent activities concerning the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

- the Chair had attended a regional scrutiny meeting about the structure and staffing of the Sheffield City Region.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
2nd June, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Cutts, Ellis, Middleton, C. Vines and M. Vines.

**LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS - ORGANISATIONAL REVIEW.**

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, and Commissioner Manzie, Managing Director, welcomed Members to the seminar.

Commissioner Manzie gave a presentation on the following areas: -

- Organisational review objectives;
- Key recruitment – cost neutral parts and some at an additional cost;
- Assistant Directors;
- Service reviews;
- The Senior Management Structure in 2014 was considered. This was compared to the management structure from February 2015 onwards and the proposed 2016/2017 senior management structure, including Council functions.

The presentation concluded by considering the implementation of the proposed changes: -

- Job descriptions and person specifications were being worked on;
- The order of recruitment was to be decided but there were clear priority posts emerging;
- Recruitment/interview panels would include both Elected Members and Commissioners;
- Certain in-house changes would also take place, including functions relating to equalities, voluntary sector liaison and performance.

Questions and discussion followed the presentation and the following areas were covered: -

Councillor C. Vines referred to the layers of assistants. The structure appeared top-heavy.

Commissioner Manzie 2/3 additional posts had been created but would lead to other management posts being removed. Some Directorates currently had a fragmented structure and this aimed to bring them together.

Councillor C. Vines asked what was happening in the lower management layers?



Commissioner Manzie described the work that was continuing with managers and communications with them on a regular basis.

Councillor C. Vines stated that these were the people that our customers saw. The electorate did not understand the top tier; three tiers down was when it started impacting on them.

Councillor Ellis asked why the Director of Public Health did not have any team on the slide presented. This risked them being thought of as 'health' and not as part of the Council. Would it be better to start with the Chief Executive who would then build their own team? Regular restructures were not beneficial and the new CX may want to change this structure. How long would you expect this structure to be in place?

Commissioner Manzie – Secretary of State's decision to have a Commissioner Managing Director led Rotherham to lose a lot of Chief Officers over a short period. It was more urgent to get the improvements to services moving. We want to attract a decent field of CX applicants. Currently there was hardly anyone to work with in the centre of the Council/corporately. To wait for the CX to recruit their own team would set the improvements back by six-months at least.

The role of Public Health would be reviewed. They were interfacing well and quite close to the Council at the moment. The new Strategic Director wanted to be in with the Council.

Councillor Ellis asked about headhunting of staff driving up costs.

Commissioner Manzie felt that Rotherham's CX salary was reasonable and was just slightly above Doncaster. It was an adequate salary level and reflected the area of difficulty. Bidding wars happened for social work posts where there was a bidding market going on and a national shortage.

Councillor C. Middleton noted that the proposed structure referred to 2016/2017 – was this classed as the medium future? When would it be looked at again?

Commissioner Manzie described the new structure as conventional and a future CX would recognise it as a sound local government structure. Commissioner Manzie would advocate that staff needed a period of stability to embed. Spending cuts may lead to posts being cut – we would have to ask 'is it viable?'. Change happens. Elected members should be the check.

Councillor M. Vines asked about the costs of £219k and how it would be met.

**REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 02/06/15**

Commissioner Manzie explained that there had already been savings made from budget effectiveness, managerial effectiveness and performance. The cost should be seen as an investment for a sound structure.

Councillor C. Vines asked whether the Assistant CX could progress to be the CX on the departure of the Commissioners.

Commissioner Manzie felt that a corporate driver was needed in the very distinct post of CX. The Council would move as soon as possible on the recruitment.

Councillor Ellis asked about the leadership and management of the Human Resources Function.

Commissioner Manzie explained that the current HR function was not a bad function at the moment. However, the 62% completion of PDRs was concerning. A functioning corporate HR Service would modernise, raise awareness, check quality and work with Trades Unions.

Councillor Read thanked Commissioner Manzie for her presentation and informative contribution to the discussion.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
2nd June, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Astbury, Atkin, Beck, Buckley, Burton, The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Cowles, Currie, Gosling, Hoddinott, Hunter, Jepson, McNeely, Parker, Pitchley, Reeder, Reynolds, Roche, Sansome, Sims, John Turner, Whelbourn, Wyatt, Alam, Evans, Hughes, Elliot and Mallinder.

**LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS - ORGANISATIONAL REVIEW.**

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, and Commissioner Manzie, Managing Director, welcomed Members to the seminar.

Commissioner Manzie gave a presentation on the following areas: -

- Organisational review objectives;
- Key recruitment – cost neutral parts and some at an additional cost;
- Assistant Directors;
- Service reviews;
- The Senior Management Structure in 2014 was considered. This was compared to the management structure from February 2015 onwards and the proposed 2016/2017 senior management structure, including Council functions.

The presentation concluded by considering the implementation of the proposed changes: -

- Job descriptions and person specifications were being worked on;
- The order of recruitment was to be decided but there were clear priority posts emerging;
- Recruitment/interview panels would include both Elected Members and Commissioners;
- Certain in-house changes would also take place, including functions relating to equalities, voluntary sector liaison and performance.

Questions and discussion followed the presentation and the following areas were covered: -

Councillor Currie – How do we scrutinise this? I support Audit being brought into scrutiny. Performance and management - where does this fit in and ensure that nothing was missed by the 3 scrutiny Select Committees?

Councillor Wyatt – I welcome the Director of Public Health reporting to the CX. Where did adult safeguarding sit? Procurement at an Assistant Director level was important.

Councillor McNeely – Are the additional costs for each year or a single cost?

Answers: - Commissioner Manzie confirmed that the £218k was a one-off additional payment. It was proposed that the scrutiny function was brought into Democratic Services. Communication to Elected Members was important and would be improved. The new corporate performance framework would blend in CYPS and corporate functions.

Adult Safeguarding and Strategic Commissioning would need further thought as to its transition.

Procurement function, internal audit and IT worked well together as a joint team.

Councillor Read confirmed his support for Scrutiny as it was in everyone's interests to get things right and tight. There would be a need to sit down at some point and analyse whether it was being done well and had the correct resources.

Councillor Parker thought that there were more Assistant Director posts. Were managers being replaced with ADs?

Commissioner Manzie confirmed that there were additional AD posts within CYPS. Other posts had been backfilled and were not additional posts.

Councillor Beck hoped that in the centralising of services no service-specific links would be lost. It would be a mistake to subsume Licensing within Streetpride. The Directorate needed to have Licensing in the Director's title. It was up there with CSE as the Council's priority. City Region Collaborations – more information would be welcome.

Councillor Hughes felt there had been a dilution of support since the titular Democratic Services Manager left. Where did it the replaced role report to? Were the links to the Monitoring Officer strong enough?

Commissioner Manzie confirmed that the Democratic Services Manager would still work closely with Legal and CX. It was envisaged that the Assistant CX would be the right arm of the Elected Members. Both Legal and Democratic Services had an awful lot of work to do and priorities to meet.

Commissioner Manzie agreed that the AD title should include licensing/regulatory services. This was a very good idea and would be incorporated.

More work was anticipated on the Sheffield City Region.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 02/06/15

Councillor Hoddinott referred to the Voluntary Sector Liaison Manager and welcomed the role as she felt they had had a patchy service in the past. Community Services was really important to Elected Members. Some areas had worked in silos in the past. How was competition prevented?

Commissioner Manzie explained the role of the Strat Director for Community Wellbeing and Housing, including liaison with the Police. Housing was a huge issue that did not get a high enough profile. Adult Services – growing area and aging population – made this a high priority.

Councillor Burton asked how community safety sat with the SRP? Where did domestic abuse sit? A Scrutiny Review had cleared up a lot of issues and it was important to ensure that someone had a hold on this and other equalities issues.

Commissioner Manzie explained how she could not find any reference to equalities on the structure chart and how odd this was. The result was there was no corporate equalities function – this is unacceptable in a Council for Equality Impact Assessments, Policy, the way in which services were delivered. The AD for Community Safety would support the SRP. Domestic Abuse would come up in a number of places but have one Co-ordinator.

Councillor Cowles asked about recruitment. Would vacancies be advertised externally? Were there any internal candidates? Had there been any succession planning or mentoring? Will we do this?

Commissioner Manzie confirmed advertising would be external but this did not preclude any internal applicants from applying. There would be further work on a mentoring programme.

Councillor Reynolds stated that success depended on communications.

Councillor Manzie agreed to look at all of those aspects raised. There would be additional costs but a lot would be done cost neutrally.

Councillor Read thanked Commissioner Manzie for her presentation and informative contribution to the discussion.

## COUNCIL SEMINAR

Present:- Councillor Lelliott (in the Chair); Councillors The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Ellis, Evans, Hamilton, Johnston, McNeely, Pitchley, Read, Reeder, Sims, Smith, John Turner, Wyatt and Yasseen.

### **MAKING SAVINGS TO THE ADAPTATIONS BUDGET.**

Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, and Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, were welcomed to the seminar by Councillor D. Lelliott, Advisory Cabinet Member.

Dave and Sandra tabled the report that presented Solutions 1 – 10 in respect to making savings to the adaptations budget.

Questions and discussion followed the presentation and the following areas were covered. Elected Members were invited to ask questions about each of the proposed savings suggestions following the explanation: -

Councillor McNeely asked about the widening of external and internal doors for wheelchair access. – Sandra confirmed that there were no changes to this; if it was needed the Council would do this.

Councillor Sims referred to section 7.3.3.17 that stated fixed-term tenancies would be for a maximum of 5 years. If during that time residents no-longer needed the adapted house, would they be helped and prioritised to downsize/move on? Answer: - Yes. The Service had consulted widely on the issue for larger properties a few years ago. Would offer newly-let properties for up to 18 years and renew if required. This was certainly a sensitive matter. We want people to feel that that is their home and be committed to it whilst also supporting some people in very ill health.

Councillor Sims asked about ramps and how these were important to lots of individuals in wheelchairs and who did not use a wheelchair. Would all of the relevant factors be considered? Answer – presently individuals could only apply for a ramp if they were a full-time essential wheel chair user and each case would be considered on an individual basis. The Council was reviewing the policy as it recognised there were circumstances where we need to be more flexible.

Councillor Ellis asked about bolt on extensions that could be removed when no longer needed. Did the test/pilot work? Can we do more of these as technology improved and the price came down? 7.3.7 referred to private major adaptations and complex adaptations. Did the Council have a preferred partner for this? Undertaking an individual tender for each job whilst aiming for completion in less than 2 months and the waiting list for Occupational Therapy Services assessment, before even

starting, would contribute weeks and weeks of delay. Design for Life Standards for all new builds. How has the Council gone on campaigning for higher level planning? Were we ensuring that contractors were paying the living wage?

Dave Richmond referred to the £40m of work per year and could not confirm that every subcontractor did this. The Council would expect them to, but could not give a guarantee. He agreed to check with the procurement policy.

Answer: - Relating to bolt on extensions, we looked into viability of physical costing and the cost to move. This came in at around £100k, this is an initial huge outlay of cost and would also include removing from one installing in another place. Compared to building a one bed-extension or a shower at around £22k. How many times in the bolt on extension's lifespan could we re-use it? Have to re-use 4 times to justify cost.

Councillor Wyatt referred to higher level strategies that needed to be considered if partners were serious about keeping people out of hospital, reducing dependency and out of care. This links into the joint HWB Strategy. What was the work with district nursing services?

Councillor Johnston explained how she was appalled to hear that someone had to be in a wheelchair before they could ask for a ramp. What about people with walking frames, Parkinsons Disease and so on and people using shopping trolleys. People experiencing these kinds of mobility issues was going to increase and not having a ramp would leave people at severe risk. This was worrying.

Councillor Yaseen asked whether any recoupment charges were applied to the estate on an individual's death? Were there any legal implications to consider? Dave Richmond explained that they were in the process of consulting legal on this. Expectation would be that charge would be in place for a maximum of 10 years applied as a sliding scale as time progressed. The situation with leaseholders would need to be considered.

Councillor Yaseen spoke about the importance of ensuring that vulnerable people fully understood the implications of what they signed.

Councillor Reeder asked where the adaptations would be funded from. Dave explained that it was a combination of the Better Care Fund, the Housing Revenue Account and Right to Buy monies.

Councillor Reeder was concerned that focus was on council house properties and she had not had long enough to read these papers as they had been tabled.

**REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 09/06/15**

Dave Richmond outlined the split between private and social housing. The Council expected those who could afford to do their own adaptations, private and public tenants, to do them.

It was agreed that an update would be provided following a six-month review.

**5 REVIEW OF THE ALLOCATION AND DIRECT HOME POLICY.**

Time had not allowed for the consideration of this issue, although it was touched up in the previous item. It was agreed that an informal Members' drop-in session would be arranged to cover these factors.



**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
29th June, 2015**

**Present:-**

**Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-**

-

**Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-**

Councillor C. McGuinness

**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-**

Councillor Emma Wallis

Councillor Caven Vines

**Sheffield City Council:-**

Councillor Jenny Armstrong

Councillor Isobel Bowler

Councillor Joe Otten

**Co-opted Member:-**

Mr. Alan Carter

**Apologies for absence were received from:-**

Councillor John Campbell, Sheffield City Council

Councillor Martin Dyson, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor Alan Jones, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

**F1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/16**

Resolved:- That Councillor Isobel Bowler be appointed Chair for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

(Councillor Bowler in the Chair)

**F2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/16**

Resolved:- That Councillor Emma Wallis be appointed Vice-Chair for the 2015/16 Municipal Year).

**F3. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

3.1 A member of the public asked the following questions:-

“How can effectiveness of this scrutiny panel be improved and how can transparency with the public and community groups throughout South Yorkshire be enhanced?”

Very few people were aware of the Panel and interested in attending. The membership of the Panel had changed at a very rapid rate leading to confusion as to who was on the Panel and whether sufficiently up to speed.

Alan Carter was the only remaining independent person on the Panel so the independent voice was depleted at the moment and it was hoped that the second post could be resurrected.

The webcasting of the meeting was welcomed.”

3.2 The Chair agreed with the importance of focussed scrutiny and also that representatives were much more effective when they had been on a Panel for a while. It was hoped that the Panel’s membership would now stabilise.

The webcasting of meetings was a good step forward together with the website which would be kept up-to-date

**Action: Engagement to be explored at a future meeting.**

3.3 Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, confirmed that there was a vacancy for an independent co-optee Panel member. The recruitment process had commenced some time ago but for numerous reasons had been stalled. Now that the elections were over and the Panel had its full complement of Local Authority members it was hoped to resume the process as a matter of priority.

**Action: Chair, Vice-Chair and Alan Carter to take recruitment forward - Immediate.**

#### **F4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH MARCH, 2015**

4.1 Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 19<sup>th</sup> March, 2015.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> March, 2015, be approved for signature by the Chair.

4.2 Arising from Minute No. J35, it was noted that the previously circulated financial information would be recirculated due to the number of new Panel members.

**Action: Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager - Immediate**

4.3 Arising from Minute No. J37 (Putting Safety First), it was reported that the Police and Crime Commissioner had provided the independent co-optee information on the Independent Ethics Panel. However, it would be helpful to have information on their work.

**Action: Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) to provide Independent Ethics Panel work plan - Immediate**

4.4 An invitation had also been extended to Panel members to visit Atlas Court, the home of the “101” number.

**Action: OPCC and Deborah Fellowes to liaise with regard to arrangements for a visit, before the next meeting**

## **F5. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW BY THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER**

5.1 Consideration was given to the report presented by Dr. Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, which detailed the role and responsibilities of the Commissioner, a summary of his Police and Crime Plan, Putting Safety First, and information on the Performance Framework being used to measure performance against the Plan.

The report also set out the last position in relation to the legacy issues facing South Yorkshire Police.

5.2 In particular, Dr. Billings highlighted:-

- Cultural change  
The Police Force needed to move to a better way of measuring what they did – outcomes rather than targets. It was a big change in the way of working and would take time
- Challenges facing the Police  
As with the public sector, there were enormous challenges facing the Police Force and it was known that the period of austerity measures would continue. The forthcoming emergency budget may have an impact on budgets
- Hillsborough Inquests  
The Commissioner had a legal obligation to support both the current Chief Constable and 8 former and serving Police Officers who had been granted ‘interested person’ status and called to give evidence at the inquests. Up to the end of the 2014/15 financial year, the costs were approximately £16M+. A submission had been made to the Home Secretary for a special grant to cover the costs; £10.7M had been awarded leaving a gap to be funded by South Yorkshire Police. Unless agreement was reached between South Yorkshire Police, the Home Office and the legal office, there would be more costs that would fall onto the Police Force
- Orgreave  
The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) had declined to investigate the events at Orgreave but had implied that there should be an inquiry which the Government should fund. If there was an inquiry, the costs must not fall onto South Yorkshire Police budget

- Child Sexual Exploitation  
A number of Police Officers had been referred to the IPCC. There were ongoing negotiations by the National Crime Agency and the IPCC. The Commissioner had commissioned Professor John Drew to lead an independent review of South Yorkshire Police's handling of reports of child sexual exploitation across all 4 districts. He would be working across the region from September to the end of December, 2015
- Engagement with the wider public/community  
The Commissioner attended numerous meetings with the Chief Constable and Senior Command Team as well as with Police Officers and PCSOs.

Communication with the public was via the media, website, letters etc. and attendance at meetings

### 5.3 Issues raised following the presentation included:-

- Hillsborough – The costs also included the archives for the inquests. The legal representation was for those most likely to be in jeopardy for the statement they had made at the inquests. Negotiations were ongoing with regard to the costs
- Referral of Police Officers to the IPCC – the Force picked up the costs if there was an investigation
- Terms of Reference for the Independent Review by Professor Drew – there had been a press release containing a summary. Once signed off, they would be published on the website
- Vulnerability was a priority for the Force in its widest sense of the word and Police Officers asked to push the boundary of what they understood as “vulnerable” and its many definitions
- The IPCC's decision was awaited as to whether the referred Police Officers were to be investigated or not
- Consideration was still being given as to how to consult with the public on the Performance Framework

### **5.4 Action:- The OPCC report on the new Performance Framework, to the September Meeting**

**5.5 Action:- That Panel members receive general training on performance management to enable them to gain an understanding and ability to comment on the Framework. Deborah Fellowes to liaise with OPCC to agree date and format**

**F6. BUDGET UPDATE**

6.1 Alan Rainford, Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer, presented a report detailing the Police and Crime Commissioner's 2015/16 budget.

He drew attention to the following issues:-

- £9.6M reduction in Government funding compared to 2014/15 but still the requirement to make sufficient budget provision (£8M) for the effect of price inflation, pay awards and the planned resources required to address the heightened emphasis given to Protecting Vulnerable People
- £17.4M had had to be found to balance the 2015/16 budget – made up of a combination of savings and additional income
- Net revenue budget of £240M of which 85% represented employees costs
- Increased collaboration working – strategic partnership formed with Humberside Police to deliver services particular support and back office services
- £27.4M Capital Programme 2015/16 comprised of 3 key elements:
  - Ensuring equipment was replaced at the most efficient time in its lifetime in line with the agreed Asset Management Strategy, Information Systems Strategy and Vehicle Fleet Strategy
  - Ensuring the estate was fit for purpose and sustainable and developed in accordance with the Commissioner's Accommodation Strategy
  - Supporting and investing in new technology which would allow the Force to deliver a better service at reduced cost
- £11M of Reserves utilised to support the investment in Capital schemes for the 2015/16 budget
- Cost of legacy issues – an assumption had been made when determining the budget and precept for 2015/16 that all costs associated with the Hillsborough inquests would be offset by Home Office Special Grant. There remained a risk that the level of Special Grant may fall well below the level of expenditure incurred and the available reserves may not be sufficient to meet the cost
- Reserves could not be allowed to fall below £5M
- The budget would be updated to reflect the emergency budget and the Spending Review when it was released later in the year

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

- The Chief Constable's budget did receive contributions from other funding sources but any awards of funding had to be agreed by the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Letters were being drafted to the lawyers and the Home Office explaining South Yorkshire Police's position with regard to the costs of the Hillsborough inquests and the position going forward
- The Home Office Circular set out in broad terms provision of financial assistance to those officers involved in legal proceedings. However, the Home Office had not envisaged anything of the size of the Hillsborough inquests. The Circular gave the presumption in favour of financial assistance to those officers involved in legal proceedings until they were seen to have acted in bad faith or unreasonable judgement in their duties. At no point did the Circular define what "reasonable costs" were in terms of financial assistance and guidance had been sought from the Home Office on what was reasonable e.g. hourly rate, types of costs. A recommendation from the cost review commissioned by the Commissioner's Office was that the Home Office Circular was not fit for purpose and suggested that they might want to amend it to make clear what "reasonable costs" meant
- A large proportion of the Capital Programme was going into IT schemes which produced short term savings
- Although South Yorkshire Police was not alone in facing financial pressures, its situation was more critical given the legacy issues. It was not known what it meant for the Police Force but, if there was less funding, it may be that certain services had to be stopped altogether or done more efficiently

**6.3 Action: That the OPCC submit quarterly budget updates highlighting any budget pressures. First report to the September meeting**

**6.4 Action: That the OPCC include business planning around the Capital Programme in the next budget update**

## **F7. UPDATE ON THE OPERATION THE COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

7.1 Consideration was given to a report of the Legal Adviser which provided an update on the handling of complaints received against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was clarified that the 3 complaints referred to the former Police and Crime Commissioner.

Since the previous meeting the following matters had been considered:-

1. A complaint about the way the Commissioner had dealt with racist and homophobic complaints.
2. Complaints from 1 complainant in relation to a possible conflict of interest of the Commissioner, how the former Commissioner completed his register of interests and a further complaint relating to expenditure on security for the former Commissioner's house
3. A complaint that the Commissioner did not reply to the complainant for 80 days.

7.2 The Legal Adviser had also received a further 6 complaints in relation to routine policing issues which had been referred to the Police as appropriate.

7.3 The IPCC had recently notified the Legal Adviser that it did not intend to investigate the 3 complaints relating to the former Commissioner as the letters did not provide any actual evidence to support the claim that the previous Commissioner had committed a criminal offence.

7.4 Discussion ensued on:-

- the Panel's role in dealing with complaints about the former Commissioner
- role of the Panel in those complaints not resolved by the IPCC
- the Panel's role in resolving complaints
- should all complaints and their responses be submitted to the Panel
- all meetings were now to be webcast so caution must be exercised if reporting an individual's complaint(s)
- possible revised procedure for handling complaints incorporating receipt of complaint, opportunity for Commissioner's Office to respond, Chair and Vice to review and submission to Panel once a resolution had been reached

**7.5 Action:- That the Legal Adviser ensures the letter from the IPCC regarding the former Police and Crime Commissioner (subject to IPCC consent) be made available on the PCP's website - Immediate**

**7.6 Action:- That the Legal Adviser submit a revised procedure for handling complaints taking into consideration the points raised at the meeting - September meeting**

## **F8. MEMBER REMUNERATION**

8.1 Consideration was given to a report of the Legal Adviser on the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council in relating to allowances payable to members of the Panel.

The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 required Councils to review the remuneration for members. The Panel had also requested that the Council review the allowances paid to Police and Crime Panel members.

8.2 Upon the establishment of the Panel, an allowance for each member of £920 was budgeted for by Central Government. This amount was no longer 'ringfenced' but formed part of the overall budget for the Panel.

The Independent Remuneration Panel had considered the allowance and decided that there should be no change in the amount paid to members.

Resolved:- That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel be approved.

#### **F9. GOOD PRACTICE FOR POLICE AND CRIME PANELS GUIDANCE**

9.1 The Panel noted the Good Practice for Police and Crime Panels produced by the Local Government Association.

#### **F10. DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

10.1 It was noted that work was taking place on the drawing up of a schedule of meeting dates and times for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

**Action: Revised schedule of meetings to be circulated by Deborah Fellowes - Immediate**