

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 27th January, 2016

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 24)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 25 - 35)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 36 - 42)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 43 - 55)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 56 - 69)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 70 - 77)
7. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 78 - 82)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
3rd December, 2015

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Burton, Elliot, Fleming, Khan, Mallinder, Parker, Rose, Smith, John Turner and M. Vines.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Hunter and Price.

46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fleming declared a personal interest on the range of matters included on this meeting's agenda as he was an employee of the Sheffield Teaching Hospital Trust. He remained in the meeting and spoke and voted on the items.

Councillor Mallinder also declared a personal interest on the range of matters including on this meeting's agenda as she was the Carers Champion. She remained in the meeting and spoke and voted on the items.

47. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

48. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) GP Event

The Chairman and Councillor M. Vines had attended the recent GP event which had been based on Health, Care and the whole package around GPs in the Borough. It had been a very interesting event partly due to the individuals who had led on the event.

Councillor Vines had talked to six student doctors about their training and had found it very disappointing that only two wished to become a GP.

Following the meeting it was established that to become a GP you needed to complete a five year degree course in medicine and a two year foundation programme of general training. You also needed specialist training in general practice which would take three years. Many foundation programmes included placements in general practice – over 40% of FY2 rotations in 2011. These provided useful and invaluable experience even for those who did not intend to train as a GP. Some but not all did 1/3 of their F2 year in general practice.

(2) RCCG Communication and Consultation Sub-Committee meeting

Councillor Mallinder had attended the meeting as a substitute for the Chairman. Engagement was the priority and the CCG was very keen to know how they could engage and communicate with others. Other issues discussed included the use of bank staff and GP shortages.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 03/12/15

Resolved:- That Councillor Mallinder prepare a report on the meeting and circulate to Select Commission Members.

(3) CAMHS

The Scrutiny Review response had been signed off by Commissioner Newsam and was to be discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 10th December. All of the twelve recommendations had been accepted and work was progressing on delivery. Some of the actions linked in with the new CAMHS Transformation Plan.

(4) Visits

Good practice visits had taken place to Wigan and North Lincolnshire with regard to Adult Social Care as part of the Adult Social Care Working Party.

(5) Health and Wellbeing Board

Councillor Roche, Advisory Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, reported that external funding had been secured from the LGA and Rotherham United for an event to share and showcase good practice that was happening in sports and health. It was to be a South Yorkshire Event held on 13th April, at the New York Stadium. There would be a key note speaker from Birmingham who had done a lot of work promoting physical activity and sport.

The Board was now moving on to developing and implementing its action plans for the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. There would be a sub-group (Engine Room) consisting of practitioners which would drive forward the key parts of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

There was to be a report to the February Board meeting from partners as to how they were progressing integration. The report would be submitted to the Health Select Commission.

49. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 3rd December, 2015, be agreed as a correct record.

Further to Minute No. 39 (Health and Wellbeing Board), Councillor Roche, Advisory Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, reported that the Board's website was being refreshed and had its own Twitter account.

Further to Minute No. 40 (Annual Review of NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group's Commissioning Plan), it was noted that a letter had been sent to the Yorkshire Ambulance Service and the Commissioning Group highlighting Councillor Parker's concerns with regard to an incident.

50. DEVELOPING THE ROTHERHAM CARERS STRATEGY

Sarah Farragher, Change Leader, Adult Social Care, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

What do we need to do

- The Care Act has a strong focus on carers, recognising the caring role as fundamental to the whole adult social care system. Carers have increased rights and status within the Act with enhanced rights to promotion of wellbeing, earlier support and personalised support

In Rotherham

- We have a mixed picture of carer involvement and support. We need to build stronger collaboration between carers, the Council and other partners
- We want to lay the foundations for achieving these partnerships and set the intention for future working arrangements
- We want to do something that makes a difference now whilst setting up the right co-produced options for the future

Progress to date and timescales

- This is a Rotherham Carers Strategy not a Rotherham Council Carers Strategy. It is a partnership plan
- Hopefully will be taken through the Health and Wellbeing Board

Progress to date and timescales

- The Group has met three times and the first draft of the Strategy has been circulated and comments made. Second draft to be worked up following Carers Rights Day
Further work being undertaken to strengthen the voice of young carers
Asking carers "what three things would make a positive difference?" through Crossroads AGM, at Carers Rights Day and through volunteer sector forums

Strategy based around three outcomes

- Outcome One – Carers in Rotherham are resilient
- Outcome Two – The caring role is manageable and sustainable
- Outcome Three – Carers in Rotherham should have their needs understood and their wellbeing promoted

What do we need to do to achieve these outcomes?

- We need to strengthen some things that are already in place to increase the reach and get parts of the system working together better
- We need to view carers as partners when making decisions about care (without losing the voice of the cared for person)
- We need more people doing Carers Assessments including partners in the independent and voluntary sector

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 03/12/15

- Need to develop a Carers Wellbeing budget and Allocation System (RAS)
- We need whole family assessments to stop duplication of assessments
- We need to target services better and understand who our carers are and what they need
- We need to provide reassurance for carers that a back up is there when they cannot provide the usual care

What three things?

- Information and advice
- A voice
- Consistent support
- Valued
- Time for me
- Involved
- Quality care
- A break
- Financial help
- Understanding

Strategy – who is involved

- Currently being developed through a working group of partner agencies – outcomes came from group and were part of consultation
- Hope was to get some carers onto the group (thirty people expressed an interest at Carers Rights Day event)

Consultation and Engagement

- Carers Forum – event end January/beginning of February organised by Councillor Mallinder
- Plan to do something every four-six months – format to be agreed

Measures and Accountability

- Strategy group will have responsibility for delivery
- There will also be a commissioning plan with specific actions, timescales following on from Strategy

More information about what is going on in Rotherham

- Carers Forum – currently being redeveloped
- Care4Carers – very strong and active as a group
- Alzheimers Café – demand outstripping supply over 200 carers attend four cafes
- Carers Resilience Service – pilot project based in GP surgeries
- Social Prescribing – identifies carers and refers through for support as well as “patient”
- Carers Emergency Scheme – over 1,000 carers registered

What is happening in Rotherham

- Approximately 2,000 hours a month of homecare were provided through the carer specific schemes
- So far thirteen carers have received Care Act assess support as a carer ... more to be done

What is going well?

- Good partnership commitment
- Social Workers and Carers Support Officers were meeting carers at the Carers Corner to complete the assessments
- Mental Health Carers Services very strong – craft groups, resilience training etc.
- Increase in referrals to Carers Corner following pro active work with GPs

What is not working well

- Carers Corner out of the way – difficult to find. Footfall at the Centre is low (even after the work)
- Plan to change building name meant difficult to advertise as the information would go out-of-date
- Carers Emergency Scheme was not working for carers of people with mental health difficulties – IT issues
- Generally, services were fragmented based on client groups rather than based on carers – not making the best use of our resources

Information and Advice

- Training for Carers – new training booklet was re-printed by Direction Team and was on display at Carers Corner
- Carers directory was being printed in the New Year (free and would be updated regularly) and also available on Connect to Support
- Voluntary and Community Services directory almost complete – would be put on Connect to Support and printed on request

Other Information

- So far not seen an increase in assessments (was predicted up to 5,357 carers)
- Assessment/recording tracking of carers would be through Liquid Logic (from mid next year) – still to be worked through
- Delegated Carers budget based on RAS (this was a budget pressure) – work to be undertaken on this
- 5,627 clients on Service and 3,192 had an NHS number recorded

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- That the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of Support for Carers will feed in to the development of the Carers Strategy
- Consultation and engagement would take place every 4-6 months to track progress of the Strategy. Once embedded the feedback would be used to ascertain if it was making a difference

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 03/12/15

- More work was required on the Carers Emergency Scheme as to how carers who had used it were finding the Scheme. It was suggested that a covering letter could be included from RDaSH asking if a carer wanted to join the Council's Scheme
- In terms of how the agencies were joined up, a meeting had taken place recently with the Carers Worker for Mental Health. More work was required to understand what the problem was
- There was a lot of mistrust of the Council and statutory bodies generally by carers especially by those that had fought the system all their lives. However, if a carer trusted a particular organisation and they were able to carry out the assessment and draw down the resources on the back of it, that would increase the numbers. Where there were carers who did not want an assessment, a whole family assessment would pick up on the needs/requirements of the carer
- Work was ongoing to develop a Health and Social Care Portal for Rotherham in terms of getting the different areas and systems working together. At the moment it very much concentrated upon the Foundation Trust systems so the question had been asked about integrating it with the Social Care and RDaSH systems. The plan was to look at it but as there was to be a move to the new Social Care system it was not appropriate to do so at the current time. There had been a discussion regarding the recording of Mental Health data more generally onto Social Care systems; Liquid Logic had been requested to ascertain how other authorities record such information
- There was a section within the Strategy on young carers. The Strategy would focus on people who were caring for an adult regardless of the age of that person doing the caring. It was not looking at parent/carers at the moment to keep it reasonably defined
- The long term view would be holistic family assessment but would start with family assessments for adults and would include young carers
- There would be a separate consultation with young carers as much of the support networks were around adult carers and older persons carers
- The Mental Health Carers Worker had carried out a lot of work going around the Teams and Hospital Wards promoting the work of carers. The idea of Carers Corner had always been to be the central point for all carers in Rotherham and, if that was right, everybody would know about it and have access to the information for all groups

- The Carers Resilience Service, a pilot service, had just started to work in GP practices to provide information from the practice. It was part of the Strategy to get to as many places as possible where people might access the Service
- Liquid Logic would enable members of the public to self-assess and self-provide the information. It was felt that the Liquid Logic portal was the appropriate place as it was a public portal and the information could be fed through to the statistical returns
- Other areas of the country had set up Service Level Agreements to pay other organisations to carry out carers assessments.
- Outreach work would be part of the ongoing work. All the issues with regard to accessing hard to reach groups, engagement, promotion would form part of the regular engagement sessions within the implementation part of the Strategy.
- The Council was now committed to working with carers
- Adult Social Care in Rotherham was not where it should be generally. In terms of implementation of the Care Act, there was a development programme around the need to change Adult Social Care which carers were part of. The Liquid Logic changes were something that had come off the back of the review of Children's Services, which Adult Services had then come on board, and having the one system for the whole Council. The implementation date was July; the existing system was not sufficiently flexible. Carers had been flagged in terms of the Resource Allocation System but care packages would be looked at first and then carers
- Work was also taking place on how the customer journey could be improved with the development of a single point of access for Rotherham – not just for carers but a single number for all Social Care in Rotherham. An initial meeting had taken place with officers from the Council, Foundation Trust, CCG and RDaSH (both Learning Disability and Mental Health) to discuss, in principle, a single point of access for Rotherham. There were different interpretations of a "single point of access" and the meeting had discussed a shared understanding of what it was. The development group would meet again in January, 2016, to work up, ascertain the appetite for and how it might work for a single access point. It would have a positive impact on carers
- The current carers' budget covered Carers Officers who were in Mental Health, the Team at Carers Corner, the building costs of Carers Corner as well as carers' monies that came out of the General Purchasing budget which included items such as home care for carers, Carers Emergency Scheme etc. There was no specific carers' budget. When developing the Resource Allocation System it was one

of the things required but not simple to do. Carers would still potentially need support and breaks for the person they cared for and it was hoped to have a separate Wellbeing budget. It had been flagged in the Adult Social Care internal budget strategy group that it needed to be included as a pressure. It was an invest to save because if a carer was supported to care for longer than would have then it would have a knock on effect on other budgets

- It would be a decision for the Council as to whether to apply the 2% precept increase to support Adult Social Care. The final details were still awaited for analysis

Sarah was thanked for her presentation.

Resolved:- (1) That the information provided about the development of a new Carers Strategy be noted.

(2) That the draft Strategy be submitted to a future meeting of the Health Select Commission.

(3) That further information be submitted before the 17th December, 2015, Select Commission meeting.

51. BETTER CARE FUND UPDATE/IMPLICATIONS OF THE AUTUMN STATEMENT FOR SOCIAL CARE AND THE BETTER CARE FUND

Jon Tomlinson, Interim Assistant Director of Adult Commissioning, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Better Care Fund Update

- Building on previous presentations – good progress around integration continues to be made
- Robust governance and reporting has enabled Rotherham to comply with national requirement to submit information about progress
- Latest quarterly return (27th November, 2015) approved by Health and Wellbeing Board and submitted
- Regional feedback has been received on the Quarter One Return

Main points from Feedback

- Rotherham is not an outlier in any areas of the BCF
- We are still working towards meeting two of the national conditions:-
 - Implementing 7 day working
 - Pilot commenced 1st December
 - Hospital Discharge Team
 - NHS Identifier
 - In scope cohort of adults records should be matched by the end of 2015

Moving Forward

- Key lines of enquiry for NHS England for future BCF Integration
- Changing format shifting focus from compliance with national conditions to strategy, pace and development of integration
- Personal health budgets, preventative care and use of integrated records across Health and Social Care are now integration metrics
- Work to rigorously review current projects has been completed
- Clearly the BCF remains a key driver for integration of Health and Social Care
- Target dates and resources have been included within the spending review
- Senior officers will be meeting on 7th December to review the strategic vision and priorities
- A new proposed model at an individual, family and community level will be considered
- This will feed into and inform the review that has been undertaken

Discussion ensued with the followings issues raised/clarified:-

- There was massive pressure on the Council to provide services to help the vision become reality. The Authority needed to ensure that the money was in the right place which was where commissioning and joint commissioning came into its own. There were probably areas that needed careful consideration and redistribution of the resources into the correct places which would then feed into the agenda of prevention and supporting people into not coming into Social Care as a statutory service. The challenge was huge but no different to anywhere else in the country.
- Integration was the first step and critical. Agencies in Rotherham were very close to being on the same page with regard to integration and looking to do the same things i.e. provide the best possible care and outcomes for the citizens of Rotherham
- Joint commissioning was the way forward for Social Care as it reduced duplication and the opportunity for varying rates. Value for money was vital. The citizens would be best placed to determine value for money with the drive to personalisation, personal budgets and individuals buying their own services.
- In terms of commissioning, the Authority had the responsibility for the overall contracting and management of the market and benchmarking would give an indication of whether it was a reasonable rate being charged. The contracting arrangements, reviewing and monitoring what the Authority received for its money ensured it got best value
- Benchmarking was just one discipline that could be used to get a sense of whether the charge was consistent or not. An exercise was currently being undertaken to get an absolute position on what the

cost of care in Rotherham was. That required a proper relationship with the market providers to look at those costs together. That work was in its infancy and was hoped to bring to a conclusion over the next six months

- The Trust was absolutely in tune with the Authority in terms of facing the financial challenges but also in providing first class patient care. The Trust realised that to deliver what it needed to do it had to do something differently and supported what BCF was trying to do
- There were ongoing discussions with NHS England in trying to reduce the tick box matrix that had to be completed. Reports were to be submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board explaining what was behind the numbers in real terms
- Work was taking place on a proposal to purchase properties into which patients, who no longer required to be in hospital but could not return to their own home, would move into temporarily. A meeting was to take place with the Foundation Trust Chief Executive to further explore the option
- Work and a development programme were underway on how to get Social Workers to think differently and changing the message so that every review should make a difference to someone's life. The professional standards lead was working with the region and the universities about producing academically qualified Social Workers that were fit to practice, as it had been found over the years, and not just in Rotherham, that students coming out of university had the theory but were less well equipped to work with people in reality. The Authority was working with universities to ensure the Social Worker training course was fit for purpose
- The Social Worker training was now generic for both Adults and Children
- The vision would make it clear that absolute integration was the aim but would at least be meeting what was expected nationally

Jon was thanked for his presentation.

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

(2) That the BCF return report be submitted to the Health Select Commission once it had been considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board.

(3) That a report be submitted to the January meeting of the Commission.

52. IMPLICATIONS OF THE AUTUMN STATEMENT FOR SOCIAL CARE AND THE BETTER CARE FUND

This was combined with Minute No. 51 above.

53. UPDATES FROM IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION

Councillor Ahmed gave the following verbal report on the work of the Improving Lives Select Commission:-

- In terms of work with CSE, we were looking at meeting some CSE survivors in December. However, that was to be arranged to ensure that there was a clear process of conducting ourselves and not overloading/overburdening survivors with questions. Hopefully, a further update would be given to the next meeting.
- The Select Commission had had CSE updates from the Police and different partners. There appeared to be a robust system in place within the MASH hub and progress was being made. In a couple of years Rotherham would hope to be seen as one of the best local authorities in providing the most appropriate support for CSE survivors
- A lot of work been done by the newly established Early Help Group which had met in November and was to meet again on 8th December where the Assistant Director was the lead. The Group was considering how the Authority could look at early help and intervention, to intervene at an early stage and prevent any young person becoming a victim of CSE. This included looking at localities, how they were based in schools, how Universal Services would play a far more proactive role in completing FCAFs to provide the assessment opportunity and asking Universal Services to take some responsibility. There would be a lot of emphasis on looked after children which was a key priority in Jay report
- Other potential work could include further audit work to identify specific themes and ensure ongoing good social work practice. Also missing young people, including those missing from the school roll
- It was important to be mindful of looking at things from the whole family perspective and what therapeutic services were in place, from the Health Select Commission point of view - looking at what gaps there were still in terms of support that the whole family can receive and the CAHMS element of it

Councillor Ahmed informed the Commission that the Corporate Parenting Panel had also discussed work that was going on in terms of CSE and a lot of excellent work that was taking place at the moment with the CSE teams and the survivors to look at preventing any young person becoming a victim.

Councillor Rose reported that she had attended a RDaSH meeting as a Governor. They were appointing a full-time CSE Worker and taking every item of any concern very seriously. She had felt very reassured that RDaSH were moving with the Authority on this issue.

54. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

55. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Resolved:- That meetings be held as follows:-

Thursday, 17th December, 2015 at 9.30 a.m.
21st January, 2016 at 3.00 p.m.
17th March at 9.30 a.m.
14th April at 9.30 a.m.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
17th December, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Khan, Mallinder, Parker and M. Vines and Vicky Farnsworth (Speakup)

Councillor Roche, Advisory Cabinet Member, Adult Social Care and Health, was in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Elliot, Godfrey, Hunter, Price, Rose, Rushforth, John Turner and Robert Parkin (Speakup).

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Vicky Farnsworth declared a personal interest in Minute No. 64 (Developing a Model for the Enabling Service for Older People and Adults with Disabilities in Rotherham) as a user of the Service.

57. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

58. PROPOSED JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH AND MID-YORKSHIRE, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND DERBYSHIRE

The Chair reported that the next phase of the Commissioners Working Together Programme for Health Services across South and Mid-Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire would include public consultation. As part of informing the work, NHS England were proposing to set up a JHOSC. Members' opinion was sought as to whether the Council should be represented on the Committee.

Resolved:- That Commissioner Manzie be informed that the Health Select Commission felt that Rotherham should be represented on the proposed Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee by the Chair and Vice-Chair as substitute as and when required.

(The Chair authorised consideration of the above item to enable the necessary arrangements to be made.)

59. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Councillor Alam

The Chairman thanked Councillor Alam for his work during his membership of the Select Commission and wished him well in his new role as Advisory Cabinet Member.

(2) Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Account

Councillor Mallinder gave a brief verbal report on the meeting held on 3rd December, 2015, to discuss the above which included:-

Quality Ambitions

- Harm Free "Stop Pressure" initiative to reduce pressure sores and ulcers
- Using Dr. Foster to compare performance with other Trusts on mortality indicators
- Clinically led task group looking at missed and delayed diagnosis
- Friends and Family response gathered on line on the Ward and A&E
- "Must Nutrition Score" Food Hostess to monitor food and beakers in a different colour to identify at risk patients

Quality Improvements

- Dementia Care Training is done in-house
- Stroke patients should be at 50% for a scan within 1 hour
- Appropriate training to be delivered on all Wards as identified
- There had been an increase in complaints against Doctors
- Nursing nationally is 1 nurse to 8 patients - in Rotherham it is approximately 1 nurse to 6-7 patients. There are 50,000 nursing vacancies nationally

How are we doing?

- There has been a spike in death rates nationally which is being looked at further
- Discharges are being analysed to see how it is working in Health and Social Care
- MRSA – 0
- CDIF- nationally 24 – Rotherham 14 to date

Discussion ensued on the nursing situation nationally. There were a high number of applications but not enough training places were commissioned by NHS England. Universities were given funding for the number of nursing students they could enrol but the funding was cut which impacted upon the number of places that could be offered.

Resolved:- That the issue of nurses and vacancies be raised with the Foundation Trust with regard to the number of applications for nursing posts in Rotherham to gain an understanding of the number of positions available compared to the number of vacancies.

(4) CAMHS Scrutiny Review

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had accepted all of the Scrutiny Review recommendations at its meeting on 11th December, 2015. The Board would be working with the Rotherham Youth Cabinet on the Children's Commissioner Take Over Challenge.

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, would be speaking with RDaSH colleagues in the CAMHS Service with regard to their involvement in the event.

The CQC Quality Summit would take place on 3rd February, 2016.

(5) Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor Ahmed gave the following verbal update from the meeting held on 16th December, 2015:-

- Information regarding CSE and where the Authority was in terms of Service provision together with the analysis and evaluation provided by Salford University
- The low number of referrals made by health partners was highlighted – approximately only 7% of CSE referrals came in via Health. Reassurance had been given that there would be further work with GPs and health professionals in terms of raising awareness and improving referrals
- There would be a further update provided to show how the additional work had impacted on the number of referrals coming through
- From a sample of young people participating in questionnaires it had been evident that there was a very low percentage from vulnerable groups e.g. Roma families, BME communities and LGBT. Reassurance had been given that a lot of work was being carried out engaging with the voluntary sector and BME communities on how engagement could be improved/enhanced

60. ADULT AND OLDER PEOPLE'S MENTAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Steph Watt (Programme Lead) and Kerry Booker, RDaSH, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Engagement activity

- Six whole system stakeholder events during the Summer
- Multi-agency steering group
- Online and survey questionnaires
- Options paper to Commissioners October, 2015
- Eight engagement events November, 2015-January, 2016
- Formal consultation February-March, 2016
- Implementation from April, 2016

What stakeholders said

- Waiting times are too long for some Services
- Access routes are confusing
- Organising Services around age creates an artificial barrier
- Too many hand offs (Adult Services)
- Improve communication
- Once in Service the Service is good

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/12/15

Financial Constraints

- Year on year 3-4% efficiency savings
- £1.2M in Rotherham for 2016/17
- Change the model to limit cuts in clinical services

Principles

- Integrated partnership working
- Patient focussed/needs driven
- Focus on quality of life (recovery/wellbeing)
- Maintain/improve quality
- Release savings

Proposals

- Cultural change – partnership working, recovery/wellbeing focus, integrated needs driven working and agile working
- A Trust-wide move from cross-Borough business divisions to a place-based Rotherham model
- A new gateway to Services
- Service re-design

Recovery and Wellbeing Focus

Traditional Approach

- Description
- Focus on the disorder
- Illness/deficits-based
- Based on reducing adverse events
- Individual adaptations to the programme
- Rewards passivity and compliance
- Expert Care Co-ordinators
- Service-led goals
- Service-led evaluation
- Fosters dependency
- Pessimism about outcomes

Recovery Approach

- Understanding
- Focus on the person
- Strengths based
- Based on hopes and aspirations
- Provider adaptations to the individual
- Fosters empowerment
- Individual is the expert
- Individual-led goals
- User-led evaluation
- Fosters independent
- Creates hope

Gateway to Services

Taking a phased approach to:-

- A 24/7, all age, single contact number
- Mental Health Gateway
- Rotherham Hub – Health and Social Care, Mental Health and Social Care, Health
- Electronic directory

Adult (18+) Service Options

- Do nothing: not an option
- Community-based ageless service
- All-age service based in 2 localities – Older Peoples Team centrally located or embedded in localities
- Opportunities to co-locate?
- Review and embed Social Care roles

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The proposal to release a couple of old Council stock properties for the development into a facility for those released from hospital but did not require care/intermediate care, would be in relation to the Older People agenda and not Mental Health
- RDaSH was presently looking at getting a single system and a different electronic record that should be able to “talk” to other systems. A single systems paper was being developed to take to various companies that, hopefully, would be rolled out in 2017 within the Trust
- RDaSH was developing physical health screening so rather than having to make an appointment for a client for an ECG etc. they had nurses who were trained. This was being rolled out gradually. The physical health screening clinics were initially for high dose prescribing but were then to be rolled out to patients with psychosis. The Early Intervention Services were the first point of contact for somebody with psychosis as a young person who was treatment naïve; they would have all the screening there before being prescribed anything. There were Key Performance Indicators against that to achieve for those patients
- There had been broad support for a Rotherham-wide approach to Access to Support. RDaSH recognised that it was complex and took time; the focus would be on the Mental Health gateway but the relationship between Mental Health and Social Care had come out really loud and clear in the consultation engagement work. RDaSH was also mindful that the Council was changing how it worked and the need to work closely together to avoid patients/service users being

passed from one to the other. The more RDaSH could understand about the bigger picture the more they could help patients and carers

- Currently in Adult Mental Health Services all referrals came through to a reception member of staff who would answer basic questions. From there if it was someone who needed clinical advice or the admin worker felt it was well beyond the basics of what they could answer, it was currently passed to a trained Social Worker who triaged all referrals, including Safeguarding, and linked in with Assessment Direct when required or with the Access Team. RDaSH wanted to maintain and grow that function because they knew from clinicians, patients and the feedback from GPs, that they wanted to speak to someone who knew what they were talking about. That did not mean that the admin staff did not know but in terms of the clinical expertise the triage would have clinically trained staff, nurses and Social Workers. It was hoped to expand it across the board for all ages/services but would not be a call centre type service. Older people's referrals went straight to treatment teams as in CAMHS
- There were a number of initiatives concerning engagement with patients on waiting lists. In those cases where a patient had been waiting longer than one would expect, Team Managers had them on their caseloads and would actively contact them, either by telephone or in writing. A number of RDaSH services now ensured that repeat letters were sent followed up by telephone calls particularly in Primary Mental Health Care and within the Access Teams. An Engagement Policy had been introduced over the last 2 years for those people who were not really engaging with the service or the service was finding it difficult in engaging with them particularly in terms of the Crisis and Access Teams. There was an expectation that those Teams would actively follow clients up rather than just writing to them and discharging them from services if they did not engage. There was a recognition that people who were mentally quite unwell or very vulnerable did not engage for those reasons. In terms of those people with personality disorder and suicide, RDaSH always reviewed suicides within their Service very robustly and action plans developed with the families
- RDaSH currently had an Access Team that conducted the first assessment and then made a decision as to whether to pass them through to a Treatment Team. As part of the transformation, the Access Assessors would be embedded in the Treatment Teams thereby facilitating a closer relationship, easier communication and hopefully address the need for someone not having to repeatedly tell their story
- With regard to the All Age Services based in two localities a piece of work was being conducted across the Trust looking at the demographic of Rotherham, buildings and the volume of referrals. The terms North, South, East and West were being used but the

localities would be divided to enable balanced teams. Consultation would take place with the Council, CAMHS and Primary Care as to how they divided up Rotherham and mirror those as far as possible

- RDaSH Services linked into the multi-agency meetings and arenas as well as the MARAC and MAPPA, particularly for those who were very vulnerable within Rotherham's communities. There would be a lot of work within the transformation to ensure that none of the existing work was disrupted. Development of some new services was taking place within the Criminal Justice arena, working with Early Help, for those young people that were picked up by the Police and were in the Police Custody Suites as well as those young people that were not taken into custody but were arrested
- Work had taken place with the Rotherham CCG and the voluntary and community sector to identify representative groups with regard to consultation. An event had been arranged for January, 2016, which would be publicised through the Trust in an endeavour to get as wide engagement as possible
- RDaSH were interested in a shared directory with the Council and a meeting would be held in the New Year to discuss further
- An electronic directory would be one tool in a range that would be used. There were accessible information standards and guidance so work was taking place with all the different contracts around looking at how information was provided

Steph and Kerry were thanked for their presentation.

Resolved:- (1) That the information provided about Mental Health Transformation be noted.

(2) That Option 3 would be the Health Select Commission's preferred option.

(3) That the Select Commission receive an update on the final approved option.

61. DEVELOPING A SINGLE POINT OF ACCESS TO SOCIAL CARE

Sarah Farragher, Interim Change Leader, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

What are the access points for adults?

- Assessment Direct – Adult Social Care
- Badsley Moor Lane – Learning Disability
- Crisis Team – Mental Health
- Out of Hours Services – RDaSH and RMBC

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/12/15

- Care Co-ordination Centre
- Others?

What should we aspire to?

- Single point of access for health and social care for Rotherham (customer or patient tells us once)
- Covers RMBC, TRFT, RDaSH
- Triage/assessed based on customer outcome not Service provision
- Operates on a 24 hour a day 7 days a week basis
- Does not replace professional to professional contacts

What we need to consider

- Shared vision for what the Service looks like
- Pooled resources
- Integrated/co-located services
- Utilising shared technology
- Provides information, advice and guidance to enable self-management for customer/patient

How we are going to get there

- Initial scoping workshop took place end of October – well attended by partners
- Positive shared desire to achieve this but more work to understand the scope and priorities
- Further working parties were being organised from January to progress the agenda

In advance of this partners have been asked to consider

- What are the must haves?
- What is the financial envelope/constraints for this?
- What are the timescales?
- What are the things we would like to do (in addition to the musts)

Information and Advice Gateway

- Currently use Connect to Support but needs work
- Need to decide whether we develop this system or use Liquid Logic (Social Care system)
- Event planned for early February to talk to both providers to inform decision making

Issues

- Both systems would need investment both in terms of the resources to implement and the ongoing maintenance
- Need to think about impact and interface with Council website
- Connect to Support does not work well locally because we have not invested in this

But

- Some Council were seeing over 90% diversion rate
- Connect to Support was a regional resource and keen to work across Health and Social Care Partnerships

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues being raised/clarified:-

- It was accepted that the Connect to Support website needed a lot of work to get where it should be and to maintain it including accessibility issues for those with learning disabilities and the visually impaired plus ensuring access to information for people without computers
- Liquid Logic was a Social Care database in two parts - Adult and Children - where assessments would be generated and stored, commissioned care packages and provided performance data. It had an additional functionality of a self-serve portal which would be where a member of the public might want to search for information and if they logged in that information could potentially come straight into the Directorate. Under the Care Act, the Authority needed to move towards people self-assessing and self-reviewing so that it was not necessarily carried out by a professional but the person themselves telling you what they needed and/or how their packages were going and Liquid Logic had the functionality to do that for those who would be self-assessing. Potentially Connect 2 Support also had the same capability so consideration needed to be given as to the best route
- There was a partnership group of all agencies working on a portal which would provide access from all IT systems into one shared system. Key points were information governance and data sharing. It was quite an innovative piece of work and probably worth having IT representatives attend a meeting to talk further
- If someone used Liquid Logic to self-assess there was an option to have their details sent through to the Directorate. Connect to Support could similarly do the same but it had the advantage of not being a health and social care but a community portal. Connect to Support was independent and if a customer/citizen said they wanted some support, it could potentially be shared because it was being shared at the request of the individual but it was still early days
- Following the scoping workshop held in October, the information had been sent to Children and Young People's Services as it had not been represented at the meeting. The pre-planned questions had been sent out to all representatives with reminders being sent as a follow-up

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/12/15

- All libraries were now wifi enabled and members of the public were able to access Connect to Support. Members of staff were trained to assist members of the public who required assistance in using the portal
- Connect to Support at the moment essentially was information and advice but could do more. Mental Health had been in attendance at the Connect to Support Regional event and there would be a further meeting to discuss local work. RDaSH had in mind using Connect to Support as a starting point and potentially growing it over time (RDaSH)

Resolved:- (1) That the information provided regarding the transformation of a single point of access be noted.

(2) That feedback in terms of the Working Party be shared with the Select Commission at a future meeting.

62. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

63. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 and 4 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to financial or business affairs and labour relations matters).

64. RESTRUCTURE OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE - PHASE ONE (MANAGEMENT)

Sarah Farragher, Interim Change Leader, presented a report setting out the proposed Phase One of the Adult Social Care restructure.

A significant restructure of Adult Social Care was necessary to deliver an enhanced customer journey and ensure that it was fit for purpose and met the statutory Care Act (2014) requirements. It would provide more accountability and allow the development of improved integration with NHS partners.

The report detailed the first phase (management restructure). A second phase would be required to develop the teams below the structure the detail for which would be worked up through the consultation period.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following salient issues raised:-

- Current structure was unsustainable due to the workload
- The restructure would provide strategy and support
- The skills required of the appointees to the new posts
- Use of agency staff
- Direct Payments and personalisation
- Workload of qualified/unqualified Social Workers
- Supervision and support of staff

Resolved:- (1) That the significant restructure of Adult Social Care Services, necessary to deliver an enhanced customer journey and ensure that Adult Social Care was fit for purpose and met the statutory Care Act (2014) requirements, be noted.

(2) That the Select Commission receive regular updates to gain an understanding of where the pressure points were and how any problems that arose would be mitigated.

65. DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR THE ENABLING SERVICE FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES IN ROTHERHAM

Sarah Farragher, Change Leader Adult Social Care, presented a report on the Enabling Service which provided intensive support for a short period to residents who may have lost their ability to live independently or who were at risk of doing so.

Currently Rotherham's Service was unable to accept all referrals and did not accept the more complex cases. Benchmarking indicated that the service was significantly less efficient than other comparable services in the region.

Discussion ensued upon the report and the three proposed options contained therein for the development of the Service:-

- The Enabling Service had emerged from the previous traditional Homecare Service
- The Service coped very well with basic needs
- What facilities would the Authority provide for training of staff to fulfil the roles available
- Consultation and feedback

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

66. ADULT SERVICES TRANSPORT FLEET

Sarah Farragher, Interim Change Leader, presented a report on the Adult Services Transport Fleet and the existing vehicle lease arrangement.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/12/15

At present Adult Services provided transport to approximately 200 customers on a daily basis (Monday to Friday) primarily to and from the existing in-house Learning Disability Day Services with some older provision and ad-hoc arrangements with in-house respite services.

Due to the expiry of the current lease and maintenance arrangements for the vehicles, it was opportune to review the arrangements and service needs in respect to the future fleet. The implementation of the Care Act also created a shift in the thinking around delivering services and moving towards independence and opportunities for customers to take control of their own lives.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following salient points made:-

- Costs of short term vehicle lease arrangements against long term lease
- Financial costs plus different working methods/independent travel
- Use of taxis
- Long term lease arrangements and use of vehicles across the Council as a whole

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

(2) That a further report be submitted detailing the finance to be incurred, value for money and a comparison of short and long term lease terms and agreements.

67. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 21st January, 2016, commencing at 3.00 p.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
16th December, 2015

Present:- Councillor Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Beaumont, Elliot, Hague, Hoddinott, Jepson, Reeder, Rose, Taylor and M. Vines. Co-opted Members Ms. J. Jones and Mr. M. Smith were also in attendance.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cutts, Jones and Pitchley.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Ms. J. Jones, Co-opted Member representing the Voluntary Sector Consortium, declared a pecuniary interest due to her substantive employment with Giving Real Opportunities to Women (GROW) representing a 'beneficial interest'. This was in relation to items 9 (Rotherham Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Analysis) and 11 (Overview of progress to date of the Child Sexual Exploitation Delivery Plan 2015-2018 in the specific areas of Voice and Influence Impact and work undertaken in schools in Rotherham). GROW had been contracted to deliver support services to victims and survivors of CSE and their family members.

Joanna left the meeting room when these items were being considered and did not take any part in their discussion.

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

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

32. COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing was raised under this item.

33. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 4TH NOVEMBER, 2015.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 4th November, 2015, were considered.

Councillor Hoddinott requested a progress update in relation to Minute number 25 (Minutes of the previous meeting held on 23rd September, 2015). She had been requesting the details of the Child Sexual Exploitation Scorecard since July, 2015.

Gary Ridgeway responded on behalf of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board (?). He acknowledged that the scorecard had been outstanding for some time and apologised for this. Finalising and circulating the CSE Scorecard had been difficult because the picture

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - 16/12/15

kept on developing, leading to the Scorecard becoming out of date. It would be circulated as it currently stood.

Councillor Hoddinott, under the same Minute from the previous meeting, asked for an explanation of Regulation 44 reports and where they had been reported to. She had first asked this question at the September meeting.

Jean Imray explained the statutory nature of the Regulation 44 reports. It was a requirement that an independent person undertake the reports and they be signed off by the Service Director. It had become clear that the reports had not been good enough, as the Ofsted judgements following inspections at the Residential Homes would not have been such a surprise. Had the reports picked-up on the matters they would have been corrected immediately. The reports needed to be undertaken with rigour and detail and the quality of future reports would be a central focus.

Councillor Hamilton, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, requested that a spotlight review be undertaken in six-months' time on how the Regulation 44 visits were progressing, along with looking at the content and quality of reports and how the Local Authority was responding to them.

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed that herself and Councillor Ahmed had received communications about their new position as audit lead Member to the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board, as agreed at the previous meeting. She asked the officers present for an update on the audit process.

Councillor Ahmed, substitute lead Member, noted that the terms of reference for the audit process had been distributed. She had comments to add into this as part of the two-way process. She required clarity on how the outcomes and lessons learned from previous audits had been taken on board.

Resolved: - (1) That the minutes from the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission be agreed as an accurate record.

(2) That a future spotlight review consider the process and effectiveness of Regulation 44 reports.

34. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION'S SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE.

Councillor Hamilton, chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed Jan Bean, Safeguarding Adults and Domestic Abuse Manager, and Phil Liversidge, South Yorkshire Police, to the meeting. The Scrutiny Review had been considered at the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 23rd September, 2015 (Minute number 20).

Further information had been submitted, including the action plan relating to the progress against the recommendations as at September, 2015. The Service's storyboard had been included. It noted: -

- Consistent representation by a sufficiently senior childrens' social care manager who would share and disseminate information appropriately;
- The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) had gone live on 1st April, 2015, and it undertook 24-hour decision making;
- A concern of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Board that South Yorkshire Police were referring a high number of cases inappropriately. A new inbox had been created for 'blue' low-level contact;
- An agreement had been reached between Children's Social Care and South Yorkshire Police that this information would be retained on children's files;
- Threshold descriptors had been updated, merged into a single document and were being implemented;
- Strengthening Families training had been rolled out;
- Practice audits had found that decision making was largely sound;
- Performance management was a daily, weekly and monthly factor and managers had a real-time performance dashboard;
- Issues for further improvement included timeliness of referral to the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference;
- Further review was required on ensuring that national risk assessment models were jointly referred to by the police and the MASH;
- The effectiveness and attendance at the MARAC needed to be reviewed and addressed.

Jan and Phil reported that the Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVA) received and reviewed new referrals each morning along with the police and social workers.

Phil explained the previous figures quoted that stated there had been a 75% reduction in domestic abuse. Phil had spoken to the officers involved with submitting the information. They had confirmed that twelve high risk disputes had been identified and work had been undertaken to engage with the parties, including substance misuse support. Overall, of the twelve couples, there had been a 75% reduction in disruptions. The scheme had been repeated and a similar reduction had been found again.

Councillor Hamilton requested that a follow-up report be considered by the Improving Lives Select Commission in six-months' time in relation to this programme.

Discussion followed and the following issues were raised: -

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - 16/12/15

Councillor Hoddinott referred to the HMIC report into Domestic Violence and felt that there was real cause for concern around Police's handling of domestic abuse cases. It would be important to look at how the force was responding to contacts.

Councillor Hamilton asked how cases involving children were recorded? - Jan Bean described the process that her Service followed to ensure that children were appropriately followed-up.

Mr. M. Smith noted that the four workers was less than the recommended level. How was the Service coping with demand? – Jan spoke about how the scrutiny review recommendation on the staffing establishment had helped. There were more workers on permanent contracts, meaning that retaining high quality staff on stable contracts boosted the service. Prior to the scrutiny review staff had been on one-year rolling contracts; now staff were permanent employees. Prevention of domestic abuse was a priority for the Council.

Councillor Ahmed asked about the ways in which the Service analysed cases to ensure that delivery was relevant – were significant factors / triggers analysed? What links did the Service have with CAHMS and Adult Services? - Jan explained that the service was constantly evolving due to the nature of issues that it responded to. Recently it had completed work on so-called 'honour-based' violence. She explained that RDASH and CAHMS representatives attended, along with sections of Childrens' and Adults' Services.

Councillor M. Vines asked about the review of the e-learning on Domestic Abuse and if it included other agencies? – Jan explained that the aim of the training module, which was available for all staff, was to get them to be comfortable with identifying domestic violence in a safe way. The protocol with health would be signed-off in the new year.

Councillor Hamilton welcomed the progress that had been made and asked the Improving Lives Select Commission to agree that the Review be signed off. She requested an update on the working of the MARAC in six-months' time, to be considered alongside the HMIC report.

Resolved: - (1) That the Improving Lives Select Commission's Review of Domestic Abuse be signed-off.

(2) That a follow-up report on the MARAC's progress over the next six-months' be considered alongside the HMIC's report at a future meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

35. ROTHERHAM CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION NEEDS ANALYSIS.

Councillor Hamilton welcomed Jo Abbott, Consultant in Public Health, and Gary Ridgeway, Assistant Director (CSE Investigations), to the meeting to present the following reports: -

- Rotherham Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Analysis – CSE joint intelligence working group LSCB CSE sub-group (December, 2015);
- Needs Analysis Report following the Sexual Exploitation of Children in Rotherham – University of Salford Manchester (Final report, October, 2015).

Jo presented the reports: -

- She apologised for the delay in submitting the Needs Analysis to the Improving Lives Select Commission. It was the first attempt at producing a Needs Analysis and there was little to draw on nationally and Rotherham had been contacted by others for guidance;
- All figures were provided with a “Health Warning” as they were a snap shot in time (about one year ago) from various agencies. The figures provided a good proxy of services that were required;
- The CSE Needs Analysis had informed the commissioning of appropriate services for victims and survivors. It was not merely a paper exercise;
- As services were established, along with data recording systems, it was anticipated that data would be “firmed up” to assist in future needs analysis.

Key issues that had been found so far: -

- Lack of knowledge about age of consent;
- Gender inequality (girls classed a slags, whilst men receive credibility);
- Sexual violence viewed as “normal” and “inevitable” leading to a lack of reporting and disclosure;
- Health impacts – psychological trauma, self-harm and suicide;
- Many victims of undisclosed abuse were receiving support in mental health, drugs and alcohol, domestic violence and criminal justice system. Services may respond to presenting issues but be less effective in addressing the underlying trauma. Jo Abbott had been having discussion with Psychotherapists at RDASH to address this. She has been working closely with other agencies on

case based discussion and help to navigate to appropriate services and offer support;

- Support for survivors – Pyramid effect with a broad base and more specialist services at the top. Self-help was at the bottom of pyramid and support going through the court process, counselling and specialist mental health services were at the top;
- All the recommendations have been picked up in the CSE Action Plan.

Jo presented the information within the report undertaken by Salford University. This report was commissioned to hear the voices of victims and their families following being accused in reports of not listening and not being transparent. This has partly led to a lack of trust. The voices of victims and their families hold the key to what is happening and how to address it.

The Salford report: -

- Independent report carried out by the University of Salford;
- The objectives were to: -
 - Gain understanding and insight into the views of victims, survivors and their families affected by CSE from all sections of the population;
 - To better understand the scale and nature of CSE as it affects the diversity of minority groups with particular emphasis on Roma and Asian communities.
- Views were collected via focus group and online questionnaires. Participants did not shy away from explaining the difficulties they faced and issues of trust as past mistakes created a sense of vulnerability;
- There was evidence that healing was starting to take place amid determination to meet current and future needs with a sense of collective rigour;
- One quote: - “I don’t want to survive, I want to thrive”.

Questions and comments followed, and the following matters were covered: -

Councillor Ahmed asked why health referrals were so low and whether there were barriers to them reporting. - Jo explained that awareness raising was leading to increased reporting. Health staff were being given designated protected learning time.

Councillor Hamilton asked why high levels of chlamydia were being reported but there were low referrals from health partners? - Jo explained about the Sexual Health Strategy Group and the flag system that was in place to ensure that referrals were made following appropriate contacts, including following requests for emergency hormonal contraception.

Councillor Hoddinott asked what agencies had learnt from the reports. What was the feedback from victims and survivors on the reports? - Jo explained that the University of Salford was providing feedback to the victims and survivors who had contributed.

Gary explained how the reports had shown him how important the third sector was in meeting victims' needs.

Kay Denton-Tarn, Healthy Schools Consultant, explained that the issue of consent was part of national PSHE materials for secondary schools. It was also important that age-related appropriate information was shared throughout the school day; it should not just be confined to PSHE lessons. Equal choices, chances and expectations needed to be in place and their absence challenged.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether early intervention or targeted support could be provided to groups showing concerning attitudes? - Kay explained that this would be done separately on a case-by-case basis depending on the issues involved. Professional judgement would be important and school and family engagement was crucial.

Jean Imray referred to children's access to violent and sexually violent computer games was a concern of hers, along with wider issues of community cohesion and separation.

Councillor M. Vines asked how agencies were working with ethnic minority communities - There was some mistrust within ethnic minority groups. Third sector agencies needed to be made more accessible.

Councillor Rose asked what support was available for wider families of victims and survivors and the support and guardianship available for children born as a result of CSE? - Jo Smith explained about the counselling that was available, and how this often enabled victims to disclose other incidents which resulted in other agencies needing to become involved.

Councillor Ahmed asked about participation in the focus groups. Was this positive? Did ethnic minority groups participate in the questionnaires? - Jo Smith explained how fragile participation was. Support needed to be provided individually in order to not jeopardise justice processes.

Councillor Hoddinott was concerned that perpetrator groups had not been engaged with. She also asked how Mosque groups were being engaged with in the programme of CSE awareness raising? - Gary Ridgeway agreed and this had been recognised as an issue. He saw their involvement as being key to vocalising condemnation of CSE. Expertise was being shared across organisations and key workers were involved.

Councillor Hamilton asked what the biggest challenges were to delivering the recommendations of the report? - Gary Ridgeway's concern was the need for professionals to work across boundaries to achieve all the aims of victim support and bringing perpetrators to justice. This would involve moving from a narrow agenda and a cultural shift. Jean Imray required reassurance about resources. The Council was receptive to responding to demand but large scale and significant investigations were happening all of the time that had impacts on resources.

Resolved: - (1) That the covering report and the Local Safeguarding Children's Board and University of Salford reports be noted.

(2) That further updates be provided to the Improving Lives Select Commission in relation to progress against these reports.

(3) That the researchers from the University of Salford be invited to attend a future meeting of this Commission to discuss their report.

36. UPDATE ON MULTI-AGENCY REFERRAL PANEL.

Consideration was given to the report presented by Gary Ridgeway (Assistant Director (CSE Investigations)) that outlined the CSE multi-Agency Risk Management Panel (MARP).

The MARP was a monthly multi-agency group with a range of managers present with sufficient authority to make decisions in respect of their service and, if necessary, act outside traditional or accepted practice. The chair was the Superintendent Deputy District Policing Commander, the deputy chair and staff officer function was provided by an interim Assistant Director from the Council, and business support was also provided by RMBC. MARP considers potential victims, perpetrators, locations and it has a small strategic role regarding issues that may influence effective CSE service delivery.

MARP seeks to improve outcomes for young people believed to be at risk of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) by discussing difficult cases with the allocated social worker and initiating appropriate supportive activity. The MARP was not a review process of professional practice or a means of escalation where professionals did not agree. Although by its very nature MARP sometimes strays into these areas of practice, members were increasingly proficient at staying focused on adding value rather than review and critique.

At the time of the meeting there had been seven MARP meetings and two extra-ordinary meetings. Social Workers saw the panel as a helpful and constructive resource. The MARP had considered 24 high risk victims and had strong engagement with the third sector. There were also strong links with the Licensing Service.

Councillor M. Vines asked what sort of work had been carried out at the four locations considered by MARP? - Gary described the involvement of agencies and local authority officers, including the BME Engagement Officer, workers from the EVOLVE team, licensing and regulation teams, and education professionals.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether the MARP would be involved in taxi licensing issues. - Gary felt that this could lead to duplication of commissioner work and the lead for liaison lay with the CSE sub-group. However, the MARP was communicating with licensing on actions to be taken forward.

Councillor Ahmed asked if there were any partners who were signed-up but not participating? - Gary outlined how the experience had been that there was a need for an 18+ MARP with Adult Social Care.

Councillor Ahmed asked about Make Safe. - Gary outlined the work that had taken place with hotels and food outlets.

Councillor Hamilton asked how the MARP recorded their successes and how case recording was undertaken? – Each case was minuted and this information was circulated to each agency involved.

Resolved: - That the developments in respect of the Multi-Agency Referral Panel be noted.

37. OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS TO DATE OF THE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION DELIVERY PLAN 2015 - 2018 IN THE SPECIFIC AREAS OF VOICE AND INFLUENCE IMPACT AND WORK UNDERTAKEN IN SCHOOLS IN ROTHERHAM.

Kay Denton-Tarn, Healthy Schools Consultant, and Jo Smith, CSE Support Services Co-ordinator, had submitted a report that provided an update on Voice and Influence Work and work undertaken in Rotherham's schools in response to CSE.

The update outlined the activities taking place across a number of activity streams: -

- CSE Delivery Plan, 2015-2018;
- Voice and Influence;
- Rotherham Abuse Counselling Service (RACS) and Pit Stop for Men;
- Giving Real Opportunities to Women;

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - 16/12/15

- Rotherham Women's Refuse (RISE) – Project Survive;
- Swinton Lock;
- NSPCC Helpline;
- Barnardo's;
- Work undertaken in schools;
- Primary children childline/NSPCC school inputs;
- Keeping safe on-line;
- Anti-bullying work;
- Puberty Education Services;
- Theatre Education on CSE;
- KS3 Chelsea's Choice – all secondary and special schools and Pupil Referral Units in the Borough had signed-up to performances;
- KS4 Working for Marcus – all but three schools had signed-up to a performance;
- Drugs Lifestory project.

Councillor M. Vines asked about take-up and funding of the theatre presentations in schools. - Kay explained that funding within primary schools was more difficult. Barnardo's funding had provided 8-12 workers to introduce CSE in an age-appropriate way.

Councillor Hoddinott asked what outcome monitoring had taken place? - Kay explained that this had been via CCG and Public Health funding.

Councillor Hamilton asked how on-line grooming and bullying was addressed by schools as there was often a link to peers within schools. - Jo outlined the Barnardo sessions presented in schools and drop-in sessions that were available. Kay explained that there was an anti-bullying officer who provided support on conflict resolution, awareness raising about on-line CSE. Rotherham's City Learning Centres offered E-safety support. Schools also had strict in-house policies on technology.

Councillor Hamilton explained how damaging bullying could be to self-esteem. She wanted to see more on-line resources offering Rotherham's youngsters support on these issues. She asked how the available information would be consistently kept up to date and whether innovative methods were being explored. - Kay described how the CCG funding had been used to quickly provide impactful resources. At risk/ vulnerable young people and their families had been invited to two evening performances. Barnardo's provision was joining-up with the Needs Analysis.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether survivors had seen any of the performances and provided feedback on it? - Gary explained that 'Chelsea's Choice' had been researched nationally with survivors.

Resolved: - That the report on voice and influence work and work undertaken in Rotherham's schools be noted.

38. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 3rd February, 2016, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
25th November, 2015

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Cutts, Gosling, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, Rosling and Whelbourn, together with co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance:- Advisory Cabinet Member Councillor Sims.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, C. Vines, Whysall and Wyatt.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

26. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

27. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

28. BUDGET PROPOSALS AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - WASTE, ROADS AND ENFORCEMENT

Further to Minute Nos. 112 and 113 of Commissioner Manzie's Meeting held on 15th October, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Officer, concerning the budget savings proposal for the Advisory Cabinet portfolio for the Waste, Roads and Enforcement. Included with the report were:-

Appendix A – the savings proposals for this portfolio, amounting to £1.289 millions over the three years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy from 2016/17 to 2018/19; and

Appendix B – the report, about the savings proposals, which has been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

The report and appendices referred to specific savings proposals in respect of:-

Waste Treatment
Waste Collection
Winter Maintenance

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

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 25/11/15

- the cost benefits which could be achieved by the extraction of carpets and mattresses from the general waste and disposing of them via the Sub-Regional Waste Plant;
- Members suggested that the issue of recycling (previously within the purview of the Recycling Group) should be considered by the Waste Management Task and Finish Group of this Select Commission;
- waste collection and rationalisation of the staffing structure, which will facilitate the achievement of savings;
- Vehicle Fleet Renewal – changing the type of vehicle used to support the kerbside collection of dry recyclables;
- use of an alternate week collection of domestic refuse during the Christmas and New Year holiday period – the Commissioners have agreed this proposal, with the facility for the collection of a reasonable amount of additional refuse placed at the side of wheeled bins; the household waste recycling centres will also be opened on an additional number of days (but not on Bank Holidays); the arrangements will include some collections on Saturdays (and on one Sunday) and no household should have an interval of more than fifteen days between collections of the 'black bin'; there will also be a collection of dry recyclables during the Christmas and New Year holiday period;
- although there is no collection of plastic materials for recycling at the kerbside; the waste disposal contract does enable plastic materials to be extracted from the general waste stream and sent for recycling;
- reducing the number of vehicles required to grit/salt the highway; rationalisation of routes to minimise vehicle travelling distances when no gritting/salting occurs; there will be no reduction in the amount and length of highway being gritted;
- reliability of the vehicles used for the gritting and salting of highways; there is a ratio of one spare vehicle for five operational vehicles.

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

(2) That the revenue budget savings proposals, as now detailed in the submitted report, be accepted and referred for further consideration by the Commissioners and by the Council.

29. HEALTH REVIEW ON WASTE

The Director of Streetpride reported that the Council's Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Services had been included in the recent Health Checks of a number of key Council services (some others being Housing,

Planning and Development, Leisure, Culture and Sport, Transportation and Highways). The Health Checks had been undertaken by a peer group of local government officers from other local authorities, during the period 20th to 22nd October, 2015.

The outcome of the Health Checks were several positive issues, others that were negative and also some challenges facing these services. Some initial feedback has been received, although the final written report of this Health Check is still awaited.

(i) Positive issues

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham waste PFI project is regarded, nationally, as an exemplar, 'milestone' project; the Health Check has suggested that this joint working partnership (inter-authority agreement) could be extended to incorporate more waste disposal contracts and further work on this issue will be undertaken in the future.

(ii) Negative Issues

Refuse Collection – during the Summer 2015, a number of household bins had not been emptied on the scheduled day; refuse collection vehicles had questionable reliability; issues concerning the recruitment and retention of light goods vehicle-trained drivers (some drivers are employed on a seasonal basis for seven months, usually for the green waste collection vehicles). A collection round missed on one day would have consequent effects on subsequent days' collections. There is concern that some staff may lack a 'citizen focus'. Refuse collection is a public-facing service and its quality often impacts upon the reputation of a local authority. Sickness absence may impact upon the deployment of refuse collection crews. The work is physical and demanding, although sickness absence rates had been higher than expected during the Summer 2015.

(iii) Challenges

- Commercial and trade waste - the opportunity exists to develop this service and to generate more income; work should take place in partnership with the Barnsley and Doncaster local authorities in order to expand the nature of this service;
- Service Management stability, in view of the personnel changes currently taking place;
- the current uncertainty in terms of the Council's budget position and the shape of the waste collection and waste disposal services in the future;

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 25/11/15

- the proposed re-organisation, by the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council, in order to align the Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Services with other street-based services, so as to facilitate better service resilience;
- the proposed development of a service improvement plan, so that the service may achieve the highest standard possible.

During discussion, Members of the Select Commission raised a number of issues relating to this health check:-

- o the consistency of the scheduled household refuse collection days;
- o changes to the configuration of the refuse collection rounds and the replacement of refuse collection vehicles;
- o the bank of employees (and use of employees via employment agencies); the green waste vehicle drivers (employed on a seasonal contract) are likely to be retained;
- o Commercial and Trade Waste Collection – currently, there is no marketing of the Council’s own service; this matter will be discussed with representatives of both the Barnsley and Doncaster Councils;
- o Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2011, which enables local authorities to challenge businesses about the quality of their waste disposal arrangements;
- o internal partnerships within the Borough Council - the link between refuse collection services, street cleansing and Winter maintenance could be improved;
- o Enforcement - undertaking a wider range of duties and adopting a holistic approach;
- o Sickness absence monitoring and assessing the fitness levels of refuse collection operatives; the emphasis on training and safe working practices; the use of physiotherapy and occupational health services.

Resolved:- (1) That the information, now discussed, concerning the recent health check of this Council’s Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Services be noted.

(2) That the official report of the recent health check of this Council’s Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Services, when available, shall be referred to the Waste Management Task and Finish Group of this Select Commission for initial consideration.

(3) That, further to resolution (2) above, consideration be given to the development and implementation of an action plan arising from the Health Check of this Council's Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Services and a report on this matter be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

30. ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE - CAR PARKING

Further to Minute No. 16 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 2nd September, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor J. Rosling (Chair of the Task and Finish Group) and by the Scrutiny Officer, concerning the preliminary findings of the investigation undertaken by this Select Commission's Task and Finish Group into car parking within the Rotherham town centre. The report of the investigation referred to:-

- the Rotherham town centre economy (business, commercial and retail);
- the availability of both on-street and off-street, short-stay and long-stay car parking within the Rotherham town centre; and whether there is a sufficient amount of short-stay car parking space available;
- car parking tariffs and the issue of whether parking should be available free of charge at certain times;
- the proposed development, by the Council, of a car parking policy;
- the Council's existing car parking enforcement policy;
- 'Blue Badge' parking areas for vehicles used by people with a disability and the action taken to prevent the fraudulent use of such parking areas;
- Rotherham town centre shopper survey (2012);
- the Council's regular dialogue with Rotherham town centre businesses and traders;
- the Council's Transportation Policy which encourages the use of alternative forms of transport to the motor car;
- the refreshed and developing Rotherham town centre master plan (Arup consultancy);
- whether there should be a review of the pedestrianised areas within the Rotherham town centre;

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 25/11/15

- the report of this preliminary investigation contained recommendations for consideration by the Improving Places Select Commission;
- the Commissioners to the Council are also investigating issues concerning the Rotherham town centre.

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

- criticism of the previous use of some of the town centre's car park sites for new building development;
- the car parking master plan will be aligned with the Rotherham town centre development master plan;
- the card payment system, introduced for the Wellgate multi-storey car park, has been well-received by users of the car park; a similar system could possibly be introduced at other car parks;
- the need to ensure that the recommendations of the report of this Task and Finish Group are progressed, initially by reporting to the Commissioners;
- the increasing residential use of buildings within the Rotherham town centre and the limited space available for residents' own car parking; the option of 'car free' housing (ie: no car space available) in appropriate locations; where appropriate, concessionary permits may be provided, enabling residents to use the Council's own car parks, in exceptional cases.

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

(2) That the report recommendations of this preliminary investigation by the Task and Finish Group, as now submitted, be referred for consideration by the Commissioners and by the Council.

(3) That the draft Rotherham town centre master plan be submitted to the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission to be held on Wednesday, 20th January, 2015 for consideration.

31. TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 16 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 2nd September, 2015, discussion took place on the progress of each of the Task and Finish Groups which had been established to consider the detail of the Council's 'Cleaner – Greener' agenda. The reports of each Group were:-

(a) Group 1 - Waste Management (Chair – Councillor Godfrey)

The Group is undertaking an examination of the operation of household waste recycling centres, involving a visit to Selby District Council which charges householders for the use of the waste recycling centres. A visit had also been made to Nottingham City Council to assess the arrangements for the collection of commercial and trade waste. Discussions continue with the British Heart Foundation which has arrangements with some local authorities (eg: Elmbridge District Council) for the kerbside collection of bulky items, textiles and small electrical goods. There will also be a visit to the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Venture waste disposal site at Wath-Manvers during December 2015.

(b) Group 2 - Leisure and Community Services (Chair – Councillor Atkin)

The work of this Task and Finish Group has been held in abeyance until the other groups have reported. A meeting is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, 1st December, 2015, for discussion of the problem of littering and the responsibility of shops and retail outlets to prevent littering.

Resolved:- That the information be noted and the reports of these Task and Finish Groups be considered at future meetings of the Improving Places Select Commission.

32. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH OCTOBER, 2015

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 14th October, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
26th November, 2015

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

Also in attendance:- Commissioner S. Manzie, Advisory Cabinet Members : Councillors Read, Roche and Sims, together with Mrs D. Thomas (Centre for Public Scrutiny).

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

52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

53. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

54. PRESENTATION ON DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board received a presentation from Commissioner Manzie concerning the Council's draft Corporate Plan and Performance Management Framework. The presentation highlighted:-

- : the Council's overall vision, direction and priorities;
- : clarity and accountability;
- : strategic actions, service-related actions and performance indicators (eg: the caseload of individual social workers);
- : ensuring that the Council works in a modern, efficient way (including governance of the Council);
- : connecting all services, teams and individuals to the corporate priorities of the Council;
- : the importance of continuing scrutiny of the Council's Corporate Plan and Performance Management Framework;
- : measurement of Council service performance against national indicators and bench-marking processes.

Members discussed various salient issues, as follows:-

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 26/11/15

- : the role of Elected Members in ensuring the implementation of the Council's Corporate Plan;
- : maintaining service performance in the light of budget pressures and in accordance with the Council's vision and priorities.

Resolved:- That the contents of the presentation be noted.

55. BUDGET UPDATE FROM THE COMMISSIONERS - BUDGET SAVINGS PROPOSALS

Further to Minute No. 124 of Commissioner Manzie's meeting held on 20th November, 2015, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Interim Strategic Director of Resources and Transformation, concerning additional budget savings proposals for the three financial years from 2016/17. Specifically, the report recommended that additional savings proposals should now be considered, totalling £5.833 millions, for the period 2016/17 to 2018/19. The proposals were listed in the submitted report according to the Advisory Cabinet Portfolios of the Leader, the Deputy Leader, Adult Social Care and Health and Housing and the Local Economy.

During discussion of this item, Members raised the following salient issues:-

- : the revenue budget for street services and community safety related services were being considered in detail and reports would be submitted to Commissioners and to Elected Members in the near future;
- : Rotherham Industrial Development Office – proposed restructuring; business rates; availability and use of external funding;
- : the Library Service and the role of libraries in supporting the delivery of other Council services; use of volunteers in libraries;
- : Rother Valley Country Park – car parking charges;
- : Rotherham Town Centre – Visitor Centre;
- : Public Health – year-on-year efficiency saving on the provider of the Integrated Sexual Health Service (TRFT); community dietetics;
- : Human Resources – shared service centre;
- : waste collection and recycling (including the recycling of plastic materials);
- : collection of household waste, including collections during the Christmas and New Year holiday period;

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 26/11/15

- : off-road vehicle prevention budget (preventing unauthorised access onto land) – capitalisation;
- : Country Parks – staffing complement of rangers; maintenance of facilities and sites;
- : increasing the generation of income to the Council and the consequences of income targets not being achieved;
- : review of the Council's Internal Audit Service (review by Price, Waterhouse and Cooper, consultants);
- : Legal Services and business support;
- : the forecast savings across the three financial years 2016/17 to 2018/19 and further savings proposals being prepared for future consideration by Commissioners and by Elected Members during December 2015 and January 2016.

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

(2) That the revenue budget savings proposals, as now detailed in the submitted reports, be accepted and referred for further consideration by the Commissioners and by the Council.

(3) That the Commissioners be requested to clarify the budget setting time-frame and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board shall arrange further meetings to consider the revenue budget savings proposals, during the weeks prior to the setting of the Council Tax by the Council at its meeting to be held on Wednesday, 2nd March 2016.

56. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 2015

Further to Minute No. 123 of Commissioner Manzie's meeting held on 17th November, 2015, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Chief Finance Manager, containing details of progress on the delivery of the Council's current year Revenue Budget for 2015/16 based on performance to 30th September, 2015. The Revenue Budget currently forecast an outturn of £10.353m (+5.1%) above budget. The forecast outturn position had deteriorated by £0.906m since the August 2015 monitoring report.

Key pressures contributing to the forecast overspend (£10.353m) were:-

- The continuing service demand and agency staffing cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough and the strengthening of Social Work and management capacity;
- Improvements made to Social Work staff terms and conditions of employment to help attract and retain good staff – this not only

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 26/11/15

improves the possibility of greater stability for relations with the children supported leading to better outcomes, but also reduced costs overall through less reliance on more costly agency staff;

- Demand pressures for Direct Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients and clients with Mental Health needs; and
- The continuing budget pressures which may affect the use of the Council's balances and reserves.

Radical action and the continued close management of spending was required urgently if the Council was to deliver a balanced outturn for the 2015/16 financial year.

A number of 2016/17 budget savings proposals have already been agreed (some only requiring Officer approval through delegated powers) which would also contribute towards in-year savings in 2015/16. As these proposals materialised, their impact on the forecast outturn would be reflected in future revenue budget monitoring reports.

Additionally, the financial impact of any decisions to release staff through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement would be factored in to future budget monitoring reports at the earliest opportunity. It was expected that these decisions would reduce the current forecast overspend.

Reference was also made to the Commissioners working with Central Government to ascertain whether specific financial assistance to support the delivery of the Council's Corporate Improvement Plan and its Children's Services Improvement Plan could be made available. Also, the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Autumn Statement in Parliament (25th November, 2015) had included the likely future permission for local authorities to use receipts from the sale of fixed assets for revenue purposes, linked to reform.

Discussion took place on the difficulties associated with the management of spending in respect of the budgets for Children and Young People's Services and for Adult Social Care.

Members also asked questions about the Education Support Grant, academies and free schools, school place planning, the costs of elections, the New Homes Bonus and the investment money which the Council has reclaimed from the Icelandic banks (a further, residual sum of money is still to be reclaimed).

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

(2) That the decisions affecting the revenue budget, taken by Commissioner Manzie at her meeting held on 17th November, 2015, be noted.

(3) That, to enable the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to continue its detailed monitoring of the Council's revenue budget:-

(a) revenue budget monitoring reports continue to be submitted to the Management Board at intervals of three months;

(b) monitoring reports on the revenue budget for Children and Young People's Services shall be submitted to the Management Board's meeting to be held on 22nd January, 2016 and every alternate month thereafter; and

(c) monitoring reports on the revenue budget for Adult Social Care shall be submitted to the Management Board's meeting to be held on 26th February, 2016 and every alternate month thereafter.

(4) That, further to resolution (3) above, the detailed monitoring of specific issues relating to the revenue budgets for Children and Young People's Services and for Adult Social Care shall be facilitated by reporting principally to the Improving Lives Select Commission and to other Select Commissions as appropriate.

57. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23RD OCTOBER, 2015

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 23rd October, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

58. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

Reference was made to the impending restructuring of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, currently under consideration by the Council and by the South Yorkshire Police.

59. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Members noted that, during the previous Children's Commissioner Day and at its meeting held on 27th February 2014, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had received a presentation from members of the Youth Cabinet about the Youth Cabinet's study of self-harming amongst young people and the advice services available to people who are at risk of self-harm. Continuing that work, the next Children's Commissioner Day will concentrate upon the study of mental health issues affecting young people.

It was also noted that several workshops have already taken place, involving Youth Cabinet members and Councillors representing both the Health Select Commission and the Improving Lives Select Commission, to give initial consideration to the most important issues and to prioritise the key themes for this study of mental health.

A planning meeting of the Youth Cabinet is scheduled to take place during the evening of Monday, 14th December, 2015 and it was agreed that the representatives of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at that planning meeting shall be the Chairman and Councillors Beck, Hamilton and Sansome.

60. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

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

- : Members' involvement in meetings of the communications engagement sub-group;
- : Members' attendance at an event for Rotherham GPs about Health Care;
- : Consideration of issues concerning quality care and also the Ambulance service;
- : The Select Commission's next meeting will include consideration of intermediate and locality care.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

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

- : Waste and Environment Budget (including Streetpride Services) – consideration of revenue budget savings proposals;
- : Initial discussion about the health check of the Council's Waste services;
- : Task and Finish groups – (i) consideration of the report of the preliminary study of car parking issues affecting the Rotherham town centre; and (ii) a report about fly tipping and litter will be considered early in 2016;
- : Future consideration of the draft Rotherham town centre master plan.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

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

- : Consideration of issues affecting children's residential homes (including the closure of the Woodview residential home, Kimberworth Park);
- : Consideration of the operation of the Early Help Service;
- : Future consideration of the report of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse and also of a report about the safeguarding of children;
- : Members have had meetings with some of the survivors of child sexual exploitation;

- : Visit by Members to Birmingham City Council for discussion about the scrutiny of issues concerning child sexual exploitation.

Audit Committee:-

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

- : Mid-Year Treasury Management and Prudential Indicators;
- : KPMG Annual Audit letter;
- : Corporate Improvement Plan – governance items;
- : External Audit and Inspection recommendations;
- : Finance and Corporate Services risk register;
- : A further joint working meeting is scheduled to take place during early December 2015.

61. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

62. BUDGET UPDATE FROM THE COMMISSIONERS - MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2016/17 TO 2018/19

Consideration was given to a report, presented by Interim Strategic Director of Resources and Transformation, containing the current draft of this Council's outline Medium Term Financial Strategy document, for the three years' period 2016/17 to 2018/19, which set out the framework for understanding the challenges faced by the Council and examined the options for meeting those challenges.

The report stated that the Medium Term Financial Strategy was expected to require further amendment when the final spending settlement for the Council from Central Government was confirmed in December 2015, with a finalised version of the Strategy due by the end of February 2016.

The following issues were highlighted during discussion:-

- : the continuing development of the Medium Term Financial Strategy to ensure that it is sustainable, in accordance with the improvement plan arising from the report about the Council by Louise Casey;
- : financial pressures arising from the Autumn 2015 Budget Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review (eg: the payment of the living wage and ensuring such payment is being made);

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 26/11/15

- : the continuing strategic review of the Council's budget;
- : Central Government proposals for the localisation of business rates; the likelihood of appeal cases; ensuring a consistent approach by the local authorities of the Sheffield City Region;
- : the Council's budget priorities, value for money, the need for maximum productivity and the specific budgetary pressures of Children and Young People's Services and Adult Social Care;
- : service delivery either by the Council's own, in-house service, by joint/shared arrangements with other local authorities, or by private sector organisations or by organisations within the voluntary and community sector;
- : the management of employee sickness absence;
- : the dialogue with the private sector (eg: Chamber of Commerce and Trade) about the delivery of Council services.

Members were invited to inform both Commissioner Manzie and the Interim Strategic Director of Resources and Transformation of any comments they may have on the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy document.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes in particular:-

(a) the update on the Council's budget setting process;

(b) the projected Budget Challenge facing the Council during the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy, 2016/17 to 2018/19;

(c) the Objectives of the Medium Term Financial Strategy;

(d) the Financial Strategy planning assumptions, as now reported;

(e) the proposals for the delivery and monitoring of the Medium Term Financial Strategy; and

(f) that the Commissioners will finalise the contents of the Medium Term Financial Strategy document prior to the document being considered at the Council meeting to be held on Wednesday, 9th December, 2015.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
11th December, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Hamilton, Mallinder, Julie Turner, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hughes and Sansome.

63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wyatt declared a personal interest in Minute No. 65 (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) – member of RDaSH and relative who works in the NHS.

64. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

65. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW: CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Further to Minute No. 109 of the 24th April, 2015, meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board and Minute Nos. 17 (13th October, 2015) and 25 (18th November, 2015) of Commissioner Newsam's Decision Making, consideration was given to a report, presented by Paul Theaker, Operational Commissioner, concerning the updated response to Scrutiny Review of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.

Although the principal focus of the Scrutiny Review was RDaSH CaMHS, the services were part of a complex system of services, commissioning and provision and the recent changes to RDaSH CaMHS, such as the reconfigured Duty Team and self-referral, were positive. However, the quality of data provided by RDaSH CaHMS remained an issue and greater attention should be paid to improving and measuring outcomes. Prevention and early intervention should remain a focus to try and reduce the number of young people needing support at higher levels or continuing into adulthood, given the emergence of many lifelong conditions during adolescence.

More flexible services across a range of community settings and greater links to Youth Services and schools were a priority to progress further. The volume of referrals to RDaSH was high and, although waiting times had been reduced for routine assessments, the target was still being exceeded with the service likely to continue to face high demand.

The improved communication between agencies and with families, clear access criteria, referral and care pathways and renewed attention on health promotion, self-help and early support through the CaHMS transformation work would help to reduce the number of young people with deteriorating mental health and emotional wellbeing.

During discussion of the report, Members raised the following salient issues:-

- Monitoring/scrutinising by the Local Authority and the Department of Health
- There had been a delay in submitting the report but this had been to allow the Scrutiny Review to dovetail with the CaHMS Transformation Plan
- Key strands of the Transformation Plan was PHSE and prevention and early intervention
- A whole school and whole community approach was being taken forward. CaHMS locality workers would work alongside schools to provide support and advice. A meeting had taken place recently with community partnerships in terms of developing the community grassroots work
- In terms of response to Mental Health issues, RDaSH were developing, as part of their new structure, locality workers across the Borough. There was also a workforce development strand and developing needs such as screening tools and putting on basic awareness training for all the children's workforce so as to identify signs and work and support young people in the community
- Work was taking place with the voluntary sector's Children and Young People's Consortium to identify partners in localities
- NHS England was the commissioner for the expensive out-of-authority placements and had been involved in the Transformation Plan but not specifically in terms of prevention and early intervention. There were discussions locally to develop a Tier 3+ service with the aim of supporting the young people at home or in the local community and not progressing into Tier 4
- Part of the prevention and early intervention work was the development of a screening tool and awareness training. The aim was to roll out a piece of training, Mental Health First Aid, to School Nurses
- The Children's Partnership Group, comprising of representatives from all of the statutory organisations as well as the voluntary sector and commissioners, would monitor the transformation plan

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

(2) That the ongoing monitoring of the action plan be undertaken by the Health Select Commission on behalf of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

66. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

67. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Members noted that a planning meeting was to be held on 14th December, 2015, with the Youth Cabinet for the Children's Commissioner Day. Also to be discussed would be the Scrutiny Review response to the CaHMS transformation.

68. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH NOVEMBER, 2015

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

69. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

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

- Development of the new Rotherham Carers Strategy
- Update on the current position with regard to the Better Care Fund which was to continue next year although the national requirements had not yet been specified
- The RFT Quality Accounts half yearly update and progress report
- There was to be a special meeting on 17th December to look at the Adult and Older People's Mental Health Transformation and development of a Single Point of Access

Improving Places Select Commission:-

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

- The work of the Waste Task and Finish Group was coming to the end of its deliberations. At the Group's next meeting consideration would be given to the Waste Health Check report carried out by a peer mentor from Nottingham County Council. It was hoped the final report would be ready for the Select Commission in January

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Chair reported that the next meeting of the Lives Select Commission was to be held on 16th December. Agenda items included:-

- Rotherham CSE Needs Analysis
- Update on the Multi-Agency Referral Panel

- Overview of progress to date of the Child Sexual Exploitation Delivery Plan 2015 - 2018 in the specific areas of Voice and Influence Impact and work undertaken in schools in Rotherham

Audit Committee:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Audit Committee:-

- Strategic Risk Register which was to be discussed at Minute No. 71

70. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.

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

71. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Colin Earl, Assistant Director Audit, ICT & Procurement, presented the Strategic Risk Register and powerpoint presentation giving an update on Risk Management as follows:-

- The position at RMBC
- Operational Risk Management
- Strategic Risk Management
- Improving Risk Management
- Responsibilities
- Role of the Audit Committee
- Priorities

The report contained, as an appendix, the latest position in relation to the Strategic Risk Register. Following criticism in the Casey report, work had been carried out to reinstate risk management arrangements including the production of a Strategic Risk Register. It signalled a new sharper approach involving a clearer distinction of the key risks affecting the organisation at a corporate level and ensuring cross-cutting assessment and review of key strategic tasks. The Risk Register would be updated once the Council agreed its corporate priorities.

There were three overall categories of risk Red, Amber, Green (RAG) representing varying degrees of exposure. Each category contains a range of risk scores, resulting in varying degrees of risk within each category.

The risks contained within the draft Register were:-

- Delivering the Corporate Improvement Plan
- Providing effective Children's and Adults Services
- Resources and Governance
- Rotherham, The Place (achieving the vision)
- Compliance and Resilience

Members discussed the following salient issues:-

- Newly appointed temporary Risk Manager
- Ownership of the Risk Register
- Funding of risk
- Challenging of Directorates
- Appointment of external auditors
- Audit Commission governance arrangements
- Possible move of Risk Management into Assistant Chief Executive's area of responsibility
- Internal Audit expertise in the area of Children's Services
- Insurance premiums
- Member development

Resolved:- (1) That the draft Strategic Risk Register be noted.

(2) That the newly appointed Risk Manager be invited to attend the February meeting of the Board.

(3) That Risk Management and an Elected Member's responsibility be included as part of the Member Development training for newly Elected Members.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
2nd December, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Sims, Steele and C. Vines.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members, the all-party selection panel chose Shokat Lal as their preferred candidate at final interviews on Wednesday, 2nd December, 2015.

Mr. Lal, currently Assistant Director of HR and Workforce Services at Coventry City Council, has 25 years' experience working in local authorities, with 13 of these being at Coventry in senior management roles. He has previously worked at Nottingham and Derby City Councils and currently holds a Board role at Southern Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group, as well as previously at Derby City Primary Care Trust.

Resolved:- That Shokat Lal be appointed Assistant Chief Executive.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
8th December, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Alam, Atkin, Beck, Buckley, Cowles, Cutts, Ellis, Godfrey, Gosling, Hamilton, Hughes, Jepson, Lelliott, Mallinder, McNeely, Parker, Russell, Sansome, John Turner, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Elliot, Fleming and Reeder.

AUTUMN STATEMENT, SPENDING REVIEW, BUDGET AND MTFS.

Councillor Read, Leader of the Council, introduced Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Manager, Financial Services, and Stuart Booth, Interim Strategic Director, Resources and Transformation Directorate, to the seminar to provide Elected Members with an update on the Autumn Statement, Spending Review, 2016/2017 budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy document.

The presentation covered: -

- £41.083m of savings were required over three years (£19.648 in 2016/2017);
- Growth requirements – some are unavoidable or essential additional spends, such as the social worker re-grade;
- Pension triennial re-evaluation, effective from April, 2017;
- 15th–18th December for provisional Settlement for one year only 2016-2017. This will allow the Government further time to consult;
- Key headlines of the Autumn Statement and Spending Review – 25th November, 2015: -
 - Business rates: - Retain 100% of rates by the end of the parliament;
 - Council Tax – 2% levy to be able to fund Adult Social Care (ringfenced). Referendum level set at 2% in 2015/2016, the level for 2016/2017 has not yet been announced. Will raise £2bn nationally. In Rotherham it would add £20.55 to a Band D bill and raise £1.7-1.8m. There was a £3.3m cost to Adult Social Care providers to pay their staff the Living Wage. Rotherham was unfairly disadvantaged due to low tax base and high levels of deprivation and need;
 - The Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire was allowed to increase the precept by £5, rather than 2%. There has been, as yet, no information on the increase to be set by the SYPCC;
 - Review of the New Homes Bonus. Reduce from six years to four, and a reduction in the amount paid. This funding would be recycled to partially fund the increase in funding to the Better Care Fund from 2017;
 - Public Health;

- Apprenticeship Levy was a PAYE commitment and would be a further £1m pressure on Rotherham's budget;
- Fixed assets - will be able to spend up to 100% of capital receipts on the revenue costs of reform projects;
- Schools – all become academies.

Budget process: -

- Major projects and Adult Social Care Development Plan were to feed into the process in December, 2015, and January, 2016;
- Some proposals are working through the process and being considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board;
- Other options to be considered: -
 - Level of Council Tax;
 - Use of Reserves;
 - Revenue / Technical adjustments as one-offs;
 - Government Support?
 - Have to set the Budget and Council Tax base by 2nd March, 2016, for the 2016/2017 financial year.

Discussion followed and the following questions and answers were made:-

Councillor Wyatt referred to the Better Care Fund and its principles of reduced admissions, improving discharge and prevention. Had there been analysis as to whether Rotherham would be a winner or loser if the New Homes Bonus funded the BCF?

Stuart Booth – Confirmed that this had not yet been done to detail. NHS funding, at a time when the NHS was in the most acute financial situation in its history, came with long-term risks. Accident and Emergency was coming to its most pressurised point of the year. The Local Authority had provided seven day social worker support at the hospital to enable discharges to be successful.

Councillor Parker asked about the announcement that local authorities would keep 100% of Business Rates. What was the detail behind this?

Stuart outlined the Business Rates Retention Scheme whereby there was a 50/50 share between local and national government (with a small percentage to fire authorities). 100% of the Business Rates levied would be kept under the Localism agenda. It was likely that this would lead to the ceasing of other schemes because local authorities would be thought to be £13bn better off. Was this a credible figure? There was further work to do on this. An in-principle deal of the Sheffield City Region's 'Stretch Target' related to additional growth being kept by Sheffield City Region local authorities.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 08/12/15

Councillor Turner thanked the Officers for their presentation. He did not feel any optimism and viewed the Local Authority as totally vulnerable. What was available in the Reserves?

Stuart explained that there was just over £11m. There were pressures in the system in the current year and potential further cuts down the line in future years. Overall, other local authorities were also not able to fully realise required savings in the same way.

Councillor Ellis asked what was a reform project?

Stuart explained that there had been no confirmed details yet. Further details, along with terms and conditions, were to follow.

Councillor Alam asked about the £1m apprentice levy on the Local Authority and asked if it would come back to local employers?

Stuart confirmed that it was applicable on all organisations with a pay bill in excess of £3m. He was not aware of recycle benefits to the local area.

Councillor Turner asked if there was a target for the sale of fixed assets?

Stuart confirmed that analysis was being undertaken on rationalising assets, with £22m available. In the current economic conditions values may not be easily realised.

Councillor Read thanked Peter and Stuart for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
5th January, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Wallis (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Beaumont, Currie, Elliot, Ellis, Godfrey, Hamilton, Jones, Khan, Parker, Pitchley, Price, Reeder, Rose, Rushforth, Sansome, Sims, Smith, Taylor, M. Vines, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson, McNeely and Watson.

SELECTIVE LICENSING.

Councillor E. Wallis, Advisory Cabinet Member for Housing, welcomed the Elected Members in attendance. She also welcomed Matt Finn, Community Protection Manager, to the seminar. Matt had prepared a presentation on the Selective Licensing scheme that had been in place in Rotherham since 1st May, 2015.

The presentation included: -

- Selective Licensing had a dedicated team to administer it;
- Admin and monitoring was funded wholly by licensing fees;
- Enforcement was funded by other Council resources, not from the licence fee income;
- There were inspections and 'Housing Health and Safety Rating System' (HHSRS) assessment of all properties as part of the scheme;
- Selective Licensing was licensing of privately rented housing in designated areas to meet specific aims;
- The cost was £592 per house, flat or small house in multiple occupation;
- Private rented houses in the selective licensing area must be licensed: -
 - There were limited exceptions, including close family lets and 21+ year tenancies by agreed changes to Deeds.
- The Selective Licensing aims joined up closely with the Housing Strategy Commitments;
- Matt shared the maps covering the areas that Selective Licensing covered: - Eastwood, Masbrough, Dinnington and Maltby;

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 05/01/16

- Matt explained why certain estates within the areas had been excluded from the Selective Licensing scheme.

The consultation process: -

- Ran for ten weeks;
- The majority of respondents were in favour;
- Many alternatives were considered during the process;
- Designations and formal notification was made in December, 2014.

The implementation process:-

- Communication with all stakeholders;
- Building preparation for the Judicial Review;
- 1st May, 2015, was the day of implementation;
- Selective Licensing worked as an integral part of wider neighbourhood enforcement work sharing skills, data, objectives, processes and systems;
- There was comprehensive guidance and information available via www.rotherham.gov.uk/landlordlicensing ;
- Applications checks were undertaken: -
 - Prior to licensing – information checks;
 - Fit and proper person test;
 - Bad debt test.

Conditions imposed by the Selective Licensing scheme: -

- There were 49 Conditions;
- Four mandatory Conditions: -
 - Gas safety and annual submission to the Council;
 - Electrical equipment and furniture safety;
 - Fire detection;
 - Written tenancy agreements.
- Other Conditions were: - property safety, management standards, security and environment and anti-social behaviour.

Compliance with the Selective Licensing scheme: -

- Initial inspection;
- Licence monitoring;
- Forward planning.

Performance against the Selective Licensing Scheme: -

- 855 (68%) applications had been received and had been processed through initial processing within the first 8 months;
- There were 513 licensed properties;
- 74 initial inspections had been completed: -

- There had been more hazards than anticipated in the properties inspected;
- The process was taking longer.
- The Year One target was to have 70% of properties licenced by April, 2016;
- The Year Two target was to have 85% of properties licenced by April, 2017;
- Enforcement.

The final section of Matt's presentation included issues and refinement relating to the current Selective Licensing scheme and national developments that were relevant.

Discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

Councillor Parker asked whether the Council sampled the inspections that had been conducted? Who was doing this? Can we trust the inspection outcomes? If there was a lag between independent inspection and sampling, it could put people at risk. How much power did the fit and proper person checks have? Were all Housing Associations exempt from Selective Licensing?

Matt agreed that the safety inspections would be problematic if there was no checking. It was a requirement that these were conducted independently. Sampling of the self-assessments did take place, and a small number had been conducted at the present time. The 'Fit and Proper' barrier did exist because the Service could not share a batch of information with the police. Housing associations were exempt by law and managed by the Homes Inspection Agency.

Councillor Currie asked whether the scheme would be widened to include all landlords in the Borough?

Matt referred to the level of uptake and differences to tenants' living conditions. It may be that, in the future, there was a case to extend the scheme into another area/s.

Councillor Wyatt asked if the council had had to bear any costs relating to the Judicial Review process?

Matt confirmed that the Council had been awarded an amount that covered the majority of costs incurred. The majority of the sum had been paid to the Council, but there was a balance remaining.

Councillor Ellis passed on her congratulations to the team for their successes so far. She had concerns about the fit and proper persons process. Could this be shared with other licensing services? Were there any trends of landlords selling up in the areas and buying in non-licensed areas?

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 05/01/16

Matt felt that this would dilute the problems and should see the loss of the areas' bad landlords.

Councillor Pitchley referred to rogue landlords in areas that were not licensed who fixed things when they know there would be an inspection.

Matt explained the communications that were made regardless of area.

Councillor Khan asked if a reduction in fly tipping had been observed? It was not unheard of for tenants to move on and wreck houses as they went.

Matt described how it was still early doors on fly tipping. Selective Licensing did have aims and expectations for landlord and tenant behaviour improvements. Many landlords were encouraged to use the reference system, including credit checks, previous landlord references and inspection of previous properties. This would check on tenant behaviour before they arrived.

Councillor Wallis thanked Matt Finn for his informative presentation and contribution to the discussion. She was convinced that there was a need for the scheme; two out of three properties inspected required work to remedy them, including fire safety measures. This could not be understated. Councillor Wallis paid tribute to the work of Councillor Godfrey who put the framework in place to improve people's lives and make a tangible difference.

Councillor Wallis thanked Matt and the Selective Licensing Team for their work and continuing efforts.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
5th January, 2016

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Commissioner Ney, Councillors Beck, Sims, Steele, C. Vines, Watson and Yasseen, Sharon Kemp, Chief Executive and Chief Superintendent Harwin.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY SAFETY

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members, the all-party selection panel chose Karen Hanson as their preferred candidate at final interviews on Tuesday, 5th January, 2016.

Ms. Hanson, currently Head of Service, Regulation and Enforcement at Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, has 27 years' experience working in various roles in local authorities and 13 years in roles related to community safety, having also worked in Nottinghamshire and West Sussex.

Resolved:- That Karen Hanson be appointed Assistant Director, Community Safety.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
8th January, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, Hoddinott, Parker, Roche, Steele and Watson.

APPOINTMENT OF STRATEGIC DIRECTOR, FINANCE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members, the all-party selection panel chose Judith Badger as their preferred candidate at final interviews on Friday, 8th January, 2016.

Ms. Badger, currently Assistant Chief Executive, Resources and Governance at Wakefield Metropolitan District Council, has 31 years' experience working in local authorities, with the last 11 years at Wakefield. She has previously worked at Doncaster Council and commenced her career with Rotherham Council, where she worked for 14 years.

Resolved:- That Judith Badger be appointed Strategic Director, Finance & Customer Services.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
11th January, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Burton, Currie, Elliot, Evans, Godfrey, Hamilton, Jepson, Lelliott, Mallinder, Parker, Roche, Sansome, Sims, Smith, John Turner, C. Vines, Wallis, Watson, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Beaumont, Buckley, Ellis, Fleming, Hughes, McNeely, Price, Rushforth, Taylor and Julie Turner.

8 SHEFFIELD CITY REGION - DEVOLUTION CONSULTATION.

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, welcomed the Elected Members in attendance at the Seminar. He also welcomed Councillor Sir Stephen Houghton to the Seminar. Councillor Sir Steve had prepared a presentation about the Sheffield City Region's devolution journey and the proposed devolution deal.

The presentation included a round-up of the existing Sheffield City Region: -

- The journey to the Sheffield City Region started in 1986;
- The Sheffield city Region had developed a ten-year plan for growth, based on more private sector jobs: -
 - Skills, employment and education;
 - Infrastructure;
 - Business growth.
- 70,000 more jobs to narrow the gap with other parts of the country;
- 6,000 more businesses to reduce the enterprise deficit;
- Approximately 30,000 more highly skilled occupations to create a more prosperous economy;
- Increased GVA in excess of £3bn to narrow the productivity gap.

The Sheffield City Region proposed devolution deal: -

- Intended economic deal – powers over the Police and Health Services do not form part of the remit;
- Part of the larger process and should not be considered to be the end-point of devolution;
- Intended that the directly-elected Mayor and Combined Authority will receive powers from Whitehall rather than aggregate powers from local areas;
- A stable, long-term financial settlement that puts the SCR in control of its own destiny: -
 - 30 year funding allocation;
 - 60/40 capital/revenue split;
 - National funding streams also to be devolved to the SCR as part of the single pot;

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 11/01/16

- Pilot the retention of 100% Business Rate Growth;
- On-going discussions about full localisation by 2017.

- An integrated 21st century transport network with greater intra- and inter-city region connectivity: -
 - Consolidated, devolved transport budget with a multi-year settlement;
 - Control of the powers and resources for the bus network in South Yorkshire;
 - Oyster style ticketing;
 - Transport for the North and HS2 and HS3;
 - Commitment to explore options for more planning powers over transport schemes delivery;
 - Identification of a Key Route Network of local authority roads that will be collaboratively managed and maintained.

- A world-leading area for innovation, advanced manufacturing and business growth;
- More people learning, earning, in apprenticeships and higher-skilled employment in the Sheffield City Region: -
 - Full devolution of the Adult Skills Budget for college and training providers;
 - SCR local skills strategy;
 - Co-design and commissioning of new employment programmes;
 - Development of a business case for an innovative pilot to support the hardest to help.

- Better use of publically owned assets and increased planning powers to double our housing delivery and increase commercial development: -
 - Best use of all public land and assets through an expanded Joint Assets Board;
 - Planning powers, including creation of a spatial framework. Potential to have call-in powers for applications of strategic importance;
 - A commitment to continue to discuss creating a flexible Housing Investment Fund.

- The totality of the deal spans the Sheffield City Region, including new powers to a South Yorkshire Mayor, as well as new powers and control over funding to the wider Sheffield City Region through the SCR Combined Authority;
- The Mayor would only be elected by the four South Yorkshire members of the CA and would only be able to exercise devolved powers over that footprint;
- The CA, chaired by the Mayor (which had secured new powers directly) will continue to operate and exercise its functions across all of the nine;
- Current legislation does not allow any of the five districts to become

- a member, but the emerging Bill could change this;
- The Mayor and the CA would be scrutinised and held to account by the SCR Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- The Mayor will chair the SCR Combined Authority and will lead an SCR Cabinet;
- Members of the SCR CA will serve as the Mayor's Cabinet and will act as a supporting and advisory function to the Mayor and the Combined Authority;
- Even powers residing with the Mayor would be subject to a SCR Cabinet veto if two-thirds of the members agreed to do so;
- The Mayor will also be a member of the LEP;
- The proposed division of powers between the Mayor and the CA was shared.

Discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

Councillor Parker asked whether it was true that all nine of the authorities had to sign-up to the deal in order for it to be valid? - Councillor Sir Steve explained that a deal could progress without all of the Sheffield City Region Local Authorities being signed up. There was one Local Authority that had concerns about the devolution deal, but these were being addressed and were unlikely to prove a barrier to the LA eventually signing up.

Councillor Wyatt asked about comparisons with Devolution Manchester and NHS Manchester. Transport for the North – HS2 and HS3 – what about connectivity between cities and towns, which was currently poor quality, diesel and foreign-owned fleet? Councillor Sir Steve confirmed that the SCR had not looked at the Health deal, as it would have taken it away from being a pure devolution deal and impacted on local councils. The Private Sector had asked for the focus to be on growing the economy. They had thought that other streams would be a distraction to this.

Beyond rail network, Transport for the North was in very early development stages and was currently considering governance issues.

Councillor Currie asked about the spending of the annual £30m allocation. Who will be paid out of this sum and who would ensure quality assurance? - Councillor Sir Steve referred to the two thirds veto – the Mayor would not be able to make decisions if there was a 2/3 vote against. The £30m would pay for the Mayor and their office and the SCR team. The infrastructure would need to be bigger than the current establishment as it would be doing significantly more. Discussions had started with the Local Authorities' Chief Executives to determine what could be done within individual councils on behalf of the SCR.

Councillor Wallis described how she had been reassured by the information shared, particularly the use of the money. Was this vindication over the closure of the regional organisations?

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 11/01/16

Councillor Parker asked about the business rates pilot. Was this only new business or all business rates that could be retained? - Councillor Sir Steve explained that the deal was 100% retention of the new business rates. It would also be discussed about the retention of all the business rates. Pooling rates could protect against fluctuations in business rates and would avoid 'dog fights' on where factories/major employment centres were sited within the SCR.

Councillor Burton asked what needed to be kept an eye on? - Councillor Sir Steve felt that the individual Mayor could be good, or not; the Constitution; Transport and Skills' budgets were reducing centrally and the SCR would pick them up as they declined.

Councillor Jepson asked whether the central government could withhold funds if they were not happy with how the SCR was spending it? - Councillor Sir Steve explained that there was nothing to prevent this. There would be five- year gateways on the thirty years, so performance management will be required: - 'Best defence is excellence'.

Councillor Sims asked about the key route network and whether the motorway network would remain with the Highways Agency? Would the SCR have to contribute to cost of HS2 and HS3? - Councillor Sir Steve confirmed that motorways would remain with the Highway Agency. HS3 – do not know, HS2 would not need to be covered.

Councillor John Turner asked about the airport and its potential. Currently underused and under-capacity but it had good facilities and linkages to major roads and motorways. It really could help out the region. – Councillor Sir Steve agreed the airport was crucial. There was a business plan to expand operations and businesses would be important. Stakeholders saw it as something that could transform the region.

Councillor Parker asked about the potential political loggerheads between the Mayor and SCR cabinet. Could these lead to stalemate? – Councillor Sir Steve explained that it was not usually the politics that divided SCR members, but the geography. Mayor can unite, inspire and so on.

Councillor Currie asked about potential for duplication. How will the SCR strategy protect against this? - Councillor Sir Steve explained the duty to co-operate and the SCR's strategic involvement.

Councillor Read thanked Councillor Sir Steve for his informative presentation and contribution to the discussion and questions. A full report to Council would follow in the not too distant future.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
Friday, 27th November, 2015

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor M. Dyson
Councillor R. Frost

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor A. Jones
Councillor G. Jones

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor E. Wallis

Sheffield City Council

Councillor J. Armstrong
Councillor J. Otten
Councillor S. Richards

Co-opted Members

Mr. A. Carter
Mr. Chufungleung

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Campbell (Sheffield), C. McGuinness (Doncaster) and C. Vines (Rotherham).

F27. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

27.1 Due to the long term absence of Councillor Bowler, nominations were sought for the position of Chair for the remainder of the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

Action: That Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards be appointed Chair until the Annual Meeting.
Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards in the Chair

F28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

28.1 A member of the public asked the following question:-

“As a layman and member of the public I have been led to believe and had the understanding that the Police Force as a whole was free from external influences with the mandate to keep the peace and maintain the law within society, therefore, free of external influences. If you accept the above in principle, can you explain why advertising on Police cars in South Yorkshire?”

28.2 Due to this question being of an operational nature, it was a matter for the Police Force and the Police Commissioner. The question will be forwarded directly to South Yorkshire Police.

28.3 A member of the press asked the following question:-

“Could you provide more explanation about why the Hillsborough costs item will be private? Which ‘individuals’ does the exempt information refer to, and why is information about them exempt when it is the subject of a public inquest, with the legal fees of senior ex-SYP officers funded by South Yorkshire tax payers and previously revealed in published spending records?”

28.4 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser, reported that, following the previous Police and Crime Panel meeting, the Coroner’s Office had contacted Rotherham Council in respect of the Hillsborough inquest in relation to possible Contempt of Court issues. As a result the papers that had been before the Panel had been removed from the website immediately and it was felt, going forward, that any issues relating to Hillsborough in the future should be dealt with in the confidential section of the meeting.

28.5 A member of the public asking the following questions:-

“At your meeting on 29th June, it was reported that Professor John Drew had been commissioned to review CSE in parts of South Yorkshire not covered by the Jay and Casey reports on Rotherham.

(a) When do you expect this review to be complete and the results publicised?

The comprehensive Engagement Strategy presented at the 16th October is welcome but may take time to implement e.g. PACT meetings, soon to be Community Safety meetings, which would require involvement from other partners e.g. Council, Fire and Rescue, NHS, Local Police Teams etc. which is not obvious in some areas.

(b) Can we suggest that satisfactory progress is monitored by a Scrutiny Committee with feedback from ordinary community members?”

28.6 With regard to question (a), the Police and Crime Commissioner reported that the review had commenced in September. Following a period of scoping it would conclude in late December, 2015/early January, 2016. It would be reported to the Police and Crime Panel shortly afterwards.

28.7 With regard to question (b), the Chair reported that scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner was work undertaken by the Panel and, therefore, would scrutinise the Engagement Strategy and how it was implemented. The Police and Crime Commissioner’s own Governance and Assurance Board would scrutinise the delivery of the Engagement

Strategy by the Force and Engagement Officers within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Legislation prescribed that the Police and Crime Panels were in place to scrutinise Commissioners in exercise of their statutory functions. It was, therefore, for this Police and Crime Panel to determine how it wished to perform that duty generally and specifically in relation to the progress being made to deliver the Strategy. The Commissioner was happy to provide regular updates to this Panel if it required such.

Members of the public were welcome to attend Panel meetings and ask questions. There were independent members on the Panel that reflected the community and organisations as well as Members who were Elected Members of the community.

Action: That the panel receives 6 monthly reports on the delivery of the Engagement Strategy - OPCC

F29. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16TH OCTOBER, 2015

29.1 Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 16th October, 2015.

Action: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th October, 2015, be approved for signature by the Chair.

F30. CSE UPDATE

30.1 In light of the communication from the Coroner's Court (see Minute No. 28), part of this item would be considered in the confidential part of the meeting due to possible Contempt of Court.

30.2 Dr. Alan Billings, the Police and Crime Commissioner, reported that as yet none of the Police Officers (both serving and retired) referred to the IPCC had been interviewed as yet. He had met representatives from the IPCC and urged them to speed up the process. He had been assured that additional resources would be employed. Other issues that were not directly related to the conduct of Officers but in relation to the culture of the Police Force itself had been picked up by Professor John Drew's report.

30.3 Disappointment was expressed that the interviewing of Officers had not commenced.

Action:- That a letter be sent to the IPCC expressing the Panel's disappointment with regard to the lack of progress – Immediate.

F31. REVISED COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

31.1 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser, submitted the current Complaints Procedure with suggested revisions.

31.2 The initial handling of complaints had previously been delegated by the Panel to the Monitoring Officer. However, following a review of the current procedure, an alternative means of operating the Procedure was proposed as set out in the flow chart at Appendix 1 of the report submitted. This was based on the procedure adopted by Hampshire PCP, amongst others, and which had been referred to in publications of the LGA as being good practice.

31.3 The revised procedure allowed for a 'triage/role for the Chief Executive of the OPCC following delegation of receipt and initial handling and recording functions of the Panel.

31.4 Members of the public may view the complaints process as not sufficiently independent should the proposed revisions be approved. However, there were a number of factors which would provide reassurance:-

- Regulation 13(1-3) required cases which were serious and criminal in nature to be investigated by the IPCC
- The Panel would monitor any 'triage' of complaints to check that complaints were sifted in a fair and transparent way. It was proposed that the 'triage of complaints' would be carried out in consultation with an Independent Member of the Panel
- If a complaint was made to a PCC about their own conduct, the PCC had to inform the Panel (under Regulation 9(4))
- The PCC or other relevant officer could not deal with complaints about themselves (Regulation 7(2))
- Ability of the IPCC to compel the Panel to record and refer a particular matter if it considers it to be in the public interest to do so
- Home Office did not consider that such a role for the Chief Executive of the OPCC represented a conflict of interest

31.5 If approved, the Chief Executive, in conjunction with an Independent Member of the Panel, would consider:-

- whether the complaint was a complaint against the Commissioner;
- was a complaint for which the Panel was the relevant Police and Crime Panel;
- whether it was a complaint at all or was a complaint relating to an operational matter of South Yorkshire Police to be resolved in accordance with the Force's complaints procedures.

31.6 The report included a flowchart illustrating the proposed handling of a complaint.

31.7 Discussion ensued on the proposal with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The proposed revision to procedure was seen as a more efficient way of dealing with matters. Officers in the OPCC had the experience and knowledge of dealing with such matters rather than the current practice
- Does the handling of the complaints by the Commissioner's Office not seem to be a less transparent process than the one in operation currently? Why take the risk of being less transparent?
- In accordance with the Regulations, any issues would be referred onto the IPCC or the Panel and any deviation would be in breach of the Regulations
- The Panel had limited resources and it was felt that if the initial handling of complaints could be delegated to the OPCC the Panel's resources could be used differently. There was no suggestion whatsoever that the PCP would no longer handle complaints about the Commissioner
- The most popular mechanism across the country for handling complaints was for the initial role to be delegated to the OPCC.

31.8 Mr. Carter, Independent Member, felt that the Independent Member would play a role in the new procedure, more so than within the present process which he felt was not transparent enough and that there was a far more efficient way of dealing with complaints than currently adopted. The Panel needed to monitor/report on complaints to the Panel on a regular basis. The revised procedure should be implemented with himself and his fellow colleague undertaking to report to each Panel meeting of any complaint(s) there had been and what their involvement had been to assure the Panel that matters were being dealt with in a proper and responsible manner.

31.9 Mr. Chufungleung requested information on the following:-

- Clarity as to whether the procedure would just be applicable to the Commissioner himself or the OPCC and if not and the complaint was with regard to the OPCC, what was the procedure for those?
Yes the procedure only related to the Police and Crime Commissioner as set down in the Legislation. However, the Home Office was looking at a national Code of Conduct for Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners.

With regard to transparency, an Independent Member would sit with the Chief Executive in the early stages of the process and witness the decision making and exercise of judgement to reassure themselves and the Panel that the duty had been exercised efficiently.

- If the complaint was to be dealt with by the Panel, it appeared that the only possible outcomes would be Informal Resolution and the IPCC. Were there other complaints in between that could be potentially dealt with by other means?
The OPCC had its own internal complaints procedure, details of which were available on the website. There was a large section on informal resolution and the IPCC but there were other means, as set out in the report submitted, of the Chief Executive fulfilling the triage role.
- To go straight to the Panel's Complaints Sub-Committee may seem to be overkill particularly if something had been resolved informally. Why did it have to go to the Complaints Sub-Committee?
A matter would not be referred straight to the Sub-Committee; if it appeared that the issue could be resolved through discussion/correspondence that would be the route pursued.
- Was there an appeal process
There was no appeal in these circumstances.
- Was there a route to the Local Government Ombudsman if the procedure had been exhausted?
There was a route to the Ombudsman if a complainant was not satisfied.

Having heard the above, Councillor Otten still felt concerned with regard to the issue of transparency and opposed the proposal to revise the procedure.

Action:- (1) That the receipt, initial handling and recording of complaints in respect of the Police and Crime Commissioner be delegated to the Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

(2) That a revised Complaints Procedure and Protocol be prepared based on the changes set out in the report submitted.

F32. UPDATE ON THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS

32.1 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser, presented a report on the handling of complaints received against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

32.2 The following complaints had been resolved:-

1. A complaint that the Police and Crime Commissioner had used his official tax payers funded office to promote his own religious activities and his book by means of issuing a press release.

The Police and Crime Commissioner had issued a statement apologising for asking the OPCC's communications team to release a press notice he had written to publicise a seminar he was leading on with regard to his book.

This had been an acceptable outcome to the complainant and, therefore, the complaint was considered resolved.

2. A complaint in relation to the Police and Crime Commissioner's declaration of interest form in that it appeared that the Commissioner did not live anywhere in South Yorkshire or he was not declaring it.

The Commissioner, to remove any doubt, had now made it clear on the form that he owned a flat in Sheffield jointly with his wife. He had asked for the guidance notes to be amended to ensure clarity in the future.

This was an acceptable outcome to the complainant and, therefore, the complaint was considered resolved.

3. Councillor C. Vines, a Police and Crime Panel member, had raised an issue in respect of the previous Crime Commissioner's security costs being paid for by the tax payer which to date had not been recovered. Councillor Vines had requested that the matter be considered by the Panel.

The OPCC had confirmed that information relating to the home security of the previous Commissioner had been published on the PCC's website in response to a number of Freedom of Information requests.

The OPCC had confirmed that any equipment that would not cause damage to the property if removed had been received on 22nd October, 2014, to the value of £6,172.00. The work had been completed at no cost to the taxpayer.

32.3 There were three other complaints which were the subject of ongoing informal resolution the conclusion of which would be reported to future Panel meetings.

Action: That the report be received and the contents noted.

F33. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (contains information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime and information relating to the financial affairs of particular persons).

F34. CSE UPDATE

34.1 Dr. Alan Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, gave a brief verbal update in respect of those Police Officers being investigated in relation to child sexual exploitation.

Action:- That the report be noted.

F35. THE FUNDING OF HILLSBOROUGH LEGAL COSTS

35.1 Dr. Alan Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, presented an update on the funding of legal costs relating to the Hillsborough Inquests.

35.2 This item was considered in the confidential part of the meeting in accordance with the Coroner's Directive.

Action: That the report be noted.

F36. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Action:- That meetings be held during the remainder of the Municipal Year as follows all commencing at 11.00 a.m.:-

15th January, 2016 (subject to change)

4th March

15th April

27th May

BARNLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
11th December, 2015

Present:- Councillor K. Sims (Rotherham MBC) (in the Chair); Councillor R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and Councillor C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC), together with Mrs. L. Baxter and Mr. A. Gabriel (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC) and Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC) and from Mr. D. Burton (Rotherham MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12TH JUNE 2015

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 12th June, 2015.

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of the following corrections:-

(1) persons in attendance at the meeting - the correct spelling of the surname of Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC);

(2) Minute No. 4, BDR Manager's Report – the inclusion of wording that the fire strategy complied for insurance purposes.

12. BDR JOINT WASTE BOARD - ANNUAL AUDIT - YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 2015

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the report about the issues arising from the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). The report included the completed annual return for the Joint Waste PFI for the financial year ended 31st March, 2015 and the appropriate sections of that return were duly read out by the Chair of the meeting.

The issues report had been prepared by external auditors BDO LLP and highlighted that:-

- with regard to the annual return and accounts, the Joint Waste Board should include this matter as a formal agenda item at a Board meeting and minute their approval and adoption;

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD – 11/12/15

- the Joint Waste Board should ensure that, after approval, the minutes of the Board's meetings must be signed by the Chair; and
- with regard to the external auditor's report on the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI, the Joint Waste Board should include this matter as a formal agenda item at a Board meeting and minute the consideration of and decision on such report.

Agreed:- (1) That the report about the issues arising from the annual audit of the 2014/2015 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI, as now submitted by external auditors BDO LLP, be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board shall ensure that the necessary action is taken in response to the issues now highlighted within the annual audit report 2014/15.

(3) That the completed annual return, including Section 1 (the Accounting Statements for 2014/15), Section 2 (the Annual Governance Statement for 2014/15) and Section 4 (the Annual Internal Audit Report for 2014/15), for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste PFI, for the financial year ended 31st March, 2015, as now submitted, be approved.

13. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report which highlighted and updated the following issues relating to the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI), for the period June to November 2015:-

- : changes at senior management level within Rotherham MBC;
- : issues reported as part of the external audit of the 2014/15 accounts of the Joint Waste PFI;
- : the internal audit of the Joint Waste PFI by Rotherham MBC internal auditors;
- : key milestones for the sites at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, Grange Lane, Barnsley and at Ferrybridge, West Yorkshire;
- : the Independent Certifier had issued the acceptance test certificate and snagging list for the Bolton Road Waste Treatment Facility on 3rd July, 2015;
- : information about the number of tonnes of waste processed and the contract performance in respect of the recycling and diversion of waste materials;
- : waste compositional analysis; a further detailed report on this issue will be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Waste Board;

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD – 11/12/15

- : complaints received about the operation of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, during the period 26th February to 31st October, 2015;
- : the health and safety audit of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : site compliance of the facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, during the period 26th February to 31st October, 2015;
- : Ferrybridge facility – Ferrybridge MultiFuel 1 had become operational on 31st July, 2015;
- : Ferrybridge facility – fuel deliveries and electricity export; site compliance;
- : the handover of the transfer station at Grange Lane, Wath upon Dearne had taken place on 1st July, 2015;
- : communications, including : (i) the submission to the Local Government Chronicle awards about the partnership working between the three local authorities; (ii) the Waste Infrastructure Development Programme quarterly meeting held in June 2015 at the BDR visitors' centre; (iii) "It's a Rubbish Adventure", a joint yearlong project between the new waste treatment facility at Manvers in Rotherham and Magna Science Adventure Centre; and (iv) in November, 2015, the Waste Treatment Facility at Wath-Manvers played host to members of the Chartered Institute of Waste Management;
- : on 13th November, 2015, HM Lord-Lieutenant of South Yorkshire, Andrew Coombe, officially opened the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : finalising the lease for the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne;
- : review of the insurance for the Joint Waste PFI and level of premiums;
- : the Inter-Authority Agreement is being reviewed to provide more clarity and remove some historical information;
- : finance – payment of the capital contribution on 6th July 2015;
- : the BDR Partnership was the subject of an interview in October 2015, as part of the Rotherham MBC peer review of Waste Management.

- : glossary of terms relating to waste management and the Joint Waste PFI.

It was also noted that the terms of reference of the Steering Group were being reviewed.

Members of the Joint Waste Board suggested that there was a need for more education for young people about the need to reduce food waste.

Appropriate training is to be provided for new Members of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

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

(2) That the Joint Waste Board welcomes the positive comments about the BDR Partnership made as part of the Rotherham MBC peer review of Waste Management and will give consideration to the further development of partnership working between the constituent local authorities in respect of waste management.

14. RISK REGISTER

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI risk status report (risk register), as at 26th November, 2015. Reference was made to:-

- : Insurance – insurance costs for waste management facilities have increased because of the number of fires at such facilities;
- : the reporting system for the Rotherham MBC risk register is changing and future risk status reports will be utilising that revised format; reports should clearly state the action to be taken to mitigate any 'red' risks shown in the risk register;
- : Inter-Authority Agreement between the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Councils in respect of Waste Management Services – there are proposed revisions to the Agreement, currently being considered by the constituent local authorities; it was anticipated that the revised Inter-Authority Agreement will be submitted for consideration at the next meeting of the Joint Waste Board.

Agreed:- That the updated information on the risk status report be received.

15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Agreed:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Joint Waste Board)).

16. BDR PFI BUDGET UPDATE 2015/16

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at November 2015, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). It was noted that current expenditure remained within the agreed budget. Further reference was made to the likelihood of insurance costs increasing.

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

17. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 11th March, 2016, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That the next following meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday 10th June, 2016 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(3) That, if necessary, a meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held during September, 2016, on a date to be arranged.

(4) That a scheduled meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on a date to be arranged during December, 2016.