

INDEX

	PAGE
1. Health Select Commission	(1 - 11)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission	(1 - 9)
3. Improving Places Select Commission	(1 - 8)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board	(1 - 23)
5. Reports for Information	(1 - 11)
6. Police and Crime Panel	(1 - 12)

1A

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
21st January, 2016**

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Burton, Godfrey, Smith, Victoria Farnsworth and Robert Parkin (Rotherham Speakup).

68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fleming declared a Personal Interest as he was an employee of the Sheffield Teaching Hospital Foundation Trust.

69. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

70. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Wakefield Health Scrutiny Committee

The Chair had attended a meeting for an update on the progress of the Yorkshire Ambulance Service action plan following the CQC inspection. The action plan was nearly complete and an internal audit plan was to be developed to increase the monitoring of the changes to the processes being implemented. Future work included the roll out of a pilot to ensure ambulances were always clean and fully equipped and the development of an Estates Strategy. Progress reports would be submitted in due course.

(2) Podiatry Service

The Chair reported of a recent situation within his Ward concerning the above Service that would end without any consultation having taken place. Following discussion with the Hospital, that decision had now been suspended pending a full review of the process and the availabilities have taken place.

(3) Kirklees and Connect to Support

If Members wished to receive a version of the powerpoint that was included in the "For Information" pack with notes they should contact Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer.

(4) Rotherham CCG Commissioning Plan

The final draft was likely to be circulated shortly to stakeholders, including the Select Commission, for comments before it was approved by the Board.

(5) Future Children's Surgery Services

Consultation by the NHS had commenced with an event held at Meadowhall on 12th January, 2016, to capture families and young people's experiences. This was a workstream under the Commissioners Working Together Programme and would probably be scrutinised by the new Joint Health Scrutiny Committee once established.

(6) NHS Planning Guidance from 2016-17 to 2020-21

This was published in December and included nine must do priorities for local health economies including new sustainability and transformation plans, waiting time targets for A&E and ambulance response times, cancer referral and treatment targets, mental health waiting time targets, improved care for people with learning disability, sustainability and quality of general practice.

The briefing notice giving an outline of the Guidance would be circulated to Members.

71. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Health Select Commission held on 3rd and 17th December, 2015, be agreed as a correct record.

Arising from Minute No. 48 (GP Event), a report had been included in the "For Information" pack. A progress report on the GP Strategy and recommendations from the previous Scrutiny Review would be submitted to the April Select Commission meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 51 (Better Care Fund), it was noted that a report was to be submitted to the March Select Commission meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 58 (Proposed Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee), it was noted that Commissioner Sir Derek Myers had approved the Select Commission's recommendations that the Council should be involved in the new Joint Committee with the Chair as its representative.

The Scrutiny Officer had attended a meeting recently with counterparts from the other six local authorities to discuss practical issues such as resourcing and support for the new Committee and to start drafting Terms of Reference.

Arising from Minute No. 59(2) (Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Account), it was noted that the information requested had not been supplied due to the Chief Nurse being on leave.

Arising from Minute No. 66 (Adult Services Transport Fleet), it was noted that the lead officer had met with Finance and the information should be available shortly.

3A

72. OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH/SPENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH GRANT IN ROTHERHAM

Terri Roche, Director of Public Health, gave the following presentation:-

Health Challenges in Rotherham

- Life expectancy lower than England average
- 9 year gap in life expectancy across the Borough for men and 7 year gap for women

England average men	79.4 years
Rotherham men	78.1 years
England average women	83.1 years
Rotherham women	8.14 years
- Rotherham people live longer with ill health and/or disability than England average
- Rotherham men live 21 years and women 22 years in poor health
- Health Life Expectancy is:

England average men	63.3 years
Rotherham men	57.1 years
England average women	63.9 years
Rotherham women	59 years

Health Challenges

- High levels of unhealthy behaviours (obesity, smoking, alcohol use)
- Too many children not having a good start to life: high rates of smoking in pregnancy, low breastfeeding rates, 11,000 children in poverty
- 1 in 4 will have a mental health problem. Half first experience mental health problem before the age of 14

What is Public Health?

- "The science and art of promoting and protecting health and wellbeing, preventing ill health and prolonging life through the organised efforts of society"
Faculty of Public Health
- Individual lifestyle factors – social and community networks – general socio-economic, cultural and environmental conditions

Core Functions of Public Health (examples of activity within each function)

- Health Protection (Health Protection Committee, Suicide Prevention)
- Health Improvement (Tobacco Control programme recommissioned, Active for Health funding)
- Healthcare Public Health (Better Care Fund, Potential Years of Life Lost plan)

The Director of Public Health

- Accountable to the Local Authority Chief Executive
- Must have a place on the Health and Wellbeing Board
- Duty to write an annual report on the health of the population – Local Authority has duty to publish the report

Role of Local Authority in Public Health

- Statutory Public Health programmes
 - Protect the health of the local population
 - Ensuring NHS commissioners receive the Public Health advice they need
 - Appropriate access to Sexual Health Services
 - National Child measurement Programme
 - 0-5 Child Health Services (Health Visiting)
 - NHS Health Check

What other services does Public Health Commission:-

- Non-statutory Programmes
 - Sexual health advice, prevention and promotion
 - Adult and child weight management
 - Adult and child physical activity
 - Substance misuse (drug and alcohol) – Adult and Youth Services
 - Tobacco control including Stop Smoking Services
 - Children 5-19 health programme
 - Non-statutory 0-5 children's health services
 - Public mental health
 - Nutrition, dental public health, information and intelligence, wider determinants, health at work and more

How is our impact measured?

- Public Health Outcomes Framework
- Overarching indicators – life expectancy/healthy life expectancy
- Four domains
 - Wider determinants
 - Health improvement
 - Health protection
 - Healthcare and premature mortality

Public Health Staff Review

- Required within 8 weeks of Director of Public Health appointment (Improvement Plan)
- Simplified structure focussed on:-
 - Core Public Health functions
 - Supporting integration of Adult Health and Social Care
 - Increasing capacity for Children and Young People's agenda
 - Increasing support for Health and Wellbeing Strategy delivery

5A

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Public Health funded a national survey (the dental epidemiology survey) which was taken by dentists who went into a selective number of schools and looked at children's teeth, counted the cavities and the extent to which the children had cavities. It was a small survey but the results were extrapolated up to suggest what the health of children's teeth was like. That was in the process of being re-commissioned across South Yorkshire
- An Oral Health Service was currently commissioned which worked with the Early Years Provision where tooth brushing clubs were encouraged and educational programmes for the children and their families. Attempts were also being made to encourage dentists to offer fluoride paint but often it was reliant on the parent being motivated enough to take their child to the dentist
- The annual report would be submitted to the Select Commission in March
- The number of NHS dentists in the Borough
- The annual report would be submitted to the Select Commission by March
- School Nurses were a very important part, as were Health Visitors, in getting messages out to families. It had to be part of the whole system's approach and did not necessarily require extra appointments to give consistent messages to families across the whole health community. The evidence suggested that behaviour change was influenced by consistent simple messages.
- One of the key ways to measure effectiveness in the next 3-5 years would be delivery against the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Health and Wellbeing Board, as a partnership, had signed up to the key priorities in the Strategy. Also close effective working with Elected Members who knew their electorate in order to tailor the messages to be relevant to the communities. A more difficult issue was with regard to targeting provision to those at greater need to reduce health inequalities, rather than all services having a universal offer to all people.

Alison Iliff, Public Health Principal, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Public Health Grant

- Grant from Central Government
- Ringfenced until the end of 2017/18
- Requirement to report to Government annually on how the grant has been spent

Value of the Ringfenced Grant

- 2015/15 - £14.175M
- 2015/16 - £15,270M (includes £1M in-year reduction plus half year transfer of 0-5 Child Health Services)
- Grant: £54 per head of population
- Under target allocation

Spending on Health and Social Care in Rotherham

- 97% - RMBC and RCCG spending on Health and Social Care Services
- 3% - Public Health Grant

Directorate Spend: Percentage of total RMBC Budget

- 32.10% Children and Young People Services
- 13.40% Economic Development Services
- 29.40% Neighbourhood and Adult Services
- 2.20% Public Health
- 17.30% Resources
- 5.50% Central Services

Public Health Grant Distribution 2015/16

- 9% Public Health salaries
- 73% Contracted Public Health services
- 15% Reallocated services
- 2% Overheads

Public Health Grant – Breakdown of spend on Commissioned Services

- 26% 0-19 Health Services
- 7% Weight Management
- 7% Tobacco Control
- 2.00% Health Checks
- 31% Drugs and Alcohol
- 22% Sexual Health
- Health Protection 1.30%
- Oral Health Promotion 0.70%
- Physical Activity 0.60%
- Community dietetics 0.50%
- Ministry of Food 0.50%
- Mental Health Promotion 0.20%

7A

Public Health Grant – Breakdown of Reallocated Spend

- Children and Young Peoples Services 47%
- Drugs and Alcohol 16%
- Physical Activity 9%
- Other RMBC staff salaries 8%
- Sexual Health 7.40%
- Mental Health – Domestic Violence 6%
- Health Protection 3%
- Noise and Complaints 2%
- Homelessness 1%
- Home Surveys 0.80%

What does the future look like?

- Current cuts – minimising impact to Public Health activity and commissioned services
- Non-statutory programmes likely to be focus for future cuts
- Staff redundancies possible
- Requirement to target services to most vulnerable (removal of universal offer for some?)
- Propose working group of Members to oversee strategic decision about spend of Public Health Grant

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

- Rotherham was receiving less per head than Barnsley, which was below its target per population, and less than Doncaster which was above its target head of population. At the moment it was still largely based on the historical spend made by the Primary Care Trusts on Public Health prior to its transition to local authorities but there were national plans to move towards an allocation formula. However, the allocation formula was very complex and included things such as the standardised mortality ratio for the under 75s, % of the population eating 5 fruit or vegetables a day, % drinking more than recommended levels, % of current adult smokers, diagnosis rate of STI plus market forces factor which took into account the costs of local health care delivery
- There were huge variations across the country the same as it varied in South Yorkshire. There was a spreadsheet for 2014/15 which showed the allocations (to be forwarded to the Select Commission)
- Public Health England had created the Spend and Outcomes (SPOT) tool which looked at certain long term conditions/behaviours where they did look at spend and outcomes but not across the whole picture of Public Health. You would probably find that the health outcomes were clearly linked with deprivation (report to be forwarded to the Select Commission)

- Recognition that this was the Public Health grant not the entire Health grant for the Borough. The graphs within the presentation attempted to demonstrate that the Public Health grant was a tiny slice of the whole Health and Social Care economy in the Borough and the £54 was only a tiny proportion compared to what Health Care actually cost and reflect the need for Public Health to influence the wider NHS & social care spend
- A specific nursing post was funded by Public Health that sat within the Safeguarding Team that supported CSE
- The Equality Impact Assessments were carried out by the Public Health team in conjunction with the providers
- The Service would do its best for 2016/17 to find the additional savings, once known, which were over and above ASR savings. The services would have to be modelled on what there was and what was provided currently to ascertain if things were provided in the right way. Members and partners should be involved because it may be that (a) stop doing things (b) do less or (c) look at ways of delivering services in an entirely different way that provided efficiencies that had not been considered before and it may be that some services would have to be delivered by particular groups
- The Drug Intervention Programme was made available to most areas of the country, but not all, approximately 12 years ago. It had been in 2 parts (1) to place teams of people within police custody cells in order to support the police who were going to test on arrest and check if positive for Class A drugs and (2) an enhanced offer for treatment as at that time the national waiting time for treatment was 3 weeks; the proposal was that would reduce to 5 working days for anyone charged with an acquisitive crime offence. Historically that grant was split into 2. The part that paid for the workers in the cells was transferred to the Police and Crime Commissioner budget who was currently conducting a review of all budgets. The Custody Suite in Rotherham would close at the end of March, 2016, and Rotherham prisoners would be taken to Sheffield. It was not known whether Rotherham staff would transfer to deal with Rotherham prisoners or a new service be commissioned

Resolved:- (1) That the new structure within Public Health to support delivery of the three pillars of Public Health, the Authority's statutory Public Health functions and the Council priorities of the child-centred Borough and health and social care integration be noted.

(2) That the emerging pressures being placed on the Public Health Grant as a result of the announcement in the Comprehensive Spending Review be noted.

9A

(3) That the proposed Public Health commissioning programme for 2016/17 and 2017/18 be noted.

(4) That in principle agreement be given to a Members Working Group being established after the May 2016 local elections to agree the future strategic spend against the Public Health Grant.

73. DETAIL OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROPOSED EFFICIENCY SAVINGS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE PROVIDERS

Anne Charlesworth, Public Health Commissioning and Quality Manager, presented details of the Public Health proposed efficiency savings of 1.8% across commissioned services.

The All Service Review process undertaken by Public Health during June and July, 2015, had identified a savings programme to deliver the requested £1M from the Public Health budget over 3 years from April, 2016-19. Part of the savings programme included a cost efficiency reduction from the large NHS contracts held as follows:-

0-19 Children's Health including Health Visiting from 2016 full cost
Sexual Health
Substance Misuse

In addition it was also proposed that 1.8% efficiencies could be delivered across the Stop Smoking Support programme area.

The service providers had been asked to identify how the savings could be achieved with minimal impact to patients and to work with leads in Public Health for each area to identify any areas of service that needed to vary in the service specification that was in place. Timely and helpful responses had been received from the South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Trust and RDaSH. A less detailed response had been obtained from the Foundation Trust in respect of how the savings would be made, however, they had indicated that they recognised that the efficiencies would need to be delivered. Some services would also be going out to tender as outlined in the Appendix to the report.

Lynn Cocksedge, Head of Contracts and Business Development, Foundation Trust, stated that the discussions to date had been very difficult but progress had been made and the Trust was confident that they would be able to deliver the savings with as little impact as possible. With regard to the Health Visitors Intervention, it was a management restructure and not a clinical provision restructure. A number of meetings had been set up with Public Health to further progress the areas that were referenced in the report and as well as internal meetings within the Trust. Due to some of the issues impacting upon staff, consultation by the Trust would be carried out in accordance with the associated regulations.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Many of the services were previously under the domain of the NHS. Part of the process was to bring them in line with all other Council processes and, therefore, the tendering process would be in accordance with the Council's procurement framework. There would be supplementary clauses such as adherence to NICE guidelines and registration with the Care Quality Commission if applicable. Attention was drawn to the briefing paper on procurement and commissioning in the information pack

- It was the Trust's intention to look at the footfall of each of the Sexual Health Clinics as some were better used than others but to ensure as limited impact on clients as possible. It may be that some had different hours of opening to accommodate clients. It was hoped that detailed information regarding the number of clients at clinics would aid better commissioning of Sexual Health services. GP surgeries also provided such services

- The integrated model provision of Sexual Health was provided in Sheffield and one that Rotherham was moving towards as well but had taken a little longer to get embedded within the workforce. Several other areas of the country had also moved the integrated model to as a way of being able to provide a bigger range of things from more bases effectively and the model Rotherham was looking to recommission

- The all services review process had not offered a very detailed mechanism to look at the proposals which were very different in nature. A method had been devised of trying to gauge what the different areas of risk may be which resulted in the risk scores some of which would have greater impact of partners and some on patients. Those that were still to be worked up with the Foundation Trust had been rated in accordance with the information available at the present time; these could be amended once the work had been completed

- The School Nursing service would form part of the 0-19s procurement exercise with the current date for publication on Yortender being May. There was a lot of work to be done before then in fully agreeing it with Children and Young People Services to ensure it covered everything they wished the services to cover and consultation with other partners

- Public Health were currently reviewing both the Public Health statutory functions "must dos" and "would like to dos" within the 0-19s procurement exercise as to what was currently provided and what might not be able to do in the future with possibly a move towards more targeted provision

11A

Resolved:- (1) That the proposed savings from SWYFT and RDaSH by way of implementation in the contracts from 1st April, 2016, be noted.

(2) That the savings for the Foundation Trust and the proposed recommissioning and procurement of service in 2016/17 be noted.

(3) That the increased recognition of the serious Public Health challenges facing the Rotherham population and of the relatively small level of the Public Health Grant be noted.

(4) That the commitment for the grant to be utilised to support the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the prevention agenda in the Borough be endorsed.

74. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

The minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 25th November, 2015, were noted.

75. UPDATES FROM IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION

The next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission was on 3rd February, 2016.

76. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

77. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 17th March, 2016, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
3rd February, 2016

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

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

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

40. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

41. COMMUNICATIONS

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser Scrutiny and Member Development, reported on the following:-

(a) LSCB Audits

Initial discussions had taken place with the Chair and Councillors Hoddinott and Ahmed following concerns raised at the Select Commission previously in relation to CSE and LSCB audit process. The work programme in terms of the audits would be shared and factored into the Select Commission work programme to ensure that there was appropriate Member involvement in the process. Consideration would be given as to how those pieces of work could inform the 2016/17 work programme to inform Members' wider understanding of Safeguarding processes.

(b) Work Programme

The next meeting of the Select Commission, scheduled for 23rd March, was the last in the 2015/16 Municipal Year. At the November meeting, it was agreed that the March meeting focus on CSE. It was suggested that a small group of Members meet to discuss the scope of the meeting, attendees, particular areas of concern etc.

Resolved:- That Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Pitchley, Rose and M. Vines meet to plan the format of the 23rd March Select Commission meeting.

42. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16TH DECEMBER, 2015

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 16th December, 2015, were considered.

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

43. ROTHERHAM LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT 2014-2015

The Chair introduced Christine Cassell, Independent Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and Jason Harwin, South Yorkshire Police (Vice-Chair).

Councillor Jepson expressed his concern regarding the format of the report. This was endorsed by other Members of the Commission.

Christine apologised for the formatting of the report which had been due to an IT issue. She undertook to provide Members with a correct version of the document and took on board the comments with regard to the general layout of the report.

The report had been produced by the previous Independent Chair, Steve Ashley, and was the annual report for 2014/15. It was very late in being submitted to the Select Commission but future reports would be submitted in a more timely fashion.

Christine highlighted the following:-

Purpose and function of the Board

- To co-ordinate what was done by each person or body represented on the Board for the purposes of Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area
- To ensure the effectiveness of what was done by each such person or body for those purposes
- It was neither a delivering or commissioning Board; other Boards carried out those functions

2015/16 Report will comment on areas of improvement that were identified as priorities for the coming year i.e.

- Effectiveness and Early Help
- The effectiveness of the response to neglect and domestic abuse
- Experience of Looked After Children
- Effectiveness of multi-agency response to CSE
- How the LSCB influences improvement across agencies and effectively challenges performance
- Co-ordination and strategic commissioning activity
- Hearing and acting upon the experience of others, particularly children and young people
- Ensuring all the issues informed learning and development across the agencies

Priorities the Board would be working on included:-

- Strengthening the understanding of performance
- Quality of safeguarding services
- Engaging with young people
- Ensuring that was alignment with the priorities being identified and commissioning decisions
- Communicating more effectively the work that the Board undertakes

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues highlighted/clarified:-

- The LSCB and the Children's Improvement Board had been working to improve the quality of data and performance information available. This would enable better challenge and scrutiny of services provided by agencies across the board.. Forthcoming annual reports would contain much improved information
- Within the document the section outlining the LSCB Statutory Framework required more explanation as to the role and function of the Board in an easy to read format
- There has been a lot of work done around Looked after Children (LAC) but there was still improvements to be made. The Improvement Board examined individual plans with particular focus on LAC to ensure that outcomes were no worse.. In line with the rest of the country, LAC outcomes were still poor although work was taking place to make improvements.
- Over the last 18 months, the LSCB has had a greater emphasis on scrutinising how services take account of the voice of the child. had. The data has been captured and fed back to services. Future reports will detail how this information is being used to change services.
- Both individual and joint services have to have plans that contained the voice of the child. This was part of the inspection framework of OFSTED; HMIC and also joint inspections. It was part of the Safeguarding Board's responsibility to make sure that services were taking account of the voice of the child and scrutinise what was done with the feedback received
- Need for clear and succinct information on the work of the Board and its six sub-groups
- Early Help was still very much work in progress so the position with Rotherham's Early Help offer was still under developed but significant strides had been made in the last six months. From the aspect of Social Care, it was now much easier for Social Workers to step down cases into Early Help. This prevented escalation into Social Care, with families who still required help being provided with ongoing

support and help in the community at the lower end of the threshold. It was better developed in some of the localities than in others but there was an enormous amount of work taking place to ensure a consistent response

- The LSCB would be asking questions about the effectiveness of Early Help around how Early Help Services knew they were making a difference to children and families; what evidence they had of the quality of support that was given; were children and families better off as a result of that as well as the impact it was having on the number of cases that went through to Children's Social Care; and was it preventing a need for more intensive support to families.
- There had been 40 registered Family Common Assessment Frameworks from primary schools
- The funding for the Board had been increased last year. Chief Officers had agreed to additional funding and there was currently a national review ongoing which would report at the end of March, 2016, which may make some comments about the resourcing of Boards many of which were time in kind. The LSCB would reflect on its developments in context of that plan
- All the initial actions in terms of the development of the Board had been met but many were now out of date. The Board was in the process of revising its business plan both in the context of the improvement actions that it had for the Improvement Board and for its own Board planning processes. The speed of progress for the Board needed to accelerate and the Board had a plan to ensure it could be more rigorous in the work it was undertaking;
- One of the issues for the Board was that individual services had their own training/learning/development plans. From the Board's perspective, it wanted to develop multi-agency training which added value particular in areas where it added value to safeguarding children and young people
- The Board had just launched an audit process with all schools across the Borough to which it had had a good response. Through that process the Board would be able to ascertain that improvements happened in Safeguarding practice
- A standardised approach to training was a challenge as services were working to different authorised practices. The Board was trying, where it could, to achieve commonality around the Common Assessment Framework and the Strengthening Families approach, and that was what was being signed up to
- With resources, including money, decreasing there was opportunity for added value from multi-agency training. There were real

opportunities for joint learning and development across Adults and Children's Safeguarding maximising the time with staff and externally with partners to get the best benefit for the public of Rotherham

The Chair thanked Christine and Jason for their attendance.

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

(2) That David McWilliams be invited to a future meeting to discuss the Early Help provision.

44. SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES PERFORMANCE 2015/16 3RD QUARTER REPORT (DECEMBER 2015)

Jean Imray, Interim Deputy Strategic Director, Children and Young People Services, presented the third quarter (December, 2015) performance report for the key areas of Safeguarding Children and Families Services. Appendix A of the report took into account direction of travel on the previous month, comparison against national benchmarking data and, where applicable, analysis against locally set targets.

This was the first specific performance indicator monitoring report presented to the Commission regarding Children's Social Care since the outcome of the 2014 Ofsted inspections. Since the inspection, performance management arrangements within the Service had undergone significant improvements and would continue to develop over time.

A number of performance improvements had been achieved in the last twelve months including:-

- A more robust and responsive multi-agency front door service (MASH) with the proportion of referrals with timely decision making consistently in the high 90%^s – 98.6% in December against a low of 36.7% at the end of 2014
- A reduction in the number of children on a Child Protection Plan for excessive periods of time – at the end of December only one child was subject to a CPP for over two years compared to eighteen in April
- Almost all Rotherham's vulnerable children now had up-to-date intervention plans in place and recorded. With 100% children subject to a Child Protection Plan, 96.9% of Looked after Children (LAC) and 90.3% of Children in Need with up-to-date plans compared to performance at the end of 2014 of 80%, 82% and 32% respectively
- Children were now being seen by their Social Workers more regularly – 96.2% of Looked after Children were receiving statutory visits on time with national standards and 95.0% of children with a Child Protection Plan had been visited in the last two weeks (local standard)

- Caseloads for Social Workers had been reduced and averages across all teams were now consistently within agreed limits of eighteen-twenty-two cases

The report also set out current key improvement areas.

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

- Due to the number of CSE operations and the possible children involved, there had been an increase in Section 47 investigations. However, a number, when investigated, had found the concerns to be unwarranted.
- All adoption agencies had their pool of adopters so not only would the Authority “buy” adopters (pay a fee to an adoption agency) but Rotherham’s adopters were adopting by way of other authorities/agencies. Currently there was a shortage of adopters so the Authority was having to place more children with out of authority adopters and having to pay a placement fee. A recruitment campaign was to be launched in the same way as there had been for foster carers. This was a national problem. There was work that could be done to improve the situation and the Authority was doing what it could.
- Anybody who was an approved adopter would have been through a very rigorous adoption assessment whether it was by a local authority or private adoption agency. The Authority would always look at the details of an approved adopter to ensure the right child was being matched to the right adopter. Once placed, the Authority would continue to visit until the Adoption Order was made; at that point the child ceased to be a LAC and that family became that child’s legal family so there would be no visits. However, for older children there was a comprehensive support package around the adoption placement to ensure the placement had the best chance of success.
- All authorities were under an obligation to notify the authority they were placing their child into. Rotherham had a system in place to ensure the notifications were sent out and a robust checking system was also carried out.
- This also applied to private independent places. Normally, if an authority placed a child outside its own area then it would be with an independent fostering agency or an independent residential home; if young people were placed in Rotherham they would not be with Rotherham foster carers, but with independent foster agencies.
- The number of LAC had increased to 423 in December, 2015. It was too early to say whether this was a trend but there had been fewer discharges for which there could be a variety of reasons e.g. young

people turning 18 and a tendency not to do any reunifications and returns just before Christmas. There was a gradual upward trend because the Service was better at identifying children who should be at home and more robust action taken for those who were still subject to a Child Protection Plan and not really improving. The Authority was suffering from a lack of an Adolescent Crisis Response at the moment and part of the sufficiency strategy was to try and develop that service if possible. There were two areas where the increase was most notable - in the under 5's and over 15's – with a much higher number of young people not actually going into care until the age of 15-17 quite often due to the lack of appropriate response to teenage homelessness and family crisis. There should be better work with young people as it was not good to go into care at that age except in exceptional circumstances. There had also been a slight increase in that age group due to some of the CSE work that had been carried out.

- The participation rates for the 4-11 and 12-17 years should be treated with caution. The “participation” could have been the filling in of the consultation form at the LAC's review. The Authority had not been good at capturing the voice of the child and then translating it into meaningful changes that informed the development of service and delivery. Generally local authorities captured this but it needed to be more meaningful such as LAC chairing their own reviews.
- The Service was developing a scorecard to be used for LAC which contained a much more detailed set of data which was only about LAC and foster carer recruitment. There would be an opportunity to include health and report thereon.
- The Care Leaving Indicator should be viewed with caution. All the 96.6% showed was that the care leavers were not in prison or B&B but nothing with regard to the suitability of the accommodation. From a Corporate Parenting perspective, there should be detailed information as to where exactly the care leavers were, whether the accommodation met the young person's needs etc. It was known that there was a problem with some of the current accommodation for care leavers and that there was insufficient variety to meet the needs in that group.
- It had been exceptionally busy in December, 2015, with regard to Social Workers' caseloads. This was probably due to a variety of reasons i.e. annual leave being taken and not having had the opportunity to close down cases or a Social Worker having a student working with them who could not be allocated cases. Newly qualified Social Workers had protected caseloads for the first year of practice – under ten cases. Sometimes Workers had high numbers of cases but consisted of large families.
- Rotherham still had a lot of agency staff which, in part, was due to the

Authority agreeing post-Ofsted to an additional thirty front line practitioner posts, however, recruitment of experienced Social Workers was a problem for all authorities. The Authority was up to its capacity now and would not take on any more newly qualified Social Workers due to their lack of experience so it was now the challenge to attract and recruit experienced Workers in Rotherham particularly given its reputation. Nevertheless, the Authority was making definite inroads and the information was being passed on regarding how it was managing to keep low caseloads particularly the caseloads for LAC.

- The fully functioning MASH required a secure environment particularly because of the sharing of very confidential information. There were problems in terms of the capacity of the accommodation currently occupied in Riverside House. The CSE Team was due to move into the Eric Manns Building which would then give the MASH more room and ability to bring more people in. A retired Head Teacher occupied the Senior Education role within the MASH but with more space, Education Welfare Officers could be added to strengthen the MASH response to children at risk because they were not in education/missing from education.
- There was a very robust approach being applied by the Virtual Head with regard to Personal Education Plans of LAC. The Service was now much more confident that the majority of the children had PEPs but would not be satisfied until it was 100% - currently 92.3%. The issue of quality was something that was under review all the time. The Virtual Head and Team constantly reviewed individual PEP's to ensure they were quality assured. The new electronic PEP would be a much better way of being able to review; its format lent itself to draw out important elements as to what progress the child had made from the last school term to present.
- There were a number of issues for secondary schools when a child came into the care system late and likely to bring with them a number of educational challenges that they had before they went into care i.e. fixed term exclusions. There was some work to be done in order to make sure teachers in secondary schools/designated teachers for LAC were absolutely signed up to sharing the same ambitions and aspirations that the Service had for its LAC.
- Reconfiguration of the Social Work Service had just been completed. Previously Social Workers in localities were holding cases that were complex children in need, children with Child Protection Plans, LAC in Care Proceedings and some LAC that were placed out of authority. Although the Service had managed to reduce the numbers, the complexity of having to work in these different specialisms had not helped to improve the quality of the work and quite often it was the LAC that got a less good response. Accordingly, the work had been reconfigured and the Team now organised into North, South and

Central teams with better alignment to the Early Help Teams/schools and the learning communities. The work would include a stronger networking with the agencies that were in their patch to and the moving of the LAC work, including Court procedures, into the LAC Teams so that the service area was able to specialise and focus only on LAC. Also there were two or three additional Team Manager posts so that no Team Manager was managing more than six or seven practitioners, and would be able to supervise better the work of the Social Workers.

- Improvement journeys were 3-5 years – there was no short term or quick fixes. However, improved practice would be more financially affordable in the longer term.
- The report was submitted to the Improvement Board, Directorate Leadership Team, Local Safeguarding Board (Performing Sub-Group, and Deputy Leader on a monthly basis.

The Chair thanked Jean for her presentation.

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

(2) That any issue of concern be reported to the Select Commission.

(3) That the performance report on be submitted to the Select Commission on a quarterly basis starting in the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

(4) That a report be submitted on Children Missing from Education, and that this report details how many of these are Looked After Children.

45. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING - WEDNESDAY, 23RD MARCH, 2016 AT 1.30 P.M.

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016, to start at 1.30 p.m. in Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 20th January, 2016

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Cutts, Godfrey, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Sims, Whelbourn and Whysall together with Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance:- Councillor Sims, Advisory Cabinet Member.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley, Reeder, C. Vines and Wyatt.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

34. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

35. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to report.

36. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 25TH NOVEMBER, 2015

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

37. REPORT FROM TASK AND FINISH GROUP 1 - WASTE MANAGEMENT

Councillor Godfrey, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, gave the following presentation on the findings of the review:-

Scope of the Review

- To explore the current provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres and special household waste collections (green waste and bulky collections)
- Examine options for future provisions identifying potential areas for savings and/or income generation
- Explore options for increasing recycling rates and introducing re-use into the Waste Collection Service

Legal and Policy Drivers

- Environmental Protection Act 1990, Controlled Waste Regulations 2012 and Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

- Collection of household waste including at least four types of recyclable waste must be free of charge
- Must provide HWRCs for depositing household waste free of charge open at all reasonable times; Legislation does not stipulate the number of sites or opening hours
- The Council can charge for green waste, non-household waste (such as DIY wastes, hardcore, rubble) and commercial waste
- RMBC's Waste Strategy covers the period 2005-2020 but it does require review; this is in progress of production with BDR partners

Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)

- Four centres in Rotherham all of limited size
- Managed and operated by FCC Environmental under BDR contract due for renewal in 2018
- No business waste is accepted
- All Centres closed one day per week with deferred decision to close for additional day in 2013
- Some impact from closure felt in terms of increased congestion, traffic queues and customer service
- One day closure has not led to any significant increase in flytipping although there have been isolated incidents at the entrance to sites

HWRC'S Charging for Non-Household Waste

- Examined successful scheme in North Yorkshire
- Kier runs the scheme and takes the income; North Yorkshire Council benefits through avoiding haulage and disposal costs
- Extensive consultation prior to introduction
- 73% reduction of deposited waste but no discernible increase in flytipping; increased use of skips
- Scheme also available to small businesses
- Task and Finish Group recommends the Council to explore introduction of charging for non-household wastes – FCC supportive

HWRC's – Introduction of Re-use Service

- No current provision on any of our HWRCs
- FCC introducing limited re-use in conjunction with WEEE Service provider and Doncaster refurbish. Reluctant to scale up within existing contract
- British Heart Foundation keen to establish re-use on HWRCs
- Task and Finish Group recommend establishment of re-use on HWRCs as part of new contract

HWRCs – Joint BDR Contract

- Work should commence now by BDR for contract renewal in 2018
- Benefits of HWRC provision being considered as a whole across the partnership – greater economies of scale
- Investigate longer term options for providing larger sites with greater scope to accept commercial waste, enhance recycling and re-use

provision

Bulky Goods Collection

- Statutory requirement but can make a reasonable charge
- Price sensitive and operates at small loss
- Some goods recycled but no current re-use
- Potential to partner with a charity such as British Heart Foundation on jointly provided or complete outsourcing basis
- Task and Finish Group recommend further discussions with British Heart Foundation to commission such a service

Textile/Small Electricals Kerbside Collection

- Elmbridge Council – British Heart Foundation run schemes alongside normal kerbside collection service three times a year at no cost to the Council
- Elmbridge were very happy with the scheme – recommend pilot in first instance
- Tangible benefits in reducing waste; income for the British Heart Foundation and job creation and synergy with Heart Town status

Green Waste Collection

- Summer service only at cost of £1M
- Pressure to introduce charges – Sheffield already do and Doncaster considering
- Charging unpopular with residents and low take up likely (only 3% in Sheffield) but other authorities have a much higher take up rate
- Increased flytipping likely and green waste in black bin could have contract implications for BDR waste facility at Manvers
- Home composting should be encouraged – look at cost/benefit of free/subsidised compost bins
- Recommend BDR examine benefits of combined contract to save costs and maintain service

Commercial Waste Collection

- Currently serve 12% of market with net budget contribution of £190K
- Charges significantly higher than neighbouring authorities
- Scope to expand this service threefold by taking advantage of available headroom in favourable price category within BDR Manvers contract
- Discussions with Nottingham City Council which runs commercial waste collection as part of wider facilities management service for businesses
- Nottingham City Council have large market share and generate surplus of £1.8M annually
- RMBC would need to invest in establishment of a tailored team to significantly expand its customer base and potentially offer additional Council services
- Task and Finish Group recommend production of a fully costed business plan with the option of a combined service throughout the

BDR partnership to maximise scale and profitability

The Review Group's recommendations were:-

Short Term (within the 2015/15 financial year)

1. Consider the ways in which home composting may be promoted in Rotherham including the cost/benefit of offering free/subsidised compost bins to residents.
2. Continue the discussions with the British Heart Foundation with a view to commissioning:-
 - (a) A joint approach to the provision of bulky waste collection service to all householders in RMBC which enables greater reuse of unwanted furniture
 - (b) The establishment of a textile/bric-a-brac/small electrical goods household collection service
3. Negotiate with FCC and a third sector/not for profit organisation to introduce a small scale re-use facility on one or more of the HWRCs as a means of encouraging re-use and raising awareness of the opportunities for re-use of household bric-a-brac and other small items.
4. Explore with FCC the scope for introducing a charge for non-household waste at HWRCs during 2016/17 for the remainder of the contract period at all RMBC HWRCs for all items of non-household waste that the Council may legitimately make a charge for. Evaluate the benefits to the Council as well as the likely impact on user satisfaction and any perverse consequences such as increases in fly tipping.

Medium Term (from 2016/17 onwards)

5. Given that RMBC works collectively across a range of waste services with Barnsley and Doncaster and there is an effective governance arrangement already in place through the Joint Waste Partnership Board:-
 - (a) That work begins early in 2016/17 with BDR partners to jointly review the most cost effective way of commissioning HWRC services across the three Boroughs and scope a service specification that will ensure income is maximised and costs are minimised while maintaining a service level that will be acceptable to residents.
 - (b) That careful consideration be given to the establishment of re-use facilities at HWRCs either as part of a new joint contract through the BDR arrangements or as a RMBC sole commissioned service.

(c) That BDR examines the opportunities and benefits of a combined contract for the collection of green waste across the three Boroughs during the growing season thus maintaining a valued service to residents, increasing recycling rates and potentially saving money not excluding the possibility that a charge may need to be made for this service.

(d) That a fully costed business plan be produced for a substantial expansion of the commercial waste collection service throughout the Borough and potentially beyond the Borough boundaries including the option of a combined service through the BDR waste partnership to maximise scale and profitability.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Kerbside Collection was subject to a full Service review that was currently underway
- The Waste Strategy required a refresh due to changes in Legislation etc. Work was taking place with Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield to develop an overarching strategy within which each of the individual authorities would have the ability to form a service to suit their local needs. It was hoped to bring a report to Members by the end of the financial year for initial consideration and then go out for wider consultation
- The issue of Rotherham residents not being able to use a Barnsley/Doncaster HWRC and vice versa needed to change. When the BDR contract was due for renewal an improved co-ordinated approach should be sought
- The Commercial Waste market was very well developed with a number of key national players. However, Rotherham's market share was less than others locally. A proposal was being developed to focus on smaller companies who may not have Commercial Waste agreements in place and possible alignment with enforcement services
- Possible use of resources to market the services
- City Region – it was believed that there was scope probably with the need for substantial investment in disposal facilities but there was an opportunity to create facilities which would enable the Authority to review the way in which it collected. Discussions had commenced with the other South Yorkshire authorities to ascertain what the implications would be with work commissioned as to the differences between the different collection arrangements and what the Authority would need to do to align them

- There was a joint steering group of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham officers which initially met to discuss the Waste PFI but the remit now extended to encompass all matters of mutual interest
- The Task and Finish Group had looked at charging for certain types of waste which may increase income/reduce costs and enable consideration to be given to reversing previous decisions to close sites

The Select Commission thanked Councillor Godfrey, Diane Thomas (Centre for Public Scrutiny) and Christine Majer (Scrutiny Officer) for the work they had done.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board for consideration.

(2) That a progress report on the Task and Finish Group's recommendations be submitted to this Select Commission in January, 2017, particularly in respect of commercialisation of the Service.

38. TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN

Simeon Leach, Economic Development Manager, reported that the draft Masterplan had been received the previous day. Due to the size of the document it was not possible to e-mail but a link would be provided to Members to access it online.

The final draft of the document would be submitted to the Advisory Cabinet on 15th February, 2016 and this Select Commission on 24th February before consultation began on 1st March, 2016.

The broad headlines of the draft Masterplan were as follows:-

Background

- Town Centre Renaissance Programme initially produced in 2005
- 25 year plan
- Funded by Yorkshire Forward
- Progress slowed down after recession, public sector funding squeeze and the winding up of Yorkshire Forward
- Revision of Masterplan agreed on the back of Rotherham's Economic Growth Plan

Progress to Date

- Delivered a number of projects:-
Westgate Demonstrator
Tesco Superstore
New Council offices
Redevelopment rail station

Main Issues in Draft Masterplan

- Gold routes to best connect parts of the Town Centre (i.e. Clifton Park to High Street)
- Enhanced gateways to the Town centre (i.e. Sheffield Road)
- Better utilise the River/Canal
- Re-model markets to provide a smaller better quality offer
- Freeing up development space
- Increase the residential offer

Forge Island

- Cinema-led leisure development (potential for residential element)
- Improve linkages to rest of the town and station
- Developments on Weirside/Corporation Street
- Utilise riverfront location

Next Steps

- Sign off of Masterplan by Advisory Cabinet
- Widespread consultation with stakeholders
- Adoption of Supplementary Planning Document
- Implementation overseen by sub-group of Business Growth Board

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- When the consultation commenced it would be made clear that it was a vision of what was hoped to be delivered subject to funding being available
- British Waterways would be fully involved in the consultation as the waterways were a vital part of the redevelopment
- There were difficult market conditions and the consultants would look at the possibilities of funding. Discussions had been taking place with the City Region and the Authority had been requested to put forward its priorities one of which would be the need to get more money for urban renaissance
- A development such as a cinema would hopefully bring custom into the town centre which would then have a knock-on effect. Town centres were changing with smaller retail cores
- The Masterplan would be used as a prospectus for investors
- A recent visit by DCLG had revealed interest in potentially two pilot housing projects

Resolved:- That the presentation be noted and a further report submitted to the 24th February, 2016, meeting of this Select Commission.

39. TASK AND FINISH GROUP 2 - LITTER AND FLYTIPPING

Councillor Atkin, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, reported that the report was now being finalised and would be presented to the 24th February meeting of this Select Commission.

It was noted that representatives from the Parish Council Joint Working Group would be invited for that item.

Resolved:- That the Task and Finish Group's draft report be submitted to the 24th February, 2016, Improving Places Select Commission.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
15th January, 2016

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hughes.

72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Whelbourn and Wyatt declared personal interests in Minute No. 74 (Housing Rents 2016/17).

Councillor Steele declared an interest in Minute No. 76 (Budget 2016/17 to 2017/18 - Consideration of Savings Proposals - RES7H Trade Union Secondment Budget).

73. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

74. HOUSING RENTS 2016/17

Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, submitted a report setting out the proposed housing rent and non-dwelling rents for 2016/17.

The previous Government Rent Policy (published in May 2014) limited rent increases from April, 2015 to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in September of the previous year plus 1% per annum for 10 years.

The Government expected that all similar properties in the same local area would have equitable rent levels, even if properties were owned by different social landlords. This process was known as 'rent convergence'. The Government set a target for authorities to achieve rent convergence by 2015/16. However, changes to the rent formula had removed the flexibility to increase rents by an additional £2 above the increase in formula rent where rent was below convergence, therefore, 2014/15 was the final year to achieve full convergence.

The average rent for 2015/16 was £73.71 per week over 52 weeks, an average reduction of £0.68 per week.

The Government replaced the former Housing Revenue Account (HRA) subsidy system with a devolved system of Council housing finance called self-financing in April, 2012. A change to the formula rent from April, 2015, had resulted in the Council not meeting rent convergence and, therefore, lower levels of income which impacted upon investment plans within the HRA Business Plan. Due to historical decisions to limit rent increases,

Rotherham's rents were not scheduled to reach full convergence until 2016/17. Government guidance stated that where properties had not reached formula rent by April, 2015, it was expected that the rent was moved up to formula rent when the property was re-let following vacancy. On average 1,700 properties were re-let each year and would generate additional income of approximately £154,000 in 2016/17.

Section 21 of The Welfare Reform and Work Bill 2015/16 set out the Government's policy on social housing rents which requires providers of social housing to reduce rents by 1% per year for four years with effect from April 2016. The new Policy applies to all registered providers of social housing including local authority landlords, who have a statutory obligation to implement the Policy.

This year it was proposed to move to rent payable over 52 weeks rather than the current 48 weeks given that the majority of rent was now paid by electronic means. All tenants had been consulted as part of the consultation on changes to the Tenancy Agreement. No objections had been received to the proposal. There would be no change to the total amount of rent payable over the year. The move to a 52 week payment cycle also accommodated the introduction of Universal Credit which did not account for rent being paid over a 48 weeks cycle.

Total housing rent income generated through the proposed revised weekly rents was estimated to be £77.851m in 2016/17 assuming 150 Right to Buy sales, and voids and rent adjustments at 2.0%. The reduction of 1% on the weekly rent charge would result in a loss in rent income of £1.3M compared with the 2015/16.

The Council had completed the building of 132 new energy efficient properties in 2011/12 the rents for which were assumed to be full converged and, therefore, set higher than those of the existing Council stock. Consequently the proposed average rent to be charged across those properties would be £95.43 over 52 weeks based on the statutory 1% reduction, an average reduction of £0.97 per week.

Discussion ensued on the proposal with the following issues raised:-

- Sustainable financial model for housing in the Borough moving forward
- Increased numbers of Right to Buy
- Impact of the Housing and Planning Bill – Pay to Stay Legislation
- High value properties

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

(2) Recommended:- (a) That dwelling rents be reduced by 1% for 2016/17 in line with the requirements outlined in the Welfare to Work bill 2015/16 which would result in an average dwelling rent for 2016/17 of £73.71 per week over 52 weeks, an average reduction of £0.68 per week.

(b) That the average rent for the energy efficient Council properties also reduce by 1% to £95.43 per week, an average reduction of £0.97 per week.

(c) That there be no increase to charges for garage rents, communal facilities and cooking gas in 2016/17.

(d) That the draft Housing Revenue Account Budget for 2016/17 be noted.

(e) That rent and non-dwelling charges be charged over 52 weeks rather than the current 48 weeks.

75. DISTRICT HEATING SCHEME CHARGES 2016/17

Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, introduced a report by the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods which reviewed the charges for District Heating for 2016/17.

There were a range of heating schemes, but in general district heating charges were made up of two components, a weekly charge and a metered charge per kilowatt hour of heating used. Weekly charges for most schemes exceeded the actual metered costs and hence 34% of all income received from weekly charges were returned to customers.

The report examined each of the three distinct schemes taking into account the cost of the schemes, weekly pre-payment charge and the impact of the level of refunds and tenant arrears owed to the Council. A further review of all schemes was to be undertaken in 2016/17.

With regard to the pooled schemes, the report, therefore, recommended no increase to either the unit charge per KWh or the pre-paid charge for 2016/17. The anticipated reduction in running costs in 2016/17 as gas prices reduced together with the review of the two schemes at St. Ann's and Munsbrough should result in achieving full cost recovery.

With regard to Beeversleigh, the report proposed no increase to existing weekly pre-payment charge in 2016/17. The scheme recovered the full cost and individual meters were due to be installed during 2016/17 which would mean that tenants would pay for the actual heating used rather than a standard weekly charge based on the size of the property.

With regard to Swinton, it was proposed to retain the unit charge at 8.72p per KWh, the same level as 2015/16 and the proposal for the pooled schemes. Tenants using the scheme had received increases in the unit charge of 14.6%, 30% and 30% over the last three years. Expenditure per property was £454 compared with income per property of £410 based on 2014/15 actual figures. Given the significant increase in unit charge over the last three years, the expected reduction in contract price of gas, the near recovery of costs and the current installation of new and more reliable meters, it would seem appropriate not to increase the unit charge and review in 2016/17 pending the outcome of the actual usage with more modern and reliable meter units.

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

(2) Recommended:- (a) That there be no increase to the unit charge for the pooled district heating schemes.

(b) That charges be made over 52 weeks in line with Housing rents (Minute No. 74 refers).

(c) That there be no increase to the pre-payment weekly charge for the pooled and unmetered scheme at Beeversleigh.

(d) That there be no increase to the unit KWh charge at the Swinton district heating scheme.

(e) That the report be referred to the Improving Places Select Commission and that a further review of the pooled schemes be undertaken in 2016/17 including achievement towards full cost recovery and for this to include the members involved in the initial review wherever possible.

(f) That Ward Members be briefed on the issues related to specific schemes in their Ward.

76. BUDGET 2016/17 TO 2017/18 - CONSIDERATION OF SAVINGS PROPOSALS

In accordance with Minute No. 171 of Commissioner Manzie's Decision Making Meeting of 7th January, 2016, Justin Homer, Head of Policy Improvement and Partnerships, presented a report setting out ten Service level proposals across Council Directorates, totalling up to £627,000 (Appendix A). Adult Social Care matters (Annex B) would be considered at the Board meeting on 22nd January, 2016.

The ten Service level proposals were:-

RESH7H	Trade Union Secondment Budget
RES10C	Terrorism Insurance
RES19A	Town Hall Catering

RES21C	Legal Services Demand Reductions
CYPS15	School Crossing Patrols
EDS6.3A	Advocacy and Appeals Service
EDS22	Parking Services Initiatives
EDS24D	Highways – Prudential Borrowing
EDS26J&L	Sports Development Match Funding

Discussion ensued on the proposals with the following issues raised:-

- Terrorism insurance - had a full risk assessment been undertaken/opportunity to pool the risk?
- Town Hall Catering – all equipment etc. should be retained pending the outcome of the review and sharing of best practice as to what services were provided in other authorities
- School Crossing Patrols – Parish Councils/Schools/Governing Bodies should be approached regarding the provision of patrols
- Parking Services – Option 2 be the preferred option
- Sports Development Match Funding – the Rotherham Active Partnership was very effective and engaged with partners and would be the future funding route

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 with the following preferred option for EDS22:-

EDS22 Option 2 (£75,000 additional income and free (off street) Saturday parking

(2) That the newly appointed Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services, once in post, be invited to attend a future meeting of the Board to discuss Legal Services and the possibility of shared services in particular.

(3) That a report be submitted to the Improving Lives Select Commission on School Crossing Patrols

(Councillor Steele declared a personal interest in RES7H (Trade Union Secondment Budget.)

77. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

78. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Work was ongoing with regard to the Children's Commissioner Day with a detailed progress report to be submitted to the next Board meeting.

Resolved:- That the invitation to the Children's Commissioner Day be extended to all Members of the Council.

It was also noted that there was to be a Holocaust Memorial Event to be held in the John Smith Room on 28th January, 2016, at 5.00 p.m.

79. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH DECEMBER, 2015

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 11th December, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

80. WORK IN PROGRESS

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Chair reported that the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission was to be held on 3rd February. The agenda would include:-

- Safeguarding
- Performance Monitoring

Improving Places Select Commission:-

The Chair reported that the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission was to be held on 20th January. Items to be discussed included:-

- Draft report from the Waste Management Task and Finish Group
- Draft Town Centre Masterplan
- Update on the progress of the Litter and Flytipping Task and Finish Group

Health Select Commission:-

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

- Options for the transformation of Adult and Older People's Mental Health Services
- Proposals for a Single Point of Access for Health and Social Care including Mental Health
- Recent meeting of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Vice-Chair to attend at RDaSH Quality Summit
- Discussions underway with neighbouring local authorities regarding a new Joint Health Overview Scrutiny Committee

Audit Committee:-

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

7D

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 15/01/16

- A self-assessment exercise on 21st January
- Awaiting PWC report into the work of the Internal Audit Services

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

There was nothing to report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
22nd January, 2016

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

82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

83. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

84. SAFER ROTHERHAM PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 111 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 24h April, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented jointly by the Council's Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager/Safer Rotherham Partnership Manager and by Chief Superintendent Jason Harwin (Rotherham District Commander, South Yorkshire Police), providing an update on the structure and governance of the Safer Rotherham Partnership.

The Board also received a presentation about the Safer Rotherham Partnership's performance against priorities and also the Rotherham Policing Model. The presentation highlighted the following matters:-

- in response to criticism written in the report by Louise Casey, about the role of the Safer Rotherham Partnership, a cross-agency task and finish group had been commissioned to undertake a review of the Partnership;
- the agreed Purpose and Vision document (appendix 1), the Safer Rotherham Partnership Board's Terms of Reference (appendix 2) and the revised Structure and Governance Chart (appendix 3) were all included with the submitted report; there was now much improved joined-up working between the various agencies;
- the review has provided clarity on the role and responsibilities of the Safer Rotherham Partnership in terms of dealing with Child Sexual Exploitation, which is a significant priority for the Partnership;
- work is currently taking place to develop an 'Outcomes Based Accountability Framework' for the Safer Rotherham Partnership; this work is being supported by Children and Young People's Services, with workshops facilitated by consultants David Burnby and Associates; a report on the outcome of this process is expected to be available at the end of February, 2016;

- as a consequence of budget reductions, there is limited capacity for policing at electoral Ward level; however, a process of automated access to information is being developed; there was a record of crime data and mapping for each electoral Ward area;
- the importance of the Case Identification Meetings (CIM meetings) was emphasised, as well as the use of social media by the Police;
- information had been widely disseminated about the Rotherham Policing Model, including roadshows at meetings of the Area Assemblies;
- work had been undertaken to reduce and manage anti-social behaviour, which was now at its lowest level for five years;
- rates of criminal damage had been increasing and the fear of crime and of violent crime was still present;
- Domestic Violence is another priority of the Partnership and has received increased scrutiny;
- the Partnership monitors the provision of support for victims;
- the priorities of the Safer Rotherham Partnership in 2015/16 are:-
 - reduce the threat and harm to victims of child sexual exploitation;
 - reducing the threat and harm to victims of domestic abuse, stalking and harassment, honour-based abuse and forced marriage;
 - reducing and managing anti-social behaviour and criminal damage;
 - reducing the risk of becoming a victim of serious acquisitive crime;
 - improving confidence and trust;
 - improve the feeling of safety.
- Councillor Sims is now the Chair of the Safer Rotherham Partnership Board.

During discussion, Members raised the following salient issues:-

- : discussion of the difference between the old and the new structure of the Safer Rotherham Partnership; the improved accountability and higher profile strategic role alongside other agencies and partnerships; attendance and representation by senior-level officials; better allocation of resources; new appointment of a senior level manager within the Borough Council with responsibility for community safety; better links between local area meetings and strategic meetings; improved analysis and scrutiny of the performance of both the Borough Council and of the South Yorkshire Police;

- : the CIM system has been very helpful, especially in terms of the sharing of information; the Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) role is very important as the 'visible' Police presence; in April 2016, Police officers will begin the trial of the use of the hand-held devices for recording information, reducing the need to return to a Police station to complete reports;
- : the 101 Police telephone service, although useful, is hampered by delays and by a lack of response; the importance of the public in having confidence in the Police response; the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner has commissioned a review of the 101 telephone service and the technology used; Members requested a report on the outcome of this review (it was noted that such report would be considered first by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel); Members were invited to inform the Police of any known examples of difficulties with the 101 telephone service;
- : Members questioned the method of appointment of the consultants David Burnby and Associates; it was noted that this Company had a good track record of working with Police organisations;
- : a question was asked about the process of the review of a domestic homicide, which will be taking place;
- : the South Yorkshire Police is undertaking a process of locality planning, which may involve the Council's Area Assemblies;
- : it was considered that the PCSO system does offer value for money and allows for the provision of additional resources whenever an incident demands them, as well as good reaction and response times to incidents; the overall importance of community policing was emphasised;
- : Members asked whether the ease of reporting forced marriages and honour-based violence may be improved, as there may be a link with child sexual exploitation; it was acknowledged that this is a national problem; the Police does have a system of 'third-party' reporting; the South Yorkshire Police has dedicated officer for these issues; hate crime is investigated; support work is available from the voluntary sector; domestic violence is at the core of child protection (as highlighted in the report by Professor Alexis Jay); the Improving Lives Select Commission has recently undertaken a scrutiny review of domestic violence;
- : the revised Police structure allows for a 'five-team' pattern, providing round-the-clock coverage, including weekends; an explanation of the shift-work pattern was provided;

: Members suggested that every endeavour be made to improve Police response times to the various incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes the progress made by the Safer Rotherham Partnership during 2015, including:-

(a) the review of the Partnership's structure and governance arrangements;

(b) the Partnership's performance against priorities;

(c) the new 'Policing Model' which had been introduced in October 2015;

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board shall receive a year-end report on the Safer Rotherham Partnership at the meeting of the Board scheduled to take place on Friday, 27th May, 2016.

(4) That a progress report on the operation of the South Yorkshire Police 101 telephone service be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in six months' time.

85. BUDGET 2016/17 TO 2017/18 - CONSIDERATION OF SAVINGS PROPOSALS

Further to Minute No. 78 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 15th January, 2016, consideration was given to a report of the Head of Policy, Improvement and Partnership, entitled "Budget 2016/17 to 2017/18 – Consideration of Budget Savings Proposals and Forecast Financial Implications of Adult Social Care Development Programme (referred to this Board from Commissioner S. Manzie's meeting held on 7th January 2016). Appended to the report was a summary of the forecast financial implications of the Adult Social Care Development Programme (totalling £9.18 millions). The various budget proposals for Adult Social Care were:-

- Focused Enablement Service – review of in-house service (reference was made to the continuing discussions with the trades union representatives); Members also discussed the Shared Life Scheme, organised on a national basis;
- Developing alternative provision for In-house Learning Disability residential care and respite care;
- Review all high cost Learning Disabilities residential care placements – Members discussed the need to ensure value for money and the

need to reduce the cost of these packages; there are regular case reviews and it is important to assess the costs of service provision during those reviews, in the light of a client's changing needs;

- Developing alternative community based services to Day Care for Older People;
- Increase capacity in local communities – review of all supporting people contracts for the provision of housing related support;
- Review Adult Services Management and reduce by two posts. Reduce Adults Training budget by 15% and review Assessment and Care Management teams;
- Review in-house day care for Learning Disabilities. The Board suggested that community assets were very important in terms of the provision of Adult Social Care and a list of such assets would be prepared.
- Review provision of in-house residential and intermediate care for Older People advocacy. Reference was made to the Age UK report on the network of support for older people.

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

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

(3) That a report detailing the availability of community assets in each electoral Ward of the Borough be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board within next three months.

86. CYPS BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30TH NOVEMBER, 2015

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services, stating that, as part of its performance and control framework, the Council is required to produce regular reports for the Directorate Leadership team and advisors to keep them informed of forecast financial performance on a timely basis such that where necessary, actions can be agreed and implemented to bring spending in line with the approved budget for the financial year. The submitted report contained details of spending against budget by the Children and Young People's Services Directorate covering the first eight months of the 2015/16 financial year, April 2015 to November 2015, as well as the forecast costs and income to 31st March, 2016. Members' discussion of this report highlighted the following salient issues:-

- Children’s Safeguarding costs – the increase in costs, with high numbers of children in residential care and some in out-of-authority placements;
- Post-abuse support for victims of child sexual exploitation; even though victims may be adults, the cost of support is met from the Children and Young People’s Services budget;
- Foster care and family placements;
- Social Workers - agency staffing and employment costs are much higher than for permanent employees;
- the Social Worker recruitment campaign;
- the importance of the Early Help Services;
- closure of children’s homes – the outcome of the review of residential care will be reported to Commissioners and to Elected Members from February 2016 onwards;
- longer term budget projection - affordability of services balanced against the need to protect children, in a way which means that the Borough Council moves out of intervention (forward planning over five years).

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

(2) That the following recommendation, as contained in the report now submitted, be supported by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

To re-affirm the Directorate Leadership Team Resource Management Group will drive forward actions which are already in place (without causing any significant adverse impact on service delivery):

- An ongoing review of vacant posts to determine which can be ‘frozen’;
- A review of agency and interim staff contracts to determine if any planned end dates can be ‘brought forward’;
- A review of the financial commitments assumed in the forecast to determine if any are overstated;
- Continue negotiations with partners about commissioning and joint levels of funding;
- Tight control of non-staffing budgets;
- Implement any 2016/17 budget savings proposals at the earliest appropriate opportunity (i.e. subject to clearance through

appropriate approval mechanisms) both to guarantee full year effect of the saving in 2016/17 and contribute to mitigating the forecast overspend in 2015/16;

- consider further measures which may be implemented to help mitigate the current forecast overspend for 2015/16, and
- Implement a scheme of delegation that is 'fit for purpose' to allow for appropriate budget controls and compliance with deadlines for the submission of monthly budget monitoring returns.

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes:

- The basis, including caveats, on which the current forecast is based;
- The Children and Young People's Services Directorate Leadership Team Resource Management approach to budget control and efficiencies;
- The implementation a 'fit for purpose' scheme of delegations to allow for the timely submission of budget monitoring returns each month to inform the Directorate's financial monitoring position.

(4) That a further report detailing the specific budget pressures in respect of the Authority's Looked After Children be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in two months' time.

87. RESPONSE TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Planning Policy Manager, concerning the Council's suggested response to central Government on proposed changes to national planning policy. A copy of the suggested response was appended to the submitted report.

The report stated that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published in March 2012, set out the Government's planning policies for England, and how they are to be applied. The Framework reinforces the central role of local and neighbourhood plans in the planning system. It promotes sustainable development, and the protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment.

During December 2015, the Government published proposed changes to national planning policy. The deadline for consultation responses is 22nd February, 2016. The consultation sought views on some specific changes to national planning policy. Changes are proposed in the following areas:

- Broadening the definition of affordable housing, to expand the range of low cost housing opportunities for those aspiring to own their own home;
- Increasing the density of development around commuter hubs, to make more efficient use of land in suitable locations;

- Supporting sustainable new settlements, development on brownfield land and small sites, and delivery of housing allocated in plans; and
- Supporting the delivery of starter homes.

Members discussed the following issues:-

- emphasising the 'brownfield first' approach, in terms of the use (and re-use) of land for future development;
- the importance of affordable housing and Council-owned (social) housing;
- further detail is required in respect of the protected characteristics as defined in the Equalities Act 2010

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

(2) That the Council's response to the consultation on proposed changes to national planning policy (attached as an appendix to the report) be endorsed, subject to the inclusion of the 'brownfield first' emphasis and referred for further consideration by Commissioners and by the Advisory Cabinet, prior to its submission to central Government before the consultation deadline of 22nd February 2016.

88. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS INTO CAR PARKING IN ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE

Further to Minute No. 30 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 25th November, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor Beck (Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission) concerning the work of that Select Commission's Task and Finish Group into car parking in the Rotherham town centre. The report stated that the purpose of the Task and Finish Group's preliminary investigation is to provide:-

(i) recommendations to the Advisory Cabinet and to the Commissioners on car parking in the Rotherham town centre; and

(ii) information and recommendations to the Improving Places Select Commission to inform discussion on whether a detailed review is required.

Members noted that the range of differing priorities across the various Council Directorates was hindering the formulation of a clear line on parking provision and currently the Council had no overall written policy for car parking. It was considered important that the views of all town centre businesses should be sought on this matter, which would be considered further by the Improving Places Select Commission, at its meeting to be held on 24th February, 2016.

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

(2) That the recommendations of this preliminary investigation, as contained in the report now submitted, be supported.

(3) That the report be forwarded to the Government-appointed Commissioners and to the Advisory Cabinet for further consideration.

89. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

90. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Planning meetings continue to be held with the Youth Cabinet, in advance of the Children's Commissioner Take-over Day meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, scheduled to be held on Tuesday 23rd February, 2016.

91. WORK IN PROGRESS

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Councillor Beck, Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission, reported on the progress of the Select Commission's Task and Finish Groups (Waste Management and Litter and Fly-tipping) and on the Select Commission's recent consideration of the Rotherham town centre masterplan.

Health Select Commission:-

Councillor Mallinder, Vice-Chair of the Health Select Commission, referred to the risk assessments for the 1.8% efficiency savings for providers of Public Health commissioned services considered by the Health Select Commission, together with the continuing monitoring of the impact of service changes. The Select Commission had received a report, at its meeting held on 21st January 2016, from the Public Health team and questions had focused mainly on Sexual Health Services. The Rotherham Foundation Trust is still working on the detail as they are reviewing the use of the Sexual Health clinics and demand patterns. The Rotherham Foundation Trust is also considering the savings through management costs in the 0-19s programme, vacancy management and oral health promotion and is confident that the savings will be achieved with minimal negative impact.

92. CALL-IN ISSUES

Further to Minute No. 117 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 24h April, 2015, Members noted that, with the imminent return of decision-making powers to the Council's Executive (Cabinet), the call-in arrangements are to re-commence in respect of scrutiny of such Executive decisions by Elected Members. It was also noted that decisions made by the Government-appointed Commissioners continue to be outside the scope of the call-in arrangements.

93. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board are to be held as follows:-

- Friday 12th February 2016 – scrutiny of the Council's 2016/17 budget proposals;
- Tuesday 23rd February 2016 – Children's Commissioner Take-over Day meeting;
- Friday 26th February 2016 – scheduled meeting.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
Friday, 12th February, 2016

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

Also in attendance : Council Yasseen (Advisory Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mallinder and Pitchley.

94. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

95. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

96. EARLY HELP SAVINGS PROPOSALS 16/17-17/18 (REPORT HEREWITH)

Consideration was given to a report, presented jointly by the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services and the Assistant Director, Early Help and Family Engagement, concerning the budget savings proposals for the Early Help Service which were to be considered in the context of the need to set a balanced and sustainable Council budget for 2016/17 onwards and in accordance with the Council's outline Medium Term Financial Strategy. Details of the Early Help Service budget savings proposals were appended to the submitted report.

The presentation of the report highlighted:-

: statistics relating to the use of services (eg: targeted youth work; open access youth centres), unit costs, demonstrable outcomes and the impact of budget reductions upon service delivery; (Members requested details of the reported statistics);

: specific early help services (eg: help and advice for vulnerable young people on issues such as advice on personal safety; family engagement; substance misuse; the prevention of the exploitation of vulnerable young people) and local authorities' statutory duty to keep children safe.

: the trend for local authorities to alter youth service provision from a universal service to targeted youth services;

: the overall requirement for the Council to achieve a balanced budget.

Members discussed the following salient issues:-

: discussions with other local authorities and with youth charities in order to seek out innovative practice relating to the provision of youth services, in the light of the need to continue achieving budget savings; the monitoring and review of service delivery;

: whether the proposals and the budget savings would ensure that this Council's Children's Services will continue to be 'fit for purpose'; Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board expressed the view that the retention of a universal service must be given serious consideration, alongside the use of specifically targeted services (Members quoted at length from the reports on Council services prepared by both Professor Alexis Jay and by Louise Casey);

: reference was made to the representations made to the Council by Sarah Champion M.P., expressing concern about the proposed reductions in the Early Help Service budget;

: it was emphasised that Children's Services will retain a significant budget; in addition, the importance of partnership working was acknowledged, with organisations such as Reachout UK, which works with disadvantaged young people; other examples were the Clifton and the Kimberworth community partnerships; it was also acknowledged that the capacity within the voluntary sector, in terms of providing services for children and young people, was currently under-utilised;

: service reconfiguration (eg: the co-location of Children's Centre leaders, education welfare officers, social workers and youth workers) building on the strengths and expertise of each service; this service reconfiguration aimed to respond to criticisms expressed particularly in the report by Professor Alexis Jay;

: representations previously made to Central Government, by a number of local authorities, in opposition to the budget reductions; acknowledging the continuing challenges of service provision (eg: the national shortage of social workers);

: local authorities being able to ensure that the Early Help Service and the process of early intervention are structured to provide better options for children, both in terms of making the best use of the limited available resources and providing value for money;

: Members requested further information about the portfolio of the buildings which are used for the provision of services for Children in communities throughout the Rotherham Borough area; and whether service provision would be assisted by the shared use of buildings and the use of premises owned by other organisations such as parish councils;

: the minibuses used for the delivery of youth work services, which are capable of being deployed in all areas of the Rotherham Borough

: discussion took place on some of the examples included in the report by Professor Alexis Jay : eg: of young people suffering difficulties caused by mental health issues, domestic violence, non-school attendance, substance abuse;

: the vision of future service delivery should be informed by the views obtained from young people themselves (eg: from the Youth Cabinet); acknowledging the value of services such as Sure Start; the responsibility to meet the needs of young people so that they have places to go and things to do; the responsibility of the wider community and young people having pathways in to youth service provision;

: from October 2015, the availability of one single, dedicated telephone number (and a form to be submitted via electronic mail) for people asking for Early Help services; ensuring a quick response time; this revised service is valued by the Council's partner organisations and a new protocol is being developed which will have its effectiveness monitored;

: the model of service provision by detached and outreach youth work, support for hard-to-reach groups of young people, who are often the most vulnerable (eg: the importance of the Lesbian, Gay, Trans-gender and Bi-sexual (LGTB) group) and the possible impact of reductions in the number of youth work posts/personnel on these services);

: the limitations of youth service facilities; examples of some youngsters who prefer to spend their time other facilities such as fast-food outlets; ensuring that youth workers will engage effectively with young people;

: the budgetary pressures imposed upon other key stakeholders in the provision of services for young people (eg: health services, Police, colleges); the service consultation process which will take place during the month from late February to late March 2016;

: the re-launch of the Children and Young People partnership and the development of a revised Children and Young People's Plan for the Rotherham Borough;

: the use of digital technology is one aspect of service provision (eg: e-safety issues, combatting the known dangers of young people's participation in on-line gaming and the development of the 'Be-Safe' smart app);

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

(2) That, subject to resolution (3) below, the revenue budget savings proposals for the Early Help Service, as now detailed in the submitted reports, be accepted and referred for further consideration by the

Commissioners and by the Council.

(3) That, further to resolution (2) above, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board expresses the view that the Council must carefully consider the impact of the proposed budget reductions for the Early Help Service, in order to ensure that the children and young people of the Rotherham Borough are to be properly safeguarded in the future and the concerns about the proposed budget reductions, now recorded at this meeting, shall inform the budget and Council Tax setting process for the 2016/17 financial year and beyond.

(4) That a further report on the provision and structure of the Early Help Service be submitted to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board after the finalisation of the Council's revenue budget for the 2016/17 financial year and including the outcome of the forthcoming service consultation process.

97. BUDGET FEEDBACK RESPONSES

Further to Minute No. 4 of the Advisory Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision-making meeting held on 18th January, 2016 and Minute No. 85 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 22nd January, 2016, consideration was given to a report of the Head of Policy, Improvement and Partnership which provided clarification on specific issues, questions and queries, as raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board during its meetings and discussions about Budget-related issues in the period from October, 2015 to January, 2016. The report stated that the various Budget proposals had been put forward so that the Council may meet its forecast cumulative Budget challenge over the next three years, now expected to be in the order of £48 millions. Appended to the report were:-

- a summary of Commissioner Manzie's responses to key Overview and Scrutiny Management Board issues and discussion points;
- a copy of the Equality Assessment for budget saving proposal reference EDS 5 E and F (online benefit claims);
- details of the Legal Services income streams relating to proposal reference RES 21 B;
- a further briefing on the proposals associated with regard to the visitor centre (reference EDS 2);
- a copy of the Equalities Assessment for Blue Badge parking change proposals, Rother Valley Country Park;
- information relating to the take-up of free school meals;
- information about the foster care agencies which are active in Rotherham.

Members discussed issues concerning the budgets for the Rotherham Investment and Development Office and about business incubation centres within the Borough area.

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.

98. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

99. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Planning meetings continue to be held with the Youth Cabinet, in advance of the Children's Commissioner Take-over Day meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, scheduled to be held on Tuesday 23rd February, 2016, commencing at 5.00 pm. A briefing meeting for Elected Members will take place earlier that day, beginning at 4.00 p.m. The focus of the meeting will be on mental health issues.

100. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 15TH AND 22ND JANUARY, 2016

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 15th January, 2016 and on 22nd January, 2016, be approved as correct records for signature by the Chairman.

101. WORK IN PROGRESS

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Councillor Beck, Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission, reported that the forthcoming meeting of the Select Commission will consider the following matters:-

Litter and fly tipping – progress of the Task and Finish Group;
Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan;
Improving Places - scrutiny work programme 2016/17.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Councillor Hamilton, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, reported that, at its most recent meeting, the Select Commission had considered:-

Rotherham Safeguarding Children Board – Annual Report 2014/15;
Safeguarding Children and Families – regular performance monitoring.

Health Select Commission:-

Councillor Sansome, Chair of the Health Select Commission, reported

that Vice-Chair, Councillor Mallinder, had recently attended the summit meeting, arranged by the Care Quality Commission, which included a quality assessment of the Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber (RDaSH) NHS Foundation Trust.

Audit Committee:-

Councillor Wyatt, Chair of the Audit Committee, reported that the Price Waterhouse Copper company had prepared a health check report about this Council's Internal Audit services, which would be considered by the Committee in the near future. The Committee was also making progress with its reviews of the Council's various risk registers

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, reported on recent discussions with the Council's Chief Executive about the scrutiny work programme for 2016/17.

102. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held as follows:-

- Tuesday 23rd February 2016 – Children's Commissioner Take-over Day meeting, commencing at 5.00 p.m.
- Friday 26th February 2016 – scheduled meeting, commencing at 9.00 a.m.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
20th January, 2016

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Commissioner Manzie, Councillors Beaumont, Sansome and C. Vines.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC COMMISSIONING

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members and Stakeholders, the all-party selection panel chose Mr. Nathan Atkinson as their preferred candidate at final interviews on Wednesday, 20th January, 2016.

Mr. Atkinson, currently Interim Head of Strategic Commissioning, Children & Families Directorate at Manchester City Council, was an experienced commissioning specialist with a successful track record spread across Children's and Adult Services over 12 years at Manchester City and Trafford Councils.

Resolved: That Mr. Nathan Atkinson be appointed Assistant Director of Strategic Commissioning.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF INDEPENDENT LIVING AND SUPPORT

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members and Stakeholders, the all-party selection panel chose Ms. Samantha Newton as their preferred candidate at final interviews on Wednesday, 20th January, 2016.

Ms. Newton, currently Interim Head of Adult Services at Rotherham Council, was an experienced Adult Social Care professional with 27 years post qualifying experience and 19 years track record in management roles, the majority of her career has been spent in Rotherham.

Resolved: That Ms. Samantha Newton be appointed Assistant Director of Independent Living and Support.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
26th January, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Atkin, Buckley, Burton, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Godfrey, Gosling, Mallinder, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Price, Russell, Sims, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

INDICES OF DEPRIVATION 2015

Councillor Roche, Chair, introduced Miles Crompton, Policy and Partnerships, who gave the following presentation:-

Indices of Deprivation 2015

- Government measure produced by Oxford University
- Updates the previous ID2010
- 7 domains (37 Indicators) = Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) with 2013/14 baseline
- SOA Geography (167 in Rotherham and 32,844 in England)
- Average of SOA Scores measure – Rotherham increased from 53rd most deprived district in 2010 to 52nd in 2015 (326 districts)
- Minor changes to methodology

Rotherham Deprivation relative to England

% of Rotherham population within English IMD deciles	IMD 2004	IMD 2007	IMD 2010	IMD 2015
Most deprived 10%	12%	12%	18%	19.5%
Most deprived 20%	33%	32%	33%	31.5%
Most deprived 30%	49%	46%	46%	45%
Less deprived than national average	29%	35%	32%	37%

23.1% of children 0-15 live in 10% most deprived areas nationally (15.6% in 2007)

Rotherham's most deprived SOAs

All in top 2% of 32,844 English SOAs

SOA	Rank in 2010	Rank in 2015
Ferham	851	242 (+609)
East Herringthorpe North	230	257 (-27)
Eastwood Village	2,207	302 (+1,905)
Canklow North	434	315 (+119)
Eastwood East	641	323 (+318)
East Herringthorpe South	920	480 (+440)
Eastwood Central	1,089	500 (+589)
Maltby Birks Holt	1,207	597 (+610)
East Dene East	707	623 (+84)
Masbrough	847	634 (+213)

Estimated Ward Indices of Multiple Deprivation Scores

Ward	2004	2007	2010	2015	2004-2015	2010-2015
1. Rotherham East	52	51	52	58	-6	+6
2. Valley	42	42	44	45	+3	+1
3. Rotherham West	38	38	40	42	+4	+2
4. Wingfield	35	33	35	40	+5	+5
5. Boston Castle	35	35	37	37	+2	-
6. Maltby	35	33	37	37	+2	-
20. Hellaby	16	14	14	13	-3	-1
21. Sitwell	15	13	14	12	-3	-2

Deprivation by Domain

Domain	Top 10%	Change 2010-15	Top 20%	Top 50%
Education & Skills	24%	0	39%	69%
Employment	24%	+2%	42%	75%
Health & Disability	21%	-12%	40%	85%
Income	17%	+3%	33%	64%
Crime	15%	+4%	25%	65%
Living Environment	2%	-1%	4%	10%
"Barriers"	0%	0	2%	15%

40% of Rotherham is in the most deprived 20% nationally but none is in the least deprived 20%

Indices of Deprivation

Change in Health Indicators

Indicator	ID 2010	ID 2015	Change
Years of potential life lost	74.3	64.8	-9.5
Comparative illness & disability ratio (sickness & disability benefits)	147.1	142.5	-4.6
Acute morbidity (emergency admissions) 2006-8/2011-13	199.5	125.8	-73.7
Mood & anxiety disorders (Mental Health) 2006-8/2012-13	0.33	0.51	+0.18
Overall Health & Disability Score	0.84	0.64	-0.20

Average SOA scores (above) show improvement

Mental Health is worse – GP prescribing, hospital episodes, disability benefits and suicides

Income Deprivation affecting Children Index 2015

- 24.3% of children 0-15 are affected by low income
- Children 0-15 are 19% of population but 25% of those affected by low income
- 35% of children in low income families live in 10% most deprived nationally

Children and Young People's Attainment
Education Sub-Domain 2015

- 27% of children and young people live in 10% most deprived areas nationally
- 16% live in 5% most deprived areas

Comparison of Life Chances: Children

20 Contrasting Neighbourhoods	10 most deprived areas	10 least deprived areas
Total population (2013)	17,486	15,822
Children (aged 0-17)	5,870 (33.6%)	2,655 (16.8%)
Live in a family with 3+ dependent children	2,975 (50.7%)	470 (17.7%)
Good level of development at Foundation (2013)	117 (36.7%)	115 (73.2%)
Achieve Level 4 at Key Stage 2 (2011-13)	143 (56.7%)	135 (88.0%)
Achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C inc English & maths (2011-13)	80 (32.7%)	141 (82.6%)
Be a Child in Need (Children Act 1989) (2014)	236 (4.0%)	21 (0.8%)
Be in contact with or supported by the CSE Team aged 13-16 (2012-14)	202 (20%)	31 (4.6%)

Comparison of Life Chances: Adults & General

20 Contrasting Neighbourhoods	10 most deprived areas	10 least deprived areas
Total population (2013)	17,486	15,822
Working Age Adults 18-64	9,732 (55.7%)	9,691 (61.3%)
Be unemployed, long term sick or FT carer	3,226 (33.1%)	505 (5.2%)
Be a disabled adult claiming DLA (2015)	1,460 (12.6%)	545 (4.1%)
Live in an overcrowded home (all households)	880 (12.6%)	114 (1.8%)
Recorded violent offences, burglary, theft and criminal damage (per 1,000 pop)	1,791 (102.4)	315 (19.9)
Older people aged 65+	1,884 (10.8%)	3,476 (22%)
Live in poverty as a pensioner	765 (40.6%)	222 (6.4%)
Male life expectancy	73.4	83
Female life expectancy	77.4	86.9

Key Messages

- Deprivation still top 20% nationally
- Employment and education deprivation most severe
- Improvements in health, crime and environment

- Most deprived areas getting worse
- Areas with average or low deprivation doing better
- Mental health getting worse
- Rising barriers to housing – affordability
- Polarisation on all domains except living environment
- 18.7% deprived of income
- 24.3% children v 16.5% working age adults
- Children more likely to be affected by deprivation

Policy Challenges

- Targeting the most deprived areas
 - Are we closing the gap? – no it is getting wider
 - Previous initiatives made little lasting impact
 - Welfare Reform exacerbating deprivation
 - Identify what works: evaluation and best practice
 - Joining-up services and targeting resources
- Improving education and skills in our most deprived areas
 - Raising school attainment and participation post-18
 - Higher adult qualifications and skills
 - Work readiness: basic life skills, welfare to work
 - Cultural shift towards learning and working

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- The information contained within the Indices were used for the submission of funding bids by the Council and other groups
- Importance of a neighbourhood approach when attempting to tackle the most deprived neighbourhoods
- Ability to drill down the information into Wards
- Need to convey the message to schools that it was not just about attaining GCSEs but also higher/further education
- For the period 2000-07 Rotherham had been 1 of the best performers in the area for job growth due mainly to the regeneration of the Manvers area; since 2007 it had been a reverse direction
- Disability Benefits were included in Indices as part of the Employment domain
- Rotherham did not compare well with similar authorities
- Long term problems not resolved by short term funding
- Partnership working required as resources diminished

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
28th January, 2016

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Commissioner Ney, Councillors Lelliott, Parker, Sims, Steele, C. Vines and Sharon Kemp, Chief Executive.

APPOINTMENT OF STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews with Commissioners and an assessment centre involving Elected Members and Stakeholders, the all-party selection panel chose Mr. Damien Wilson as their preferred candidate at final interview on Thursday, 28th January, 2016.

Mr. Wilson, currently Assistant Director Regeneration and Planning at Hartlepool Borough Council, had 25 years local authority experience having previously worked at Gosport, Dumfries & Galloway, Bath & North Somerset, Kennet, North Tyneside and Gateshead Councils. As well as regeneration and development his experience included management of planning, housing, public protection, tourism, culture & heritage.

Resolved:- That Mr. Damien Wilson be appointed Strategic Director Regeneration and Environment.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
Thursday, 4th February, 2016

Present:- Councillor Wallis (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beck, Elliot, Jepson, Jones, Mallinder, Parker, Price, Russell, Sansome, Sims, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

10 ROTHERHAM'S HOUSING STRATEGY

Councillor E. Wallis, Advisory Cabinet Member for Housing, thanked Members for attending today and outlined the challenges being faced by the cuts and falling resources, which were not helped by the proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill.

The proposed three year Housing Strategy was an early attempt to provide support and alignment and maximise any opportunities.

The Chair welcomed Dave Richmond, Assistant Director Housing, Asset Management and Neighbourhood Services, and Jane Davies-Haire, Strategic Housing Manager, and invited them to give their presentation on Rotherham's Housing Strategy.

The presentation drew specific attention to:-

- The Vision for the Strategy.
- Evidence.
- Consultation.
- Key Consultation Messages.
- Challenges.
- Opportunities.
- Themes.
- Theme 1 – Housing Growth.
- The Council's Strategic Enabling Role.
- Housing Growth – Key Actions.
- Theme 2 – Social Housing.
- Maintaining High Standards.
- Opportunities for People to Move.
- Strengthening Communities.
- Social Housing – Key Actions.
- Theme 3 – Private Rented Sector.
- Private Rented Sector – where want to be in three years.
- Private Rented Sector – Key Actions.
- Theme 4 – Affordable Home Ownership.
- Home Ownership – Key Actions.
- Theme 5 – Specialist Housing.
- Housing for Older People.
- Children and Young People.
- Other Groups.
- Next Steps.

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

- Councillor Parker asked whether the New Homes Bonus was paid to the Council or social housing and advised it was paid for any house that was built in the borough.
- Councillor Beck referred to the various strategies, but specifically asked if as part of the town centre strategy there would be similar ones for the other townships like Dinnington, Thurcroft, Maltby and Swinton and was advised there were no separate plans, but this was a big opportunity for Rotherham Town Centre and they would look to see how the other smaller town centres could be involved.
- Councillor Parker referred to the auctioning of small plots of land and whether self-build opportunities should be expanded and shared between small builders and was advised this was an area being explored for specialist custom build which incorporated a custom build register on the website.
- Councillor Whelbourn made reference to the recent Central Government consultation on the proposed changes to National Planning Policy and asked how good was Rotherham in getting mortgages and suggested there be some liaison between relevant officers. He was advised that this was subject to consultation with further discussion on starter homes.
- Councillor Wyatt referred to the number of Right to Buy properties which were now privately rented at twice the price, but suggested there be more initiatives for living in the town centres with accommodation about shops to improve viability. He also asked about the numbers of privately rented properties stood empty and if there were any limitations on bringing those back into use.

He was advised that there were a range of actions being looked at including feasibility work about rental accommodation in town centres and grant support to bring empty homes back up to standard.

Any detail about accommodation stood empty should be forwarded on information and if a former Right to Buy property was stood empty the Council had some powers to be able to buy the property back.

- Councillor Jepson referred to the Core Strategy hearing two years ago and asked if the Housing Strategy would feed into the Local Development Plan and was advised that work plans were in place with funding from the HRA to ensure the key documents worked together.

- Councillor Russell referred to increasing homelessness and deprivation and asked if there were any plans to create more provision and how Rotherham would cope with the problem if there were no top-ups.

She was advised that this was a big problem and there was a need to understand how many people this may affect. The new Allocations Policy criteria had stringent affordability checks before properties were let. Stock needed to be re-assessed and consideration given to other occupancy provision in order to be more pragmatic and do the best for Rotherham's residents.

- Councillor Elliot pointed out that there was an omission as low income/owner occupiers did not feature and asked if there was any provision for assistance for this group with the difficulty of upgrading and maintaining properties to a high standard.

She was advised that grant assistance from the Council was no longer available, but that schemes were occasionally extended to owner/occupiers on estates where upgrades to say roofing programmes were taking place and owners were afforded the opportunity to link into these making upgrades and maintenance more affordable.

- Councillor Mallinder referred to the aging population, the decreasing housing stock and the creative initiatives for adaptations and she was advised that whilst the budget for adaptations was sufficient to accommodate requests this would come under increasing pressure as budgets were squeezed further. The Adaptations Team were working closely with Health colleagues to look at adaptations and exceptions were required.

Resolved:- (1) That Dave Richmond and Jane Davies-Haire be thanked for their informative presentation.

(2) That the information shared be noted.

EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL
Monday, 15th February, 2016

Present:- Councillor Alam (in the Chair); Commissioner Ney, Councillors Read, Roche, Sims, Wallis and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Vines.

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

15. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Financial Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

16. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - HOUSING

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Housing Services.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

17. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - HOUSING, ASSET MANAGEMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Housing, Asset Management and Neighbourhood Services.

Resolved:- That the application be deferred pending receipt of further information.

18. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - 2010 ROTHERHAM LIMITED

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of 2010 Rotherham Limited.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

(All Panel Members declared they had had no prior involvement with 2010 Rotherham Limited)

19. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REPORT - ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Environment and Development Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

20. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Children and Young People's Services.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
Wednesday, 27th January, 2016

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Councillor R. Frost

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Councillor A. Jones
Councillor G. Jones

Sheffield City Council
Councillor Armstrong
Councillor J. Campbell
Councillor S. Mair-Richards (**in the Chair**)
Councillor J. Otten

Co-opted Member
Mr. A. Carter

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. McGuinness (Doncaster), C. Vines (Rotherham) and E. Wallis (Rotherham) and Mr. S. Chufungleung (Co-opted Member).

F37. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

37.1 It was noted that a question had been submitted from a member of the public that had been asked on a number of occasions. The member of the public concerned was not present at the meeting, however, the Chair ruled it as being out of order due to it being repetitious and the questioner having been previously told that it was a procedural matter which had been submitted to the Chief Constable.

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

“Despite recently being the victim of an armed robbery, I am not someone who wants the sight of armed police on the streets of Sheffield to become familiar or normal.

Is the PCP or PCC able to comment on any conversation they had with the Chief Constable or the PCP with the PCC in respect to the armed police on patrol in Sheffield city centre over the Christmas period?

Were they or the PCC consulted on the matter or was it handed down from the Home Office as a fait accompli?

If so, where does this leave the so called democratic control of the Police that the PCC is supposed to represent?”

37.3 The Police and Crime Commissioner replied that, as far as the Police were concerned over the Christmas period, it was a reaction to the attacks in Paris. The judgement was taken, which was not dictated by the Home Office or the Home Secretary but were local judgements taken, not just in Sheffield, but other local centres and Chief Constables put some armed police in centres like Meadowhall and city centres in order reassure people. The Police and Crime Commissioner had not been consulted. There had been a reaction from the public mainly favourable but not everybody. It was thought that the Chief Constable would reflect upon the reactions and think about that if he feels needs to do anything like that again. The Commissioner did not see it as being routine and depends upon the level of threat that is perceived by an individual Chief Constable. The Commissioner and Chief Constable do discuss things but it was his decision at the end of the day.

37.4 As far as armed officers are concerned yes there were armed officers but they were not visible to the public; they were in cars going about South Yorkshire 24 hours a day but you did not see them because the Force needed them to respond immediately if there was an incident.

37.5 Councillor G. Jones reported that Doncaster Council had been made aware that armed police were going to patrol particularly in the Frenchgate Centre in Doncaster and told that was happening following the issues in Paris. One complaint had been received about the armed police being on the streets, however, Councillor Jones had spoken to people subsequently who were reassured equally in that measure. It was a one-off particularly following those fateful attacks and hopefully would never see it again but it had certainly given reassurance to most people.

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

(a) "How did the Police and Crime Commissioner feel about moving the Fire Service and Police Force together. As the Police Force seem to suffer changes about every two years could they not be left to settle down to the local Police team working before more changes take place. These changes always have a grave impact on partnership working which then impacts on the public.

(b) How valuable does the Police and Crime Commissioner see the Confirmer system set up by South Yorkshire Police and used in partnership with Neighbourhood Watch and if he approves of it could he ensure that the Force use it for crime information. Instead of ignoring it because they have not time. Is this not a waste of money?"

37.7 With regard to question (a), the Police and Crime Commissioner agreed that there had been turbulence happening within the Police Force and it did need to settle down and embed and the local Police teams needed a period of stability to settle. As far as collaboration and partnership possibly with the Fire Service concerned, there was an agenda now which was not being driven by the Force locally, South

Yorkshire had its own ideas about collaboration with the Fire Service, but it was very much from the Home Office and Home Secretary. This appeared to be the direction of travel from the Government and it seemed to be fairly clear at some point there would have to be discussion with the Fire and Rescue Services. That is not to say South Yorkshire did not value a partnership with the Fire Services as there were a number of things that could and were done together such as shared buildings for example the building at Maltby. That was the level at which the Force was taking things in that partnering/sharing way but recognises there were pressures coming from the Home Secretary.

37.8 With regard to question (b), the Police and Crime Commissioner felt it was a valuable service. It was maintained by South Yorkshire Police and performed a valuable service. It was the Commissioner's understanding that the Police were now so stretched in terms of officers and officer time that the ideal of them operating the system and sending down messages on a pretty regular basis will probably not happen because the personnel were not available. His advice would be for Neighbourhood Watch ought to meet with the District Commanders or with local Inspector to see what it could do to make it a better system.

F38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

38.1 Councillor Frost asked the following questions:-

(a) "I would like you to look at sharing buildings with the fire and ambulance services on 'out of town' sites to enable valuable sites to be sold and reduce running costs.

(b) Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour is a key priority and remaining committed to Neighbourhood policing. Already warranted officers have been moved to LPTs and now PSCOs are being centralised so we will miss their local knowledge built up over time. Is this the end of neighbourhood policing?

Penistone members are concerned that at certain times they will be left with no cover as travelling to Penistone can be delayed by traffic or weather problems. How can this be overcome?

(c) We are already seeing difficulties getting officers to PACT meetings and Crime and Safety Sub-Groups. How can Elected Members report problems/concerns to the Police? How do we set PACT priorities?

There were good links between Neighbourhood teams and Berneslai Homes HMOs responsible for anti-social behaviour where information was shared and appear to be lost. How can these links be restored?

(d) Crime is rising and the teams getting intelligence and with links to the community are being lost."

38.2 With regard to question (a), the Police and Crime Commissioner replied that the South Yorkshire Police and South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Services were already looking at ways to share buildings and reduce costs for both services. Maltby was a good example of a shared facility and it was envisaged this would happen more over the next few years. They would also be looking at working with the Ambulance Service though this was more complicated because they operated on a Yorkshire-wide basis.

38.3 With regard to question (b), the Police and Crime Commissioner replied that he was committed to the concept of neighbourhood policing though the size of the Force had had to be reduced in recent years due to funding cuts.

The new Local Policing Teams had a neighbourhood focus and officers were being equipped with hand held computers that allowed them to stay in communities to write up their reports. They did not have to keep going back and forth to police stations.

Police Community Support Officers were being retained as part of the new Local Policing Teams as a pledge had been given that the percentage of PCSOs would remain at about 6% (225 PCSOs) for the next four years to 2020.

They were a vital resource for enabling communities to feel safe and as a source of local intelligence for the Police.

The Commissioner had given reassurances to Penistone residents that, despite the cuts, their concerns would be addressed and the local Inspector understood very well that some of the smaller or more remote communities must also be kept safe and feel safe.

38.4 With regard to question (c), the Police and Crime Commissioner reported that since there were fewer officers their attendance at community meetings was being reviewed. He would ask all local groups – TARAs, PACTs, Community Forums etc. – to talk to their local Inspector about how the Force could engage with them in the future. Local arrangements would vary. Some meetings may arrange for officers or PCSOs to attend on a less frequent basis. All groups could arrange for information to be passed electronically.

38.5 With regard to question (d), the Police and Crime Commissioner reported that not all crime was rising. In fact some crimes which concerned community groups a great deal – such as burglaries – were falling. It was vital that community groups worked with South Yorkshire Police to understand the new Local Policing Teams and to agree ways of continuing to share information.

This was one reason why the Commissioner was determined that the number of PSCOs would remain at the present number for the next four

years.

38.6 Mr. Carter asked the following question:-

“It relates to the decision taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner to move his office location from Regent Street in Barnsley to the Police Headquarters in Carbrook in Sheffield. I did have a little concern about what message that might give to the general public in terms of the independence of the PCC from the Police Force to be located continuously with him. I suggested, although I appreciate it is a matter entirely for the Commissioner’s for his consideration and determination, that it might be helpful if the address given at least indicated a certain separation from the Chief Constable and his Command Team.”

38.7 The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the OPCC had very much taken the latter point Mr. Carter was making. He explained that clearly there was an environment where the PCC was having to save every penny possible and a principal motive for moving was financial and the move was going to save something like £100,000 a year. Consideration was then given as to where the OPCC would move to and, because the Police estate was shrinking, there were a number of options in terms of police stations, either whole or partly, and all had been considered and finished up with Carbrook which had space in it. The OPCC had moved into part of the ground floor and had a separate entrance and was separately badged. Mr. Carter was right in terms of what the OPCC put on their e-mail address, address and notepaper and must make the distinction absolutely clear. Perception was important and the PCC and OPCC had thought long and hard about that and in the end became an inhabiting factor before made the final decision. All things being equal Carbrook was the obvious place to go. Staff had moved in and been there for over a week.

38.8 The other key thing was in terms of the savings in petrol and people going backwards and forwards by Meadowhall to Barnsley. The Senior Command Team were highly paid people spending a good proportion of their life every month on the motorway stuck in traffic. .

38.9 Mr. Carter asked if the Commissioner was now required to pay relocation expenses to members of your staff by virtue of change of their office?

38.10 The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that there had been some cost in altering the building and the other costs of the kind you mentioned because changing terms of conditions. There would be some initial costs but it was then envisaged saving a lot of money.

F39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 27TH NOVEMBER, 2015

39.1 Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of

the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 27th November, 2015.

39.2 It was confirmed that a letter had been sent to the IPCC expressing the Panel's disappointment with regard to the lack of progress (Minute No. 30 CSE Update).

39.3 The Chair stated that the revised procedure for the initial handling of complaints would be kept under review (Minute No. 31 refers).

39.4 Arising from Minute No. 28.5(a) (the report by Professor John Drew), the Police and Crime Commissioner reported that the report had taken longer than initially hoped but was now in the process of being written up. There was some sensitivity around its release date due to the trials taking place at Sheffield Crown Court, however, all local authorities would have sight of the report before an announcement was made.

39.5 Mr. Carter asked if Panel members in future could receive the draft minutes of meeting in advance of the next meeting's agenda to allow submission of any possible questions to the Commissioner.

Action:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th January, 2015, be approved for signature by the Chair.

(2) That Panel members receive the draft minutes as soon as possible after the meeting – Immediate.

F40. PRECEPT PROPOSAL FOR 2016-17

40.1 Consideration was given to a report, submitted by the Chief Finance Officer to the Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, containing information about the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner's proposed Council Tax precept for the 2016/17 financial year.

40.2 Attached to the report was a draft of the Police and Crime Plan setting out the strategic direction for policing in South Yorkshire and providing the information necessary for the determination of the revenue budget and Council Tax precept.

40.3 The Chancellor had announced the outcome of the Spending Review on 25th November, 2015, stating that the Government would protect overall Police spending in real terms over the spending review period, an increase of £900M in cash terms by 2019/20 which would provide funding to maintain overall Police force budgets at current cash levels.

40.4 The Spending Review also provided some Police and Crime Commissioners greater flexibility in their local funding decisions by allowing those areas that had historically kept Council Tax levels low to

increase the Band D Council Tax by £5. The 2015/15 Council Tax for policing in South Yorkshire was the eighth lowest policing Council Tax in England and therefore the “greater flexibility” was available to the Commissioner.

40.5 The Police Minister announced details of the Police Grant for 2016/17 on 17th December which stated that for 2016/17 direct resource funding for each Police and Crime Commissioner, including precept, would be protected at flat cash levels assuming that precept income was increased to the maximum amount available. This meant that no PCC would face a reduction in cash funding next year compared to this year and the majority would see marginal increases in their spending power.

40.6 An analysis of the grant funding position for Policing in South Yorkshire showed that funding from the Government, in respect of Police Grant and Formula Grant, would fall by approximately £1M in 2016/17. However, the Police Minister was able to suggest that funding for South Yorkshire would actually increase by £0.9M by assuming that Council Tax income would increase by £5 on a Band D property and that additional income would be generated by a small rise in the tax base.

40.7 The Police Funding Settlement was only for one year which made it difficult to undertake medium term financial planning. It also meant that assumptions had to be made as to the potential levels of funding for years beyond 2017 linked to the overall Home Office totals shown in the Spending Review document.

40.8 The net revenue budget for 2015/16 was £240.128M. On the basis of the funding settlement and assuming a Council Tax increase of £5 for a Band D property, the overall net revenue budget for 2016/17 would be, based on the current tax base and with no inclusion of the Collection Fund position, no more than £239.724M an overall reduction in resources of approximately £0.4M.

40.9 The overall forecast budget gap amounting to £10.5M. There was the potential for this to reduce following the determination of the tax base and collection fund position by the district councils. The gap would, therefore, need to be met from savings in revenue expenditure in 2016/17.

40.10 With employee costs representing approximately 90% of the revenue budget, it was likely that the majority of the savings would be found from reductions in employee numbers. Where such reductions involved severance/redundancy payments, the costs would be a feature of the Reserves Strategy. The approach to reducing such numbers would in part be determined by the review of operating structures which was being carried out and guided by the working assumptions set out in the Police and Crime Plan 2016-20.

40.11 The PCC would need financial reserves in order to ensure funding

was available to meet future commitments and avoid unplanned reductions in activity as a result of unforeseen or unbudgeted expenditure. The costs associated with legacy issues was not included in the revenue budget previously. There was no nationally recognised measure of the level of reserves but the Audit Commission suggested that most Chief Finance Officers regard an amount of between 3% and 5% of net revenue spending as a prudent level for general reserves.

40.12 The PCCs Reserves Strategy would be finalised as part of the budget process, however, during the current financial year the PCC had changed the planned strategy of using general reserves to contribute to funding the capital progress to preserving reserve levels for potential future legacy costs. This had resulted in planned review contributions to capital for 2015/16 being released back into reserves and the financing of capital spending replaced with borrowing.

40.13 In renewing the Police and Crime Plan 2016-20 Putting Safety First, there would be more emphasis of emerging themes of:-

- Victims of domestic abuse, human trafficking and hate crime
- Seeking to understand the causes of fatal road traffic collisions to enable greater prevention
- Developing an effective counter terrorism capability
- Ensuring an effective response to armed criminality within South Yorkshire
- Building confidence with the public and contributing to community cohesion

40.14 The following working assumptions would underpin all decision making:-

- Remaining committed to neighbourhood policing
- Deploying resources to areas of highest demand based on threat, harm and risk
- Finding ways to understand and address appropriately feelings of safety
- Distinguishing more carefully between demand that requires an appropriate police response and demand that is the primary concern of other partners
- Consulting public and partners about what they expect of South Yorkshire Police
- Encouraging the workforce at all levels to contribute towards improving service delivery
- Maximising partnerships with other forces, local authorities, emergency services and others in the criminal justice system at local, regional and national levels, where it makes for greater effectiveness and efficiency
- Embedding the Code of Ethics for policing in our culture

After the Police and Crime Commissioner had completed his presentation of the budget report, the Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked the following questions:-

- The OPCC had organised two events with partners to look and map who was doing/providing what in particular areas and was there any duplication/overlap, could the resources be pooled and work together better. The message was coming back that everyone was squeezed and struggling with the financial situation but unless all agencies worked together the small resources available may be wasted so it was important all worked together
- The back office functions of HR, Finance, IT, Legal and Finance – were shared with Humberside and had resulted in a number of savings but there was more to be done. Priority based budgeting, a close look at activities to ascertain if any more savings could be made, was being undertaken. This not reflected in the budget as that work had only just commenced but it was hoped that more savings would be found during the financial year. There was already co-operation with other Forces with regard to specialist activities.
- The possible 50-60 jobs would go through natural wastage so the likely gaps were known. However, it was now becoming more difficult to redeploy given the vastly reduced workforce
- The £4.8M funding for Legacy issues was divided into two. Firstly, £2.4M for the potential costs of the National Crime Agency inquiry into CSE and the remaining £2.4M for the Hillsborough costs which were ongoing. What this figure represented was if there were additional costs, and there would be in both areas, the minimum that would certainly have to be found would be £2.4M. If South Yorkshire applied to the Home Secretary for a specialist grant and for it to be favourably looked upon, she had made it clear we would have to stand the first £2.4M of expenses which was roughly 1% of the total budget so as a precaution we need to have £4.8M in there
- The settlement going forward, unlike local authorities who were given some reassurance over the next 4 years the Police did not; the fund was for 1 year only. There was the flexibility relating to the ability of the Commissioner to raise the Council Tax £5 but it was not known if that would be available for the next year. The Commissioner had not been formally asked to sign off the budget for 2016/17 as work was still taking place to find ways of balancing the budget. As part of the budget process work was still underway in terms of the medium term forecast from April 2017 onwards. At the present time it was felt that the forecast would involve a flat line police finance settlement position probably assuming there would continue to be a reduction in Government grant but that those reductions would be offset by Council Tax increases as that appeared to be the assumption underlying the spending review. That would mean that the reductions

in spending would have to be found in future years to offset Government increases and costs increases

- It was not felt that a full collaboration of South Yorkshire and Humberside Police Forces was being moved to. The two Forces were working very closely together as it made sense being neighbours. The collaboration still had a long way to go and more savings to be achieved. However, the footprint for the new Sheffield City Region, was different and had to be considered. The Police operated at national, regional and local levels.
- The Ministry of Justice Grant was funding that was issued annually. The figure for South Yorkshire for next year was £1.6M, a slight increase on 2015/16. There was no indication of the level of funding in future years. It funded Youth Offending Teams
- The number of Specials were rising. They were trained officers and could do everything a Police Officer could do but they were not available when they were at work. The use of volunteers generally was something that the Home Secretary was very keen all Forces look at South Yorkshire was being cautious and clear that they were not using volunteers to do things that should be paid jobs within the police force
- It was not a comprehensive list of emerging themes in the Putting Safety First Plan. Domestic abuse, human trafficking and hate crime had been in the Plan previously but suddenly seemed to have come to the fore. There was a HMI report on domestic abuse which said that South Yorkshire had to improve with regard to domestic abuse. Having a police force able to deal with these issues meant having to have the right calibre of officer and training
- It was becoming a real anxiety for the increased use of the Police Force as the "last resort" particularly with regard to cases involving mental health. There were growing concerns and issues on the Police having to respond when someone was in trouble. Discussions were taking place with the NHS and local authorities with regard to mental health cases as police officers were not trained. It was a growing area of concern across the country
- The staff at Atlas Court were doing a very difficult job with outdated equipment. They had great responsibility when receiving a call, making a judgement and making the right response to that call; it was a skilled operation. They were as much front line as neighbourhood police officers. There was a Capital Programme of approximately £12M. Tenders had been received with the chosen bidder being selected by 1st April; there would then be a period of a year for the design of the actual technology which would be state of the art. It was acknowledged that in hindsight more should have been done earlier but last year when there had been real difficulties with 101 it had not

just been the equipment but also some mistakes made about the number of people in Atlas Court which had now been rectified

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

(2) That the contents of the documents detailing the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposals for "Securing the Future of Neighbourhood Policing" (distributed to Panel Members at this meeting) be noted.

(3) That the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel supports the proposal, now submitted by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, to increase the Council Tax by 1.95% for 2015/16, which is equivalent to an annual increase for a Band D property of £2.83 (6p per week).

F41. INTRODUCTION OF THE OPPORTUNITY FOR GENERAL QUESTIONS FROM PANEL MEMBERS TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

41.1 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser, to the Panel, presented a report proposing changes to the Rules of Procedure to introduce the opportunity for members of the Panel to ask general questions of the Commissioner.

41.2 It was proposed that, in relation to Point 9 of the Procedure, in the absence of the Member who had given notice of a question, that the Member be supplied with a written answer.

41.3 Discussion ensued on point 7(2)(b) of Appendix 1 "most not repeat or substantially repeat any question that has been asked and answered at a meeting of the Panel in the six months preceding the date of the meeting". It was established that it would be for the Chair to make a judgement call as to whether the question had been answered previously.
Agreed:- That the Panel's Rules of Procedure for meetings be amended to include the procedure in relation to questions from members of the Panel to the Commissioner on general matters, as set out in Appendix 1 including the further revision to Point 9.

F42. UPDATE ON THE OPERATION THE COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

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

42.2 The following complaints had been resolved:-

1. A complaint about the timeliness of South Yorkshire Police's response to a robbery.

As this complaint was an operational matter it had been referred to South Yorkshire Police. The complainant had been informed that

this had happened.

2. An anonymous complaint had been received that on two occasions the complainants had been unable to speak to someone when using the 101 number to try to contact the Police.

As this was an operational matter it had been referred to South Yorkshire Police. However, as the complaint had been made anonymously it had not been possible to inform the complainant of the action taken.

3. A complaint had been received in respect of the former South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

This had been referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission who would decide as to whether the issue would be investigated further and at that stage a further report would be provided to the Panel.

42.3 Mr. Carter expressed concern that neither he nor Steve Chufungleung had been consulted in the above complaints as per the revised complaints procedure.

42.4 The Legal Adviser advised that the proposed changes had not been implemented as yet. They required specific changes to the complaints procedure which would hopefully be submitted to the next meeting, therefore, the complaints had been dealt with under the existing procedure of the host authority dealing with the initial handling.

42.5 Michelle Buttery, OPCC, reiterated the assurance given at the previous meeting that, when the process did change, the Office would seek to involve the two independent members in the vetting process so they could witness and quality assure the process.

42.6 Disappointment was expressed that the complaints procedure was still under review and not implemented as yet.

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

F43. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Action:- That meetings be held on 4th March, 15th April and 27th May, 2016, all commencing at 11.00 a.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.