

## ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

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

**Date:** Friday, 19th May, 2017

**Time:** 2.00 p.m.

### A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 39)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 40 - 59)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 60 - 76)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 77 - 154)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 155 - 172)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 173 - 200)
7. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 201 - 203)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION**  
**Thursday, 19th January, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Andrews, Brookes, Cusworth, Elliott, Marriott, Short and Williams, Vicky Farnsworth and Robert Parkin (Rotherham Speak-Up).

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Elliot, Ellis and John Turner.

**64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

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

**66. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) Information Pack

The pack contained:-

- November Health and Wellbeing Board minutes
- CQC overview
- Response from Public Health to Councillor Williams' question on data from the Sustainability Transformation Plan powerpoint
- Notes from the TRFT and RDaSH Quality Account sub-groups

(2) Consultations for CWTP and Learning Disability

The Chairman urged Members to get involved in the consultations. It was imperative that Councillors complete the consultation, whether agreeing to the proposals or not, and then needed to get the facts out to constituents.

The Vice-Chairman stated that at the previous meeting assurance had been given that the consultation documents had been sent to all GP surgeries. He had recently visited 2 local surgeries and found no evidence of any documents. He was concerned that either all the documents had gone or that there had been a breakdown in communications which may be indicative of the low response that had been received so far.

Tony Clabby, Healthwatch Rotherham, confirmed that the materials had been distributed to GPs and that Healthwatch had also been involved in distributing them through their networks.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, reported that with regard to the Learning Disability consultation, currently there had been 193 completed online questionnaires and 180 requests for hard copies. He agreed that there was a need for as many people as possible to be involved in the consultation and he would raise the issue of leaflets in GP surgeries with the CCG.

The Chairman reported that it was the plan that all Members would be provided with a copy of the leaflet at the next Council meeting.

**67. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 27TH OCTOBER AND 1ST DECEMBER 2016**

The minutes of the previous meetings of the Health Select Commission held on 27<sup>th</sup> October and 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2016, were noted.

Arising from Minute No. 43 (Response to Scrutiny Review: Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services), it was noted that:-

- there was an agenda item providing more information on the whole School Mental Health Pilot and considering Member involvement.
- the Scrutiny Officer had had a recent positive meeting with the CCG and RDaSH to discuss presenting future progress updates following issues raised at the previous meeting and to revisit timescales where needed with some realistic revised dates.
- the latest performance report produced by RDaSH for November was now available for circulation.

Arising from Minute No. 44 (CAMHS), the RDaSH Voice and Influence template was with the Youth Cabinet for comment.

Arising from Minute No. 45 (Response to Children's Commissioner's Takeover Challenge Review), it was noted that:-

- the new Transition Board would hold its first meeting this month.
- dialogue with regard to transition was still to take place.

Arising from Minute No. 54 (South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw Sustainability and Transformation Plan), it was noted that this had been discussed at 11<sup>th</sup> January Health and Wellbeing Board.

Cabinet Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, stated that he was still very concerned with regard to the consultation on the STP which NHS England was terming "awareness raising". He was in discussion with the Chief Executive as to the most appropriate way of gaining Members' approval/endorsement of the STP. There would be a meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> February regarding governance of the Rotherham Place Plan.

Tony Clabby, Healthwatch Rotherham, reported that NHS England had asked local Healthwatch's and Voluntary Actions across South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw to deliver engagement and communication sessions. Further information was awaited from NHS England as to the timetable and the messages they wished to be included.

Arising from Minute No. 55 (Adult Social Care Performance – Yorkshire and Humber Year End Benchmarking), it was noted that the quarterly reports were to link in with other reporting cycles and that the six monthly reports were to be submitted in July and December.

Arising from Minute No. 56 (Adult Social Care Performance – Local Measures), it was noted:-

- information supplied with regard to LM01-4 for October and November, 2016. With issues arising to be fed in and discussed in March.
- the performance clinic held in July was not a formal minuted meeting. However, there was now a Practice Challenge Group.

Arising from Minute No. 36 (Learning Disability – Shaping the Future Update), it was noted that the work of the People's Parliament at Speak Up should be taken into account.

Resolved:- That the minutes be noted.

(2) That the minutes of Practice Challenge Group be submitted to this Commission.

**68. OVERVIEW OF THE ADULT CARE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME/BETTER CARE FUND**

Keely Firth, Rotherham CCG, and Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director Strategic Commissioning, presented a progress report of the Adult Care Development Programme and the Better Care Fund (BCF) as of Quarter 3 December, 2016:-

Nathan Atkinson reported on the Adult Care Development Programme - the overarching strategy to transform Adult Care highlighting the following:-

- Community Catalysts, a not-for-profit organisation, had recently won a tender to provide expertise as to the development of community groups to deliver preventative services and supplement the wider Adult Care offer
- The Village integrated health and care locality pilot had been running since July, 2016. A Key Performance Indicator suite was being developed to enable practical comparisons to be made with other localities in terms of performance and impact.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 19/01/17

- Training commissioned to support operational workers with understanding and delivery of a strengths based approach to assessment.
- Formal consultation on the future offer in Rotherham for people with a Learning Disability.
- All eighty-four customers attending Charnwood Day Centre had been reviewed and moved to more appropriate support.
- Current offer by the Shared Lives Team had been reviewed with a view to the development of an effective expansion plan based on national best practice.
- Community Opportunity Pathway Programme continued to work with ten customers and their families. Support for the programme ended in December, 2016.

Keely reported that the Better Care Fund was made up funding from the CCG (approximately £20M) and the Local Authority (approximately £4M). There were thirty-six schemes which had now been categorised into six key objectives of the Fund.

During 2016/17 a review had been carried out of all the services for strategic relevance, whether there were strong robust contracts in place and ways of measuring success and the outcomes.

Seven of the eight national conditions were being fully met. The remaining condition was partly met; better data sharing between Health and Social Care based on the NHS number (fully met) and better data sharing including whether Adult Care could ensure that patients/service users had clarity about how data about them used, who may have access and how they could exercise their legal rights (partly met).

What had the Fund done for the people of Rotherham:-

- Defined, improved and increased the joint working with Social Care.
- Mental Health Liaison Services introduced where Mental Health Workers from the local Mental Health Trust now worked in the front end of the Hospital allowing people accessing A&E Services to have intervention before admission and if admitted, through the Mental Health Liaison Services, they could be targeted much faster.
- Social Prescribing – excellent feedback and had given real benefits to those in receipt. It had now been extended for Mental Health Services.
- Increase in the number of community beds which enabled patients to be discharged safely from Hospital where appropriate and had meant delayed transfers of care was less of an issue.

- Increase in the number of people that accessed Personal Health budgets.
- Community Occupational Therapy Service had been subject to a rigorous review resulting in some innovative practice that had reduced waiting times and enabled people to return quicker to their own homes.

The BCF had enabled changes but had also resulted in partners working well together, especially through the difficult period of winter pressures.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The Community Catalysts would be working in Rotherham for two years (February 2019) and would work with the Service to create different options and look at shifting the way of thinking and current practice models, especially for people with Learning Disabilities. It would run alongside the current consultation. A diagnostic exercise of looking at what was available in the community had commenced. It was hoped to create fifteen alternatives within Rotherham communities in the first year starting with some taster sessions to give people an opportunity to go and test different activities, options and things that were available in the community. It would also include looking at community assets and buildings and working with the Community Link Workers.
- The emergency re-admissions target was a contractual Indicator and included in the Foundation Trust's contract with the Trust being incentivised not to discharge patients before it was safe to do so. However, the problem with the BCF metrics, and was a national issue for both emergency re-admissions and non-elective metrics, was that it was counted differently using different activity and patient groups. It almost became a spurious figure. Consideration was currently being given to replace it locally with an equally strong measurement with the same aims of the BCF metric.
- Continuing Health Care (CHC) was where packages of care were put into place; that was not in the BCF at the moment. The Fund had been generated through local investment as BCF was not a national pot of money but derived from partners assessing which national conditions had to be met and agreeing on the funding to pool. There had been some additional investment in Social Care but the bulk of it came from the partners. When the Fund was set initially the focus had been on the areas that felt intuitive to deliver the objectives but there was nothing to prevent the inclusion of CHC.

Both the Council and CCG were investing more in the CHC type packages. There was no cross-subsidisation but there was an increase in investment in CHC from a different set of funds.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 19/01/17

- Consideration should be given to CHC becoming part of the BCF. There were CHC reassessments of adults whose health were not going to improve and then that funding was lost together with residential and nursing homes then competing for funding to care for the older people.
- There had been some marked improvements in the Integrated Health Village recently. An event was to be held on 24<sup>th</sup> January to refocus activity.
- The review of Breathing Spaces had been undertaken to gain an understanding the flow of patients and there was excellent feedback from outpatients. The issue for Rotherham was that patients were frequently accessing the hospital initially as an A&E attendee, admitted for short stay assessment and then generally referred/discharged to Breathing Spaces. An audit of cases had revealed that there were those that were in clinical need and appropriate to have gone to A&E in the first instance but there were also those incidents where 999 ambulance crews had not known of Breathing Spaces' existence as an alternative. Nationally Rotherham stood out on how much it spent on people with respiratory disease but also how many people then had a good outcome from the condition. Rotherham was an outlier i.e. appeared to spend more than others but the outcomes were not showing that immediate benefit. The review was trying to ascertain what was done there, what was working well and whether things could be done differently.

The Foundation Trust was working with the CCG to review Breathing Spaces. There was an opportunity for more "step up" arrangements and a need to review the clinical evidence base on outcomes.

- The BCF performance metric relating to permanent admissions of older people to residential and nursing care homes was a two part measure reflecting the number of younger adults and older people. Part one was younger adults and part two was older people where their long term care needs were met by residential care. It was relative to the population group and measured by how many per 100K were going into provision.
- The emergency re-admissions Indicator was performing very close to the target. It was a symptom of how seriously ill people were when they were went into hospital, the care undertaken and the discharges carried out; there would be occasions when people needed to be readmitted. From a contractually perspective with the Hospital it was not a metric that was underperforming but rather due to the way the metric was calculated.

There was with some complexity around the metric. It would refer to those patients re-admitted with the same condition and there was some detail about other types of re-admission. The aim was right

which was to ensure when patients were treated in the acute setting and that they were supported and discharged at an appropriate point; if things were done prematurely people would be re-admitted. Scrutiny of the metric was welcomed as it was something that the Trust focussed on to ensure that as the length of stay for patients was reduced, particularly for the non-elective patients, it could be tracked as to whether it created more problems and resulted in re-admissions. The Trust was finding that as it reduced the length of stay it was still performing and above average in terms of re-admissions level - approximately in the top 1/3.

- Concern that once local Indicators were selected that the emergency re-admission indicator remain until there was a better understanding of the situation.
- All of the eighty-four customers attending Charnwood Day Care resource had moved onto alternative provision except three that were still accessing day services but from a different day service. A review would take place with those customers six months post their new service. No issues or complaints had been received.
- Information would follow regarding consultation with Light Bite users.

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

(2) That the possibility of Continuing Health Care funding being included as part of the Better Care Fund be raised at the Health and Wellbeing Board Executive Group.

(3) That feedback be submitted to this Select Commission on the 24<sup>th</sup> January Integrated Health Village event and the review of Breathing Spaces.

(4) That a briefing be provided on Community Catalysts.

(5) That the Better Care Fund be submitted to the Select Commission for comment and pre-decision scrutiny prior to sign off by the Health and Wellbeing Board.

*After the meeting the additional information was provided:*

***Lite Bite***

*A dedicated piece of work has been undertaken to look at the operation of the café Lite Bites which is based within the complex of the Trinity Hall in Wath Town Centre.*

*Lite Bites is under the operation of the Oaks Day Centre and is run by staff with support of customers from Oaks Day Centre. The work undertaken has looked at the outcomes, cost and any*



*opportunities/threats. The work has been carried out with Oaks Day Centre in conjunction with the operation of the café within the centre itself.*

*A briefing note is being finalised to consider what the options are that should be considered for the cafes. This will be discussed at Senior Management Team in the coming weeks.*

### **Community Catalysts**

*Community Catalysts are now working within Rotherham and have successfully appointed a Catalyst worker who commenced in post on the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2017. There has been an initial project group meeting which brought together key partners of the project.*

*The Catalyst will support and compliment the work that has already begun around collation of information and advice and building on the work that Community Link Workers and other individuals have undertaken to build community capacity. The project is focussed around the work for Learning Disabilities and will support the modernisation of the Learning Disability Offer for Rotherham.*

*The Community Catalysts Project forms part of the Adult Social Care Development Programme as a workstream. Therefore this has a requirement for regular updates into the internal and external board meetings to ensure progression.*

## **69. TRANSFORMATION OF ACUTE AND COMMUNITY CARE**

Louise Barnett, Chief Executive of the TRFT, and Dominic Blaydon, Associate Director of Transformation, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Overview of the Trust's vision for the next five years

- We will continue as a stand-alone district general hospital
- We will build a reputation for innovation and quality care
- We will achieve a CQC rating of "good" or better
- We will deliver financial sustainability
- We will have a strong emergency and urgent care function
- We will develop sub-regional specialist care centres
- We will provide a strong community health service offer
- We will integrate with health and social care partners

Community Transformation Programme

- Integrated Health and Social Care Teams
- The development of a Reablement Village
- A multi-disciplinary Integrated Rapid Response Service
- A joint approach to care home support
- An enhanced Care Co-ordination Centre

Acute Care Collaborations

- Hyper-Acute Stroke Services
- Breathing Space

Children's Transformation

- Integrated Locality Teams
- Review of Children's Assessment Unit
- Rapid access to a Community Paediatrician
- Reconfiguration of Inpatient Bed Base
- A joint approach to Workforce Development

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

- Currently if a Rotherham resident had a suspected stroke they would be taken by ambulance direct to the Stroke Unit at the District General Hospital and assessed for thrombolysis (an immediate treatment to enable to reduce the possibility of having a secondary stroke). If, due to the capacity of the Stroke Unit, a patient would be taken to A&E and receive the medical intervention or wait in A&E for a bed in the Stroke Unit. They would then spend the first seventy-two hours on a local Stroke Unit and then moved to stroke rehabilitation either at the Stroke Unit, intermediate care or rehabilitation.
- Under the new model, dependent upon where the patient lived, they would either go to the Hallamshire or Doncaster Hospitals for the first seventy-two hours. After that time they would be repatriated to Rotherham Hospital.
- Currently Rotherham residents would be taken to Rotherham Hospital to receive care unless their needs were particularly specialist/had very severe needs when they would then go to Sheffield.
- There was concern with regard to the response times, changes to the journey and what affect that would have on a patient if there was a delay in getting the right treatment. The CCG would be making the decision about what happened to Stroke Services in Rotherham and one of the key principles to making the decision was whether the quality of care to Rotherham patients was going to be better. The Governing Body would be looking very closely at if outcomes for patients would be better or worse. Travel factors would be taken into account.
- The commissioners collectively across South Yorkshire looked into whether the new care pathway would improve the quality of care. They also looked at the evidence base available which showed that where you potentially centralised the care you could provide high quality care irrespective of whether the place that a patient went to currently was providing it at the moment so there was the expectation

that that would increase. It was on that basis upon which they were putting forward the proposal.

- Rotherham Trust's performance had been poorer than the Trust would have liked but had improved recently and providing much better care than previously in terms of the Sentinel Stroke National Audit Programme (SSNAP) Indicators (national metrics upon which the Trust was measured) and seeking to improve further. The case for change was there in terms of the clinical outcomes and the Trust needed to ensure through consultation that there was real input and feedback. All of the issues could be thrashed out in terms of patient experience and the lack of clarity over patients that mimicked a Stroke so that the commissioners in Rotherham and other commissioning bodies were absolutely clear on the basis on which they were making the decision and that it related to outcomes.
- There was a set of indicators that was used nationally around stroke and were gathered by SSNAP which included how quickly a patient got into a Stroke Unit, received thrombolysis and how much time they spent on a Stroke Unit when in hospital. When aggregated Rotherham performed very well even when compared to Doncaster and Sheffield. As part of the consultation process feedback had been provided that Rotherham was already a relatively high performing Stroke Unit and asked the question as to what the criteria was being used to decide who the specialist unit was. In principle the Trust did not have a problem with centralising the resource in terms of sustainability and quality of the Service but the information submitted to the Trust and CCGs as part of the consultation process had not evidenced that. The Trust needed them to look in more detail about the impact of transporting those patients and then work through the detail of the precise plans so as to be confident that the quality of the outcomes would manifest if it happened in South Yorkshire.
- Information available regarding outcomes following a stroke such as chances of survival and maximising recovery e.g. speech, movement as well as the metrics on the stroke care pathway.
- In terms of clinical evidence around the number of individuals that the Hospital supported in terms of stroke, it was important because there was a threshold and it was helpful for clinicians to see lots of people in terms of their practice and outcomes for patients. However, since this process had begun Rotherham was slightly above the threshold that had been identified.
- Sustainability of the Trust as a standalone hospital if services were removed – Whilst the Trust would support stroke patients post-72 hours or all the way through depending upon the outcome, it needed to ensure that overall it had a breadth, depth and range of services that held together as a high performing organisation in Rotherham for patients. It was looking internally and across the place on community

and making sure that integration was strong and effective but also what was needed in terms of acute. The Trust had recognised that it did not have the workforce resilience to deliver what it needed regularly, was quite vulnerable in certain teams with small numbers of clinicians and there were national shortages and so needed to work in partnership with other organisations. The aim would be to get the sustainability required with the service configuration based on population need. There was a case for specialist centres such as for spinal care, but there were still many conditions and complex needs that needed to be provided at home in the community looking at in-reach.

- The transformation of Acute and Community Care model would look at patient safety, ensuring that people were better off in terms of how the Trust did things and the need to reduce harm in terms of falls and pressure ulcers. Another area was patient and family experience and patient expectations; it was recognised that whilst medical advancements had been made, people wanted things more quickly. It was a big piece of work that the Trust needed to carry out and ensure they were able to be part of shaping what future provision would look like and do it together rather than imposing on the public. It was acknowledged that, as an organisation, it needed to get better and listen to people's opinions. The Trust had the clinical expertise but did not experience it the same as a patient and their family.
- No alternative model was being considered other than localised specialist acute model; the Trust needed to decide whether it was going forward on that particular model as part of the consultation. Should the CCG decide it did not want to proceed with the model the Trust would need to look at how it would deliver it locally. Locally there was a fully integrated Stroke pathway and there would have to be a very strong argument to fragment it and take out Hyper Acute and move to another centralised centre. There would need to be absolute assurance that the additional travel time and inconvenience for relatives and patients would achieve better outcomes and better quality service.
- The importance of easy read information and ensuring effective communication with patients and their families so everyone knew which hospital a person was being taken to following a stroke.
- It was really important that people were able to access local services that were easy to get to. There may be certain situations where it was better for the patient and family to move services further from Rotherham but the decision would not be taken lightly and every attempt made to ensure the right balance taking into account the importance of delivering services locally and the impact on patients and relatives.

### HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 19/01/17

- The Foundation Trust and CCG were stating that if proposals, in their view, resulted in a Stroke Care pathway that was not viable then they would not agree to it.
- Staffing and bed capacity in Sheffield and Doncaster and sharing information between services to manage additional capacity?
- Once the pathway was in place Yorkshire Ambulance Service would be fully involved and clear about where a patient was taken. The Trust had raised the point in their consultation response with regard to Doncaster and Sheffield Hospitals having the capacity and capability to be able to delivering the extended service.
- Where was the best medical team going to be?
- With regard to the proposed Children's Transformation, one area that had been rated "Inadequate" by the CQC was Safeguarding but there was no remedial action mentioned in the proposal – information to follow.
- A multi-agency project group was overseeing the Co-ordination Centre single point of access. There were three workstreams – how to incorporate the Mental Health element, how to encourage the Social Care element and also links with the Integrated Rapid Response Service. It was thought that the new extended version of the Care Co-ordination Centre would be agreed within the next year with an implementation plan of six months.
- Under the proposal everyone who might have had a stroke would initially go to Sheffield or Doncaster not Rotherham. There was still some ambiguity about a person who presented with stroke-like symptoms. More sophistication was needed through the consultation to deal with those instances.
- Once a stroke patient had stabilised they would be repatriated to Rotherham. There had been discussion as to whether the whole of acute stroke would transfer but the consultation document just dealt with the first seventy-two hours. Rotherham Hospital would have a stroke unit to deal with everything after the first seventy-two hours.
- Concerns regarding the immediate family getting to and from Sheffield/Doncaster had been raised at the JHOSC.
- The proposed model would be advantageous to those patients that were more complex and avoid them having to be transferred to the Hallamshire Hospital for treatment.
- Governance and influence over future services if transferred from Rotherham would be through the CCG.

- It was unclear what would happen in the case of those patients who unfortunately then had secondary strokes.
- Feedback had been provided on the issue of travel times. Work had been carried out on Yorkshire Ambulance Service having the capacity to meet the travel target, however, the Service's response times were not performing well currently on their eight minute response time. The guidelines stated that a patient needed to receive thrombolytic treatment within an hour; the assessment from the consultation process stated it could be achieved by having two centralised units at Sheffield and Doncaster.
- Was the chance of having a second stroke more likely to happen within the first seventy-two hours? How did Rotherham treat patients differently in that period? An answer would be supplied.
- Transformation of Children's Services and the Locality Teams and ensuring adequate staffing given some of the recruitment and retention issues – Currently there was a lot of duplication and inefficiency in the way professionals worked with an individual coming into contact with a number of agencies, having to retell their story each time and some of the information not being joined up. If a team was brought together to support the child and family there may be less professionals but should create an ability to provide a better and more responsive support compared to the current fragmented service. There would be still be national shortages in certain fields but there would be more attractive roles and give the opportunity to develop apprenticeship roles, Bands 2, 3 and 4, to those who had a wealth of skills and experience which would then free up others.

It was noted that Louise Barnett would seek the Trust Board's consent to supplying the Commission with a copy of its consultation response.

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

(2) That a future report on the evaluation of The Village pilot be presented to the Commission.

## **70. BRIEFING ON SCHOOLS MENTAL HEALTH PILOT**

Further to Minute No. 43(8) Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented a briefing on the pilot that had taken place on adopting a whole school approach to the promotion of mental health and wellbeing in Rotherham.

Six schools had been invited to take part in the scheme representing each of the Social and Emotional Mental Health school cluster areas in north, south and central Rotherham.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 19/01/17**

The whole school pilot was based on the eight principles outlined in a national guidance document produced by Public Health England and the Children and Young People's Mental Health Consortium:-

- Leadership and management
- School ethos and environment
- Curriculum teaching and learning
- Student voice
- Staff health, development and wellbeing
- Identifying need and monitoring impact
- Working with parents/carers
- Targeted support

Each of the six schools had been encouraged to benchmark themselves against all eight principles and then pick at least two to progress and written up into an action plan. The schools had until July 2017 to deliver their actions.

The report set out the six schools and their selected actions.

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

(2) That the following Members accompany officers on the one-to-one update meetings with schools:-

Rawmarsh	Vicky Farnsworth
Newman	Councillor Short
Wingfield	Councillor R. Elliott
Wales	Councillor Marriott
Oakwood	Councillor Cusworth
Maltby	Councillor Andrews

*Following the meeting the changes below were agreed:-*

<i>Rawmarsh</i>	<i>Councillor Marriott</i>
<i>Wales</i>	<i>Councillor J. Elliot</i>
<i>Maltby</i>	<i>Councillor Andrews and Vicky Farnsworth</i>

(3) That, subject to the approval of Commissioner Myers, Councillor Cusworth be nominated to represent the Select Commission on the Whole School Steering Group.

**71. HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION SUB-GROUP: OLDER PEOPLE'S HOUSING**

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, submitted a copy of the report to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board following the scrutiny session undertaken by a sub-group of the Select Commission regarding housing for older people in Rotherham.

The purpose of the session was to develop a clear understanding of the key issues involved in increasing the number of homes suitable for older people and to make recommendations to inform future plans for older people's housing.

The report summarised key issues identified and the ten recommendations which were as follows:-

(1) That an article be included in the tenant newsletter explaining how bungalows are allocated to different groups of people, not only older people, based on need.

(2) That discussion takes place with transport providers, including Community Transport, regarding:-

- Services for proposed sites before building commences
- Maintaining transport links to those sites in the future.

(3) That the importance of family pets for older people's health and wellbeing is considered in developing housing options.

(4) That consultation is undertaken with older people currently living in three storey buildings to capture their views on how suitable this housing is for their needs, to feed in to decisions about future models.

(5) That consultation is undertaken with older people to ascertain their views on the term extra care and how housing schemes should be branded.

(6) That the approach to branding and marketing housing options for older people should be a positive one such as promoting the third age rather than one of moving towards the end of a person's life.

(7) That new housing schemes are designed to look more generic rather than looking like they are only for older people:-

- To reduce the risk of older people being targeted
- To reflect mixed communities and reduce negative perceptions.

(8) That Shaftesbury House undergoes external renovation and is made more secure for residents.

(9) That action is taken to maintain high quality in current older people's housing to avoid the development of a "two tier" system with differences in quality and experience between current and new provision.

(10) That all multiple storey buildings for extra care housing should have lifts.



**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 19/01/17**

This was a good focussed piece of work and showed the role of scrutiny in policy development as opposed to its role in holding agencies and the Executive to account. It was positive to have all ten recommendations accepted with a clear response and timescales for implementation.

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

**72. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION UPDATE**

Councillor Cusworth gave the following update on the recent Improving Lives Select Commission meeting:-

- Independent Chair of Adult Safeguarding Board provided an annual review
- Domestic Abuse Service provision in Rotherham

The key link to Health was with regard to health partners responding to disclosures or signs of abuse and regional work on implementation of the Mental Capacity Act.

Should any Member require more information they should contact Councillor Cusworth directly.

Councillor Cusworth was thanked for her report.

**73. JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMISSIONERS WORKING TOGETHER PROGRAMME**

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, reported that NHS England had carried out their planned mid-point review of the public consultation in late December led by the Consultation Institute. The review had found that, although the Christmas period had been taken into account regarding the length of the consultation period, it had had a greater impact than planned as the response rate was lower than expected given the approach and methodology used.

The consultation deadline had been extended until 14<sup>th</sup> February to allow for further engagement. This meant that the final decision would now be made by the Joint Committee of CCGs in April, 2017.

In light of the concerns expressed by the Select Commission regarding the proposals for Hyper Acute Stroke Services, the Chair and Vice-Chair had met with a representative of the South Yorkshire Ambulance Service to discuss their ability to deliver the service, the number of vehicles they had at their disposal currently and how many more they felt they would need to carry out the new service.

The representative had been quite clear that the Service had no problems in maintaining the service whatsoever nor were there any issues with regard to the skilling of staff. The only issue was that the Service felt it

needed an additional three ambulances bearing in mind the new proposed models of working.

Members reiterated the importance of having clear data and evidence when officers and partners were presenting information to the Commission.

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

(2) That the Commission submit a collective response to the consultation.

**74. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

Tony Clabby, Healthwatch Rotherham, reported that the Autism Strategy was to be launched by the Autism Partnership

**75. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 2nd March, 2016, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION  
2nd March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Bird, Brookes, Cusworth, Elliott, Marriott, Short, John Turner and Williams and Vicky Farnsworth (SpeakUp).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrews, Elliot, Ellis and Ireland.

**76. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

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

**78. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) Information Pack

The pack contained:-

Quarterly briefing notes

Paper regarding The Village as requested

(2) Consultation

NHS England had launched national consultation on Congenital Heart Disease Services. This would probably be considered by the Yorkshire and Humber JHOSC [www.engage.england.nhs.uk/consultation/chd/](http://www.engage.england.nhs.uk/consultation/chd/).

**79. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH JANUARY, 2017**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 19<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, were noted.

Arising from Minute No. 67 the STP consultation commenced on 13<sup>th</sup> February and ran until the end of March. It included an on-line survey as well as the work by Healthwatch and Voluntary Action Rotherham. [www.smybndccgs.nhs.uk/what-we-do/stp](http://www.smybndccgs.nhs.uk/what-we-do/stp)

Arising from Minute No. 68 it was noted that supplementary information had been provided after the meeting. There were recommendations with regard to the Better Care Fund (BCF) and these would be discussed at the next Health and Wellbeing Board. Select Commission Members were asked to feed back any comments on the BCF plan (available on the website under the Board's agenda papers for 8 March).

Arising from Minute No. 69 further information had been received from the Foundation Trust and would be e-mailed to Commission Members.

Arising from Minute No. 70 it was noted that the representatives for the Schools visits had been amended slightly. The visits were being arranged with the first two (Newman and Maltby) taking place next week.

## 80. UPDATE ON INTERIM GP STRATEGY

Jacqui Tuffnell, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group, gave an update following the Scrutiny Review carried out in 2014/15. The powerpoint presentation illustrated:-

### Improving Access to General Practice

We said

- We would bid to improve telephony systems across Rotherham

We have

- Bid unsuccessful to date so Primary Care Committee has approved utilising Primary Care funding to enable the upgrades and also to enable call recording to support telephone consultation
- Appendix A details completed practice upgrades and those which will be completed before 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017

We said

- We would introduce telehealth across Rotherham

We have

- Piloted and now rolled out telehealth to 19 practices (as at the end of January) and will complete full rollout before 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017
- Appendix B details the benefits already being seen from implementing the telehealth system

We said

- Access would be a significant element of our Quality Contract

We have

- Access improvement will be a requirement of all 31 practices from 1st April 2017. Practices have all confirmed that they will meet the requirements of the quality contract by this date
- Appendix C - confirms the requirements of practices by 1st April 2017
- All practices undertaking a resilience programme 'Productive General Practice' to support their ongoing sustainability by the end of March, 2017
- It provides essential tools for practices to support for example skill mix, front and back office functions, planning and scheduling
- Examples
  - The Village - care navigators
  - Woodstock Bower - telephone consultation for Advance Nurse

Practitioners

Rationalisation of back office functions such as clinical documentation

We said

- We would work with practices to provide more flexibility in appointments

We have

- We have audited the number of appointments in practices to understand if more or less capacity is being provided.
- Appendix D - report and papers associated with the access audit
- Commenced a pilot of Saturday routine appointment availability to complement our urgent appointment offer in January
- Publicising appointments in practices
- Text messages regarding Saturday appointments to all patients with mobile phones
- Article in Rotherham Advertiser (Appendix F)
- Appendix E - initial report of the uptake and patient feedback regarding the Saturday service
- Patient online numbers have significantly improved over the last year. The CCG and NHS England are working with practices who are struggling with their uptake of patient online
- Appendix G - current information regarding uptake of patient online
- We continue to look at ways of raising the profile of the availability

We said

- We would implement our interim strategy for general practice

We have

- The Strategy has now been superseded by 'the Rotherham response to the GP Forward View'
- Appendix H – our response to the GP Forward View
- Appendix I – NHS England's February assessment of our progress in relation to implementation

We said

- We would consider health implications of building schemes impacting on Rotherham

We have

Waverley development

- We are now at the design stage with the developers and are advised that subject to planning, the build of the new health centre will commence in September 2017
- In the interim, an improvement project for Treeton medical centre has commenced to improve capacity
- Reviewed medical capacity for the proposed increased housing to other sites and there is capacity in the practices surrounding the area:
- Bassingthorpe Farm development – Rawmarsh, High Street, Bellows Road and Parkgate
- York Road development - York Road, Shakespeare Road and The Gate

- Forge Island development
- We are reviewing the medical capacity as urban capacity is more limited.

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

- Had the advent of Saturday appointments reduced the numbers attending A&E? – It was not believed that the offer of a Saturday GP service had significantly affected the position. Significant numbers of patients had not been identified that needed a routine appointments with their GP as opposed to those identified that required self-care i.e. pharmacy
- What was the overall aim for improving access to GPs? The main aim was in terms of the 24 hour (urgent) and the five day (routine) access and also ensuring if it had been indicated that someone needed to go back to the practice, that they could get in contact with the practice by telephone/online and make an appointment. 2 practices were providing Physio First where a patient saw the Muscular Skeletal practitioner in the practice rather than the GP and waiting for a referral. Work was taking place on improving the offer of interpreting as well as ensuring that those people that were hard to reach were reached in different ways. The Limited Liability Partnership (consisting of the 31 practices) was converting to a Community Interest Company and had employed a Federation Manager and advertising for a Lead Development Nurse. The two postholders would independently support the practices to improve their standards across the board and share the learning.
- What about those people who could not read or did not have very good eyesight? If they were sent text messages/emails they would struggle as well as the need for easy read letters – The use of text messages was another vehicle to improve communication with patients and was only done so with those patients that had given permission. Letter notification and telephoning the patient directly would continue. The CCG agreed to a follow up discussion with Speak Up.
- How confident was the CCG that the improvement journey could continue given the shortage of GPs and Practice Nurses nationally? Technically Rotherham was “overdoctored”. The journey being taken with productive general practice was to evidence to the GPs that they needed to change how they worked and that there was another workforce that could be employed to do the “everything”. Bands 1-4 staff could be utilised to carry out the basic level skills that were currently conducted at a higher level i.e. GPs. It was also about the GP workforce adjusting to that change of working practice. A bid had been submitted to the CIC for 8.5 fte pharmacists who were a different workforce and carry out medication reviews that were currently done

by GPs. It was already being seen in a number of practices where there were less GPs and more Advanced Nurse Practitioners taking over the roles traditionally carried out by GPs. The feedback from patients was that they had more time with the individuals than the GPs. Patients also needed to understand the different workforce.

- Concern with regard to reducing access to GPs on the basis that in many cases patients booked an appointment for an issue but it was not actually the issue they wanted to discuss. Removing that option may have implications/unintended consequences - This was not the intention; it was the capacity/demand and the actual identification of patients that did not necessarily need to see a GP. It was still expected that soft intelligence would be picked up by practitioners and then brought to the attention of the GP.
- Members of the public valued their relationship with the GP and may share something with them that they would not with a practice nurse – This would be monitored as it progressed. There was a GP recruitment crisis so the resources had to be used correctly but it should not cause a barrier.

There was work taking place nationally in improving the offer to GPs with a supporting infrastructure to attract more to the profession. A number of GPs in Rotherham were aged 55+ with 16% in the 55-59 years category. There was also the new role of physician associate with 40 students on courses in Sheffield, who would be able to work in both Primary and Secondary Care.

- What kind of contract management performance would there be? Peer review visits were carried out to all the practices and would also incorporate the contract review. On the CCG website under the Primary Care Committee a dashboard of is published showing information for each individual GP practice.

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

(2) That a further update be received in 12 months' time.

**81. ADULT CARE - LOCAL MEASURES PERFORMANCE REPORT - 2016/17 QUARTER 3**

Further to Minute No. 56 of 1st December, 2016, Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, together with Scott Clayton, Interim Performance and Quality Team Manager, and Sarah Farragher, Head of Service Independence and Planning, presented the Q3 Local Measures performance together with the four existing Corporate Plan measures for the period October-December, 2016.

The report set out the current performance challenges as at 31<sup>st</sup> December or as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 'shut down' of SWIFT/AIS data, 2016, which included:-

LM05-07 – Commissioning KLOE's

LM08 (CP2.B3) – Number of people provided with information and advice first point of contact (to prevent service need)

LM09 (CP2.B5) – Number of carers assessments (only adult carers and not including young carers)

LM10 (CP2.B7) – Number of admissions to residential rehabilitation beds (intermediate care)

LM11 (CPS.B9c) - % spend on residential and community placements new measure 2016/17

The report also set out responses requested with regard to LMO1-LMO4 at the 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 meeting.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- Recently signed agreement for the Royal Society for Blind in Sheffield to develop an Enabling Centre in Rotherham.
- Overall the indicators across Adult Social Care (ASC) showed a very positive upward trend with most of the targets met or on the way to be met.
- Review of the current KPIs to check they were appropriate and fit for purpose.
- Summary of the pressures and challenges facing ASC overall and in relation to the Indicators.
- Improved information and availability of better cohort data meant a greater understanding of the customer base.
- LGA Peer Challenge findings of Commissioning in People's Services across Children's and Adult Social Care had been extremely positive. It had found good direction and that capability was not an issue, however, capacity was an issue. There had also been positive feedback about the Protection Team.
- LM01-04 were all Adult Social Work Services that clients were receiving some of which would be crosscutting packages and/or commissioned services from the independent sector.
- Once in receipt of services, clients should be reviewed in time. At the point of access there was a duty system which responded to immediate and priority cases within 24 hours and clients would be triaged and assessed. There were waiting times for assessments and reviews, the reasons for which were set out in the report, but the



Service was picking up those that were in immediate need and prioritising that work. Whilst the figures needed to be improved significantly, people were being kept safe.

- It was known that there was an issue with the assessment of care packages and work was taking place. Services that impacted upon people were so very important.
- The four new cases would be young people that had come through CYPS TO Adult Services. Young people with complex learning disabilities and physical disabilities were now surviving into adulthood with increasing numbers of young people with Autism and the package of support was very intensive. It was a combined issue of the Directorate not having a sufficiently developed market in terms of being able to manage the costs of providers nor a sophisticated offer. Rotherham's inhouse services were not set up to deal with people with the most complex needs. Every care package was being looked at to ascertain if costs could be reduced without impacting upon the care of the patients. This was the purpose of the Practice Challenge Group
- There had been significant vacancies within the Directorate for the past 12-18 months which had been put on hold until completion of the restructure. Some of the vacancies were now out to advert. There had been some backfilling with agency staff but that had been reduced due to the budget situation.
- Adult Social Care Social Workers had been regraded on the back of the work in CYPS, however, some of the enhancements offered in CYPS were not offered in Adult.
- Due to carers now being able to choose not to have their own assessment there would be a gap in the activity that was no longer captured. Through the use of the new recording system, the intention was to ensure that the staff at the front end were at least giving the opportunity to those carers to have a single assessment and for some services ensuring that it was done. That recording mechanism would give teams an opportunity to report that some carers had been through the process and opted not to have a carer's assessment and the reason why. If the measure was continued going forward it might need a new baseline.
- The Mental Health Carers Team was located in RDaSH and their data was not recorded on the Authority's system. It was hoped that Liquidlogic would resolve this issue. It was a small team and they had suffered sickness absences.
- The Carers Strategy was now approved, signed off and in implementation phase. Part of the action plan was how to get carers' needs better assessed but the feedback received from carers was

that actually the wording of the assessment was quite frightening; they felt they were being assessed as to whether they should be caring for their loved ones or not. A way forward was needed. There was also scope to build on the assessments undertaken by Crossroads to enable carers to access budgets and support.

- Care assessment reviews in the past had taken the form of a “tick box” exercise. Work was now taking place on how the review supported people to be more independent. There were massive changes taking place to the service at the same time as still running the service and had resulted in a dip in performance. However it was a recoverable position. Those that would not be a priority response would include self-funders who had now fallen below the threshold and waiting for re-assessment, those that wanted to make a change to their care package etc.

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

(2) That continuing performance updates to be reported as agreed previously.

(3) That a demonstration of Liquidlogic and the cohort data dashboard be made to the Commission

(4) That Select Commission Members contact Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Adviser, on any areas they would like to focus upon during 2017/18 in relation to performance measures and targets.

**82. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW - CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

Barbara Murray and Christina Harrison (RDaSH), Paul Theaker and Ruth Fletcher-Brown presented an update on response to the Scrutiny Review of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.

Barbara gave the following powerpoint:-

Rotherham Children and Young People’s Mental Health Services – Progress Report

**Service Model**

- Incorporating local and national priorities and agendas
  - Future in Mind, local transformation plans, including eating disorder pathways
  - Building early intervention and prevention
  - Community focussed engagement

Pathway Overviews

- Learning Disability
  - Specifically working with young people with a mental health problem and moderate to severe learning disability
- Single Point of Access
  - Receiving all referrals and triaging for urgency on the same day
  - Available as a point of contact for anyone to ring with any concerns
  - Working towards working jointly and some co-location with Early Help and MASH ('First Response')
- Crisis/Intensive Community Support
  - Urgent assessments
  - Short term additional support during crisis supporting people into and out of hospital
  - Longer term interventions where there are high levels of risk
- Locality Teams
  - Assessments and brief interventions (6-8 sessions)
  - Liaison with other services – GPs, schools, Early Help
- Psychological Therapies
  - Time limited specialist therapy alongside other workers and consultation to colleagues
  - Longer term work with young people/families
- CSE
  - Works alongside other colleagues
  - Provides support, advice and consultation to different services
- Developmental Disorders (ASD and ADHD)
  - Diagnostic assessment for ASD and ADHD
  - Post-diagnosis support for ADHD

Attention was drawn to:

- All pathway leads were now in post, with the last one, the Locality Work Lead from January 2017.
- Closer working with Early Help had led to greater mutual understanding of each other's work and resulted in fewer people "bouncing round" the system in the last few months.
- Due to the work of the Crisis/Intensive Community Support Team there had been a reduction in Tier 4 or inpatient stays in the last 6-12 months
- The new lead for Developmental Disorders had changed the pathways and reduced waiting times significantly in a short period.

In accordance with Minute No. 43 of 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2016, Paul Theaker, Operational Commissioner, and Ruth Fletcher-Brown, Public Health Specialist, presented a further update against progress of the Scrutiny Review's 12 recommendations.

It was noted that the refresh of the Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Needs analysis was complete and a common performance framework that provided improved and standardised data collection

across the whole mental health system had been developed and was being tested with service providers.

The timescales for outstanding actions within the response template had been revisited due to the impact of delays in the CAMHS Service reconfiguration and were now achievable and realistic. There was robust monitoring of the actions taking place through the CAMHS Contract Monitoring Group and CAMHS Partnership Group to ensure that they were completed by the due dates.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Findings from the Needs Analysis refresh had shown a need for improved links between CAMHS and SEND and work on pathways for vulnerable groups such as the Youth Justice System.
- Currently the data captured included numbers of contacts, caseloads and referrals, plus waiting times and interventions. Each Service collected the high level information but more needed with regard to demographic and geography.
- RDaSH would expect to see the right referrals coming through to the right places; the development of a screening tool would help with signposting people to the right service depending on their level of need. The investment in workforce development had already seen an impact within Early Help with a reduction of 122 people signposted in Quarter 1 to 81 in Quarter 3 and the number of inappropriate referrals sent back reducing from 25 in October to 6 in January.

All courses facilitated by Public Health measured the change in people's knowledge and confidence which hopefully would have a knock on effect for RDaSH CAMHS Services and get the person to the right service at the right time. Alongside the Workforce Development wider CAMHS work, consideration would be given as to what training was available and which training providers. Leeds City Council had carried out work with their providers in quality checking the training that was available.

- RDaSH Locality Workers were very much engaged with schools and teachers with their consultation meetings affording an opportunity to raise any issues/queries about a child. RDaSH could deliver formal training but often individual cases were raised with the teacher coming away from the meeting with a broader knowledge and understanding. RDaSH could provide advice/assistance on an individual case by case basis alongside delivering formal training.
- In terms of the Education Skills agenda, schools had now set up Social, Emotional and Mental Health school clusters with the aim of preventing young people being excluded from schools. The clusters were made up of a number of schools within a geographic area and

managing those young people. CAMHS Locality Workers linked into that work and worked with schools in the cluster to prevent young people being excluded and keeping them within the school environment.

- Video conferencing was a method used by Public Health to receive information. Recently Public Health had received a series of webinars appropriate for schools which had circulated accordingly. Schools did not necessarily have to attend a training session and could deliver the webinar in-house.
- If a parent noticed something wrong with their child but the school did not think there was a problem, the role that RDaSH could play was with regard to the emotional health and wellbeing and help schools to be able to understand and know what to look out for. RDaSH was trying to work much more closely with Education particularly around Autism and ADHD. There was the Single Point of Access where members of the public could ring and have those conversations: the Locality Worker would then work with the parent and school to understand and support that voice. An added value of the training was the improved communication.
- Work was taking place on producing a Sufficiency Strategy looking at project numbers of young people coming through the system, what specialist provision there was in Rotherham and what was needed going forward. This issue of whether Rotherham had specialist education capacity for those diagnosed early with developmental disorders would be raised with Education.
- There were no Key Performance Indicators currently with regard to the Locality Worker model being monitored through the RDaSH contract. However, work was taking place with RMBC and RCCG to firm up what they would be and how they would be captured. RDaSH was gathering feedback and information from its partners on an informal basis and it was understood that, from the Council perspective, there would be a Survey Monkey questionnaire processes to gather the information around ease of access.
- The names and contact information for the Locality Workers would be provided for Elected Members.
- Taking into account the performance figures received in the past, was there an argument that the 3 week target waiting time should be reviewed (recommendation 8)?
- The current position was that the 3 weeks stretched target would remain for 2017/18. However, it was important to point out that the 6 weeks national target was where Rotherham was looking at benchmarking itself. The stretched target was a very local target to push itself. RDaSH agreed to share the benchmarking information.

The Chairman stated that a lengthy discussion had taken place with regard to the new approach to future updates without the use of the response template since the Service had changed significantly since the original review. Suggestions had been made by Members as to key areas for future updates.

Resolved:- (1) That the monitoring and progress made against the response to the Scrutiny Review of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services be noted.

(2) That future updates focus on the key areas identified by Members i.e.:-

Waiting time data

Performance management information,

Impact of single point of access and is it preventing escalation where people

Impact of locality working

Training and development across the wider CAMHS workforce

Transition from CAHMS, Policy and CQUINS.

(3) That an update on waiting times for assessment and treatment be submitted to the Select Commission on a monthly basis.

(4) That a further update be submitted in October, 2017.

**83. PROGRESS ON ROTHERHAM YOUTH CABINET REVIEW - IMPROVING ACCESS TO CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented a report on the progress of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet Review – Improving Access to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.

The review had formed part of the ongoing work by the Youth Cabinet to improve access to Mental Health Services and support for young people in Rotherham following their work on self-harm in 2014. The key focus of the young people's attention was on services provided by Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust (RDaSH) following a major reconfiguration that resulted in a new service model. They had also been keen to scrutinise wider working and links between partner agencies especially through the School Nursing Service as previous work had shown inconsistency in access to School Nurses and a need to raise their profile in schools.

Progress was being made in transforming wider CAMHS through the CAMHS Strategy and Partnership Group. Integrated multi-agency working, both strategically and in localities, was central to the transformation and the new service model linking RDaSH CAMHS with

Early Help Services through a single point of access was now being rolled out.

The Youth Cabinet had made 11 recommendations all of which had been accepted (set out in Appendix 1 of the report submitted) together with the latest progress updates on the actions agreed by partner agencies.

Several of the recommendations aimed to enhance consultation and involvement with children and young people in Service development and monitoring. They also linked in with the outcomes of the RDaSH Voice and Influence Review commissioning by the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group. The review had identified a number of priorities for developing engagement with children and young people in direct practice, Service management and organisational leadership.

Resolved:- That the progress updates for the review undertaken by the Rotherham Youth Cabinet be noted.

**84. JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMISSIONERS WORKING TOGETHER PROGRAMME**

The Commission's consultation response for both Service proposals had been submitted online on 10<sup>th</sup> February with only minor amendments from the version circulated for comment.

The JHOSC would meet on 3<sup>rd</sup> April with an additional CSC meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> March to consider the papers as they would include the final outcomes from the consultation and the high level business case.

The Joint Committee of Clinical Commission Groups was to meet on 18<sup>th</sup> April to make the final decision.

**85. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION UPDATE**

Councillor Cusworth gave the following update on the recent Improving Lives Select Commission meeting:-

- Lifestyle Survey completed by students in Y7 and 10  
Young people appeared to be making healthier choices, high percentage drinking less than one sugary drink a day, many saying they had never tried smoking at all but the use of contraception had increased. There had also been a slight increase in the number of young people trying drugs for the first time and consistency with last year in those identified as having a disability or long term health problem.
- Looked After Children's Care Leavers Strategy 2017-2021  
1 of the underpinning outcomes was that children were healthy and safe from harm with one of the strategic objectives being to improve the physical health of LAC including their emotional wellbeing.

- The concern regarding delay in undertaking health assessments should improve as nurses now have access to LiquidLogic with notifications coming through in 3-4 days. Good joint working was taking place between RDaSH CAMHS and RMBC.

Should any Member require more information they should contact Councillor Cusworth directly.

Councillor Cusworth was thanked for her report.

**86. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

No issues had been raised.

**87. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 13th April, 2017, commencing at 9.30 a.m.



**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION  
13th April, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Bird, Albiston, Andrews, Cusworth, Elliot, Elliott, Ellis, Fenwick-Green, Marriott, John Turner, Williams, Wilson and Short.

Also in attendance:- Councillor Simpson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brookes, Ireland and Marles.

**88. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor J. Elliot declared a personal interest in Minute No. 92 below (RDaSH Quality Account), because of her role as a public member of the RDaSH NHS Foundation Trust. Having declared her personal interest, Councillor J. Elliot spoke in respect of that item and voted.

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

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

**90. COMMUNICATIONS**

Members were reminded of the discussions about the Health Select Commission's work plan for the 2017/18 Municipal year, which would commence at the rising of this meeting.

**91. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 2ND MARCH, 2017**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meetings of the Health Select Commission held on 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2017. Members noted that:-

(a) (Minute No. 81) Adult Care – Local Measures Performance Report – 2016/17 Quarter 3 – the demonstration of Liquidlogic and the cohort data dashboard, to Members of this Select Commission, was scheduled to take place on Thursday, 8th June, 2017; and

(b) (Minute No. 82) Response to Scrutiny Review – Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) - performance data has been requested from RDaSH CAMHS and will be distributed to Members of this Select Commission in due course.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2017, be approved as a correct record.

**92. RDASH QUALITY ACCOUNT**

Consideration was given to a briefing paper submitted by the Scrutiny Officer concerning the “Quality Dashboard” of the Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber (RDaSH) NHS Foundation Trust. The report stated that reconfiguration had involved the creation of place-based care groups across the Trust. Services in the Rotherham Care Group were:-

- Adult and Older People’s Mental Health Services;
- Learning Disability Services;
- Drug and Alcohol Services.

Members were informed that, each year in June, all NHS Trusts were required to publish a Quality Account as part of their annual report and accounts. These Quality Accounts are written to a given overall format with mandatory information, including performance on targets. The Quality Account includes progress on the quality priorities and actions agreed in the previous year and an outline of the priorities for the coming year.

Members received a presentation from Dianne Graham (Care Group Director, RDaSH) and Gavin Portier (Head of Quality, RDaSH) about the Rotherham Quality Dashboard (a document containing information about health services’ performance). The presentation highlighted the following matters:-

- The Care Quality Commission Well-Led Inspection and “What Next” including (the connection between management and staff);
- Since 2015, the Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber (RDaSH) NHS Foundation Trust has moved from a “requires improvement” rating to a “good” rating, as a consequence of Care Quality Commission assessments;
- Launch of the Sustainable Improvement Plan for the Trust – the objective of “outstanding status” after Care Quality Commission assessment;
- Patient Care Experience – emphasis on improvement of communication with patients; especially improving the provision of information to patients prior to them receiving health care and treatment;
- The emphasis which the Care Quality Commission has placed upon improvements to the Pharmacy Service;
- Progress with the Medication Management Initiative;
- Specific actions required in respect of the “Sign Up to Safety” campaign, to reduce avoidable pressure ulcers;

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 13/04/17

- Quality Improvement Strategy (including addressing specific matters raised by patients using the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services);
- The Rotherham Vocational Service worked with the Inpatient Occupational Therapists at Swallownest Court, to consider providing a therapeutic space for community patients to engage in ‘job skills’ prior to returning to work;
- The three Quality priorities for 2016/17, to be in accordance with national priorities : (i) Mental Health Five Year Forward View; (ii) People with learning disabilities; (iii) Future In Mind.

Members of the Health Select Commission raised the following salient issues:-

- Time frames for implementation of the quality improvement proposals (and the emphasis upon continuous improvement);
- RDaSH new ways of reporting; the use of comparative material from previous years;
- Use of locality-based management structures;
- Use of “happy or not” consoles and the limitations of the computer licensing; the implications for customer feedback (eg: “your opinion counts” and score cards); collation and analysis of all customer feedback information;
- Reviews of cases of suicide; ensuring that services are able to learn from all cases of suicide; the community awareness work (eg: in relation to loneliness and isolation); campaign targeting men; review of patients’ discharge from hospital who may pose a risk of suicide, including seven day follow up;
- Access to community based services and the development of a single point of access for patients with mental health issues and other vulnerabilities;
- Safeguarding of adults and children – importance of training for staff at all levels; effective processes and recording of training undertaken and staff competences;
- Triggers in respect of the “duty of candour;”
- Reporting of medicine-related errors; the use of the “ten-point checklist” in order to assess whether an error could have been avoided; presence of “speak-up guardians” enabling staff to discuss issues of concern;

- Cases where patient restraint has to be undertaken; training and refresher training for staff in the use of restraint procedures; information provided to families in cases where a patient has had to be restrained; suggestion made to review cases of restraint by an independent person;
- Concerns regarding reference in the dashboard to access to training for staff in dealing with domestic abuse/violence issues;
- Analysis of complaints and whether outcomes lead to service improvement;
- Development of an Autism Strategy for Rotherham;
- Work with the Care Co-ordination Centre to integrate mental health and learning disability:

Members asked to be provided with copies of the RDaSH complaints procedure.

The Select Commission thanked the representatives of RDaSH for the informative presentation.

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

(2) That this Select Commission suggests that RDaSH, in association with its partner agencies, should provide domestic abuse training for staff.

(Councillor J. Elliot declared a personal interest in the above item because of her role as a public member of the RDaSH NHS Foundation Trust. Having declared her personal interest, Councillor J. Elliot spoke in respect of this item and voted.)

*Following the meeting additional information was requested and obtained with regard to the issue of access to domestic abuse training:*

*Domestic violence and abuse training is incorporated in the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Toxic Trio training, which is ongoing and delivered by RDaSH and RMBC.*

*There is also domestic abuse training run by Adult Services, through a training pool who are delivering their own domestic abuse training, which also covers the DASH (Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence) risk assessment tool and MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference).*

*The LSCB is currently in negotiation with the Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator to provide some extra sessions later in the year around teenage relationship abuse and other associated issues which are not covered in great depth at present due to time constraints on the workshops.*

*There is a DA e-learning module available to all staff and partners on the RMBC Directions website as well.*

*It was confirmed that the reference to training being suspended related to a period when the Council's previous Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator had left the Authority and there had been a gap before the new Co-ordinator was appointed, which had had an impact on overall training capacity.*

**93. WHOLE SCHOOL APPROACH TO PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION**

Further to Minute No. 70 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 19th January, 2017, consideration was given to a report of the Scrutiny Officer concerning the recommendation of the scrutiny review of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services that in its leadership role with schools, the Borough Council should ensure schools link in with partner agencies to discharge their wider duties and responsibilities towards children and young people's emotional wellbeing and mental health.

Individual Members reported on their visits to specific schools (eg: progress at the Maltby Academy and at Wales High School). The Select Commission requested information about the progress at a wide range of schools and it was agreed that such information would be included within a further progress report to be submitted to a meeting of this Select Commission during September, 2017.

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

(2) That the progress by schools piloting a whole-school approach to promoting mental health and wellbeing, as now reported, be noted.

**94. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION UPDATE**

Councillor V. Cusworth provided an update in respect of issues considered at the Improving Lives Select Commission meetings:-

- Overview of the Provision and Services for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) in Rotherham;
- SEND Information Advice and Support Service (SENDIASS) Annual Report April 2015/ March 2016.
- Rotherham Children and Young People's Plan 2016 to 2019;
- Children's and Young People's Services Performance Report - January 2016/17;
- Looked After Children – health outcomes;
- Early Help and Family Engagement Monthly Performance Report, as at Month End: January 2017.

Councillor Cusworth was thanked for providing her report.

**95. JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMISSIONERS WORKING TOGETHER PROGRAMME**

The Health Select Commission received an update report from the Scrutiny Officer concerning the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) for the Commissioners Working Together Programme. The issues highlighted from the recent meeting were:-

- Recap of the cases for change by clinicians – an anaesthetist and a stroke consultant and a run-through the consultation findings report.
- Three members of the public representing local campaigning groups in Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield all made a short presentation, raising some concerns but also making links more widely into Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) and future scrutiny of these.
- Discussion of submissions from hospitals and the issues they had raised which will also feed into the business case and be responded to, including hospitals' potential loss of income from changes to services. Reiteration that both proposals are not about saving money in the NHS and there may be a short term increase in costs for Hyper Acute Stroke services.

**Hyper Acute Stroke**

- Investment in the ambulance services to meet increased demand for transfers – Joint Clinical Commissioning Groups will consider resources as part of the business case if the proposals go forward.
- The longer term intention to move stroke care in Sheffield from the Royal Hallamshire Hospital to the Northern General Hospital (Sheffield), which the majority of people at the meeting had not been aware of in advance of the submission from the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- The increased volume of stroke patients cared for at Rotherham Hospital was noted and the improved performance by the Trust on stroke care was welcomed. With regard to the *Sentinel Stroke National Audit Programme (SSNAP)* indicators, this mainly related to the acute phase rather than the hyper-acute phase.
- Rotherham was still not providing a seven days' service, only Sheffield and Doncaster were. Two consultants are unable to cover a full seven days' service, so there is the issue of workforce resilience and needing to future-proof.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 13/04/17

- Recruitment and need for a regional workforce strategy – possibly some future joint appointments across hospitals and a meeting is due between NHS England and Health Education England about the medical and wider workforce across senior and junior staff.
- For each additional patient having thrombolysis it has been calculated that this leads to a saving of £11,000 across Health and Social Care services, as well as a better outcome for the individual.

Children's Surgery and Anaesthesia

- 18-24 months' work to develop the options through a series of workshops;
- Reiterated that this would affect small numbers of patients; therefore, only a small number of ambulance transfers and if the care pathway was correct, patients would be taken directly to the correct hospital;
- Issues about staff undertaking procedures through the day but not then doing them in the evenings or at weekends (in relation to anaesthetists) – good attendance by anaesthetists at events and key criteria was firstly the age of child (under or over 3 years), then complexity and type of surgery required.
- Template being developed to ensure all hospitals met the required standards for care on the relevant tiers of paediatric care.

Consultation

- High volume of web hits and use of social media not then converted into formal responses.
- The telephone survey response was less negative than the people who had self-selected to respond.
- Introduction of the telephone survey in the consultation process, following the mid-point review was undertaken by an independent company who undertook the sampling.
- Public meetings and meetings with community groups raised the same themes as the surveys/telephone survey for both proposals.
- The on-line poll was suggested by the Consultation Institute at mid-point review and questions were checked with a market research agency (in response to some concerns that they were leading questions).
- For future consultations it was suggested to avoid the Christmas period and to keep the JHOSC fully informed about any changes to the consultation process, once it has begun.

- The Joint Committee of Clinical Commissioning Groups will have a meeting on 24th May 2017 (in public with web-casting) to make the final decision regarding the proposals and the consultation report will be one of the pieces of work that inform the business case and the final decision on future service reconfiguration.
- A number of JHOSC members wished to see the business case in advance of that meeting, but this will not happen other than being able to access the papers the week before the meeting, on publication. There will be another meeting of the JHOSC in June or July 2017, which will be an opportunity to discuss the final decision and to discuss future scrutiny following any changes.

During discussion, Members of the Health Select Commission expressed concern about the apparent intention to move hyper acute stroke care from the Rotherham Hospital to Sheffield and Doncaster. Members asked to be informed of further details of this proposal, as well as information about the thrombectomy procedure.

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

**96. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

The representative of Healthwatch Rotherham, Mr. Tony Clabby, reported that the following documents are available to view on the Healthwatch Rotherham Internet web site:-

- guide to mental health and wellbeing services in Rotherham;
- Health and social care signposting directory.

**97. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, were noted. Reference was made to Minute No. 54 (Voice of the Child Lifestyle Survey 2016) which has been considered in detail by the Improving Lives Select Commission, at its meeting held on 1st February, 2017.

**98. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 15th June, 2017, commencing at 9.30 a.m.



**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**1st February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Clark (in the Chair); Councillors Allcock, Beaumont, Cooksey, Cusworth, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Jarvis, Keenan, Marriott, Napper, Senior and Short.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Hague, Khan, Pitchley and Tweed.

**41.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

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

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

**43.       COMMUNICATIONS**

The Select Commission discussed the following items:-

(1) Child-centred Borough - update

The six principles of a Child-centred Borough (adhering to UNICEF standards) are:-

- a focus on the rights and voice of the child;
- keeping children safe and healthy;
- ensuring children reach their potential;
- an inclusive Borough;
- harnessing the resources of communities;
- a sense of place.

The most recent meeting of the Working Group in January 2017 had considered:-

- Learning from other areas which have successfully achieved a child centred focus in their area and to help understand how this could look for Rotherham. An officer from Leeds City Council had agreed to attend a future meeting of the working group.
- Working with Co:Create (South Yorkshire Housing Association) to develop consultation and engagement activity with children, young people and their families across the Borough area, to understand what being 'child centred' meant to them and what would make their experience of living in Rotherham better.

- A questionnaire survey is being undertaken of children who live in Council housing.

(2) Corporate Parenting Panel - update

The forthcoming meeting of the Corporate Parent Panel will consider the following items : the health of looked After Children; the Looked After Children and Care Leavers Sufficiency Strategy 2017-2021; and financial support for Foster Carers.

(3) Rotherham Adult Safeguarding Board 2015-16 Annual Report

Further to Minute No. 38 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 14th December, 2016, it was agreed that an item be placed on the agenda of the next meeting to enable Councillors to report on their forthcoming visit of inspection with the contract commissioning team (scheduled for 24 March 2017).

**44. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH DECEMBER, 2016**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of the following amendment:-

The first sentence of the third paragraph of Minute No. 39 (Domestic Abuse Service Provision in Rotherham) shall be amended to read in full:-

“Progress had been made but the Partnership was not where it wanted to be as yet in relation to Domestic Abuse”.

(2) That written responses be issued to the individual Members in respect of the following matters:-

(a) (Minute No. 38 – Rotherham Adult Safeguarding Board 2015-16 Annual Report) – whether there was progress to report on consideration of the appointment to the Rotherham Adult Safeguarding Board of someone representative of the private, independent care sector (either residential, nursing or domiciliary care);

(b) Minute No. 39 (Domestic Abuse Service Provision in Rotherham) – a request for details of the outcome of the meeting of the newly reformed Domestic and Sexual Abuse Priority Group, which had been scheduled to take place during January 2017;

(c) Minute No. 39 (Domestic Abuse Service Provision in Rotherham) – a request for information about the Perpetrator Programme, including the method of evaluating this Programme and whether perpetrators were re-referred if further incidents occurred.

**45. VOICE OF THE CHILD LIFESTYLE SURVEY 2016**

Further to Minute No. 42 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 28th January, 2015 and to Minute No. 7 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 29th June, 2016, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Head of Service (Performance and Planning), containing the key findings from the 2016 Borough-wide Lifestyle Survey. The report stated that the Lifestyle Survey had been open to schools throughout June and July, 2016.

The lifestyle survey results provided an insight into the experiences of children and young people living in the Rotherham Borough area and provided a series of measures to monitor the progress of the development of a child-centred Borough and underpin the six themes:-

- a focus on the rights and voice of the child;
- keeping children safe and healthy;
- ensuring children reach their potential;
- an inclusive Borough;
- harnessing the resources of communities; and
- a sense of place.

The submitted report to this meeting included:-

- the 2016 Borough-wide Lifestyle Survey Report;
- the 2016 Trend Data Analysis provided to the Child-Centred Borough Group; and
- the press release about the 2016 Survey, issued by the Council on 7th January, 2017.

The Select Commission discussed the following salient issues:-

- requesting the non-participating schools to share the outcome of their own individual surveys of pupils, within their schools;
- the surveys are anonymous;
- support for young carers (who have rights in law to an assessment of their needs);
- the Voice of the Child process (eg: the Youth Cabinet; the Looked After Children Council; the Young Inspectors' programme, drawing from a broad spectrum of young people);
- ensuring the awareness of child sexual exploitation (eg: Sophie's Choice) within the school curriculum (Personal, Social and Health Education);

- the various reasons why children may not feel safe (eg: in school; when travelling; safety within the Rotherham town centre; the concern about the protest marches within the Rotherham town centre);
- the trends across the successive years in which the surveys have been completed.

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

#### **46. EARLY HELP AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Assistant Director, Early Help and Family Engagement, concerning Rotherham's Early Help and Family Engagement Service which had been launched on 18th January, 2016. The report included information about the Early Help Service priorities, current performance and progress against the budget savings proposals for 2016/2017. Reference was also made to the draft Early Help Strategy and to the outcome of the improvement visit made by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) on 19th and 20th April, 2016.

The Improving Lives Select Commission welcomed service users Neil and Michelle, who explained their family circumstances which culminated in their referral to Early Help and the assistance which the service was able to provide for them and for their families. They also answered several questions from the Members of the Select Commission.

The presentation at the meeting highlighted the following matters:-

- Early Help is concerned with identifying needs within families early and providing support before problems become complex and more costly;
- the importance of local agencies working together;
- service priorities and performance; use of exit surveys, completed by service users;
- the service demonstrating that it is able to make a positive difference to children and their families;
- Restorative Practice – working with people, rather than doing things to or for people;
- the establishment and role of the Early Help Review Board;
- compliance with Youth Justice Board standards;
- the focus on the whole family;

- financial resources and constraints and the necessary budget savings;
- investment in and bids for funding for various projects (eg: family group conferencing; the pause project);
- service flexibility enabling changing responses to changing issues; the importance of casework oversight;
- support in localities (eg: parenting programmes; targeted youth programme; operation keepsafe).

The Improving Lives Select Commission discussed the following salient issues:-

- development of trust with partner agencies, especially with community and voluntary sector organisations; treatment of partner organisations as equals (eg: the example of the peer review by the Youth Justice Board); increasing familiarity with the availability of the service; confidence amongst service users that assistance will be available;
- the auditing (and re-auditing) of case files to assure the quality of practice and to ensure compliance with HM Working Together 2015 (WT15) and the Early Help and Family Engagement service standards;
- caseloads for individual case workers;
- Members of the Select Commission questioned the feedback being received by the service and asked to be provided with further details of the exit surveys completed by service users;
- continual development and review of the service and resources; the effectiveness of the service in coping with change and implementing new initiatives;
- management of sickness absence amongst staff;
- effectiveness of the referral process; use of online reporting forms;
- adherence to local targets – early contact with families (within three days).

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

(2) That a progress report on the Early Help Service be submitted to a meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission in twelve months' time.

**47. LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN AND CARE LEAVERS SUFFICIENCY STRATEGY 2017-2021**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Deputy Leader and the Deputy Strategic Director of Children and Young people's Services concerning the Looked After Children and Care Leavers Sufficiency Strategy, which had been developed in line with the duty to provide or procure placements for Children Looked After by the local authority (Children Act 1989, Sufficiency Statutory Guidance 2010; Care Planning, Placement and Case Review Regulations 2011). This included a duty of 'sufficiency' that requires local authorities and Children's Trust partners to ensure that there was a range of sufficient placements which meet the needs of children and young people in care and to take steps to develop and shape service provision to meet the needs of all children and young people in care at a local level, as far as was reasonably possible.

The Strategy explained the way in which Rotherham Children's Services would fulfil its role as a Corporate Parent and meet its statutory sufficiency duty by providing good quality care, effective parenting and support to children and young people in and leaving local authority care. In addition, the Strategy described this Council's 'one market' approach to the commissioning and provision of secure, safe and appropriate accommodation and support to children in care and care leavers over the next four years (2017 to 2021).

The outcome of the Strategy would be safely and appropriately to reduce the number of young people requiring care by the local authority, responding to the challenges identified and improving outcomes for children. Whilst this Strategy was not primarily a financial one, it was expected that the commissioning and strategic intentions set out would provide significant cost avoidance and savings opportunities and were essential to the sustainability of improved outcomes and the Local Authority's budget.

During discussion, the Members of the Improving Places Select Commission raised the following issues:-

- the legal duty upon local authorities to publish a Sufficiency Strategy;
- poverty being one indicator of the likelihood of a child being taken into care; the impact of national issues upon local circumstances;
- statistics on discharge from care according to a young person's age;
- the various causes of foster placements which become disrupted;
- the health requirements of Looked After Children (including mental health);
- the need to minimise the number of out-of-Authority placements;

- the continuing endeavour to increase the number of foster carers within the Rotherham Borough area;
- the HM Government definition of “suitable accommodation” for Looked After Children.

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

(2) That a further report on the Looked After Children and Care Leavers Sufficiency Strategy be submitted to a meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission in six months' time, providing information about the budget monitoring of this Service.

**48. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17 - UPDATE**

Consideration of this item was deferred until the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, scheduled to be held on 22nd March, 2017.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
22nd March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Clark (in the Chair); Councillors Allcock, Beaumont, Cooksey, Cusworth, Elliot, Jarvis, Keenan, Marriott, Napper, Senior and Short.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from The Mayor (Councillor Pitchley) and Councillor Khan.

**49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Allcock declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 53 (Overview of the Provision and Services for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) in Rotherham) as he was a member of the SENDIASS Moderating Committee.

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

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

**51. COMMUNICATIONS**

Corporate Parenting Panel

Councillor Cusworth had provided Members of the Select Commission with a summary of the last meeting of the CPP and drew attention to the following issues:-

- Initial Health Assessments for Looked After Children (LAC) were still causing concern. Part of the delay was due to partners such as doctors typing up notes. It was hoped that Liquid Logic would alleviate some of the issues with nurses receiving requests for assessments a lot sooner
- Recruitment of Social Workers in the area of LAC
- Wilmott Dixon had committed to ringfencing a portion of the sixteen apprenticeships to care leavers, waiving the requirement for GCSE Maths and English and supporting the young person to achieve the qualifications during the period of apprenticeship
- 67% of care leavers were in Education, Employment and Training compared to the national average of 43%
- Rotherham had 12% of care leavers in higher education
- The recent Ofsted visit to Liberty House had recognised further improvements

Fostering Panel – 6<sup>th</sup> March

- Recommended approval of one new prospective foster carer
- Considered two annual reviews and two bi-annual reviews and recommended continued approval of all
- Two foster carers had resigned
- The Panel would welcome any Elected Member



Child-Centred Borough

Councillor Allcock reported that at the last meeting:-

- A representative from Leeds City Council had attended to talk about their approach to being child centred and how they had managed to embed it as an ethos across the whole authority
- Looked at ideas that the Authority may start implementing across Rotherham in order to move towards being more child centred and focussed

**52. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 1ST FEBRUARY, 2017**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2017, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That an update be provided to the next meeting with regard to the management of sickness absence amongst staff (Minute No. 46 - Early Help and Family Engagement).

**53. OVERVIEW OF THE PROVISION AND SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY (SEND) IN ROTHERHAM**

Paula Williams, Workforce Development & Quality Assurance Co-ordinator, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

The Rotherham Context

- There were 43,882 children and young people attending Rotherham's maintained schools as at January 2016 School Census. 7,124 children are identified as having a Special Educational Need (16%)
- 2.8% have needs met with support of an Education Health and Care Plan
- 21.8% have needs met by a graduated response

Current Provision – what constitutes the current offer

- Family Advice and Support
- Special Schools
- Enhanced Resources
- Local Authority Alternative Provision
- Post-14 Transitions
- Private and Voluntary
- Early Years Support
- The Mainstream Inclusion offer
- Social Care Provision
- The Health Offer

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - 22/03/17**

Special Schools (total capacity 595) – current offer

- Hilltop – PMLD – age 2-19 95 places  
Redwood Early Years Resource
- Abbey (designation under review) 7-16 90 places (110 from September)
- Kelford (SLD, PMLD) age 2-19 100 places  
Kimberworth Primary Resource
- Milton (Autism and Complex Needs) age 5-16 120 places  
Canal Side Resource
- The Willows (MLD) age 7-16 100 places
- Newman (Physical needs) age 2-19 102 places  
Newman Enhanced Resource (highly complex needs and autism 20 places)

Enhanced Resources

- Hearing Impaired Resources  
Bramley Grange Primary age 5-11 11 places
- Hearing Impaired Resources  
Wickersley age 11-16 11 places
- Primary Speech and Language Resource  
Anston Hillcrest Primary age 5-11 15 places
- Secondary Autism Resource  
Swinton Secondary School age 11-16 20 places

Local Authority Alternative Provision

- Aspire  
Primary (19) and secondary (60 places plus 30 in partnerships)  
Sites currently being reconfigured
- Rowan Health Alternative Provision  
42 places age 5-19
- Home Tuition  
19 places age 5-19
- Private and Voluntary  
Morthyng  
Really Neet Co.
- Post-16 Providers

RMBC CYPS – SEND/Inclusion within Education and Skills

- Education Health and Care Assessment Team
- Educational Psychology Service
- Inclusion Support Services: Autism Communication Team, Education Other than At School and Central Register, Hearing Impairment Team, Learning Support Service, Social Emotional and Mental Health Team, Visual Impairment Team
- Special Educational Needs and Disability Information Advice and Support Services (SENDIASS)

Close liaison with:-

- Rotherham Parents Forum
- Virtual School for Looked After Children
- Elective Home Education

Demographics in Rotherham

- Evidence suggests that the population of Rotherham will increase by 1.7% from 2016 to 2021 from 261,400 to 265,800. A growth of 4,400 people
- We can assume that although the overall population is growing at 1.7% the adult population is producing a higher ratio of children
- There is a greater predicted increase in pupils aged 3-19. If realised, there will be a corresponding increase in the number of school age pupils from 44,626 to 48,858, a growth of 2,231 (an increase of 5%)
- It is predicted that the number of pupils with SEND will increase from 7,253 (2016) to 7,616 by 2021 which is an increase of 363 pupils (5%). This represents the total increase in SEND and includes pupils with EHC Plans and those pupils receiving SEN Support in mainstream schools

Education Health and Care Planning – Local Picture

- Overall Rotherham have 1,570 statements and Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP)
- 2.8% of the population (2.8% national average)
- As of February 2016 we have 545 Statement conversions to complete (DfE target date 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018)
- Conversions target 2016/17 – Y6, Y9, Y11, Y14 = 255 (in total)
- Conversion target LDAs December 2016 – fully met
- Average number of new EHC assessment referrals 24 per month

National Picture May 2016

- Education Health and Care Plans issued within 20 weeks in May 2016
- Rotherham 66.9% - national average 59.5%
- Rotherham Tribunal Cases 2016/17 – one – national average 4.34%

Genuine Partnerships

- National work of Rotherham Charter Team launched June 2016
- Local Authority (Educational Psychologist) and Parent Forum Co-lead
- Diverse team of parents, carers, young people and practitioners modelling genuine co-production, appreciative approaches
- Consultation, training packages, tiered packages of support leading to Gold Accreditation
- Influential to SEND reforms 2014, wider than SEND
- NATIONAL INTEREST – Voices: National Alliance for Local Area Partnership Working
- Partnership for NDTi (“inspirational”), Shropshire, more to follow
- Four Charter Principles to be adopted nationally as ‘Cornerstones for Participation’, starting with four Local Authority pilots (pending DfE formal statement and funding arrangements)

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - 22/03/17**

- Rotherham described by Voices as a “Mothership” Local Authority
- Grant funding (Awards for All and Comic Relief): Parent and Practitioner Induction Programme and Young People’s Project
- University of Sheffield regional project
- Rotherham Forum 600+ members, positive relationships in main with young people and families, tribunals rare
- Hybrid of Local Authority, trading and grant funds – three year Business Plan, seeking continued Local Authority financial partnership post-2017 as important social investment raising Rotherham profile and saving money for Council

**SEND Governance Arrangements**

- Children’s Progress Board
- CYPS Transformation Project Group
- Children and Families Strategic Partnership
- SEND and Inclusion Senior Management Group
- SEND Data Dashboard
- Education and Skills Senior Leadership Team
- CYPS DLT – Children’s Transformation Board and Children’s Resource Board
- Joint Commissioning Strategy
- Health and Wellbeing Board
- SEND Area Inspections
- SEND Assurance
- Children’s Improvement Board

**Rotherham SEND Strengths**

- Excellent nationally recognised relationships with parents/carers and a high level of co-production
- Drive and determination from all practitioners to ensure provision is matched and personalised to need
- High take up of traded services by educational settings
- Ability to provide high quality training bespoke to a diverse audience
- Newly appointed stable leadership improving the whole system

**Rotherham SEND main areas for development**

- To continue to improve and achieve timelines for Education Health and Care Plans, Annual Reviews and Statement conversions
- Reconfiguration of provision for Social Emotional and Mental Health and Autism needs
- Co-location of services within a SEND Hub

The Select Commission welcomed Catherine who was a Service user and Kerry Taylor, Service Lead, SENDIASS. Catherine explained her family circumstances and her experience of using SENDIASS.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- How good were the schools that specifically focussed on an area of specialism able to support children with multiple and complex needs – Most schools supported children with a range of needs; even though a school may have a resource e.g. Speech and Language Resource, it would only be for up to 15 children - the rest were in mainstream school. The School would also have a Special Needs Co-ordinator who had the experience and knowledge of the graduated response to deal with the whole range of needs of the remainder of the school. It was very rare for children with Special Educational Needs to have just one difficulty. The Service endeavoured to always put the child at the centre and personalise around that child.
  
- What was the process of reviewing children who had entered special school provision at an early age and if possible helping them access mainstream school? – A child entered into a specialist provision via an Education Health Care Plan (EHC). The EHC, which legally had to be reviewed annually but could be done sooner, would look at the child's provision. It was common to have children moving from one specialist provision to another but there was not enough children moving back into mainstream provision. Often emotional, social and health needs were of a temporary nature and the Service was investigating how services could be personalised around the children with those needs with regular reviews taking place to ensure that provision was adapted and de-escalated if needed with the child returning to mainstream as and when appropriate.

If a parent wanted a child to stay in mainstream school then the Service would make the appropriate provision through the EHC for them to be maintained in a mainstream school.

- How were the wishes and feelings of the young people and children captured? – Work had commenced on what needed to be developed with one of the self-assessments taking regard to the voice of the young person. Rotherham had “Child Centred Reviewing” with some young people leading their own review. Every attempt was made to involve children and young people in the strategic work.

SENDIASS had a Moderating Group that looked at its services and included representation from different Service users including children and young people and considered what it needed to offer them. There was a Children's Information Officer who worked with children 0-16 around SEND and a Young People's Information Officer who worked with the 16-25 age within the Team. The work also covered many different issues such as the annual review process, the EHC work that took place to make sure wishes, hopes and feelings were captured and they could support any SEN matter in school. It was new to the Service and still developing but had already seen a doubled amount of children accessing the Service.

- Nationally the statistic for young people accessing the Service was three boys to one girl. Were there any thoughts as to why that particularly happened in Rotherham as well and what was the Service's approach? Work was taking place on establishing a better understanding of all the data to enable to address any issues necessary. Rotherham was in line with the national position.
- The report to a approximate overspend of £30,000 overspend, £14,000 to be carried over and £16,000 to be recouped by the Local Authority. Was the £16,000 from other agencies? SENDIASS had been allocated £30,000 from the SEND Reform Grant when the 2015/16 annual report had been prepared. However, at that time the Service had changed significantly due to the loss of staff. Some of the funding had been utilised to recruit a Referral Officer for parents but the lengthy recruitment process had resulted in the underspend. It was a similar position for the current financial year.
- Why had the provision of advice, information and support to young people moved from the Integrated Youth Service to sit within Rotherham SENDIASS? It had been as a result of restructuring within CYPS, the development of the Early Help provision and in order to ensure that SENDIASS was appropriately placed as they who had the expertise within special education needs and disability to support families and young people. However, the relationship between Early Help, Health and Social Care was very close. It was hoped that parents and the young people did not see a division and that they had the appropriate specialists around the table who were working together to support the family rather than acting as independent organisations.
- There was a special schools total capacity of 595 but only 20 places in the highly complex needs and Autism. What happened if there was a need for more than the 20 places? A Sufficiency report was being compiled looking at the growth in population, the type of/how much future provision was needed and bringing the special schools together, along with providers, to look at how to plan to increase provision.
- Were there any barriers preventing Services getting into schools? On the whole Rotherham Academies were working with Services and in most cases the SEND provision and services were well established and working before they were academised. Through the work of the School Improvement Service the Head Teachers regularly met and shared the knowledge of what services were available. As part of the approach to Social, Emotional and Mental Health issues, there were now partnerships of schools working together and look at how to address those needs in their localities more strategically.

- What position would the Local Authority be in if a school decided it could/would not to buy in services? Certain areas of the work were statutory such as the Educational Psychologist who had to provide a report for an EHC Plan. The EHC Plan, once written, was a legal document which would state the type of support that was necessary which necessitated schools having to bring in the required specialists. Schools/academies were legally bound to deliver an EHC Plan and could be directed to accept a child with an EHC Plan.
- With regard to the case study, did schools buy into training and more education to stop others having to go through the same experience? SENDIASS were there to listen, help and support the family.
- Was there genuine buy in from partners e.g. CAMHS? Rotherham was ahead of other areas with regard to the Authority's relationship with Health Services and CAMHS and there was a good and developing relationship with the CCG who commissioned services. The SEND hub would be in the same building as CAMHS, health therapists and the Social Care Disability Team bringing the three areas together to develop communication and improve the EHC process and the offer that was available to families. The CAMHS Transformation Plan had brought a team together consisting of Education, Health and Social Care staff to support parents after a child has been diagnosed.
- Were there any checks to establish if Pupil Premium was spent on the child for the benefit of the child? Pupil Premium information had to appear on a maintained school/academy's website. The Council had responsibility for the allocation of Pupil Premium for a Looked After Child and had to evaluate its effectiveness.
- Traditionally there were problems on the transition from Children's Services to Adult Services and work had taken place in this area. Were there any particular problems being commonly encountered on the seamless life journey? The Transition Group and Plan had brought together Adult Services and Children Services from across Education, Health and Care. The Group was looking at a number of actions some of which had already happened. There was now a Transitions Team in Adult Social Care that worked very closely with colleagues in Children's starting their work with children of 14 years to commence the preparation of, not only what they needed to do as a Service, but also to prepare the young person for being an adult and part of Adult Services. It also helped the families to understand some of the expectations around Adult Services and what was/was not provided.
- Was the Transition Team involved in the commissioning cycle looking at future services? The Team would be involved in the outcome of the Sufficiency plan as well as the SEND hub and some of the strategic groups. It was the intention that they be involved in every

strategy for SEND that covered Children and Adults' education, health and social care.

- Governance arrangements – what role did Elected Members play? Elected Members attended many of the meetings.
- There had been a reduction in the number of referrals to the Service followed by a noticeable sharp increase. Was there any particular reason for that or just natural fluctuation? The reduction in the number of referrals had been at the time of the staffing issues at SENDIASS. So far this year, there had been a massive incline in numbers - as of 14<sup>th</sup> March there was a 25% increase in referrals compared to the same period last year.

There had also been an incline because of the change from Statements to ECH Plans.

- What additional safeguarding training/checks were carried out because of the vulnerability of these children? The starting point was that the children had to be and must be safe. Safeguarding was a key element both in terms of staff training, commissioning of places and the monitoring of any place. The focus on safeguarding was the first piece of work that had to be carried out.

The Chair thanked Paula, Karen and Kerry for their presentation.

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

(2) That once complete the Sufficiency Strategy be submitted to the Select Commission for discussion.

(3) That the Select Commission given consideration to the establishment of a Working Group to discuss the case study

(4) That consideration be given to a joint meeting with the Health Select Commission with regard to Transitions to Adult Services.

**54. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES PERFORMANCE REPORT - JANUARY 2016/17**

Mel Meggs, Deputy Strategic Director, presented a summary of performance under key themes for Children's Social Care and Early Help Services as at the end of January, 2017.

It was noted that this was the first performance report for the Select Commission since the implementation of the new Liquid Logic case management system at the end of October, 2016. The changeover had created a number of challenges in terms of data quality and reporting but significant progress had been made. However, teams were still adjusting to new recording requirements and addressing data migration gaps.



The report highlighted examples of good and improved performance and key areas for further improvement.

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

- Social Worker caseloads had reduced again across all the teams and were now within the normal bounds – only one with a caseload of 25.
- Currently there was only one Social Worker and one Team Manager vacancy.
- Had there been an improvement since the extra staff had started in the amount work carried out? The caseloads had reduced. The Service had seen its first outstanding audit and the Looked After Children Service had had its first outstanding element of an audit. Ofsted had not deemed any cases to be critically inadequate as nor had the Peer Review; most the cases were deemed requiring improvement which was a better position than that originally. Over the next couple of months “Signs of Safety” would be implemented and a dramatic improvement expected; now that there were the numbers of staff to have the time to do the quality of work desired they now needed the tools to do the work.
- The persistent absence percentage was high and the percentage of children attending school was low. What work was being done – The Government had changed the persistent absence threshold and a student only had to have a few absences for it to be classed as persistent absenteeism; this may account for some of the increase. Clearly there was link between persistent absence and levels of attendance and the Education Welfare Officers who worked as part of the Early Help offer were producing some additional actions.
- Were we looking into how individual schools were tackling persistent absenteeism/low attendance? It relied upon the Local Authority having voluntary engagement with the schools. Schools not maintained by the Local Authority were allowed to make their own decisions with regard to absences and the sharing of information. The Early Help Teams were there to provide support to schools around their absence policies and procedures and clearly had to have that relationship because it was the Local Authority that had the power to take formal action around school attendance. Each school would be expected to have an attendance strategy but that was done with Early Help support.
- Health Assessments should be completed within 35 working days. Was that realistic? A family did not wait long for an assessment where it was known that there were needs that could be met. Families needed a timely service and it would be made sure an assessment was undertaken to access those services. The 35 days

could be extended but it was questionable whether the quality of the information or assessment would be any better as opposed to the quality of the experience for the family. There were no information or guidelines but 35 days was a good principal.

- The Leaving Care tracker showed 10 young people were not in suitable accommodation - was there any movement on the ones that were overcrowded/bed and breakfast/sofa surfing? These were the most vulnerable young people and were kept under review. Their personal adviser would be working with them.
- Early Help was doing well and Ofsted were impressed. Looking at Early Help as a form of mitigation from families, children being stepped up. Are we seeing that coming through in the figures or something expected to see in the future? The Children in Need figures over the last couple of months had seen a decrease of approximately 200-300 children being supported by Social Care. It was known that children would not live their life at one point of a threshold and it was important that they received a seamless service whatever their needs. It was expected that when some of the evidence based models e.g. Signs of Safety were implemented that coming out of the Social Care system should be quicker for children. There should be fewer children in care and more supported at home with their parents.
- In January 2017 there were twelve children that ceased to be LAC. Had they reached an age where they ceased to be LAC or twelve families that work had taken place with and managed to return them home? It could be one of three routes. It may be that they had found alternative permanency through adoption or Special Guardianship Orders where they stayed with their family, those that turned 18 years of age so became care leavers and those that had returned home.
- Could a breakdown be provided of the percentage of LAC who had had three or more placements? It was more likely that it was those children who came late into the care system and therefore subject to more placement disruption. It was known that a child was unlikely to disrupt a placement if they came into the system at an early age; if they came in at the age of 14 it could sometimes take longer to find an appropriate family. Some of the disrupted placements were due to planned moves but there was no doubt that there were too many children whose placement was disrupted because their carers could not meet their needs. A strengths and difficulties questionnaire had been undertaken with the results analysed to give an assessment of a child's emotional wellbeing. A score of 18 indicated that they were more likely to have placement disruption; 30 children had been identified through the process and extra resources to be provided to give support prior to disruption. A scheme, "Mocking Bird", was to be introduced where foster carers provided support to other foster carers.

- In January, 2017 50% of the Health Assessments of LAC carried out. The 50% was two children of which only one had a Health Assessment.

A Health Summit with the CQC had been held looking at a range of issues of which Health Assessments was one of them and a range of actions were in place. The CQC had been asked to conduct a review as the Authority felt its issues had been resolved. The issues that remained were within the Health part of the system and were working very hard to manage them – having sufficient clinic time and the paediatricians submitting their report within 20 days. There was an action plan which was monitored every week.

- Was there any data on how many children had stopped going into care because their families were looking after them through Section 20 etc.? Was there support for families? If Social Care had not been involved the child could live with a relation under a private fostering arrangement. Where Social Care was involved, there was an obligation to support whoever cared for the child. If it was a Special Guardianship Order the Authority would pay an allowance and make a contribution to the child's upkeep as well as providing a range of different support dependent upon the level of need. They would be considered as a Child in Need. There were also children at home on a Supervision Order and a Child Arrangement Order where the Authority provided help and support. Those arrangements were reviewed to ensure they were fully working.
- Voice of the Child – for audit purposes how well were the decisions documented not to instigate a Section 4.7 investigation? They were documented under the management decision on every child's case and there would be a rationale as to why that decision was made. In January there been 19 cases where it had been found that the concerns had not been substantiated and in those instances an audit had been requested to check that the decision was right and the rationale was clear.
- What was being done to make ensure that a CPP was not being closed down too soon? It was felt that Signs of Safety would help in ensuring better analysis and only closing cases where they could be when it was seen that the change in a child's circumstances was being sustained. Most of the cases were those on a CPP because of emotional abuse and neglect so it was more difficult to know when and if a family was able to sustain an improvement. The Authority was applying for funding to pilot under the National Innovation Programme, NST for Neglect, as there was work to be done around how families were helped where it was believed neglect was having an impact on the children.

- What other reasons were there for the decline in performance other than high turnover of staff across the LAC Service? – The number of children placed in an out of area placement was an issue. Rotherham's caseloads were low in comparison with other authorities but Social Workers had distances to travel and was why attempts were being made to bring children back to Rotherham to Rotherham families. The target for the number of foster families had been achieved (15) and had been increased to 25.
- Were there applicants from all across the community and society? There was insufficient diversity in the system. Specialist recruitment work in some communities would not be unhelpful.

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

(2) That the next Children and Young People's performance report include SEND Service performance data.

(3) That the Select Commission consider as part of the 2017/18 work place exclusions and persistent absence.

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

Resolved:- (1) That the next schedule meeting be held on Wednesday, 14th June, 2017 at 1.30 p.m.

(2) That a special meeting be held on 17<sup>th</sup> May to look at the work programme and to consider the report of the review group on the alternative models for Children and Young People's Services.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**11th January, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Jepson, Jones, Marles, McNeely, Price, Reeder, Sheppard, Taylor, Julie Turner, Walsh, Whysall and Wyatt, Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck, Cutts and Rushforth.

**41.           DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor McNeely made a personal interest in Minute Nos. 46 and 47 (Council tenant).

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

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

**43.           COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chair reported that her Local Government Association Mentor, Head of Scrutiny at Lambeth Council, would like to attend the next meeting and pre-meeting briefing of the Select Commission.

Resolved:- That an invitation be extended to the Head of Scrutiny at Lambeth Council to attend the 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2017 meeting of this Select Commission and pre-meeting briefing.

**44.           MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH NOVEMBER, 2016**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2016, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Arising from Minute No. Minute No. 37(6) (Housing Allocation Policy Amendments), Councillor McNeely asked how the Directorate would deal with a person who had a tenancy but they had chosen to be homeless?

Arising from Minute No. 37 Resolution (2)(iii) the Scrutiny agreed to the proposed 6 amendments and (iii) referred to new tenants not being allowed to apply to transfer within the first 2 years of their tenancy. There was a loophole for Band 4 in that existing tenants could transfer within 2 years; new tenants and existing tenants should be treated the same.

Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, confirmed that anyone who took on a new tenancy could not go back onto the Housing Register for 2 years as set out in the Transfer Policy. This was intended to tighten up the loophole.

Arising from Minute No. 37(d), it was noted that a report had been approved at the Cabinet/Commissioners' meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, regarding enhanced Enforcement activity across the Borough and proposing a joint contract with Doncaster Council who already had an external provider undertaking enhanced environmental impact work. The contract was open for the Authority to enter into it for a 12 month period.

Arising from Minute No. 37(h), it was noted that Dignity and its sub-contractors would be held to account by the Authority. Dignity had employed additional contractors to ensure grounds maintenance works were completed in a timely fashion and to a better standard. It would cover all cemeteries and not just Maltby.

Arising from Minute No. 37 (resolution 2), information was requested on the pricing structure for the provision of memorial benches, opening hours of cemeteries and crematorium and the availability of land for a possible extension to the Maltby cemetery.

Resolved:- (1) That a report be submitted in 6 months on the joint enhanced Enforcement contract with Doncaster Council.

(2) That the information requested with regard to the provision of memorial benches, opening hours of cemeteries and crematorium and the availability of land for a possible extension to the Maltby cemetery be submitted to the next meeting.

**45. EMERGENCY PLANNING TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

Councillor Wyatt, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, provided the following progress and update details:-

- The Group met in December which had been attended by an experienced Forward Liaison Officer and 2 Borough Co-ordinators
- The Emergency Plan was being re-written and consulted upon
- The Group was to meet on 16<sup>th</sup> January and would be considering procurement and commissioning and how external providers complied/assisted with the emergency plan
- The issue had been raised in the re-writing of the Plan of the need not to lose community resilience

The Select Commission thanked Councillor Wyatt for his update.

**46. REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

Damien Wilson, Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, presented a performance report for the Services provided by the Regeneration and Environment Directorate.

Performance information for the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of the 2016/17 year was currently being collated by the Performance and Quality Unit. The current status of performance for the Service at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter (April-September 2016) was as follows:-

- 4 Indicators were off target (red)
- 22 Indicators were on target (green)
- 2 Indicators were (amber) off target but progress towards achieving the target was satisfactory
- 12 measures were reported annually and information would be available at the end of quarter 4

The Directorate plan was currently under review to meet the 1<sup>st</sup> April deadline which would also reflect some of the Performance Indicators as well as some new Indicators.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The blue rating on the performance scorecard referred to no performance information being available or that it was an annual Indicator.
- The missed bin collection rate was well under target and did not include the collection of recyclates. The recyclates collection vehicles had been out of date for some time and were being explored for the green waste collection. There were cost implications but a business case was being prepared.
- Further information would be sought with regard to the percentage of municipal waste landfilled.
- Whilst Rotherham probably had the most stringent taxi licencing policy in the country, it could not impose it on anyone else or stop people from licencing their taxis elsewhere and operating under a sub-contract arrangement with an existing Rotherham taxi operator. The message was to ask for a Rotherham registered taxi so you would know that the driver had been subject to the rigorous policy. If customers continued to ask for a Rotherham taxi hopefully there would be no trade for those that came from outside Rotherham and flouted the rules.
- In terms of enforcement, those drivers that had not complied with the BTEC requirement due to an issue that they could rectify, their licence could be suspended and re-issued once complete. If it involved something that the driver could not rectify e.g. historic behaviour the licence would not be re-issued/granted.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 11/01/17**

- There was data for each individual library across the Borough which could be supplied to Members. Consideration was being given to a more central town centre location for the main library.
- Acknowledgement that the town centre had migrated with the move of Tesco from the Forge Island site. Footfall data was analysed on a quarterly basis using the same fixed points and giving consistency in how it was gathered. If the cameras were moved to take account of the new town centre it would be a new baseline and take a period of time to enable comparisons to be made.
- Request for a breakdown of actual anti-social behaviour incidents including figures rather than percentages.
- The Police crime recording measures had completely changed with a lot more recorded than previously.
- Rotherham was the third best performing local authority in the country with regard to planning applications.
- Key sites were already monitored by cameras some of which were battery operated. Currently there were a limited number of cameras but there would be investment if they proved their worth. Flytipping formed part of the broader enforcement activity with a general enforcement target. That was then broken down to look at what was done in Enforcement.
- Further analysis required with regard to the levels of street cleanliness measure.
- There was action (including financial penalties) the Authority could take with regard to utility companies when highways were not reinstated to an acceptable condition after conducting works.
- It was critical to develop alternative income streams if there were non-statutory activities the Authority wanted to maintain in the future. Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing staff had been challenged to sell the services of the Authority and spot any opportunities. When a contract was lost it should be challenged as to why.
- The current target for Grounds Maintenance contacts was 719, 286 for Q2 and 73 in Q3. An understanding of the nature of the contacts was required as some may be compliments/requests for service opposed to complaints.
- Recruitment was underway for the post of Street Scene Manager.



- Work was underway in gathering data on the number of people resident in the town centre.
- There was data available through the Safer Roads hub with regard to people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents. The data indicated where the priority areas, however, in the South Yorkshire context, Rotherham was not particularly high by comparison.

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

(2) That the quarter performance be submitted to the Select Commission once it had been considered by Cabinet.

#### 47. NEW STRATEGIC TENANCY POLICY

Wendy Foster (Social Housing Officer), Sarah Watts (Housing Intelligence Officer) and Sandra Tolley (Housing Options Manager) gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

##### Fixed Term Tenancies

Localism Act 2011	Housing and Planning Act 2016
Landlord's discretion	Compulsory for local authorities
2 years in exceptional circumstances	Discretionary for Housing Associations
5 years the 'norm'	2-5 years unless:- Tenants forced to move Someone with disability or long term illness Families with children under
No upper limit	

##### Benefits

For landlords	For tenants
Make better use of social housing stock	Greater independence
More flexibility with properties	Support tenants to achieve aspirations
Support housing management	Minimise under-occupancy/fuel poverty
	Receive increased support

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 11/01/17

## Affects for existing tenants

Existing tenants who move through choice are likely to be issued a fixed term tenancy:	Existing tenants are likely to keep their periodic tenancies if they are:
Mutual exchanges Non-statutory successions Transfers	Fleeing domestic abuse Forced to move through regeneration Full-time carers Severely disabled or have mobility/care needs

## Concerns raised throughout the consultation programme

- Residents, Elected Members and Officers all expressed concerns around the blanket issuing of Fixed Term Tenancies (FTT) undermining the long term sustainability of communities

## The Council's Approach

- The Council aims to balance the need to support settled, sustainable communities with the need to make best use of its stock and house residents in the greatest housing need by:-  
Issuing tenancies for the maximum 'usual' term of 5 years  
Ensuring tenants are aware of how their behaviour could impact on the renewal of the tenancy on sign-up
- All tenancies will be reviewed and the Council will seek to offer a further 5 year tenancy in the same property for the vast majority of tenants

## Tenancies will not be renewed where

- The Council will allow fixed term tenancies to come to an end where there have been serious breaches of the Tenancy Agreement leading to a Notice Seeking Possession (NSP) being active at the point of review:  
NSPs are usually served for rent arrears or anti-social behaviour  
Notices are active for a period of 12 months  
Currently 1,149 (5.7%) RMBC tenants with an active Notice Seeking Possession

## A tenancy for a different property will be issued where:-

- A further 5 year fixed term tenancy for another, more suitable property will be offered where:-  
The property is adapted, the adaptations are no longer needed but are likely to be helpful to another family  
The household is overcrowded  
The household is under-occupying a 4+ bedroomed house

## Discussion and Feedback

- Is issuing fixed term tenancies for the highest (normal) 5 year term the right approach for RMBC?
- Is the proposed approach to renewals right?

- (a) Allowing tenancies to expire where there is an active Notice Seeking Possession
- (b) Offering alternative properties where tenants are significantly under-occupying, are over-crowded or no longer need an adapted property
- (c) Issuing a further 5 year tenancy if (a) and (b) do not apply

#### Fixed Term Tenancies in Rotherham

- RMBC opted to introduce fixed term tenancies in 2013 to tackle under-occupancy and fuel poverty and make better use of its larger (4+ bedroomed) homes

	2013	2015
Number of properties with just 1 occupancy (262 properties)	117	82
% of 4+ homes under-occupied	45%	38%
Number of/% of fixed term tenancies issued		34 10%

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The Housing Bill had received Royal Assent in May 2016.
- Issuing FTT was not the right approach but the Local Authority had no choice.
- Is issuing fixed term tenancies for the highest (normal) 5 year term the right approach for RMBC?
  - The maximum FTT should be for 5 years - any less and tenants would feel it was not worth decorating, create a community etc.
  - It was not thought that automatic renewal would be allowed.
  - Tenants feeling it was not worth investing in their property would have a knock-on cost to the Authority
- Is the proposed approach to renewals right
  - If a tenant had an active Notice Seeking Possession (NSP) they had contravened their Tenancy Agreement. However, if a tenant received a NSP mid-way through their tenancy but there was nothing further for a year it would be removed; if it was received in the last 6 months of the 5 years tenancy they would be penalised.
  - It would increase the number of people in private tenancies.
  - NSPs should continue to be used as it gave an opportunity to manage the behaviour of tenants in a less resource intensive way.
  - It was hoped that a full explanation on sign up of the implications of non-compliance with the Tenancy Agreement would help with sustainability
  - Consideration was required as to what point a NSP broke a 5 year tenancy and clear criteria for officers.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 11/01/17

- Tenants should not be moved from their property due to under occupancy, particularly elderly tenants. Work should take place on persuading them to move into more suitable accommodation.
- The Authority did not tend to use Demoted tenancies. An application had to be made to Court and it was almost a first step to seeking possession but giving the tenant a chance to pull the tenancy back.
- A detailed Tenancy Policy would be written once the Regulations were published. Current tenants would not receive a copy of the Tenancy Policy as existing tenants would not be affected by the changes unless they applied for a mutual exchange/transfer. There would be 1 Tenancy Agreement even though it would not apply in full to all tenants.
- Currently it could only be assumed that the appeal process would be the same as it was for flexible tenancies for 4+ bedroom properties i.e. tenants could appeal when they were first offered a tenancy, the term of tenancy but not the kind of tenancy and if it did not accord with Policy. They could appeal when the review was carried out and had the outcome thereof. It was envisaged that the Area Housing Officers would visit look at the tenancy and make a decision; it would then be passed to their Senior Officer. If there was an appeal it would be considered by Housing and Estates Manager or equivalent who had the knowledge but not directly involved in making the decision. Customers had been given the information upfront and knew how long their tenancy was for. There had been no appeals as yet as the tenancies were not due to end until 2027.
- Under the Localism Act the Authority had tightened up on statutory successions and within the Policy there was the discretion to manage successions. However, it was not known whether there would be that discretion within the new Regulations. The new Tenancy Agreement had also included successions and additional family members to succeed but had been put on hold pending the Regulations.
- It was important that the Council tried to get the balance with regard to under occupancy and was difficult for both the tenant and for the Department to approach the subject. Through fixed term tenancies it opened up communication between the Department and tenants so it could be addressed sensitively.
- The mandatory FTT was for new tenants and not existing tenants. Downsizing was being addressed with existing tenants in a sensitive manner. FTT tenants would be made aware from the start that the tenancy was issued for a fixed period and work with them through the reviews and verification period to identify at what point in their lives they would need more suitable housing. At the end of the 5 year period a review would take place and, if the property was still deemed as suitable and there had been no tenancy issues, they would stay. If

a property was no longer suitable there was the Choice Based Letting process and they would be helped to find a property through the Allocations Policy. The proposals included anyone who had mobility needs who would retain a life time tenancy upon moving in.

- The Government had mooted that families with children under the age of 9 would get a tenancy for up to 10 years so that the child(ren) could stay in secondary education. They had also mooted carers and pensioners may be given life time tenancies.
- Proposal that it be mandatory for all new tenants to attend a tenancy workshop and have a housing options interview before they joined the housing register to emphasise the expectations around a FTT.
- There was to be a Financial Inclusion Team and Tenancy Support team with the emphasis on supporting tenants rather than the enforcement role.
- It was important to balance the time cost implications as well as reviewing a tenancy. A number of new tenancies were issued that required a review before the 5 year period ended which was resource intensive. 2 years was a short period tenancy and would translate into higher number of voids and associated costs of re-letting properties. The Service would not wait until the end of the 5 years to take action against anyone undertaking anti-social behaviour or not paying rent.
- Letting and sub-letting were addressed through the tenancy verification process.
- A new tenant would be issued with an Introductory Tenancy, usually for 12 months, and then a 4 years MFTT – a total tenancy term of 5 years so giving parity with existing tenants.
- Clear links with Key Choices and the Choice Based Lettings Policy would be ensured so that tenants did not feel they were being forced into particular areas. It was hoped that implementation of the Policies would make better use of the existing stock.
- There was a likelihood that the introduction of MFTT might lead to an increase in the number of Right to Buys given that the qualification period had reduced from 5 years to 3.

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

(2) That once issued, the Regulations and the Tenancy Policy be submitted to the Select Commission.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 11/01/17**

**48. COUNCIL HOUSING TENANTS - SCRUTINY UPDATE**

Co-opted member Mrs. L. Shears reported that there was no update to be reported.

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

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Wednesday, 22nd February, 2017 at commencing at 2.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION  
22nd February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Allen, Buckley, Jepson, Jones, Marles, Price, Reeder, Rushforth, Taylor, J. Turner, Walsh and Wyatt; together with co-opted members Mr. P. Cahill, Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance : Councillor Steele (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board);  
Councillor Edward Davie (Chair of Scrutiny of the Lambeth London Borough Council);  
Councillor Hoddinott (Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety) – for Minute No. 55 only.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkin, B. Cutts, McNeely, Sheppard and Whysall.

**50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With regard to Minute No. 55 (Scrutiny Review of Waste Management), both Councillor Reeder and Councillor Wyatt referred to their involvement and consequent personal interests, as volunteers, with charitable organisations participating in schemes for the recycling of various materials.

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

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

**52. COMMUNICATIONS**

The following items were reported:-

(1) the Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission had visited the Lambeth London Borough Council, to view that Authority's scrutiny arrangements and a report on the outcome of the visit would be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

(2) further to Minute No. 38 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 30th November, 2016, arrangements had been made with Dignity Funerals Ltd. for a visit of inspection to the Maltby Cemetery on 9h March, 2017. Also, on 16h March, 2017, there would be a visit of inspection to the Rotherham Crematorium. Members requested that representatives of the sub-contractor, Glendale Countryside management Ltd., be asked to attend the visit of inspection to the Maltby Cemetery. It was noted that the Maltby Town Council would also be represented on 9th March, 2017.

**53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH JANUARY 2017**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, subject to the clerical correction of the inclusion of Councillor Allen in the list of persons who had submitted their apologies for absence for that meeting.

**54. ROTHERHAM ECONOMIC GROWTH PLAN 2015 - 2025 - PROGRESS UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Manager of the Rotherham Investment and Development Office and the Economic Development Manager, concerning the Rotherham Economic Growth Plan 2015 to 2025. The report stated that the Rotherham Economic Growth Plan had been officially approved and adopted by this Council and by the Rotherham Local Strategic Partnership in the Autumn, 2015 (Minute No. 74 of the meeting of the Council held on 21st October, 2015, refers). The Growth Plan comprised seven themes, each of which had a number of targets and a delivery plan, setting out the priorities and activities for the first year of delivery.

Members were informed that, with the Growth Plan having been “live” for twelve months, the Council’s Economic Development Team was now leading an exercise to monitor the progress against the targets and work plan. The full monitoring return document was attached as an appendix to the submitted report.

The submitted report provided details of the progress of each of Growth Plan themes:-

- Theme 1 - Grow Existing and Develop New Business
- Theme 2 - Skills for Employment and Progression
- Theme 3 - Inclusion, Wellbeing and Employment
- Theme 4 - Employment Land and Business Premises
- Theme 5 - Housing
- Theme 6 - Town Centre
- Theme 7 - Transport

The Select Commission members raised the following issues during discussion of this item:-

: the arrangements for the sub-groups dealing with the seven themes of the Growth Plan;

: the development of the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (at Waverley);



: the Tram-Train transport link between Sheffield, Meadowhall, Rotherham and Parkgate, scheduled to begin operating during 2018;

: the impact of the proposed development of the HS2 high-speed railway line;

: the business incubation scheme, encouraging new business start-ups; the business accelerator programme, usually lasting thirteen weeks, helping to accelerate the process of establishing a new business with a strong, sustainable business model;

: the availability of business administration support for existing companies within the Rotherham Borough area;

: a scheme relating to the identification and acquisition of suitable properties for business growth;

: the possible development of a cinema and a hotel within, or near to the Rotherham town centre;

: proposed improvements to retail markets;

: the Council's acquisition of the Forge Island site, within the Rotherham town centre and the possible redevelopment of that site;

: the Council's imminent acquisition of the Rotherham Magistrates' Court building;

: the availability of appropriate employment-related and vocational training and courses offered by the Rotherham College of Arts and Technology; enabling young people to obtain employment locally;

: the implications of the Growth Plan for social inclusion, equalities and deprived communities;

: the incidence of self-employment and also of people who have 'zero-hours' employment contracts;

: Members requested details of the proposed mainline railway station to be developed at Parkgate;

: the implications of the eventual termination of existing European funding being provided for business start-ups and for employment creation;

: the installation and construction of infrastructure for broadband connections to business and domestic properties; Members requested details of the installation and construction programme affecting the Rotherham Borough area;

: Members requested details of the Rotherham Investment and Development Office apprenticeship scheme;

: the refurbishment of the Rotherham Passenger Transport Interchange which is currently taking place;

: the level of footfall within the Rotherham town centre; anti-social behaviour within the Rotherham town centre and the endeavours of various organisations to improve public safety within the town centre.

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

**55. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF WASTE MANAGEMENT (TASK AND FINISH GROUP)**

Further to Minute No. 37 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 20th January, 2016, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Cabinet Member for Waste, Road and Community Safety and by the Street Scene Manager concerning the progress of the scrutiny review of Waste Management being undertaken by the Task and Finish Group established by this Select Commission.

The report stated that the Task and Finish Group had:-

i) recognised that Waste Management is one of the most important front-line services that this Council delivers to the people of Rotherham. This Council is both a Waste Collection and a Waste Disposal Authority;

ii) examined options in relation to Household Waste Recycling Centres; re-use facilities; the collection of bulky items, green waste collections; kerbside collections; textiles and small electrical, as well as the collection of commercial waste.

The outcome of the scrutiny review had identified several short- and medium-term actions, all of which were detailed within the submitted report.

The progress of the various aspects of the scrutiny review were also highlighted within the submitted report and it was noted that the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group's scrutiny review would be taken into account and included within the service development plans of the Regeneration and Environment Directorate, which were being prepared during 2017.

The Select Commission highlighted a number of issues during discussion of this item:-

: the campaign of public communication with residents (eg: about the availability of home composting bins);

: British Heart Foundation – scheme for the collection and re-use of unwanted furniture and electrical items; this suggested scheme had not commenced for reasons of cost, affecting both this Council and the British Heart Foundation;

: some large items of furniture are disposed of at landfill sites, although recycling is also utilised (eg: wooden furniture), depending upon the material from which the furniture items are made;

: the trial of the re-use project (eg: electrical items; bicycles) at household waste recycling centres; this scheme had begun during January 2017 and would be of benefit to charities; the scheme had not yet been widely advertised; Members requested further details of the re-use scheme;

: charging for non-household waste at household waste recycling centres – the current contract does not permit this arrangement; there will be further examination of this possible arrangement, although the household waste recycling centres are currently not resourced to accept commercial waste; it was noted that the current contract with the FCC Company is a joint contract between the local authorities of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham;

: joint working with the other principal local authorities in South Yorkshire (eg: the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham existing joint arrangement); discussions will continue in respect of residents of one local authority being able to dispose of waste for recycling at the household waste recycling centres situated in the other local authorities' areas;

: recycling of plastic bottles – the Council does not currently collect plastic bottles from the kerbside for recycling, although plastic materials placed in the black domestic refuse bins will be separated for recycling at the waste treatment facility at Manvers; the collection of plastic bottles at the kerbside would have cost implications for this Council;

: domestic waste collection at intervals of four weeks – this Council was not considering such an arrangement;

: the recycling centre at Conisbrough, Doncaster;

: the allocation and use of permits for light commercial vehicles and large vans entering the household waste recycling centres;

: the commercial waste disposal contracts and enforcement where necessary;

: ensuring that other organisations (eg: Parish and Town Councils) were aware of recycling facilities and schemes, in order to assist with the provision of publicity for such facilities;

: the desirability of goods for sale having environmentally-friendly packaging;

: the damage to the environment caused by fly-tipping.

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

(Councillor Reeder and Councillor Wyatt referred to their involvement and consequent personal interests, as volunteers, with charitable organisations participating in schemes for the recycling of various materials)

## **56. EMERGENCY PLANNING TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

Further to Minute No. 45 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 11th January, 2017, Councillor Wyatt, Chair of the Emergency Planning Task and Finish Group, provided the following progress and update details about the Group's work:-

: the Task and Finish Group has had two further meetings;

: one of the meetings was with the Council's Procurement Team, for discussion about the way in which procurement and commissioning processes are able to assist the Emergency Planning function; one of the recommendations of the scrutiny review will be for procurement and commissioning to be involved with the Emergency Planning Room and its role in any post-incident recovery operations;

: another meeting was with Mr. Simon Dennis (the Council's Corporate Risk Manager) who would be introducing risk principles into the drafting of the Emergency Plan;

: at the end of February and beginning of March 2017, there is to be an Emergency Planning table-top, mini exercise for officers; two Members of the Task and Finish will be observers of this exercise and will report their findings to the Group;

: the recruitment process continues for Borough Council employees, who are encouraged to become volunteers and fulfil various roles in the event of an emergency incident within the Borough area or in the wider region and affecting the Rotherham Borough; appropriate training is provided for the employee volunteers;

: the Task and Finish Group is also scheduling a meeting with the Council's Communications Team;

: the Task and Finish Group is to have a meeting with the Council's Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting to discuss the shared service arrangement for Emergency Planning with Sheffield City Council, with emphasis upon the governance arrangements;

: the Task and Finish Group is also scheduling a meeting with another of the Forward Liaison Officers for Emergency Planning;

: the report of the scrutiny review, including its recommendations, is expected to be drafted during March, 2017

The Select Commission thanked Councillor Wyatt for providing this information.

Resolved:- That the report of the Emergency Planning Task and Finish Group be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

**57. COUNCIL HOUSING TENANTS - SCRUTINY UPDATE**

There were no items to report.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**2nd December, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Price and Julie Turner.

**41.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

A member of the public asked the following question with regard to Housing Related Support Contracts specifically the Young Homeless Contract:-

“If the Board would consider sending this particular item back for a further review before any final decision was made. We would like to be involved in some discussions and consultation with the Council about how this funding could be reduced but still provide a suitable service.”

**43.       BUDGET 2017/18 AND MTFs PROGRESS UPDATE**

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, together with Judith Badger, Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services, presented an update on progress to identify potential budget savings to deliver the initial estimated financial challenge of £41.861M over the three years 2017/18 to 2019/20 with £13.125M being the estimated financial challenge for 2017/18.

A report seeking further investment would be considered at the 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, Council meeting. If approved the funding gap for 2017/18 would increase by £11.005m to £24.130m.

At a previous meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> November, the Board had considered the first tranche of budget proposals for 2017/18-2019/20 in respect of the Assistant Chief Executive, Finance and Customer Services, Adult Care and Housing and Public Health Directorates. Appendix 1 of the report submitted set out further savings proposals in respect of Children and Young People's Services and a further budget proposal in respect of Adult Social Care.

It was proposed that where it was appropriate to do so and where there was no external consultation required, the savings included in Appendix 1 be implemented during 2016/17 in order to assist with mitigating the current in-year forecast overspend as well as ensuring that the savings could be delivered with full year effect in 2017/18.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 02/12/16**

The previously considered budget proposals as well as those set out in Appendix 1 had been released for public consultation on the Council's website on 1st December, 2016. The consultation closed on 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2017.

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

- Would there be opportunity for the Board to consider the criteria for the Equality Assessment?
- How confident that the appropriate savings targets would be achieved?

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, and Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director Strategic Commissioning, presented the further budget proposal for Adult Social Care. All the “soft” budget options had been taken; any cuts which were now being made would affect front line services and customers.

Discussion ensued on the budget proposal ASO3 (Review of Housing Related Support Contracts) with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Housing Related Support funded many services all of which were additional services and not statutory. The Local Authority had a statutory commitment to house young people which the Housing Team would meet.
- The review of ASO3 had to be concluded by September, 2017 or earlier if possible. If it did not lead to negotiated savings then it would have to revert to competitive tenders for 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2018, start.
- Need for the review to be visible and transparent. The aim was to co-produce a new service offer with existing providers and users of all services and stakeholders.
- Concern that it was a cut in Service to the most vulnerable people and should be reconsidered.
- A Transformation Committee had been established with the aim of ensuring all the information was transferred from Children's Services and that each person was reassessed as they transitioned into Adult Services.
- The Suffolk Judgement required all Local Authorities to provide accommodation for 16 and 17 years whether the young person was a Child in Care or not. There was a close working relationship with the Transition Board and colleagues to make sure no young person was sleeping on the streets.

- It was not just about housing for 16/17 year olds.
- Meetings had been held with the existing providers to consider how the whole programme could be re-profiled. There was also recognition that some of the services were of significant value above the EU Regulations and needed to be subject to competitive tender.

Mel Meggs, Deputy Strategic Director, Children and Young People Services, presented the further budget proposals for Children and Young People's Services.

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

- The Authority currently did not directly employ any transport escorts or passenger assistants; they were provided by the transport operator.
- The review (ASR-Transport A) had commenced with the intention of completion by February/March. There would be an opportunity for consultation with the Board before the start of public consultation.
- Firmer figures would be known once the proposals had been drawn up.
- The costs related to Rotherham children who may be transported out of the Borough.
- Independent travel training opened up opportunities for the young people.
- Concern that once again the review would be affecting a vulnerable group of workers and that there would not be any unseen consequences.
- The benefits of Liquidlogic would enable Social Workers to complete assessments themselves and modernise business support.
- Commitment that once understood which posts were in scope and who currently worked in those areas, a new role and job description profile would be developed and match existing skills.
- Commitment not to increase and minimise the use of agency staff.
- Request for information on the grades of those that were likely to have to leave as a result of the review.
- Expecting to start reviews around the development of contracts relating to CSE, Advocacy and Counselling. Discussions would be held with providers, look at some of the individual contracts and



progress through the political process. Expected to start as soon as possible.

- Range of contracts with different children providers to provide support to vulnerable children but they were non-statutory services. Meetings would be held with providers to look at what was provided and ascertain if efficiency savings could be made without a huge detriment to children and families.
- The budget management process would continue throughout the year and there would be an opportunity at a Department, Corporate and political level to demonstrate the progress being made.
- There was integration and closer working between Children and Adult Services and the CCG. Work was underway looking at the funding that was provided to support the more complex and vulnerable children. It had been agreed to move towards a Section 75 pooled funding arrangement to jointly support those children and thereby achieve savings
- All the post-abuse support services would be considered between now and February, 2017 and providers met with to look at efficiencies. A proportionate response would be taken. The Council had priorities in protecting some of the work which would be taken into account during the review.

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

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

(3) That, with regard to ASO3, a report be submitted to the 16<sup>th</sup> December meeting on how it was intended to consult with user groups and who the budget proposal would affect.

#### **44. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT - TIGHTENING FINANCIAL CONTROLS**

Further to Minute No. 36 of 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2016, Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting and the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services presented a report setting out how the current management actions would be furthered and what additional actions were being put in place to strengthen financial controls and identify opportunities to move towards a more positive outturn forecast over the forthcoming months. Achieving this outcome would help minimise the use of available reserves and largely mitigate any significant adverse financial impact on future years' planning and the Council's overall financial resilience and sustainability.

Three themes for consolidated and proactive management action, across all Directorates, had been identified to help reduce the in-year overspend focussing on:-

- Theme 1 Managing the workforce and Workforce Change
- Theme 2 Tightening Procurement and Purchase to Pay processes
- Theme 3 Technical and Accounting Adjustments

The report submitted set out the actions being taken under each Theme.

The supplementary management actions had been agreed with the Senior Leadership Team, the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance.

Strategic Directors, Assistant Directors, Managers and budget holders would ensure continued close management and scrutiny of spend for the remainder of the financial year and would ensure adherence to both the letter and spirit of the actions set out in the report.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The newly established Workforce Management Board would challenge the need to advertise posts and bring in controls around workforce management.
- There would always be issues that affected the year end expenditure that had not been foreseen; the forecast overspend was the best that could be estimated at the current point in time. Currently there were “deep dives” into Service spend being undertaken with each accounting line challenged.
- The Corporate Plan Indicators report was submitted to the Cabinet/Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting on a quarterly basis. Some of the ASRs contained within the report submitted would be relevant in the 2017/18 financial year and it was suggested they should include an impact assessment within the Corporate Plan.
- Build into the quarterly reporting some link to where the savings had been and any performance impact of those savings.
- What cross-Directorate savings had been made?
- Had every area identified what savings could be made?
- It was thought that the impact of the removal of Salary Sacrifice would not affect the Authority until 2018/19. Work was now taking place as to the cost impact of that on the Council and would be built into the final budget proposals in terms of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 02/12/16**

Resolved:- (1) That the measures set out in the report submitted to further strengthen the Council's financial control framework in relation to HR, financial management and procurement practices across the Council and reducing the in-year forecast overspend be noted.

(2) That the Corporate Performance Plan be submitted to the Board for pre-scrutiny prior to its submission to the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting.

(3) That Children and Young People's Services and Adult Social Care continued to submit budget reports on a monthly basis and the remaining Directorates submit on a three monthly basis to enable the Board to monitor progress.

**45. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

**46. WASTE SERVICES - PROCUREMENT AND AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF KERBSIDE COLLECTED RECYCLED MATERIAL**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment Services presented a report on the current contracts in place to treat and dispose of kerbside collected household recyclable waste would both come to an end in 2017.

The Council was currently undertaking a comprehensive review of Waste Services. It was anticipated that implementation of changes to the Service would be agreed and implemented during the 2017/18 financial year.

The Board's attention was drawn the proposals set out in the report and to the corresponding timetables.

Resolved:- That the commencement of procurement activity and award of a one year contract(s) aligned to the current Service specification for both blue bag and blue box recycled materials with both contracts ending together on 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2018, be noted.

**47. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Friday, 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, commencing at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
16th December, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Cowles, Mallinder, Short and Walsh.

Councillors Lelliott, Roche and Yasseen were in attendance for Minute No. 54 (Budget 2017/18 and MTFs Progress).

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Clark, Sansome, Julie Turner and Wyatt.

**50. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of such Act indicated, as now amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 (information relates to finance and business affairs).

**51. ASR03 - REVIEW OF HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT CONTRACTS**

In accordance with Minute No. 46 of 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017, the Strategic Director of Adult Care and Housing submitted further information as requested with regard to the Review of Housing Related Support contracts.

The report set out the background to the review, the number of people served by the programme, budget/savings, the future vision for Housing Related Support, consultation and the timetable for implementation of the decision.

Resolved;- (1) That the existing and future provision of Housing Related Support in Rotherham be noted.

(2) That the Board receive further updates on the Housing Related Support Review in 6 months.

(The remainder of the agenda items were then considered in the public session.)

**52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following Declarations of Interest were made:-

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/12/16

Councillor Steele	Non-Pecuniary interest	R&E11
	Personal Interest	R&E4
Councillor Allcock	Personal Interest	R&E20

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

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

**54. BUDGET 2017/18 AND MTFs PROGRESS UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 46 of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017, the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services presented an update on progress to identify potential budget savings to deliver the initial estimated financial challenge of £41.861M over the three years 2017/18 to 2019/20 with £13.125M being the estimated financial challenge for 2017/18.

At previous meetings held on 18<sup>th</sup> November and 2<sup>nd</sup> December, the Board had considered budget proposals amounting to £7.724M in 2017/17 and £8.475M over the 3 years. Appendix 1 of the report submitted set out further savings proposals amounting to £3.506M and £8.475M over the 3 years.

It was proposed that where it was appropriate to do so and where there was no external consultation required, the savings included in Appendix 1 be implemented during 2016/17 in order to assist with mitigating the current in-year forecast overspend as well as ensuring that the savings could be delivered with full year effect in 2017/18.

The previously considered budget proposals as well as those set out in Appendix 1 had been released for public consultation on the Council's website on 1st December, 2016. The consultation closed on 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2017.

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

- Review of the Emergency Planning Shared Service budget
- Support for the engagement of a specialist legal adviser to review the overall Leisure PFI
- Maltby Leisure Centre was to be the pilot for the possible use of LED lighting
- No discussions had taken place as yet with regard to Rothercard
- Savings target achieved by the Civic Theatre
- The additional income through investment in 6 electric boats on the lake at Rother Valley Park had been based on a 6 months period April-September. The estimated projection was derived from examples elsewhere in the country

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/12/16

- In Rotherham's comparator group the highest average spend per head of population on books was £1.33 with the lowest being 88p – the proposed £1 per head placed Rotherham in the middle
- A review had taken place and a Corporate Property Team was to be established. Regular health checks were undertaken on properties deemed surplus to requirements and once completed a corporate landlord approach would be taken
- Current Asset Management Strategy not fit for purpose
- Useful to have corporate community profile for each Ward including community assets
- Assurance that the reduction in the cleaning schedule would not affect public spaces
- The capitalisation of Highway revenue would not impact upon service delivery
- Concern with regard to the cessation of the provision of consumer advice to vulnerable residents by Trading Standards and the possible re-focus of possibly only providing a re-active service. It was felt that a vulnerable person would not know to ring the CAB for advice. Assurances were given that there would be regular dialogue with the CAB
- Capacity of the CAB to take on the additional work. The concerns expressed would be fed into the forthcoming review of the CAB contract
- The standard of the seasonal bedding displays would be maintained
- Increased fees and charges for Pest Control Services although still lower than private companies would impact upon the most vulnerable

It was noted that R&E5 (Environmental Enforcement including the increased use of Fixed Penalty Notices) was to be considered at Pre-Scrutiny on 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2016.

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

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

(3) That ASR26 (Increase income on Pest Control) be monitored with regard to the take up of the Service following the increased charges.

(4) That a report be submitted in 6 months on the newly formed Rotherham Construction Partnership Framework (R&E15)

(Councillor Steele declared a non-pecuniary interest in R&E11 (Industrial Communities Alliance)

(Councillor Steele declared a personal interest in R&E4 (CAB) and left the room whilst discussion took place.)

(Councillor Cowles assumed the Chair whilst R&E4 was discussed.)

(Councillor Allcock declared a personal interest in R&E20 (Review of Home to School Transport provision) and left the room whilst discussion took place.)

**55. ADULT SERVICES BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST OCTOBER 2016**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Finance Manager, Adult Social Care and Housing, containing the forecast outturn position for Adult Care and Support to 31st October, 2016, based on actual income and expenditure to the end of October 2016.

The report stated that the forecast was for an overall overspend of £3.740m against a net revenue budget of £67.792m. The principal budget pressures were due to the increase in demand for services mainly in respect of direct payments, domiciliary and residential care across all client groups. These pressures were being partly reduced by forecast underspends within Assessment and Care Management, Day Care Services and Supported Living provision.

Members' discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- Direct Payments were awarded in accordance with the Care Act guidance. There had been issues in the past with regard to the interpretation of the guidance. However, the key was to follow the correct processes and ensure that whatever was offered met the requirements of the individual within a reasonable cost base
- There was a need to maximise the offers available from good quality voluntary sector providers in Rotherham and also improve the information and advice as the web offer currently was not particularly good and difficult for people to navigate through the system. This formed part of the development plan for Adult Care and had a specific workstream.
- Adult Social Care was a demand-led service and, as was seen nationally, the Local Authority was seeing an increased demand. There had been a number of high cost packages in the Borough as well as a legacy of some practice which put cost pressures on the budget and could only be addressed by new systems/processes and retrospectively look at each individual care package. All expenditure/committed spend was being reviewed line by line and the move towards a brokerage team meant that there would be people that had the requisite skills to challenge costs.
- As part of the 2017/18 budget setting process discussions were taking place across all Directorates looking at the pressures, how to mitigate the pressures and how to work collaboratively across Directorates.

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/12/16

There would be a big focus on the transitions work which would benefit both CYPs and ASC. Some of that activity was underway and seeing some immediate benefits around the collection of Continuing Health Care funding from the NHS where there was eligibility. There needed to be cognisance that demands on the budget would ebb and flow and the need for reserve plans.

- Any overspend for the Council would default to come out of reserves. As part of the budget setting process consideration had to be taken as to whether to replenish those reserves. Proposals would be submitted in the New Year.
- Demand pressures increased during the Winter period. There was also pressure around the use of domiciliary care and Direct Payments the latter which formed part of the budget recovery plan.

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

(2) That the latest financial forecast against budget for 2016/17 and the actions being taken to mitigate the budget and demographic pressures facing Adult Services, as described in the report now submitted, be noted.

(3) That a report be submitted in January, 2017 on Older People and in February, 2017 on Physical and Sensory Disabilities.

(4) That discussion take place on the presentation of future reports.

**56. CHILDREN'S SERVICES BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST OCTOBER 2016**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services. As part of its performance and control framework, the Council was 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 seven months of the 2016/17 financial year.

The October forecast position for the Children and Young People's Directorate was for an overspend of approximately £8.394m.

Members' discussion of this report highlighted the following salient issues:-

- The November financial monitoring report to be considered at the 9<sup>th</sup> January Cabinet meeting forecast the overspend, after management actions, to be £548,000 which was over and above



## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/12/16

the investment sum. Of the £548,000, £124K were costs related to new activity from the Police and National Crime Agency investigations which hopefully the Authority would receive additional Government funding contributions.

- LAC numbers were greater than the level of the revised set budget. It was very difficult to accurately predict the numbers but the national trend was an upward projector. The menu of services to mitigate this i.e. Adult Adolescent Response Service and Family Group Conferencing would not commence until March/April 2017; once those services were in place there would be activity the stem to flow. There was also need to ensure that the adoption process found families for children, where appropriate, as quickly as possible together with exit strategies/reunification in place every time a child was taken into care.
- CYPS worked with Housing Services and discussed alternative options for ensuring 16-17 year olds had access to good quality accommodation. As part of the national policy, Putting Children First, CYPS had to publish a care leavers offer and were legally obliged to ensure young people were properly accommodated. Currently 98% of Rotherham care leavers were deemed to be suitably accommodated using the Government metric.
- The Early Help Service in place in Rotherham would have an impact at the threshold where a child was identified as in need and that their health or development would be impaired without a Social Worker being involved in supporting them.

The Services that would have an impact on a LAC were Family Group Conferencing, Edge of Care Service and multi-systematic therapy focussing on 11-17 year olds. Early Help would only have an impact over a very long period of time because they would prevent some children deteriorating through the various spectrums of care from Children in Need to Looked After status.

- The Early Help Service delivered a raft of delivery at different levels including attendance at school, ensuring that children were not NEETs, had positive activities such as Youth provision. The way the Service was designed was more likely to have an impact on children who may be subject to Section 17 as opposed to LAC. Early Help should have an impact on the Social Care workload as it would reduce those children who were or could be classed as Children in Need.
- Rotherham had more children in care for 4 years or more than found in other places because of historical practice. Due to the change in practice and consideration of reunification/exit strategies, it was expected to see that trend reversed and children spending shorter periods in care than previously. Depending upon the

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/12/16**

quality of Social Work practice and intervention, families could be kept together rather than children being brought into the care system. However, that required an operating model which Rotherham currently did not have; the Signs of Safety would be rolled out from April 2017

- The Improving Lives Select Commission would be looking at Early Help Services next month.

Resolved:- (1) That the latest financial forecast outturn for 2016/17 and the pressures facing Children and Young People's Services be noted.

(2) That the mitigation and cost avoidance implemented through in-year management actions be noted.

(3) That it be noted that should LAC numbers continue to increase there would be a further pressure on social care budgets and a risk that the reported position would worsen before the end of the financial year.

(4) That the latest Dedicated Schools Grant financial forecast outturn for 2016/17 and Recovery Plan be noted.

(5) That Commissioner Bradwell be invited to a future meeting to discuss the budget situation.

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

No issues had been referred.

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

Janet Spurling, Policy Officer, gave a verbal report on the plans for the Children's Commissioner Takeover Challenge. The Council had supported this for a number of years and OSMB and Scrutiny Officers worked with the Youth Cabinet to undertake a piece of work which often took the form of a spotlight review.

Janet had met with members of the Youth Cabinet on 1<sup>st</sup> December. Their preferred topic was public transport. The Youth Cabinet had looked at this in the past with OSMB but was in relation to different issues. The young people already done some good work and research and published a report, "Get in Gear: Accessibility of Public Transport for Young People".

The agreed date for the session would be Tuesday, 21<sup>st</sup> February 3.30-5.30. p.m.

The young people would determine the witnesses they wished to invite.

Councillor Lelliott would be attending as portfolio holder for Transport.

Following the launch of the young people's report SYPTE had already been in touch with the Youth Cabinet Support Officer regarding setting up better engagement with young people.

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

**59. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Improving Places Select Commission**

Councillor Mallinder reported that the Commission had met and discussed:-

Tenancy Agreement

Housing Allocation Policy

Housing Income Review

Policy requested for Families of Deceased RMBC Tenants

Tenants were to have a Housing Options Interview as they joined the Housing Register

Impact Assessment to review the outcomes of the Benefit Cap

Looking at Town Centre

Chair to visit to Lambeth to look at Scrutiny

Dignity had shared refurbishment plans and update on the Services they provided

Task and Finish Group – planned training exercise to see if plans in place for emergency plans were viable

Training from Centre for Public Scrutiny

RIDO performance management

**Health Select Commission**

Councillor Short reported that the Commission had met and discussed:-

3 sub-groups had met in the last month

6 monthly updates on Foundation Trust and RDaSH – both Trusts awaiting outcomes from recent CQC inspections

Older People's Housing

Adult Social Care performance, final year benchmarking and progress on the local measures for commissioning

Sustainability and Transformation Plan

3 updates on transforming Services for people with Learning Disabilities and Autism

**Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny**

Councillor Short reported on the meeting that was held on 21<sup>st</sup> November:-

Update on the consultation

Ambulance Service provided information on staff training, response times and stroke care

**Improving Lives Select Commission**

Councillor Allcock reported that the Commission had met and discussed:-

Domestic Abuse  
Adult Safeguarding

Resolved:- That the reports be noted.

**60. CALL-IN ISSUES**

No issues had been referred for call-in.

**61. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Friday, 23rd December, 2016, at 9.00am

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
23rd December, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Short, Julie Turner, Walsh and Wyatt.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Price.

**62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

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

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

**64. ENHANCED ENVIRONMENTAL CRIME AND PARKING ENFORCEMENT**

Further to Minute No. 68 of the meeting of the Cabinet and Commissioners held on 12th September, 2016 consideration was given to the report which described the Council's desire to strengthen the non-statutory enforcement activity around environmental crime issues such as littering, dog fouling and fly-tipping.

The report described the Council's desire to strengthen enforcement activity around environmental crime issues such as littering, dog fouling and fly-tipping, which was detrimental to all neighbourhoods and of concern to local residents. It was, therefore, proposed to increase enforcement activity with a time for action approach and a more robust response.

Three options were submitted for consideration and were outlined in this report. Option 3 was recommended for approval to progress discussions with Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council to develop a shared service provision for twelve months, utilising their existing contract with an external provider, with an initial evaluation after three and six months after the contract had been rolled out.

It was anticipated that, subject to successfully discussions with Doncaster, the trialled shared service would be in operation for the start of the financial year on the 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2017 across the borough to tackle these issues and add value and enhancement as it also included car parking enforcement.

The Board were largely in favour of the proposals, but sought clarification on a number of areas through Members' questioning and were summarised as:-

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 23/12/16

- Support to the initiative through a poster campaign in schools.
- Responsibility for bins, business ownership around hotspot areas and ensuring sufficient quantities.
- Costs to the Rotherham ratepayers and consultation with the workforce.
- Enhancement to the current car parking enforcement team with no displacement of staff.
- Additional capacity to cover hotspot areas across the whole borough and local intelligence.
- Terms of Conditions and Living Wage for staff.
- Additional resources to target hotspot areas, particularly with dog fouling.
- Six month and nine month evaluation of the twelve month contract, potentially through a seminar and by this Board.
- Review of the contract and the model and its detail.
- Action for persistent non-payers of fixed penalty notices and enhanced action through prosecutions.
- Fly tipping and the severity of the penalties.
- Action for cigarette disposal and inappropriate behaviour such as spitting.
- Importance of emptying litter bins to prevent overspill in light of budget constraints in priority areas.
- Liaison with Sheffield Magistrates Court.
- Additional vehicle removal powers for prolific offenders and the use of wheel clamps.
- Deployment of CCTV cameras to enhance the ability to prosecute for fly tipping.
- Relationship with Doncaster MBC, viability and potential for a break clause in the contract after six months.
- Budget savings through the initiation and flexibility of the contract, the wider benefits and the generation of surplus/income.
- Approaches to Parish Councils and partnership working with bin emptying, street cleansing and CCTV cameras.
- Increased numbers of CCTV cameras and their deployment.
- Assurances for the workforce, conditions of service and adjustments to meet demand.
- Details of the contract and service provision.
- Measuring the impact of success, benchmarking and feedback.
- Feedback from the success of the Doncaster mode, numbers of prosecutions and enforcement.

The Board were happy to endorse the recommendations and were satisfied for it to proceed with Cabinet with the period of review at both six and nine months.

**Resolved:-** That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting for approval for discussions to commence with Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council to explore the options and feasibility of a

shared service, utilising their existing contract with an external provider, to deliver enhanced environmental crime and parking enforcement within Rotherham on the basis of a twelve month pilot (with an initial evaluation after six months and a further review after nine months).

**65. PURCHASE OF THE ADVANCED MANUFACTURING PARK TECHNOLOGY CENTRE (AMPTC)**

Consideration was given to the report which sought for the Council to purchase the Advanced Manufacturing Park Technology Centre (AMPTC) using Sheffield City Region (SCR) capital funding, subject to a satisfactory valuation of the building.

**Resolved:-** That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting for approval for:-

- The Council purchasing the AMPTC, subject to securing funding for the purchase from the Sheffield City Region and undertake the necessary due diligence regarding the financial viability of the AMPTC and the legal and taxation implications arising from its purchase.
- The Assistant Director of Legal Services be authorised to negotiate and complete the necessary legal documentation to purchase the building and any grant documentation required by SCR.
- It being noted that any operating surplus generated by the AMPTC may have conditions placed on it via the SCR funding agreement and that, subject to the purchase being agreed, an amendment to the Capital Programme will need to be made by Council in due course.

**66. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That a further meeting be held on Friday, 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
13th January, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Clark, Mallinder, Price, Sansome, Short, Julie Turner and Walsh.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Cowles and Wyatt.

**70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Councillor Steele declared a personal interest in Minute No. 75 (Budget Pressures in relation to Older People's Services) on the grounds that his mother had Dementia.

**71. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 16 DECEMBER 2016**

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

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

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

**73. HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION SUB-GROUP: OLDER PEOPLE'S HOUSING**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director for Strategic Commissioning, which detailed the outcome of a sub-group of the Health Select Commission regarding housing for older people in Rotherham. Members wished to carry out this work given the close links between housing, adult social care and health in terms of maintaining people's independence and enabling them to live in their own home.

Members identified a number of important matters to be considered in the planning and delivery of housing for older people, and formulated ten recommendations. The response from Housing and Neighbourhood Services to each of these was included in Appendix A.

Members welcomed the workshop and noted the housing schemes already in existence in other areas of the country, the facilities on offer and the suggestions of other schemes which should potentially be visited.

It was suggested that following an in-depth look at alternative schemes a full cost benefit analysis on these types of schemes be developed. These would require strategic decisions moving forward, but a report on progress would be submitted to the Improving Places Select commission in due course.



## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 13/01/17

**Resolved:-** (1) The report be received, the contents noted and any comments obtained.

(2) That as Improving Places Select Commission scrutinises delivery of the Housing Strategy which will incorporate progress on delivery of older people's housing.

**74. NOVEMBER FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT 2016/17 AND MID-YEAR TREASURY REVIEW**

Consideration was given to the latest budget monitoring report presented by Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Finance and Customer Services, and supported by Judith Badger, Strategic Director, which set out the financial position for both the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme at the end of November and was based on actual costs and income for the first eight months of the financial year and forecast costs and income for the remaining four months of 2016/17.

The revenue position, before adjusting for the additional budget allocation approved by Council on 7<sup>th</sup> December, showed a forecast overspend of £9.623m after currently identified management actions. The additional in year budget approval had reduced the forecasted overspend down to £1.775m, however, this additional budget approval had to be funded and the extent to which in year revenue spend across the whole Council could not be reduced, would inevitably impact the Council's reserves and future financial sustainability.

The Council report approved additional in-year funding to address pressures, predominantly in Children's Services (£7.848m) and £608k for new investments for Adults, Children's and Corporate services which would enable the delivery of significant savings in future years. The report also approved additional funding for 2017/18 of £11.005m which would be built into the Medium Term Financial Strategy and specific budget plans for next year.

There was also a significant forecast overspend (£5.505m) on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) High Needs Block. This was a forecasted increase of £4.5m in an eight month period. Whilst this did not affect the Council's financial position directly at this time it was imperative that the recovery strategy reported in September Financial Monitoring Report to Cabinet was implemented in order to address this position and avoid any risk to the Council in the future.

The report showed the detailed reasons for forecast revenue under and over spends by Directorate after management actions which have/were already being implemented and which also included extensive controls with monthly budget challenging meetings, the Workforce Management Board which scrutinised all requests for recruitment etc. and was chaired by the Assistant Chief Executive, management of procurement spend and deep dives into unspent budgets.

The Capital Programme was currently on target to deliver within the overall approved budget and the report provided a detailed update and sought support to recommend to Council the inclusion of £277k costs capitalisation in the 2016/17 programme and the re-profiling of some approved budgets to reflect revised timescales for project delivery.

The report also detailed the revisions to the regulatory framework of treasury management during 2009 which introduced a requirement that the Council receive a mid-year treasury review, in addition to the forward looking annual treasury strategy and backward looking annual treasury report required previously. The review informed on performance against the plan and included key messages on investments, borrowing and governance, which was monitored by the Audit Committee.

Members' discussion highlighted the following salient points:-

- An update on the Workforce Strategy Board and the numbers of agency staff employed by the Council.
- Pressures on the Dedicated Schools Grant linked to the increases in children with complex needs, level of exclusions and the effectiveness and sufficiency of providing support in mainstream education. It could take a few years for this pressure to lead to resolution, but it was anticipated with a new strategy in place, following agreements with the Rotherham Schools' Forum, over the next few years the Dedicated Schools Grant would balance and that where appropriate the costs returned back to the schools. This had now been included as a standing item of business on the Rotherham Schools' Forum agenda.
- Impact of Dedicated Schools Grant costs on schools and the delivery of services to children with complex needs.
- Use of reserves for Children and Young People's Services, the current level and the impact should the Council use all its reserves and the use of capital receipts to reduce the budget overspends. The Council was financial sound and decisions on meeting the budget challenges would be tough. Rotherham was not dissimilar to other Local Authorities, but the difference being there were other costs associated with historical abuse.
- Overspends and budget pressures arising from demand in Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's Services and the potential this could be more if demand for these services increased. These were unprecedented times and budgets set at indirect assumptions of need. It was noted that the current number of children in care was 489 and the number planned for was set at 500.
- Detecting overspends sooner and becoming smarter to unearth difficulties to resolve as part of the budget setting process.

**Resolved:-****Revenue**

1. That the current 2016/17 forecast overspend of £1.775m, after management actions and the allocation of additional in year budget. (Paragraph 3.1) be noted.
2. That the specific actions being implemented to challenge planned spend between now and the end of March to reduce the forecast overspend and minimise the call on reserves (Paragraph 2.7) be noted.
3. That any additional actions which could be implemented to help manage down the current forecast overspend be recommended to Cabinet.
4. That a detailed Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) High Needs Sufficiency Strategy and Financial Plan to address funding and provision be discussed and consulted upon at the 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 Schools Forum meeting (Paragraph 3.16) be noted and for a detailed account to be included in the December budget monitoring report.

**Capital & Mid-Year Treasury Review**

5. That it be noted that Council would be asked to include the following schemes in the 2016/17 Capital Programme (paragraphs 2.13):-
  - Capitalisation of Building Repair and Maintenance Costs - £157,000
  - Capitalisation of costs relating to Pit House West - £85,000
  - Capitalisation of Grass Cutter - Rother Valley Country Park - £35,000
6. That it be noted Council be asked to approve changes to budgets identified in Appendix 3 for projects which are already included in the Approved Capital Programme.
7. That the position in respect of the Mid-Year Treasury Review be noted and that Council be asked to approve the changes to the 2016/17 prudential indicators.

**75. BUDGET PRESSURES IN RELATION TO OLDER PEOPLE SERVICES**

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, supported by Anne Marie Lubanski, Strategic Director for Adult Care and Housing, and Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director, Strategic Commissioning, introduced the report which highlighted the budget

pressures and actions being taken in relation to Older Peoples Services, as part of the overall Adult Care budget.

There was a forecast overspend after management actions of £2.950m against a net revenue budget of £29.358m for Older People Services. The main budget pressures were due to the increase in demand for services mainly in respect of direct payments, domiciliary and residential care. These pressures were being partly reduced by forecasted underspends within assessment and care management, day care services and transport.

A number of management action plans to mitigate budget pressures have been implemented in order to reduce the overspends. The pressure on residential placements, domiciliary care and direct payments had increased. Some of the challenges were as a result of historical residential care practices and would take time to rectify positively and in turn mitigate access demand.

Demographically people were more frail, which was a further challenge for the hospital with more people presenting as medically unfit and a complex area with patients living longer with multiple conditions.

A close working relationship had been established and discussions were taking place with Health, the Clinical Commissioning Group and the hospital looking at hospital admissions/discharges and care needs. This would be assisted nationally via a former Executive Director of Oxfordshire, now working for the LGA, who had agreed to support the Council in its transformation and how to use its budgets differently.

The next twelve months would be challenging as costs were examined and intelligence obtained.

Clarification was sought on a number of areas through Members' questioning and were summarised as:-

- Outcomes for patients and learning from experience.
- Challenges for the hospital in coping with demand and the wellbeing of patients.
- Variations in care costs, resource allocations and direct payments.
- High demand for adult social care nationally and the challenges for Councils.
- Demographics across the borough and the measures for dealing with an aging population.
- Delivery of the Locality Plan in meeting needs, preventing isolation and ensuring residents were provided with self-help to maintain independence.
- Challenges for Dementia and Alzheimer's sufferers and the work currently taking place, supported housing options, supported care packages and inclusion.

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 13/01/17

- LGA Public Health Conference at the Town Hall on Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> January, 2017.
- Lack of investment from National Government to meet the increase in demand for adult social care and how long before this area was in crisis.
- Transformational programme to meet the challenges of reduced budgets and limited resources.
- Impact on older people and the decisions to be taken.
- Keep fit transformational programmes.
- Increased costs in residential care and pay enhancements following the introduction of the Living Wage.

**Resolved:-** That the latest financial forecast against budget for 2016/17, the demographic pressures facing Older Peoples Services and the actions taken to mitigate the budget pressures be noted.

(Councillor Steele declared a personal interest on the grounds that his mother had Dementia)

## 76. BUDGET PRESSURES IN RELATION TO LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, supported by Ian Thomas, Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services, Ian Walker, Head of Looked After Children, and Judith Badger, Strategic Director for Finance and Customer Services, introduced the report which set out the management actions and budget proposals that were underway to address the Looked After Children budget pressure both in the short and long term.

The original 2016/17 Looked After Children (LAC) budget was sufficient to fund only 400 placements, 88 less than Rotherham's total of 488 as of 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2016. This increase to the current level could not have been foreseen at the start of the year, but estimated prior to April, 2016 by the Directorate Leadership Team did put the number at between 440 and 450.

There was no hiding the fact that intervention costs and Rotherham, like all seriously inadequate authorities had had to spend a significant sum to make the system safer. With the system now more stable it was essential that a realistic budget – reflecting the current number of looked after children – was set going forward.

The challenge now, after the rebasing of the budget to reflect actual numbers and activity, was two-fold. Firstly, to continue work that has begun this year to address the lack of good placement provision in borough. Getting the setting mix right in Rotherham would mean better outcomes for children at a lower cost to the Council. Secondly, to put in place edge of care and preventative measures to reduce the growth in demand so that numbers reached a peak, plateaued and then slowly started to reduce.

It was noted that the in-year budgetary position for Children's Services was challenging. To date approved savings of £1.267m and cost avoidance of £3.063m had been delivered; and further in-year mitigation

of £2.126m was on target. However, medium and long term financial sustainability would only be possible through the commitment to investment in the workforce and edge of care preventative services that would enable a pathway to significant cost reduction, a balanced budget for Children's Services in future years and significantly better outcomes for children.

It was pointed out that the appendices to the report set out budget proposals to achieve a sustainable Children's Service budget and to address Looked After Children budget pressures. Investment into the service would provide additional in-house foster places and prevent young people being placed in residential care.

Funding was also being sought for additional clinical practitioners to deliver highly responsive and intensive interventions for Rotherham's children in care identified as needing it most. This proposal would operate in conjunction with the fostering 'offer' and special guardianships whereby children 'most at risk' within Rotherham would have access to good quality and responsive wrap around therapeutic support to address the child's specific emotional and mental wellbeing needs.

It was explained that there would be a reduction in the likelihood of placement and special guardianship breakdowns which often resulted in the use of more expensive placement provision, including re-entry to care or move to more expensive residential placements. The service could deliver therapeutic interventions more cost effectively than by commissioned services. There was a clear argument that breaking the cycle of disruptions through intensive provision early in the child's care journey would lead to better emotional wellbeing for children and better outcomes for these children in later life. The monetary benefit, therefore, would be one of cost avoidance rather than a direct budget saving.

Clarification was sought on a number of areas through Members' questioning, which officers responded to, and were summarised as:-

- Upward trend in the numbers of Looked After Children, quality of the intelligence, current budget allocation and the potential for this number to continue increasing.
- Potential for further overspends should the upward trend in Looked After Children continue.
- Protecting children and the challenges with managing and driving down care costs.
- Budget setting and challenging drivers through unduly high care packages.
- Regular robust review of care packages and the appropriateness of out of authority placement use.

- Investment into Children and Young People's Services and realisation of the return.
- Evidence based approaches and performance monitoring.
- Financial and budget monitoring drivers.
- Current budget position and options available for decision.
- Predictive analytics and scenario setting to assist with budget setting involving the Strategic Directors for Children's Services and Finance and Customer Services.
- Concerns around the increasing numbers for Looked After Children and the level of demand.
- Positive involvement of the Pause Project which engaged with mothers on a one-to-one basis creating a bespoke programme of intensive therapeutic activities and practical support. A review of progress was also to be undertaken.
- Implementation of a feasibility study, the outcome of which would be presented to Members to agree proposals moving forward, looking specifically at budgets, reducing trends for Looked After Children and repeat removals.
- Addressing poor performance, management arrangements, staff motivation, training and support.
- Monitoring and reporting of the progress of the foster care strategy and the appropriateness of placements, human cost benefits of long term foster care and rehousing.
- Full assessment of need for residential care and out of the borough placements
- Visibility of progress and links to the performance for Looked After Children, details of which could be provided.
- Positive increase in foster carer numbers and engagement of long standing foster carers.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their input.

**Resolved:-** (1) That the reasons for the pressures facing Looked After Children budgets be noted.

(2) That the mitigation and cost avoidance implemented through in-year management actions be noted.

(3) That it be noted that if Looked After Children numbers continued to increase then there would be a further pressure on social care budgets and a risk that the reported position would worsen before the end of the financial year.

(4) That the long term impact of the Sustainability and Sufficiency Strategies and the resulting forecast cost reduction of £4m, against a baseline of £64m, by 2020/21 be noted.

(5) That the Improving Lives Select Commissioner continue to monitor progress for Looked After Children and receive progress on the feasibility study and monitor performance in due course.

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

There were no issues referred from Area Assemblies.

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

There were no issues referred from the Youth Cabinet or Young People.

It was noted, however, that the Takeover Day would take place on Tuesday, 21st February, 2017 at 3.00 p.m. with a pre-brief at 2.00 p.m. Members of Scrutiny were asked to support this meeting.

**79. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Health Select Commission**

Councillor Sansome reported on recent activity which involved himself and the Vice-Chair meeting with the hospital, RDash and the CCG to discuss ambulance response times. A further meeting was also arranged to consider the Better Care Fund.

He also referred to the consultation taking place on the children's cardiac unit and he stressed the importance of all Members sharing information with local residents and for them to have input into the consultation. It was noted that information sharing had been poor, but every effort would be made to promote and share this more widely.

**Improving Places Select Commission**

Councillor Mallinder reported that the Commission had met and discussed the Regeneration and Environment Performance Update, New Strategic Tenancy Policy and the Council Housing Tenants – Scrutiny Update.

It was suggested that the quarter performance for Regeneration and Environment be submitted to the Select Commission once it had been considered by Cabinet.



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 13/01/17**

Councillor Mallinder's mentor from Lambeth Council had also extended an invitation on the 10<sup>th</sup> February, 2017, to attend a meeting as part of the forward plan of work. Information would be reported back in due course.

The Task and Finish group for the Housing Strategy had a further scheduled in a few weeks' time.

**Improving Lives Select Commission**

Councillor Clark reported that the Commission had met and discussed Domestic Abuse and Adult Safeguarding, but had chosen not to have the meeting webcast due to the content discussed.

The next meeting in February would consider investment into Early Help and the impact of this and the SEN and Disability Strategy.

For information the Improving Lives Select Commission had been asked to formulate a cross part group looking at alternative models of delivery for Children and Young People's Services. This would involve visiting other Councils throughout January and February with an anticipated completion of report by the end of March, 2017.

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Board**

The Chairman further outlined a number of reports that would be presented to the 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2017 pre-scrutiny meeting and views to then be reported back to the Chief Executive.

The future meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2017 would also consider the Housing Allocations Policy.

**Resolved:-** That the reports from Select Commissions be noted.

**80. CALL-IN ISSUES**

No issues had been referred for call-in.

**81. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING - FRIDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 9.00 A.M.**

**Resolved:-** That a further meeting be held on Friday, 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2017, at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
3rd February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Clark, Cowles, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Mallinder, Price and Julie Turner.

**82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Allcock declared a pecuniary interest in Minute No. 86 (Amendments to the Housing Allocations Policy) on the grounds of being a Council tenant.

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

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

**84. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 JANUARY 2017**

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

**85. BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2017-18**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Councillor Read, Leader of the Council, and Judith Badger, Strategic Director for Finance and Customer Services, that proposed the Council's Budget and Council Tax for 2017/18 based on the outcome of the Council's Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement, budget consultation and the consideration of Directorate budget proposals through the Council's formal Budget and Scrutiny process (Overview and Scrutiny Management Board) alongside a review of the financial planning assumptions within the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

This Budget incorporated over £10m of additional investment in Children and Young People's Services, of which £5.7 m was from reserves. In addition, there was also over £3m of additional direct investment in Adult Social Care alongside indirect budget increases resulting from increased costs of current service provision. It would enable the reinstatement of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Living Wage rate from April, 2017 for the Council's own staff and would also provide £100k funding to help to partially mitigate the impact of Welfare Reform on the most vulnerable and the capital investment plans from the Capital Programme.

In setting the proposed 2017/18 Budget, Cabinet were being asked to recommend to Council an increase of 1.99% in the Council's basic Council Tax and a further 3% increase for the Adult Social Care precept; a combined increase of 4.99% for 2017/18.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 03/02/17**

Although this report contained proposals to balance the revenue budget for 2017/18, further work needed to be undertaken to bring forward proposals for future years to enable the Council to establish a clear and sustainable financial plan which addressed the estimated £42m financial gap that remained over the next two years (2018 to 2020).

The Budget would provide resources to support and enable the delivery of the specific savings included within this report and to assist with the development and delivery of the further £42m savings that were required over the next two financial years and should be sustainable moving forward.

This report also provided feedback from both public and partners in relation to the budget proposals that were published on the Council's website for consultation until 3rd January, 2017.

Clarification was sought on a number of areas through Members' questioning and were summarised as:-

- The reviewing and developing of existing services and the need for additional information.
- Supporting adults with disabilities and older people and their carers to be independent and resilient.
- Impact of changes to ordinary prescriptions on older people.
- Expectations and perceptions of public services.
- Service by service approach.
- Delivery and associated costs with asset based community approaches.
- Modernisation and exploration of different delivery models such as shared services and partnering arrangements and the likelihood of this happening.
- Adoption of a more commercial approach to service delivery and the need for transparent robustness with any submitted business plan to Members.
- Drivers for growth and skills and programmes through the Sheffield City Region, including the Brokerage Scheme for Employers, Skills Council and H.E. Campus in Rotherham.
- Encouraging investment into the region.
- Council tax calculations, including the increase in the precept by 1.97% for the Fire and Rescue Authority when fire appliances were being reduced.
- Shared services and resource partnerships.
- Community asset transfer and commercial activity.
- Changes to staff terms and conditions of employment and delivery of the savings.
- Replenishment of reserves and maintaining the value over the medium term.
- Formal consultation and engagement in the budget process.
- Review of the district heating charges and proposals to come

forward.

- Investments and review of networking equipment, server equipment and storage area network.
- Use of mobile devices and remote working.
- Monitoring of performance against the budget and the challenges facing Local Authorities.
- Becoming a smaller, more efficient, more connected organisation.

**Resolved:-** (1) That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting.

(2) That a further report be submitted to the Board on consultation and an early commencement of the budget consultation process for 2018/19.

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board receive further reports on commercialisation and how this could be progressed.

(4) That Councillors and Officers be thanked for their hard work in the budget process and in the development of the budget for 2017/18.

#### **86. AMENDMENTS TO THE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Councillor Beck, Cabinet Member for Housing, supported by Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, which detailed the proposed amendments to the Housing Allocations Policy, following a period of review and consultation, and which would come into force from 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2017.

Six amendments were recommended which aimed to increase tenancy sustainability, take into account lessons learned over the past twelve months, changes brought about by the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016, give priority to under thirty-five year olds and to prepare for the Homelessness Reduction Bill.

The details of the amendments, as set out in the report, and the rationale behind each one were shared with Board Members.

**Resolved:-** That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to Cabinet and the Commissioners' Decision Making meeting for approval.

(Councillor Allcock declared a pecuniary interest in Minute No. 86 (Amendments to the Housing Allocations Policy) on the grounds of being a Council tenant)

**(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR A PRE-SCRUTINY DECISION PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION BY THE CABINET AND COMMISSIONERS ON THE 13TH FEBRUARY, 2017)**

**87. PROPOSAL TO PERMANENTLY REMOVE PUBLIC PHONE BOXES IN THE BOROUGH**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Bronwen Knight, Planning and Building Control Manager, which detailed how British Telecommunications had proposed the removal of forty-eight public telephone boxes around the Borough which they considered to be no longer viable to maintain in use.

Under Ofcom guidance the Council was required to undertake a two stage public consultation on the proposal. After considering comments, raised from the consultation process, the Council would provide a final decision on any telephone boxes which it was in agreement with that British Telecommunications could then remove or any which it considered should remain in active use for public calls.

The Council having undertaken consultation and was now in agreement to the removal of twenty-five of the forty-eight phone boxes. Twenty-three were proposed for retention for public calls under the local veto, the details of which were set out as an appendix to the report.

Discussion ensued on the consultation process, response rate to the consultation, alternative uses for telephone kiosks and the discussions taking place about housing defibrillators, consultation with Parish Councils, the criteria adopted in line with Ofcom guidance and the use of "local veto" by the Council.

**Resolved:-** That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting for approval.

**88. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That a further meeting be held on Friday, 17th February, 2017, at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
17th February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Julie Turner and Walsh.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Allcock, Price, Short and Wyatt.

**89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Mallinder declared a personal interest in Minute No. 93 (Adult Services Budget Monitoring report) as she was the Council's Carers' Champion.

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

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

**91. EMPLOYEE PULSE SURVEY AND OTHER EMPLOYEE FEEDBACK**

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services, and Shokat Lal, Assistant Chief Executive, introduced the summary of the findings from the Pulse survey and focus groups, subsequent staff briefing sessions and the management action taken so far to address the themes, ideas and suggestions raised.

The survey took place in May 2016 and focus groups held in June 2016 with questions focused on whether employees had seen improvements in the key areas previously identified and contained within Improvement Plans. Additional questions regarding Safeguarding were included to assess employee understanding and to gauge whether further training was required. A question relating to a range of health and wellbeing matters were also included to aid assessment against the Workforce Wellbeing Charter.

The response rate to the survey equated to 36% with 98 people attending one of the 13 focus groups. Appendix 1 of the report submitted was the action plan developed as a result of the themes, issues and ideas arising from employee feedback. The key themes identified were:-

- Job security and making the best use of skills when reshaping the Council
- Stability and visibility of the whole Senior Team
- Communication to more remote workers and during change
- Recognition for ideas and hard work
- The quality of PDRs
- Training and development availability to support succession planning and career development

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/02/17**

- Cross-Directorate working
- Health and wellbeing and work life balance
- Customer service

The report also set out actions completed since publication of the action plan.

There would be a full Employee Opinion Survey carried out in April 2017 which would enable a fuller assessment of employee perception and benchmarking with other public sector bodies/Councils.

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

- A cross-Directorate Managers Group was looking at the response to customer service and a refresh of the Customer Service First Policy.
- It was hoped that the next survey would bear out the work taking place with regard to how staff felt and addressing the issue of trust.
- The full employee opinion survey was a paper survey completed once a year across the whole workforce; the Pulse survey was electronic. Some of the frontline staff did not respond but were targeted in the focus groups.
- Timescales on the action plan should be specified rather than 1 (within 3 months), 2 (within 6 months) or 3 (12 months or more).
- Good managerial practice made a difference with regard to reducing sickness absence i.e. return to work interviews, support and looking at preventative measures. A programme was to be developed around how it would be managed going forward and look at the reduction of sickness absence.
- A number of things mentioned in the report related to good people management. The HR Team were spending time with managers reminding them of their responsibilities, the processes around how to manage, communicate and engage and how to deal with performance of individuals on an informal basis.
- Each Directorate received its own survey findings which the respective Directorate Leadership Teams were working their way through and developing corresponding action plans. There would be different challenges for different Directorates although there was not a vast amount in terms of the results across them.
- To assist with the qualitative aspect of the survey, as well as some of the frontline staff taking part in the focus groups, employees who had completed the survey were also invited to attend. The findings from the survey were put to the focus groups and asked did this feel right?

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 17/02/17

Directors and Assistant Directors also carried out of specific work in the form of coffee chats and focus groups where they went directly to the workforce and discussed/raised issues to enable correlation against the survey.

- Approximately 13 focus groups had been held with an average 12-13 people attending each. There had been a further 7 Chief Executive and Leader briefings which had been attended by 250 employees. The 36% survey return rate was comparable with the industry standard but it was acknowledged that there were still 4,000 employees who had not responded.
- The challenge around Terms and Conditions had been put directly to the workforce and a further survey undertaken seeking ideas and suggestions with regard to finding the £2M budgeted saving. There had been a good response with over 1,300 employees responding.
- If staff were consistently given negative feedback with regard to services there would be no move from the blame culture. Was it not time to draw a line and use the strength and asset approach with staff as desired with the community? These comments would be fed back to the Senior Leadership Team.
- There was a detailed breakdown of sickness absences by Service area that could be supplied.
- There was a strong theme of employees feeling it was not one Council and did not know about some of the good news stories. The cross-Directorate Groups had been considering the issue of smashing the silos.
- As the Authority shrank there was a lot of work to be done on redesigning services and how employees worked e.g. use of technology.
- There was a Change Programme involving approximately 200 employees. Work was taking place currently around the workforce drivers with groups of managers coming together, looking at the drivers and what they meant for the Council. Moving forward it would include what would the Council be like, how would it operate and what it meant for them as managers in the organisation. The Brilliant Basics programme would also be run with some sessions being held so far with more to do including a communications tool kit/reinforcing communication tools managers should be using with the workforce, people management skills, performance management framework and planning and translate plans to the frontline workers

Resolved:- (1) That the key improvement themes emerging from employee feedback be noted.



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/02/17**

(2) That the action taken so far in response to employees' views be noted.

(3) That the forthcoming full Employee Opinion Survey be noted together with the need to ensure a structured approach to responding to the findings.

(4) That the action plans be amended to reflect the comments made at the meeting.

**92. 2016/17 CORPORATE PLAN - QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE REPORT**

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member Corporate Services and Budgeting, and Shokat Lal, Assistant Chief Executive, introduced the Quarter 3 performance report of the 2016/17 Corporate Plan.

The performance report and scorecard (Appendix A and B) provided an analysis of the Council's current performance against 14 key delivery outcomes and 102 measures (the Corporate Plan included 86 measures however a number included different elements). The report was based on the current position of available data along with an overview of progress on key projects and activities which also contributed towards the delivery of the Corporate Plan.

At the end of the third quarter (October-December, 2016), 25 measures were progressing above or in line with the target set. Although this represented 24.3% of the total number of measures, performance showed that 43.9% of measures which had data available for the first quarter were on target. 28.1% (16) of the performance measures measured had not progressed in accordance with the target set (15.5% overall).

Attention was drawn to Appendix B – Corporate Plan dashboard. The relevant Directorate representatives reported on the red flags indicators that had been off track in Q2 and still off track in Q3 as follows:-

**Red Flag Areas**

- 5.D2 (days lost per FTE) Work was taking place including an action plan. A Sickness Steering Group had been established consisting of Trade Union representatives, Elected Members and officers focussing on improved return to work interviews, Occupational Therapy referrals, implementing Workforce Wellbeing Charter. There was recognition within the Senior Leadership Team that work was required around sickness absence.
- 5.D3 (Reduction in Agency cost) The 2016/17 Indicator had been a 10% reduction in agency costs – there had been a 44% increase. Work was taking place with a detailed report being prepared Directorate by Directorate on agency spend.

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 17/02/17

- 1.A3 (% children who had a social care concern raised within 12 months of the last concern ending (re-referrals). The January data was now below the corporate target that had been set and below the national average for re-referrals of children into social care - 22.7%. This had been due to the impact of some of the further training and development work that Members had supported for the Social Work workforce.
- 1.A4 (% children who are subject to repeat child protection plans). This was continuing to rise but it was hoped that the achievement of Signs of Safety in April 2017 would start to address this. It was expected that by the end of 2017 there would be a difference for those children that were subject to repeat plans
- 1.C4(b) (% of triaged referrals that were assessed within 3 weeks). There had been further work with the CAMHS Service to improve performance and there had been improvement around the emergency cases that they received. However, there was still a need for improvement for the non-emergency cases. Children's Mental Health and Mental Health Services were under huge scrutiny nationally due to the issues around their improvement journey. Locally there was an improvement in performance but it was slow. Work was taking place an example of which was pooling budgets with CAMHS to ensure driving forward on some of the priority groups resulting in CAMHS now agreeing that Children in Care received priority. Work was continuing as to how help and support Early Help intervention to prevent some of those children being on the waiting list at all. The Clinical Commissioning Group was the primary commissioners of CAMHS.
- S.B5 (number of carers assessments) Work had included review of the target level, what should be achieved in 2017/18, the pathway, meeting carers and issues in the Carers Assessments.
- 4.B4 (number of new affordable home ownership units started in year) Currently under target. Moving into the new financial year, there was a work plan for strategic acquisitions to increase numbers and, with the recently announced Government funding, the new Regeneration and Housing Board would hopefully achieve the target.

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

- Acknowledgement that the process was not perfect as yet but clarity required as to which Indicators were improving and those that were off target.
- Process for the 2017/17 Corporate Plan was underway focussing on the Indicators that could be reported upon on a frequent basis.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/02/17**

- The Indicators were decided by the Cabinet Members, in particular the priority measures, working closely with Strategic Directors.
- Acknowledgement that the report format was very difficult to read and inability to drill down into the issues. If a performance measure had improved then it should state why there had been an improvement and if/how it could be transferred to an area that was not performing. If an area had failed in 2 quarters an explanation was required as to why. It was also felt that the narrative was inconsistent with the Indicator marks.
- Indicators were marked as to their rating by the Performance Lead Officer for each Directorate which was then challenged by the Assistant Chief Executive's Directorate.
- Have you got the right measure to scrutinise and measure performance?
- Future reports should clearly set out where performance had failed, who owned it, what the actions would be to rectify the situation with associated timescales and, if the Indicator had failed over more than 1 quarter, it should be red flagged.
- Regionally Rotherham sat in the middle with regard to delayed discharges. The LGA had offered to conduct a review of the pathway.
- A weekly report was received from the hospital on delayed discharges and the reasons i.e. social delay, waiting for equipment/therapy or family choice.

Resolved:- (1) That the overall position and direction of travel in relation to performance be noted.

(2) That the performance reporting timetable for 2016/17 be noted.

(3) That the comments made at the meeting with regard to the format/language used in the report be taken into consideration.

(4) That a report be submitted in 9 months on sickness absence.

(5) That a report on agency spend be submitted in March, 2017.

**93. ADULT SERVICES BUDGET MONITORING REPORT - BUDGET PRESSURES IN RELATION TO PHYSICAL AND SENSORY DISABILITY SERVICES**

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, supported by Anne Marie Lubanski, Strategic Director for Adult Care and Housing, and Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director, Strategic Commissioning, introduced the report which highlighted the budget

pressures and actions being taken in relation to Physical and Sensory Disability Services, as part of the overall Adult Care budget.

There was a forecast overspend after management actions of £1.341m against a net revenue budget of £4.997m for Physical and Sensory Disability Services. The main budget pressures were due to the increase in demand for services mainly in respect of direct payments, domiciliary and residential care. These pressures were being partly reduced by forecasted underspends within day care services and equipment and adaptations.

A number of management action plans to mitigate budget pressures had been implemented in order to reduce the budget pressures. There were pressures on the residential and nursing care budgets as a result of a significant increase in 2015/16 combined with a loss of Continuing Health Care income contributions. There were currently 42 placements within the independent sector with the average gross cost of a care package being £845 per week.

It was noted that there had recently been a LGA review of commissioning in Rotherham's Adult Social Care and a separate review of the ASC budget. They resoundingly concluded that Adult Social Care was extremely well led by the management team and that it was better than the Authority thought it was in comparison with other local authorities. Work would continue on the overspend.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The client base had increased by 1/5<sup>th</sup> this year
- Capacity was a real issue
- There had been 19 new entrants to the Direct Payments Service over the last 12 months. The big focus was to ensure the principles of self-directed support were correct making sure that the assessments/budget allocation/principles were right. The Practice Challenge Group ensured compliance with Care Act requirements and making the best use of the resources available.
- As people reached their 50's and above they started accessing the services (the numbers were quite small for the young cohort (18-24)). It tended to be people that had been living with long term conditions who had hit a trigger point that required more help. The offer for the high cost placements tended to be the more complex cases who received a multitude of services. Within the Physical Disability cohort although there were 430 customers they were accessing 587 different services.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/02/17**

- Early Intervention and Prevention were key and was where funding needed to be invested. An announcement was awaited as to the 2017/18 Better Care Fund monies but hopeful that it would be significantly increased. The Adult Care Transformation Plan and journey had built in a number of the principles that may not have been as extensive and robust historically as they needed to be. Part of the challenge was to find the financial headroom to get the monies to invest and the Better Care Fund was an excellent example of where you could tap into that but also work with the voluntary sector and lever in 3<sup>rd</sup> party finance.
- The Rotherham Place Plan was still very much a high level strategy document. It did contain within it an implementation plan with the challenge of making it real.
- The mood nationally and of the Care Act was to reduce residential care. Local Authority provided residential care but was more expensive than the private sector partly due to the higher staffing levels.
- There was a big focus to really understand who the Authority's customers were, looking at trend analysis and predicting where the demand would come from and use that intelligence to inform activity and future budget projections/setting. Liquid Logic was aligned to the finances so was able to look at real time activity and marry it to finances.
- There would always be a need for an element of residential care and nursing beds but it was about managing the market properly and ensuring they were the right type of care homes, with the right ethos and values and delivering the right type of care. Rotherham had a high number of care homes in the Borough; a large prevalence of those delivering learning disabilities and a large proportion for older people which just dealt with residential. In the future it was probable that there would be a need for nursing care homes and required engagement with the independent sector/providers to encourage them to develop the right type of service

It was noted that at the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> February it had been agreed that there be a reduction in the maximum charge for residents in the 3 Local Authority homes.

Resolved:- That the latest financial forecast against budget for 2016/17, the demographic pressures facing Physical and Sensory Disability Services and the actions taken to mitigate the budget pressures be noted.

**94. CYPS BUDGET MONITORING REPORT - LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN AND CARE LEAVERS SUFFICIENCY STRATEGY 2017-2021**

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, reported that the Looked After Children and Care Leavers Sufficiency Strategy had been developed in line with the duty to provide or procure placements for Children Looked After (CLA) by the Local Authority. This included a duty of 'sufficiency' that required Local Authorities and Children's Trust partners to ensure that there was a range of sufficient placements which met the needs of children and young people in care and to take steps to develop and shape Service provision to meet the needs of all children and young people in care at a local level as far as it was reasonably possible.

The Strategy set out how Rotherham's Children's Services would fulfil its role as a Corporate Parent and meet its statutory duty by providing good quality care, effective parenting and support to children and young people in and leaving its care.

The outcome of the Strategy would be to safely and appropriately reduce the number of young people requiring care by the Local Authority, responding to the challenges identified and improving outcomes for children.

It was expected that the 'one market' approach to the commissioning and provision of secure, safe and appropriate accommodation and support to children in care and care leavers over the next 4 years together with the strategic intentions of the Strategy would provide significant cost avoidance and opportunities for savings and were essential to the sustainability of improved outcomes and the budget.

It was noted that there had been a "spike" in the last 12 months nationally as well as Rotherham's improved service and getting better at identifying risk. In December 2016 more children had come into care through the Court system than any month previously. The current number was 484 compared to 424 April 2016.

Actions had been taken as part of the Sufficiency Strategy with less children now in residential care. The number of inhouse foster carers had increased with 21 recruited against the target of 16 and 38 enquiries in January 2017.

The Strategy hoped that in the short to medium term the numbers would reduce, however, other factors such as poverty could influence the figures.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Part of the work of the Child Centred Working Group was to look at child poverty strategies.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/02/17**

- There was concern about the reduction of beds provided for care leavers when assessing whether they would be able to live either on a semi-independent basis or on their journey to independence. However, what was being seen in Rotherham and nationally was a high number of looked after children wanting to stay with their foster carers. “Staying Put” allowed children that had grown up in foster care to stay with their foster carers until the age of 21 in the first instance. In the longer term, if the fostering was correct and there was firm attachment between the child(ren) and their foster carers, there would be less need for semi-supported housing sector provision. There was still the internal alternative provision (Hollowgate) which would be used more flexibly and a range of drop-in provision developed. Regular consultation took place with the Care Leavers’ Forum.
- It was believed that the pressures would reduce because of the proposals previously considered by the Board which had all been evidence based i.e. the Edge of Care Service, Early Help, Signs of Safety working model and Family Group Conferencing. All had been used in other areas and had reduced demand for care.

Resolved:- That the Looked After Children and Care Leavers Strategy 2017-21 be noted.

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

No issues had been referred.

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

Board Members were reminded that the Children’s Commissioners Take Over Day was to be held on Tuesday, 21<sup>st</sup> February, 2017, commencing at 3.30 p.m.

**97. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 3RD FEBRUARY, 2017**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2017, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

**98. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Health Select Commission**

Councillor Sansome, Chair, reported at the last meeting the agenda had included:-

- Overview of Adult Social Care Development Programme and the Better Care Fund
- Update on Community Transformation and Integration at The Rotherham Foundation Trust

- Briefing on the Schools' Mental Health Pilot – 6 Members and 1 Co-optee would be taking part on monitoring visits to the participating schools
- The Commission had submitted a collective response to the proposals of the Commissioners Working Together Programme regarding Hyper Acute Stroke and Children's Anaesthesia
- Commission Members had been requested to participate in the Learning Disabilities consultation that was underway

#### **Improving Lives Select Commission**

Councillor Clark, Chair, reported that at the last meeting the agenda had included:-

- Early Help
- Children and Young People Lifestyle Survey
- Review Group established looking at alternatives for Children and Young People's Services. It was hoped that the report would be finalised in March/April
- The next meeting would consider SEN and Disabilities

#### **Improving Places Select Commission**

Councillor Mallinder, Chair, reported that at the last meeting the agenda had included:-

- Housing Allocations – 6 recommendations with codicils with regard to Housing and Bereavement Team and mandatory training around new tenancies
- Future meeting to look at the Waste Review and discussions/presentation from the Rotherham Economic Growth Board
- Site visits for Maltby Cemetery and Crematorium with Dignity
- Visit to Lambeth Council at invitation of LGA mentor to look at their Scrutiny
- Identified some areas for the work programme

#### **99. CALL-IN ISSUES - TO CONSIDER ANY ISSUES REFERRED FOR CALL-IN**

No issues had been referred.

#### **100. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING - TUESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 2017 AT 3.30 P.M. (CHILDREN'S COMMISSIONER TAKEOVER DAY)**

It was noted that the next meeting would be on Tuesday, 21<sup>st</sup> February, commencing at 3.30 p.m. for the Children's Commissioner Takeover Day.



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
21st February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Julie Turner and Walsh.

Rotherham Youth Cabinet:- Emilia Ashton, Megan Berg, Molly Crossmore, Ashley Gregory, Alex Guest, Maks Golus, Jack Hogan, Tom Jackson, Joshua Martin, Jamie Mullins and Toni Paxford.

RMBC Cabinet Member:- Councillor Lelliott.

RMBC Officers:- Colette Bailey, Sarah Bellamy, Steve Brown, Lisa DuValle, and Janet Spurling.

Transport Operators:-  
David Boden, TM Travel  
Clare Cocken, SYPTE  
Richard Issac, Northern Rail  
Allan Riggall, First Group  
Nigel Wragg, Supertram

Apologies for absence:- Councillor Allcock, Raegan Beckett, Paige Hobson, Councillor Short, Paige, Joseph Skelly, Jake Vickers and Councillor Wyatt.

**101. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

Councillor Steele welcomed everyone to the meeting and referred to the background to the Children's Commissioner Take-Over Day.

Tom Jackson (Youth Cabinet) assumed the Chair.

**101. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

Councillor Steele welcomed everyone to the meeting and referred to the background to the Children's Commissioner Take-Over Challenge.

Tom Jackson (Youth Cabinet) assumed the Chair.

**102. ROTHEHAM YOUTH CABINET - THE VOICE OF THE FUTURE**

Ashley Gregory (Youth Cabinet) gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

What is Rotherham Youth Cabinet

- Rotherham Youth Cabinet is a group of motivated and enthusiastic young people aged 11 to 18 from across Rotherham, who are active in ensuring young people have a Voice. We do this in order to ensure young people have a positive impact throughout our communities.

What Do We Do?

- We help young people in Rotherham to have a Voice, be listened to and influence decisions about local services and issues
- We find out about the concerns which young people tell us about and create campaigns to work on these

Manifesto Aims 2016-2017

- To help young people to feel confident with their own appearance and raise awareness of the effects and impact of negative body image
- To widen youth voice participation to help all young people know how to have a Voice, what opportunities for participation are available and encourage them to have equal opportunity to be involved in Youth Voice initiatives
- To work with Rotherham Looked After Children's Council and other young people across the Borough to create a proud and positive image of Rotherham
- To work with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and local bus companies around issues regarding public transport for young people
- To raise awareness of Water Safety amongst children and young people to make them aware of the dangers of open water and how they can stay safe

Previous Transport Work (Manifesto 2015-1)

- To work with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and local bus companies around issues regarding public transport for young people with a particular focus on bus passes for 16 to 18 year olds

**103. "GET IN GEAR" - ACCESSIBILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE**

Toni Paxford, Youth Cabinet, presented the 'Get in Gear: Accessibility of Public Transport for Young People' report.

For the past 3 years transport has been part of the Make Your Mark ballot which was the largest youth consultation in Europe. In 2016 public transport was the top issue for young people for Yorkshire and Humber so the Rotherham Youth Cabinet had felt it needed to review the situation in Rotherham and surrounding areas.

In 2013 the Youth Cabinet had raised issues around toilets, behaviours, staff, services and the Interchange building itself. Most of the issues had been addressed but it was felt that further research was in order to ensure that the issues were still being addressed and if any new concerns had been highlighted:-

### Bus Passes and Pricing

- 11-16 Megatravel passes – allowed 16 year olds and under to use public transport at any time at a child fare. The passes were free and accepted by all operators. Valid up until 31<sup>st</sup> July of the year the young person turned 16 unless their birthday was in the month of August and therefore valid until the day before their 16<sup>th</sup> birthday
- 16-18 student passes – free of charge and accepted by all operators to entitle young people 16-18 a child fare. Available if in full-time education and the household paid Council Tax to a South Yorkshire local authority. Also expired on 31<sup>st</sup> July as above.
- Mi Card – free card for under 18's in Barnsley and automatically renewed after the 16<sup>th</sup> birthday and expired the day before the 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. Allows travel at 60p for those in Barnsley, 80p anywhere else as well as half fare on all train journeys within South Yorkshire.
- Zero fare passes – free and valid for use during the academic year until 7.00 p.m. A young person qualified for the pass if they were in full-time education and had to travel more than 3 miles to get to school.
- All the passes expired prior to the summer holidays unless the young person's birthday fell in that period.
- The weekly First Bus pass was praised as it allowed use of any bus or tram in South Yorkshire by young people.
- It was also noted that young people taking part in the National Citizen Scheme (NCS) received free and discounted travel with the First bus company. It was believed this would help with the financial implications for the 2 week social action project within the program, however, other groups in the area felt that this was unfair as there were social action projects which also benefitted the community and met during the holidays. This meant those young people would have to pay full fare in order to commute to and from their specific groups.

### Times

- Consultation forums had been held in Dinnington and Barnsley the outcomes of which were not known as yet.
- A survey conducted by SYPTE in 2014 found that only 18.5% of people used paper timetables, 19.9% used those at bus stops and 22% used the Travel South Yorkshire website.
- Many young people had recently complimented the apps which were now available for bus timetables.

#### Experiences on Public Transport

- 48% of those who filled in questionnaire said they had had a positive experience including buses waiting for passengers, some welcoming drivers and passengers feeling valued and helped.
- 65% of respondents said they had had a negative experience at some point.
- Issues with regard to the changes to the X78 route. Some changes had been made to the route on 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2016, to address some of the concerns raised.

#### Apprenticeships

- 53% of young people in an apprenticeship spent more than £3 on transport a day.
- 62% of respondents had had difficulty using public transport for a multitude of reasons.
- Public transport was “very expensive” and “unaffordable” because they could not access 16-18 bus pass because they were not in full-time education.
- Unreliability of buses – arriving late for work and being punished.

#### Looked After Children’s Council

- Focus group held with the Looked After Children’s Council on 4<sup>th</sup> May, 2016.
- Positive aspects of public transport included the USB chargers, warm buses and the Wi-Fi.
- Time of the buses being unreliable, rude drivers and lack of common sense used in some circumstances e.g. when a young person in school uniform forgot their bus pass and vandalism.
- The cost of public transport
- The zero fare passes could not be used at weekends, after 7.00 p.m. or during holidays – many young people had commitments and events after school which may run until after 7.00 p.m.
- Praised the First company bus prices

#### Rotherham Young Carers’ Council

- Sometimes certain drivers were using discretion for young people if slightly short on change.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17**

- Rude drivers.
- Times and lateness of buses.
- Cost

Recommendations:-

- (1) Extend the expiry dates on the passes even if only to the beginning of September.
- (2) Zero fares for 16-18's like they have for secondary schools for 6<sup>th</sup> forms.
- (3) More improvement of advertisement of tickets and cheaper tickets for what people need rather than paying too much for a ticket they might not need.
- (4) Apprenticeship passes so similar discount to those in full-time education.
- (5) Cleanliness of buses.
- (6) Link Young Carers Card to the fare being charged – often young carers charged when taking parent/person they were caring for to a medical appointment.
- (7) Improve the collection of praise and concerns by passengers.
- (8) Wi-Fi and chargers were a success and would like to see them on all buses.
- (9) Promotion of timetables in various ways and not just one format.

**104. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH PARTNER AGENCIES**

Members of the Youth Cabinet asked the following questions relating to the provision of public transport. Responses were provided to the questions by each of the transport providers present at the meeting:-

- (1) Why should young people have to pay adult fare during the summer weeks? Could the expiry date be at the end of the holidays allowing young people to use public transport services at a more affordable rate?

Response (First Group) This was something that had been pushed for within SYPTE for a couple of years. First Bus had accepted passes up until the end of September through the last 2 years and work was taking place with the PTE who issued the passes. There were concessionary funding issues i.e. if there was a disproportionate growth in passengers it would cost the local authority money that had not been budgeted for.

However, First had agreed to waive any increased concession as was felt an important time for young people particularly between leaving school and starting college.

Response (TM Travel) It was a national funding issue around concessionary fares. One angle would be to address it through the Safer Roads Partnership as the demographic group most likely to be involved in road accidents was young people aged up to 25. A ticket promotion had been run last summer for young people. It was hoped to look at something similar this year.

Response (Supertram) There was some inconsistency between operators. Supertram currently only operated in Sheffield but there was dialogue between operators and SYPTE with regard to providing a clearer and more transparent ticket offer over the summer holidays.

Response (Northern Rail) Put pressure on your elected bodies to support you with the discounted travel. It was a very limiting factor for young people aged 16-24 when trying to get access to employment opportunity with such high adults fares to pay for the majority of time.

Response (SYPTE) There was awareness of the issue. It was proposed to discuss with the Chair and the Youth Councils around South Yorkshire with regard to establishing a Youth User Group where representatives of the PTE would be present and engage in direct conversation.

(1a) Was it something that the First Group and TM Travel were planning to do again in the summer and if so how would they let the young people know?

Response (First Group) It was not announced due to the fact that it was a PTE pass and did not want to cause confusion with other operators if they were not accepting them. However, if a young person had boarded a First bus they would not be challenged for the pass. It was hoped to discuss with the PTE and other operators and get a wider announcement out and do it on a more formal basis this year.

With regard to the National Citizen Scheme, First had given 2 weeks free travel to 2,000 NCS students in the summer who had enrolled on the NCS programme. That was on the back of NCS programme administrators approaching First and explaining their package and what they could deliver in promoting First travel. It was untrue that First had favoured NCS but that no other organisation had made contact. If any other organisation wanted to contact First and promote public transport, a similar arrangement would be explored.

Response (TM Travel) A £1 token fare had been charged if a young person showed their bus pass. Discussion would take place within the company to ascertain potential schemes for the summer.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17

Response (RMBC) – Happy to talk to SYPTE and ask why bus passes where not continued throughout the summer.

1(b) Was it not just a case of changing the date on the card if they were being accepted informally anyway? Even if not for this year but in the process of it happening if it missed out another stage in the process.

Response (SYPTE) There was a budget behind a concessionary fare and the offer to the 16-18 year old was something that the PTE was aware of. The report had been passed around the organisation, including the Executive Director, and would be followed up with a response, however, there were budgetary reasons why the date on a pass could not be changed.

Response (Supertram) Operators were working together to provide affordable travel on all buses. All operators worked under the concessionary travel scheme from SYPTE and for every child that travelled at 80p, they received funding because it was a lot less than an average fare. In South Yorkshire it was a generous scheme; elsewhere child fares were  $\frac{3}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$  of an adult fare. Under Travel Master, which all the operators worked to, worked for affordable fares.

1(c) Seems to be reasonable willingness to do this within bus operators. What is the budget constraint? How much money was involved if operators went ahead and granted the extension?

Response (SYPTE) The actual figure was not available at the meeting but would be reported to the Youth Cabinet. The budget had reduced and it was an opportunity for the PTE to look at what it could do/offer.

(2) Do you have any systems in place to offer free or reduced travel to young people going to college over a certain distance and if not why?

Response (TM Travel) As bus operators it went back to the concessionary arguments. However, there used to be Central Government funding for post-16 transport and when dissolved by the Government, the money went to the colleges in an unringfenced grant so there was money available at colleges to help with travel bursaries. It was worthwhile for young people go to their college to ask how much support the college would offer to help towards transport costs.

Response (First Group) The zero fare under 16 pass was fully funded by the SYPTE and First received funding for every journey made by a young person that did not have an education place within 3 miles. Anything for the 16-18 year olds would have to be funded from elsewhere because seats were being taken up on the bus that were not generating funding. The 16-18 year olds were offered the £6 weekly ticket and also a South Yorkshire Students All Term ticket for £210 for 11 months travel (just over £4 a week) which was not subsidised at all. They were promoted heavily to university students but not necessarily college students.

Response (TM Travel) In the process of reviewing all its ticketing options and wanted to encourage young people to remain as bus passengers.

Response (Supertram) The youth and student markets for operators was very competitive so there were some very good fares available. The qualifying criteria was generally the NUS or NUS Extra card and operators also accepted the Apprentice Extra cards. The Travelmaster South Yorkshire Connect 18 was discounted on the adult fare.

Response (SYPTTE) The PTE teams went into colleges just before the summer holidays to work with them on the different methods of applying for passes, provided a suite of material they could communicate to students and the value for money tickets that would be available. This issue could be put on the agenda for the Youth User Group.

2(a) If the Students All Term ticket was promoted mainly to university students should it not be rolled out widely so 16-18s at FE college could access that? If the ticket was £220 per year was it paid in 1 lump sum or instalments?

Response (First Group) It was allowed to be paid in 6 instalments. It had been promoted to certain colleges but not all. The Get Social campaign to launch the £5 weekly ticket was an award winning campaign and had been reissued last year. There had been a nervousness in the past to go into schools to promote the commercial message but something that has been taking place a lot more recently.

2(b) It was a shame the 11 month ticket cannot be extended for 12 months?

Response (First Group) It was based around the term time travel. Attempts had been made to make it as cheap as possible based on 47 weeks.

2(c) Why was there a range of different price options?

Response (Supertram) What had been found in the market recently people just wanted to pay for what they wanted. Through Travel Master, the rail travel had been split from bus and tram travel because of the restrictive pricing on rail which was set by the Government. There was a layered system where operators would do their own products because it was the cheapest, then the multi-operator ticket and then the youth travel with train.

(3) Why did apprentices have to pay full fare when they were still in education and earning extremely low wages. Surely this would deter some young people from taking up apprenticeships if it cost too much to get there?



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17

Response (TM Travel) It was a very valid point. Unfortunately when Legislation was put through in terms of eligibility for transport when the Law changed the way it was drafted did not compel the free element to it. Again it would be a budgetary issue. Operators would be more than willing to work with National Apprenticeship Council to look at a strategic way of funding this transport issue.

Response (First Group) The issue was the age of apprentices extending to 24 years; there needed to be segregation of the 16-19 year olds and 19-24. Stagecoach and First had added the Apprentice Extra card to the student products which included the £210 11 month ticket. There was some nervousness because apprentices could work out at a 50% discount for a 24 year old who did not really need it. It probably required apprentices being accepted into 16-18 student pass and differentiating them from the general apprentices.

3(a) When speaking to some apprentices there had been the general consensus that, although accepting they were earning, some were very low paid and were spending everything they earned on transport. It was appreciated that some apprenticeships paid more than others but for the lower paid ones it seemed unfair.

Response (TM Travel) The DWP Job Centre Plus had identified budgets to help people to get into employment opportunities. It was suggested that the question be asked of the DWP Manager who covered Rotherham.

Response (Supertram) As operators, commercially there was only so much discount that could be offered before it became untenable and then that was bridged by the Concessionary Scheme the funding for which was provided by the tax payers. It was a limited fund and the PTE had budget cuts so it then became a juggling act on what the money was spent on. It was a valid point but the reverse was a full fare paying adults saying why did they pay the full fare and 24 year old in a full-time job paid a discounted fare.

Response (TM Travel) It was an opportunity for the Rotherham Youth Cabinet to take the agenda forward by working with elected representatives to put pressure on other Departments, not just the DWP, but Regional Development people.

3(b) A 28 day pass at £48.48 a month for a student regardless if in full-time education and under 18 but the finding of it had been an issue. If people knew what was out there it would be less of an issue.

3(c) Could there not be a scheme where you had to prove how much you earned in order get a reduced fare so the highest earning apprentices were not claiming a lower fare?

Response (First Group) It was a good idea and the way it needed to go. The issue at the minute was there was nothing in place. It was a good forum to raise the issue and the company could start to work with the PTE through the Youth Group to look at getting that implemented.

(4) There were a variety of tickets available from the different service providers. In what way were they collated for ease of access and how do you think this could be improved? How could people find out the cost for any individual journey prior to getting on public transport?

Response (TM Travel) Intention to improve the marketing of TM tickets. They were on the website but there could be further clarity.

Response (RMBC) A number of the questions were related to subsidised/free travel. An offer was made for Steve Edwards (Transport Executive) to attend the Youth User Group and conduct a session specifically on how budgets were decided at the SYPTE, how young people could influence them and the impact on their travel.

Response (First Group) Currently there was a search engine on the PTE website which allowed you to enter your age and it would return all ticket options. In terms of promotion, the Rotherham Bus Partnership set a marketing budget for the year and then worked together to promote things. Through the Competition Markets Authority it was still a commercial market and operators had to promote their services but the Bus Partnership and the PTE was the forum to do it through. The 2017/18 marketing budget was currently being worked through. Young people's bus tickets would be added to it so there was a fully co-ordinated campaign.

Response (Supertram) The competitive market did drive prices down and they were competitive. The PTE was impartial and there to promote public transport.

Response (Northern Rail) Arriva Northern had won the franchise in April 2016 to be the train operating company for this part of the country, with some other providers, for the next 8 years. Work had taken place to improve its offer around mobile applications, the advanced on demand ticketing and the discounts that could be gained via the booking system. The Marketing Department was working on capturing the travelling youth market. There will be marked upgrade in marketing of offers on the Northern network over the next 12-18 months.

4(a) Could a child fare be added to the advertising material?

Response (First Group) The new timetables featured child's fares although were not included on the Travel Master. The marketing budget this year had been focussed on children.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17**

4(b) If a young person was using different modes of transport for one journey was there somewhere they could go to find out how much the journey would cost them instead of going to different websites?

Response (First Group) The PTE website on the ticket finder search engine.

Response (SYPTE) The Travel South Yorkshire website or the local call centre who would be able to help with products.

(5) Had the DVD which we helped to produce a couple of years ago been of any help? How had the training of those who worked for the PTE developed since and how would you develop this further in the future?

Response (SYPTE). Customer service training was carried out as well as a series of awareness training. Feedback was always welcomed, positive or negative.

5(a) Why was there such a vast variety of attitudes from staff?

Response (Northern Rail) Northern Rail had identified that its customer service skills and some of its staff needed to be updated. A series of training events had commenced with all staff since the start of the new franchise. There was a strong focus on its customer service experience and improved travelling experience for customers. The branding was changing and there was a Station Improvement Fund to improve the customer experience when at the station which would be complemented by the staff. There would be ticket vending machines with the staff moved to giving advice and guidance to the customer.

Response (First Group) Bad behaviour by drivers was not condoned. Every driver received customer service training and had to undertake compulsory driver CPC training which consisted of 5 days of training over 5 years. Customer service was always 1 of the modules. Attitude problems needed to be reported and dealt with on a case by case basis.

5(b) How effective were the 5 days training over 5 years?

Response (First Group) Probable need to be more forceful with the training session and making it more meaningful. Currently putting together a module called Find Your Human which would be delivered over the next year on how deal with other human beings.

Response (Supertram) Customer service training was something the company had tried for a number of years in recruitment to put customer service to the fore. One of the training modules was anti-conflict training for staff.

Response (TM Travel) Bad customer service could never be excused. New tests had been introduced as part of the recruitment process. Feedback was very important if encountering someone whose attitude was inappropriate.

5(c) What did the other operators do for training?

Response (TM Travel) All bus operators had to carry out the CPC training; it was a legal requirement. It was always a fine balance about what time was spent but it was a continuing process.

Response (Northern Rail) Continuous training. Within the new franchise the Proud to be Northern agenda was being rolled out so all staff would be undergoing the process.

Response (Supertram) Tram operators did not operate under the CPC, however, Supertram conducted initial training together with refresher training every other year. Front line staff had regular 1:1 with their managers.

5(d) Was it possible to identify the driver or the bus if a customer had a bad experience so the drivers could have further/additional training to improve their service?

Response (TM Travel) There was a way of doing that. All the buses had a fleet number so could identify the driver, time and location.

Response (Supertram) Tram tickets stated who the driver/conductor number was, time and machine number.

Response (First Group) The fleet number was included on the interior or exterior of the bus as well as the ticket. All the details were entered into the contact system and drivers were ranked. If a driver received a complaint they were spoken to.

Response (Northern Rail) It was the same for the rail industry. Each carriage had an individual number. Within the Northern app there was a report faulting where a member of the public could report something wrong with the train, short description of what the issues were and it would be followed up through the contact centre.

(6) What steps were being implemented to improve your system of feedback?

Response (First Group) There was no incentive to participate in feedback but it was a really good idea. Stagecoach Bus had included feedback slips on their vehicles last year. Increased feedback was being received via online contact.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17

6(1) Stagecoach had run a customer feedback week in the past. Was it something other companies would be willing to do?

Response (Supertram) A Customer Service Week and Tweet the Manager initiatives were run as well as Nominate a Champion where you nominated your bus driver or tram conductor. If the employee went on to win the Stagecoach national scheme, the person who nominated the winner received a cash prize.

Response (TM Travel) TM Travel was a small company but employed a dedicated Customer Services Officer. If there was an issue with a bus, a member of the public could ring the telephone line which was manned until 1.00 a.m. by traffic control. The company was not doing social media as yet but there was email and every effort was made to respond as quickly as possible.

Response (Northern Rail) The largest growing team within the company was the Social Media Team. There was a dedicated contact centre in Sheffield as well as the ability to raise issues via the app and website. There was a Communities Manager in each of the areas whose role was to engage with community groups/youth groups about the service Northern provided and how that service could grow.

Response (SYPT) All the operators had their own customer services as well as Travel South Yorkshire having a website, contact centre or the Customer Services desk at the Interchange. We can also forward any comments onto the relevant operator.

6(2) In terms of TM Travel, if young people wanted to pass on some feedback they would not want to ring a number; it would be either online or through social media

Response (TM Travel) That was very good feedback. Social media would be launched fairly soon and there was email.

6(3) How do young people know that complaints or praise had been listened to?

Response (TM Travel) The company always went back to the person unless it involved a disciplinary issue.

Response (Supertram) When making a complaint there was no reference to age. Every complaint was given a unique reference number and was dealt with exactly the same.

6(4) What did drivers receive from the positive comments?

Response (TM Travel) Whenever an employee had a commendation it was put on the noticeboard for all the depot to see and placed in the driver's file.

Response (First Group) A Bus Driver of the Year as well as a Superstars Campaign.

Response (Supertram) Any feedback was put on the staff notice board to show that was the standard desired. People were very quick to complain but it took a lot of effort to praise because they were not actually asking for something to change. Positive feedback was needed to enforce the message that people appreciated what the staff were doing and sent a message out throughout the business.

Response (Northern Rail) Any praise was usually for the conductor and the service they provided. With the train crews it was a crew approach and crew praise because they were all part of a team. If 1 person received praise then it was for all the team.

(7) What processes were currently in place for ensuring public transport was clean for its paying customers and how do you think this could be improved? Do you have plans to improve cleanliness of public transport?

Response (First Group) Vehicles were cleaned every night and once every 28 days were deep cleaned. It was not the drivers that littered the vehicle but the passengers and it was very disappointing. Education was the issue. In-service cleaners had been discussed recently at the Bus Partnership as there would be situations where cleaning in-service was required. There were also a lot of issues with young people on school trips where the vehicle got into a bad state.

Response (Supertram) All the trams were cleaned at night.

Response (TM Travel) There was always a litter receptacle at the front of the bus.

Response (Northern Rail) All the train stock would be replaced by 2019 with new and/or refurbished trains which would improve the train environment and working with the train presentation crew to ensure that it remained like that. Northern Rail employed a contractor (Carillion) to clean the stations both manned and unmanned. If there was a problem it should be reported. Once a month all the stations were deep cleaned. It was hoped this would improve things significantly but it was always a challenge with unmanned stations. A "Station Adopters" scheme was to be set up whereby members of the community would be invited to get involved with their station and possibly adopt their station. There was funding available to support and improve the station environment which reflected the communities it served. It was hoped that the approach would encourage community ownership and reduce litter etc.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17

7(1) Posters on First Buses included information regarding litter, eating and drinking – was it worth having a push on reinforcing the point that other people used buses? Was it not worth having something for rubbish whilst in-service?

Response (First Group) The company had held back on signs on the buses because it did not want to be seen as the bus operator with a list of dos and don'ts. In-service cleaning did come down to cost and the time taken to carry it out which would impact on the running times/availability of the vehicles.

Response (Supertram) Litter bins were provided at all tram stops and passengers were asked that they take their rubbish off the tram with them. In-service cleaning had been provided in the past but it had been found that it encouraged passengers to leave their rubbish as they knew someone would be there to clean it up.

(8) The X78 and X1 services had free charging stations and Wi-Fi which was a huge success amongst young people. Are you planning on implementing these services-wide? Would this be provided on local trains and trams?

Response (Northern Rail) The aim was to have free Wi-Fi on all trains by 2019 when the new stock came into service with a seamless interface between station and train.

Response (TM Travel) Wi-Fi was currently offered on the 218 service (Chatsworth and Bakewell). The provision was under review with the hope of extending it to further routes.

Response (First Group) All the new buses came with Wi-Fi. The USBs did not come as standard but the new vehicles being received later in the year would have it included in their specification. Retro fitting was costly.

Response (Supertram) It was not provided on trams. The 7 new vehicles did not have Wi-Fi or USB as it had not available when they were purchased. When the PTE looked to renew vehicles in the future it would more than likely have become standard fit.

(9) An adult carer was entitled to a free fare when travelling with the person they were looking after, however, a young carer was not. Would it be possible for a young carer to use their already issued Young Carer Card to receive a free fare when travelling with the person they were helping to look after?

Response (RMBC) Councillor Mallinder was to look into this issue due to her previous work on the adult Carers Card.

Response (First Group) It was something the company would definitely support.

9(1) Young Carers Card did exist and was linked in Doncaster. Why has it not been started anywhere else?

Response (Supertram) South Yorkshire was one of the areas where you could get a Mobility Pass under the English National Concessionary Scheme and that was with carer so if you needed someone to help you travel you can get and that included free travel for the carer. There were medical restrictions to qualify for the pass.

(10) How do you ensure that people were aware of bus times? Have you any plans to improve this?

Response (TM Travel) Printed timetables were made available on the buses as well on the website and on the Travel Line portal. Work would continue on finding ways to improve availability.

Response (Supertram) Supertram came under the Stagecoach bus app and there was a journey planner. There was printed material as it was known that some sections of the population preferred that method. Timetables could be updated constantly on-line whereas printed material was out of date as soon as it was printed.

Response (SYPTTE) All timetable information was available on Travel South Yorkshire. There was also the facility to register your device and receive an email alert of a forthcoming timetable/route change to your regular journey.

10(1) There had been issues with the unreliability of the app where the times were different to those printed timetables and the wrong streets.

Response (Northern Rail) There had been investment in the company's apps and did have real time information. There was also investment in the unmanned stations in the provision of customer information screens providing real time information on when the next train was due, if there was a delay etc. The majority of the younger customers worked off their mobiles but it was accepted that many still preferred the printed timetables.

Response (TM Travel) There had been some technical issues with the TM travel app which would resolved quite quickly.

Response (First Group) All services were mapped in the company's database to a national standard database and automated so services such as Google could use the same database. It would be useful to know if it was the timetable that was wrong or the countdown? If it said a time that would meant it was not tracking real time. If it had a countdown it meant that it was tracking real time. Problems were probably due to the mapping.



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/02/17**

10(2) How would you ensure when young people know when services have changed because the tender had been won by someone else.

Response (TM Travel) If TM Travel won a tender all the new timetables would be included on the website and the app updated.

Response (SYPTTE) Information regarding any bus changes were provided on bus stops, information at the Interchange, on Travel South Yorkshire, use of social media, alerts sent out and to the local Elected Members and community groups. The Youth Council could be added to the list.

Response (First Group) All the operators currently did their own thing with regard to notifying the public of any changes. Discussions had recently taken place about working together and combining resources to achieve improvements.

Response (Supertram) All the information was submitted to the PTE. There were also QR codes at bus stops and a paid for text messaging service.

Response (Northern Rail) Within the rail industry it was a franchise commitment that they inform when there was to be timetable change inviting communities of interest to comment on the changes to the timetable, to the rail users group and local authority transport leads. It was governed by Network Rail and the current major infrastructure upgrade was impacting on the timetabled upgrade.

The various representatives were thanked for their responses to the above questions.

In terms of the next steps there had been some commitment and suggestions for further activity certainly a need for some discussion around budgeting and concessionary fares with the suggestion that Steve Edwards attend the Young User Group meeting.

Councillor Mallinder taking forward the Young Carers Card.

The Scrutiny Officer would work with the RYC to produce a report summarising the discussion and key points. There was a standard template used for Scrutiny Reviews which would be sent to partner agencies for a full response to the recommendations with timescales. The intention was to have the response reported back to OSMB and RYC by 5th May.

**Action points:-**

- Councillor Mallinder to follow up on the Young Carer Card.

- Councillor Lelliott to discuss bus passes with SYPTE and report back to RYC.
- SYPTE to add RYC to the alert list for bus changes and to report back on the budgetary implications of extending the date for passes.
- First Bus to explore incentives to encourage customer feedback
- TM Travel to feedback to RYC about their summer offer
- First Bus to work with SYPTE through the Youth User Group to consider age and earnings related apprenticeship fares.
- Steve Edwards (Transport Executive) to attend the Youth User Group and conduct a session specifically on how budgets were decided at the SYPTE, how young people could influence them, the impact on their travel and how to improve advertising and promotion of the offer.
- First Bus and Northern Rail both invited RYC to attend and assist with their training sessions. Northern Rail suggested they might like to take part as mystery shoppers in the customer service training.
- SYPTE and too RYC to alert list for timetable changes
- RYC to share their contacts with SYPTE with regard to the new Youth user Group.

**105. YOUNG TRANSPORT USERS GROUP**

The Chair reported that he had met with Clare Cocken (SYPTE) and discussed the plans with the PTE to meet with young people from South Yorkshire to discuss transport, what changes could be made, what was good, what not, and making it South Yorkshire wide.

Clare reported that discussions had started with Rotherham about the Youth User Group because of the report the Youth Cabinet had produced. However, since then she had met with Sheffield and also had meetings planned with Barnsley and Doncaster. It was hoped that the first meeting of the User Group would take place around Easter and it was important that it was useful for young people.

All the operators were very committed to the Group and willing to take part.

**106. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

In closing the meeting, Councillor Steele thanked the Youth Cabinet Members, Elected Members and officers of each organisation for their participation in the meeting and contributions to the debate.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
3rd March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Clark, Mallinder, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Allcock, Cowles, Price and Julie Turner.

**107. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report at this meeting.

**108. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

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

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

**110. REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT FEES AND CHARGES**

Consideration was given to the report which set out the proposed fees and charges for the Regeneration and Environment Directorate for 2017/18 and beyond.

The proposed fees and charges were reflected in the budget savings proposals included in the Council's Budget and Council Tax setting report, which were subject to approval by Council on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

The charges for each service within Regeneration and Environment were presented in Appendices 1 – 9. Where no increases were proposed to charges in 2017/18, charges would remain at the amounts approved by Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2016. Within the proposed fees and charges, the following changes were specifically highlighted:-

- **Planning and Building Control Service** – proposals to introduce a new charge for property addressing.
- **Leisure and Green Spaces** - Fees and charges have been reviewed in the context of the known demand for individual services. As a result, a number of charges have been held at existing levels and others have been increased by at least the rate of inflation. Charges are applied for the 2017/18 financial year; however, there are several exceptions to this:-

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 03/03/17

- Charges for Wedding Packages in Clifton Park for 2017/18 and 2018/19.
  - Car parking tariff at Clifton Park for over 3 hours during the summer and for the remainder of the year have been increased to reflect demand for this service.
  - Allotment rents giving tenants twelve months' notice of any increase.
- **Building Regulation Charges** – Building Control Application Fees have been reviewed and were proposed to be increased for the first time since April 2014.
  - **Market Service and Borough Fairs Charges** – Market Service charges have been, but it was recommended that rents for the Centenary Market Hall remain frozen for 2017, to ensure that the Market Service remains competitive and attractive to new businesses. However, an increase of £2.10 (10.6%) for Tuesday Street Market Casual Traders was proposed, to reflect the popularity of this market. In addition, in respect of Borough Fairs Charges, Appendix 4b, a 5% increase was proposed, to reflect the fact that charges have been frozen in recent years.
  - **Community Protection Charges** – Changes to the Housing Licensing fee structure were made in 2016/17. With the exception of charges for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO), which would increase by 1% to reflect salary cost increases, it was not proposed to increase any of the other charges in this area.

Consultation Fees would be at the appropriate hourly rate for the officer carrying out the work.

- **Library, Customer Services, Theatre Services and Heritage Services** - Heritage Services' charges would largely remain static in order to improve take-up of these services.

Registration Services were able to set fees on a cost recovery only basis, for any non-statutory services they delivered and an increase was proposed from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017.

No changes to fees and charges proposed for Library and Customer Services.

Theatre Services' fees and charges applied to theatre hire, equipment hire, specialist additional staffing support and ticketing, but negotiation of professional contracts would continue, with a £1 ticket fee for professional show bookings, to recover administration costs.

- **Commercial Waste Charges** – Proposed to increase commercial waste charges by 2.5%.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 03/03/17

- **Business Regulation Charges** - Proposed that the fees for 2017/18 were increased in line with the 1% increase in staffing costs across the service.
- **Pest Control Fees** – The proposed fees have been set and were across a range of pest control.

It was suggested that officers be given flexibility on prices charged in respect of areas of commercial activity, to allow the Council to retain and attract business, where necessary, and include promotional discounts and negotiate individual charges to meet the needs of the business.

It was also noted there were no proposals to increase fees and charges for Highways Services, Parking Services, Licensing and for the hiring of directly managed community buildings. A review of these charges would be undertaken in 2017/18 and proposals for 2018/19 brought forward in due course.

Further information Was also provided on the process should an application be received to temporarily close a road under the Traffic Regulations Act for a public event, the support provided and the circumstances when the management fee was charged.

**Resolved:-** That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting for approval:-

(a) Of:-

- Proposed fees and charges for the Planning and Building Control Service as set out in Appendix 1.
- Proposed fees and charges for Leisure and Green Spaces as set out in Appendix 2.
- Proposed Building Regulation charges as set out in Appendix 3.
- Proposed Market Service and Borough Fairs Charges as set out in Appendix 4.
- Proposed Community Protection charges as set out in Appendix 5.
- Proposed Library, Customer Services, Theatre Services and Heritage Service charges as set out in Appendix 6.
- Proposed Commercial Waste charges as set out in Appendix 7.
- Proposed Business Regulation charges as set out in Appendix 8.
- Proposed Pest Control charges as set out in Appendix 9

(b) That, subject to the approval of the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment or the appropriate Assistant Director within Regeneration and Environment, officers be given flexibility on prices charged in respect of areas of commercial activity, to allow the Council to retain and attract business where necessary.

(c) That, subject to the approval of the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment or the appropriate Assistant Director within Regeneration and Environment, officers be given flexibility to introduce promotional discounts and negotiate individual charges to meet the needs of the business.

**111. FINANCIAL INCLUSION PLAN FOR ROTHERHAM COUNCIL TENANTS**

Consideration was given to the report which sought authority to approve the Financial Inclusion Plan for Council tenants.

This plan aimed to remove barriers and support people to become more independent and to take control of their own finances. Evidence indicated that improving financial capability and confidence would contribute to reducing poverty, improving health and educational attainment as well as increasing skills and employability.

The plan would not stand alone to deliver solutions, but recognised that a co-ordinated approach that brought Council services, partners and agencies together would be more cost effective and achieve greater success in providing tenants and residents with the support required to enable them to access the benefits basic financial services could provide.

The aim was to help Council tenants improve their quality of life by reducing debts, reliance on high interest cost lenders and increasing levels of educational attainment; which would improve overall skills and job prospects, as well as increasing independence and build resilience longer term. The plan would be implemented by housing staff in the remodelled Housing Income Team and Council Housing Allocation Officers.

Following further development of the corporate approach to tackling poverty it was intended to learn from implementation of the tenants Financial Inclusion Plan and where appropriate align resources and offer services irrespective of tenure.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Invest to Save had been utilised to transform the Financial Inclusion Team and was looking to reduce the debt through the process. There was a series of Performance Measures which would be reviewed as the new Team structure was implemented;
- Development of the methods of support for tenants was underway; some tenants may not want to attend a workshop and may need individual support to understand the implications of taking on a tenancy;

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 03/03/17**

- Funding through the Housing Revenue Account and had Officers working in Children's Services to assist when families were in difficulties to assist in sustaining their tenancies;
- It was essential that new elements of the Housing Income Team were connected to the Allocations and Housing Management Teams and ensure that Officers worked together for the benefit of tenants to sustain tenancies and to ensure they were in suitable accommodation;
- The Council was aware that some of its tenants were struggling to pay their basic household bills and some of the work required as part of the financial inclusion work included helping tenants get into work through training programmes, signposting and connectivity to appropriate training and skills;
- There were more people on zero hours contract; many people who were "poor" but were actually in employment and using food banks so the Strategy had to be more creative. It was known that some of the workforce was working at the minimum wage which did not match up to the cost of inflation, food costs etc. Part of the role of the Community Catalyst from the Adult Social Care perspective was to look at micro enterprises as well as the lobbying taking place nationally with regard to people with learning disabilities who wanted to be in work but not being paid the minimum wage;
- There were currently 6,000 people on the Council's housing waiting list;
- Rotherham did not have a significant increase in homelessness on the street. South Yorkshire had recently been successful in securing resources for additional workers to work with those citizens in danger of becoming homeless.

**Resolved:-** (1) That the report be received, the contents noted and the report progress to the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting for approval of the Financial Inclusion Plan for Housing for the period 2017 to 2020.

(2) That the Equality Impact Assessment be completed and monitored by the Improving Places Select Commission in six months.

**112. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That a further meeting be held on Friday, 17th March, 2017, at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
17th March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Allcock, Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Councillors Atkin, Lelliott and Read were in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Albiston, Price and Julie Turner.

**113. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

A member of the public asked the following question with regard to the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP):-

“We have been asking for the consultation period to be extended. Within the model IRMP planning procedures you can have a period from 2-12 weeks; because of the late feedback from the Service and on examining that feedback we have some other issues.

My original question submitted to 8<sup>th</sup> March Council meeting was around response times and whether the Councillors were aware of the impact of the proposals on second night time fire engine response times in Rotherham.”

Councillor Atkin, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority representative, stated that the consultation at the moment was on the IRMP going forward from this year for the next 4 years; the issue relating to the removal of the second pump on nights was part of the consultation that took place 4 years ago. There was extensive consultation at this time and the proposals were agreed, which are now being enacted.

Cllr Atkin apologised for not being at full Council on 8<sup>th</sup> March. He had to attend a conference in Newcastle as the Vice-Chair of the Fire Authority.

With regard to the consultation event at Parkgate on 7<sup>th</sup> March, I have spoken to Councillor Taylor, who was an ex-fire fighter, who attended who thought that it was unsatisfactory. I have raised it with our officers and awaiting feedback.



The Fire Authority have met with a full Brigade Committee to consult on the IRMP. There is a 6 week period for consultation because there are few proposals in it and this will not vary. Cllr Atkin stated that the questions raised issues relating to a decision that was made 4 years ago.

Cllr Atkin explained that the removal of the night time pump at Rotherham will have an effect on turnout figures but suggested that it would be marginable.

The member of the public asked a supplementary question.

“You had just quoted about the negative impact on the response time but in the detailed response I got from the Service, this is not based on the impact of the 4 years’ worth of cuts to the Fire Service. These have impacted on the second pump response times and where the resilience pumps are coming from which they have collated the data to put into the new IRMP.

In terms of where we are with the last IRMP and the new IRMP, it is the job of Scrutiny to scrutinise the direction of travel in terms of primary calls, secondary calls, fire deaths throughout the period of that IRMP so an IRMP is not considered solely within a 3 year period but considered throughout that period and formulates part of the next IRMP. The difficulty is that the Service handled in 2012 around 20,000 calls; currently we are now handling about 30,000 calls. In 2012 we had 740 fire fighters but now 556. We are severely under strain and concerned about the resilience that is left in the system not just in Rotherham but in other areas and the response for Rotherham will come currently, under the latest proposals which are not contained in the last IRMP, from Birley Moor fire station in Sheffield which will significantly increase response times to your constituents in Rotherham.

Could Councillors consider in the light of what I have just informed you of an increase in the consultation and engagement period to allow us as a Fire Brigade Union to work with the employer to provide a balanced budget going forward?”

Councillor Atkin reported that the consultation would end on 27<sup>th</sup> March. There was to be an All Member seminar on Tuesday, 21<sup>st</sup> March. The proposals for the new IRMP did not reduce any fire cover and in fact in the day there would be 2 extra fire engines.

Resolved:- That a special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held as soon as possible to discuss this issue.

**115. COUNCILLOR PRICE**

It was reported that Councillor Price had submitted his apologies for the meeting due to his wife having given birth to a baby the previous day.

The Select Commission congratulated Councillor Price and his wife on their new arrival.

**116. BUDGET 2018-19 - CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH**

In accordance with Minute No. ?(2) of 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2017, the Leader and Leona Marshall, Interim Head of Communications and Marketing, presented a report on setting out the principles with which the consultation and engagement would be undertaken by the Council and the role of consultation as part of the budget setting process.

A strategy was to be developed once the budget process for 2018/19 was formally underway and which the Board would be consulted as part of finalising the approach.

The report set out the process for the consultation process for the 2017/18 budget process. Specific public consultation had ran from 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2016 to 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2017 and resulted in a total of 31 responses by email and separate responses from the Council's partners recognising the difficulties the Council was facing and supporting the proposals put forward.

For the 2018/19 budget process it was the intention that:-

- All communications would be set in the context of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy as well as the Council's established strategic priorities as set out in the Corporate Plan;
- The Council would be looking to maximise its resources and engage with its target audiences to ensure representation from across the Borough via combination of online and more traditional offline channels
- In line with the Council's digital-first approach, the Council's consultation events alongside the use of Council and partner publications;
- It was important for all feedback and opinion to be captured by the Council and stored in one accessible central location in order to ensure that this could also be incorporated into the final decision making process and final budget setting report.

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

- Response rate was approximately 30 a year to the formal consultation
- Complexity of the budget and ability of the layperson to understand the implications for themselves
- Higher response rate to open consultation e.g. Learning Disability and Autism consultation with service users

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 17/03/17**

- Vulnerable and minority groups should be included in the key audiences
- Additional information had been included on the new Council Tax bills
- The use local radio and newspaper had been used to publicise the consultation
- Use of social media/digital technology - the Council's Facebook had been relaunched and would be used
- Piggybacking onto partner's events/meeting and increased work with voluntary and community sector partners
- Consult with key stakeholders about services that affected them
- Minimum period for consultation was 6 weeks – consultation around sensitive groups was much longer with face-to-face engagement taking place
- The Strategy would include consultation, engagement and communication
- Dedicated resources specifically for consultation v diverting resources to consult about budget cuts

Resolved:- (1) That the principles with which the consultation and engagement will be undertaken by the Council and the role of consultation as part of the budget seeing process for 2018/19 be noted.

(2) That it be noted that a consultation and engagement strategy would be developed once the budget process for 2018/98 was formally underway and submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board for consideration.

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

No issues had been referred.

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

Following a successful Children's Commissioner Take-Over Day, a report was being produced and expected in May.

**119. WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Improving Lives Select Commission**

Councillor Clark reported that at the last meeting the agenda had included:-

- Alternative models for CYPS – it was hoped that the findings would be reported at the end of April
- The next meeting was to focus on SEND with some Service users invited to attend

**Health Select Commission**

Councillor Sansome had nothing to report.

**Improving Places Select Commission**

Councillor Mallinder reported at the last meeting the agenda had included:-

- Presentation by RIDO on economic growth and the Town Centre
- Dignity – a visit had been made to Maltby Cemetery with a further visit to Rotherham Crematorium. There would then be a strategic meeting to discuss Dignity provision in Rotherham
- A report would be submitted in the next Municipal Year on the waste contract with Doncaster Council

**120. CALL-IN ISSUES - TO CONSIDER ANY ISSUES REFERRED FOR CALL-IN**

No issues had been referred.

**121. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

**122. PURCHASE OF ADVANCED MANUFACTURING PARK TECHNOLOGY CENTRE**

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, together with Simeon Leach (Economic Development Manager) and Jon Baggaley (Finance Manager), presented an update on the Council's purchase of the Advanced Manufacturing Park Technology Centre (AMPTC) using capital funding secured through the Sheffield City Region, subject to a satisfactory valuation of the building and securing the funding.

Purchase of the Advanced Manufacturing Park Technology Centre using Sheffield City Region capital funding would retain it within the public sector in the Sheffield City Region, without putting the Council at the financial risk of using its own funding.

The report had previously been considered at the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 (Minute No. 146 refers).

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised and appropriate responses given:-

- Repairs and maintenance/service charge
- Title Deeds
- Occupancy
- Ownership/management of the Centre
- Funding/cost of acquisition
- Risk

Resolved:- That the latest situation with regard to the Council's purchase of the AMPTC and the operation of the facility subsequent to the purchase be noted.

**123. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Friday, 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017, commencing at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
31st March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Clark, Cowles, Mallinder, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Price and Julie Turner.

**124. TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE PRESS AND PUBLIC SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF ANY PART OF THE AGENDA.**

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda which would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

**125. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEM WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.**

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda requiring urgent consideration by the Board.

**126. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest by Members or officers present.

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

It was reported that no questions had been received from the public or press.

**128. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2017**

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2017 be agreed as a true and correct record.

**129. REVIEW OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING**

Consideration was given to a report which set out the conclusions and recommendations of a review of neighbourhood working across the borough. It was noted that the aim was to undertake a review which would herald the introduction of "a new model of citizen engagement and neighbourhood working linked to a review of Area Assemblies" to provide a focus on communities and introduce a new way of working.

It was reported that the working group, which had been led by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services, had supported a new neighbourhood working model which would result in the 21 electoral wards becoming the key building blocks for supporting councillors in their community leadership role. It was further reported that a complimentary project had been initiated by the Council and Rotherham Together Partnership to examine locality working across the wider partnership. This would present an opportunity to bring together other stakeholders e.g. South Yorkshire Police (SYP), Health, voluntary and community sector, and other Council services to develop a holistic locality model.

The Working Group had made a long list of recommendations regarding the governance and accountability framework for neighbourhood working, the preparation and status of Ward based place plans, devolved budgets and dedicated Ward based support.

It was noted that detailed consultation had taken place with Area Assembly Chairs and Vice-Chairs and that community consultation would be incorporated into the ward plans during the transitional period. It was further noted that the report proposed to Cabinet that transitional arrangement be agreed for the new model to allow a flexible and organic move towards ward based working over a 12 month period.

In presenting the report, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services, Councillor Yasseen, indicated that the proposals were not prescriptive and had been developed to enhance accountability, as well as citizen engagement and involvement.

Reference was made to the operation of individual Area Assemblies and how the proposed arrangements may prove to be difficult in bringing wards together in future. The proposed approach was identified as not being radical, although it was acknowledged as the right way to proceed in ensuring that councillors and officers are more active in communities and localities.

Members sought assurances in respect of how the arrangements would work in wards where all three councillors did not represent the same party and where accountability would rest where all three councillors were not agreed on the priorities of the ward plan. In response, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services indicated that members from the same party did not always agree on the priorities for their ward, so the political split in a ward was not necessarily a significant obstacle to the proposed approach. With regard to accountability, the proposal for reports back to the Cabinet Member, along with reports to the Improving Places Select Commission and Council were considered to be adequate. It was noted that the model was designed to bring councillors to work together for their communities irrespective of political persuasion and that priorities should be influenced by community demand.

Members highlighted the absence of an overall neighbourhood working strategy and indicated that this required attention during the transitional arrangements.

**Resolved:-**

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That training be arranged and delivered for Ward Councillors on developing Ward Plans as a matter of urgency.
3. That the Cabinet Member be recommended to initiate the development of an overall strategy for Neighbourhood Working.
4. That an update report on implementation of the new model be submitted to Improving Places in October 2017.
5. That a further report be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in March 2018 detailing the review of the new arrangements.

**130. FEBRUARY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT 2016/17**

Consideration was given to a report which detailed the financial position for the Revenue Budget at the end of February 2017 and was based on actual costs and income for the first eleven months of the financial year and forecast costs and income for the remaining one month of 2016/17.

It was reported that the revenue position, compared with the revised budget approved by Council on 7th December 2016, showed a forecast overspend of £2.017m. This forecast overspend had reduced by £526k since the December monitoring report. It was further reported that further mitigation of the potential impact on reserves would be addressed through the robust procurement and recruitment controls that had been put in place. It was noted that the majority of the approved budget savings for 2016/17 had been or were going to be achieved, with the main exception being the £1m saving from the review of staff terms and conditions of employment agreed by Council in March 2016 which would not now be delivered in 2016/17. The non-delivery of the 2016/17 £1m saving was reflected in the forecast outturn in the report.

Members noted the financial position and reflected on the budget setting process, which had concluded at the Council meeting on 8 March 2017, and the ongoing concerns around managing potential overspends and underspends. The Board reiterated its concern to the Leader of the Council regarding the robustness of monitoring throughout the year and indicated that it would wish to receive a quarterly budget monitoring report in the 2017-18 financial year.



**Resolved:-**

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That Cabinet continue to monitor the budget on a monthly basis to identify potential variances at an early stage and implement management actions to deal with potential overspends or underspends.
3. That Overview and Scrutiny Management Board receive a quarterly financial budget monitoring report in the new financial year.

**131. COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS FOR JOINTLY COMMISSIONED SERVICES WITH ROTHERHAM CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (CCG) - COMMUNITY OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SERVICES**

Consideration was given to a report which detailed the outcome of a review of Community Occupational Therapy Services by the Council and Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group.

It was noted that the Community Occupational Therapy provided assessments for adults, older people and children who were permanently or substantially disabled and their carers. The overall cost of the services in 2016/17 was £746,000 per annum, with the Council contributing £372,000 towards the service and the CCG contributing £374,000 per annum.

It was reported that a formal review had recently been completed by the Council and Clinical Commissioning Group in order to:

- a) Ensure that the service is meeting the needs of customers and their carers
- b) Reduce the waiting times for assessment
- c) Reduce the number of customers being referred to the service by signposting them to alternative services at the first point of contact
- d) Carry out analysis of performance data to predict demand and capacity of service
- e) Carry out analysis and evaluation of customer and carer satisfaction rates and outcomes
- f) Examine whether the service promotes Value for Money.

The review demonstrated that the Community Occupation Therapy service had carried out assessments for low level/single need customers and that resources needed to be diverted towards providing assessments to support complex needs. In addition to this, it was identified that Assistant Practitioners/OT Assessment Officers could be upskilled to carry out assessments for level access showers, straight stair-lifts and ramps and that the level of paperwork completed was onerous and needed to be streamlined.

The report, therefore, recommended that the contract for the Community Occupational Therapy Service be extended for one further year to allow alignment with the Adult Care Development Programme (including the BCF Work Programme) and the evolving Specialist Housing Strategy. Within the extended period to April 2018, providers would be expected to achieve all recommendations highlighted in the COT review report and to work with the Council and the CCG to implement new models of service delivery. The Lead Commissioner arrangements for the Community Occupational Therapy Service were proposed to be assigned to the Clinical Commissioning Group as they had the largest financial stake and greater capacity to lead the activity.

Having reviewed the proposals within the report, Members indicated that they were broadly supportive of the proposal. The Board considered that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health should seek the input of the Health Select Commission if further work was required on this area at Member level.

**Resolved:-**

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That if additional work is required at Member level, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health be recommended to approach the Health Select Commission to support such activity.

**132. REVIEW OF PETITIONS SCHEME**

Consideration was given to a report which detailed the outcome of a review of the Council's petition scheme, which had been undertaken to support the ongoing improvement of the authority's governance.

It was noted that the Council had adopted a petitions scheme in May 2010 in accordance with the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. This scheme had been subject to subtle changes following the review of Standing Orders in 2014. It was reported that the statutory provisions governing the petitions scheme had been repealed through the Localism Act 2011.

This report identified that the Council's approach to handling petitions could be improved in a procedural sense and also in terms of the wider trust and confidence held in the Council by the residents of the borough. The report recommended that the current petitions scheme be replaced by guidance which would provide clearer advice to citizens on how to submit a petition and what to expect after submission to the Council.

Members were broadly supportive of the proposal within the report to reduce thresholds to enable debates at full Council and the proposal for any petition with 600 signatures to be referred automatically for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

**Resolved:-**

1. That the Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That petitions with 600 signatures be referred to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board for review or investigation and lead petitioners be given 15 minutes to present the petition to that meeting.

**133. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would be held on Friday 5 May 2017.

**APPEAL PANEL**  
**19th December, 2016**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Cowles.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**APPEAL - D1/12/16 - FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

The Panel considered the appeal by D1/12/16 against her earlier dismissal. She was represented at the hearing.

The Panel confirmed the finding of the disciplinary hearing and rejected the appeal against dismissal.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**APPEAL PANEL  
19th December, 2016**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Wyatt.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**APPEAL - G1/12/16 - FACILITIES SERVICES**

The Panel considered a grievance appeal by G1/12/16.

He was not represented at the hearing.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**APPEAL PANEL  
19th December, 2016**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Tweed and Wyatt.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**APPEAL - D2/12/16 - WASTE MANAGEMENT**

The Panel considered the appeal by D2/12/16 against his earlier dismissal. He was represented at the hearing.

The Panel confirmed the finding of the disciplinary hearing and rejected the appeal against dismissal.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL  
13th February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Commissioner Ney and Councillors Cowles.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alam and Watson.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT - ADULT CARE AND HOUSING**

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Adult Care and Housing.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**RELEASE OF PRESERVED PENSION BENEFITS - ADULT CARE AND HOUSING**

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

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Children and Young People's Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT - FINANCE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES**

This application was withdrawn.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
24th February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley, Cutts, Hoddinott, Jarvis, Keenan, Lelliott, Marriott, Reeder, Taylor, John Turner, Walsh and Williams.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alam, Albiston, Allen, Beaumont, Brookes, Cowles, Cutts, Hague, Jepson, McNeely, Read, Sansome, Senior and Sheppard.

**ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE - ORGANISED MARCHES**

Members received information from the South Yorkshire Police in respect of the organised march/demonstration which would be taking place in the Rotherham town centre on Saturday, 25th February, 2017.

The South Yorkshire Police representatives were Assistant Chief Constable T. Forber, the Rotherham District Commander R. Odell and Constable P. Read.

It was confirmed that the Borough Council's official position was that such marches and demonstrations were unwelcome in Rotherham. Written representations had already been to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, seeking a change in the law so as to prohibit such marches and demonstrations. However, the response was that the law would remain unchanged and that people have a right to peaceful protest. The Borough Council would continue to strive to reduce the negative impact of these marches and demonstrations upon the Rotherham town centre.

It was also confirmed that the South Yorkshire Police does not want these marches and demonstrations to occur in Rotherham, because of recognition of the cumulative impact of repeated demonstrations on the different sections of communities and because they often fuel divisions between communities and also cause disruption to businesses.

The South Yorkshire Police representatives informed Members that:-

: the English Defence League (EDL) have organised the march to take place on Saturday 25 February 2017;

: the role of the Police is to maintain law and order, minimise any disruption to normal, everyday life in the community and also to minimise the opportunity for criminality;

: the expensive cost of policing marches and demonstrations represented public finances which could be better spent on other Police services;

: the Police are bound by and have to act within the law and must recognise the right to peaceful protest; both the Police and the Council share the legal duty to facilitate this right;



REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 24/02/17

: it was emphasized that this was not a “day out” in Rotherham for the EDL; strict conditions have been imposed by the Police on the march and also on any counter-protests, again in order to minimise disruption to the town centre;

: the EDL has been instructed to comply with conditions from 10.00 a.m., even though the march is scheduled to begin at 2.00 p.m.; robust policing will ensure that participants in the march enter and leave the Rotherham town centre in an orderly manner; by notice issued in accordance with Section 35 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, the Police may order the dispersal of people from the town centre, within a specified period of time;

: there will be Police presence in respect of those person who choose to travel to Rotherham by public transport (eg: bus and rail);

: a specific route for the march has been established through the town – from the muster point at Main Street, to Ship Hill and to the exterior of the Town Hall at Moorgate Street; the return route is the same, to the muster point at Main Street, enabling participants to leave Rotherham using the routes to the west of the town centre; the Police will maintain a positive approach to law enforcement;

: persons involved in the counter-demonstration will have a separate muster area at the Minster Gardens;

: the Police are aware of the extent of dismay and frustration from within the community, the business and retail sector, as well as amongst Elected Members in respect of the frequency of these marches and demonstrations; the Police must act independently in accordance with the law; neither does the law allow the Police to prevent further marches and demonstrations happening in Rotherham again in the future;

: there has been very good co-operation with the Police from the majority of licensed premises within the Rotherham town centre, some of which will increase the level of security at their own premises so as to help in maintaining public order; some premises will close during the period of time in which the march takes place and others prefer to remain open to serve their regular clientele; the licensed premises will maintain a dialogue with the Police;

: key lessons have been learned from the policing of the previous marches and demonstrations in Rotherham (eg: a specific incident at Wellgate in 2015); a previous demonstration in Rotherham (18 February 2017) had been robustly policed and had passed without incident causing disruption to the Rotherham community;

: a detailed explanation was provided of the extent of the Police presence in and around the Rotherham town centre, as planned for 25 February 2017; there will be the use of the various social media, by both the Police and the Borough Council, to provide general information about progress during the day, especially in order to reassure communities and the public in general that the march is passing without incident; this aspect was important because of other public events happening elsewhere in the town centre, for the enjoyment of the wider public;

: it was anticipated that the Rotherham Community Safety Partnership would review the day's events and consider whether there is any appropriate action which could be taken to try and make Rotherham a less attractive place for this type of unwelcome demonstration (eg: the possible use of Public Spaces Protection Orders in accordance with the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014);

: robust action will be taken by the Police in respect of any incidents of hate crime occurring during the march and demonstration; the use of the closed circuit television systems will assist in the identification of suspected offenders; members of the public are encouraged to report any such incidents to the Police;

: Elected Members were encouraged to report any concerns, as witnessed on 25 February 2017, to the South Yorkshire Police.

Members' subsequent discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

: there were concerns about specific premises within the Rotherham town centre being targeted; it was noted that the Police had been made aware of these concerns and would be providing an appropriate response in order to disrupt any possible crime and disorder around specific premises and areas in the town centre;

: there would be separate discussions about forthcoming town centre events to be promoted by the Borough Council;

: there was further, brief reference to previous marches and demonstrations held in the Rotherham town centre, noting that legal action was continuing in some cases and therefore such matters could not be the subject of discussion at this meeting;

: it was acknowledged that the presence of additional Police officers within the town centre would itself serve to increase the level of anxiety amongst the general public; nevertheless, the Police would endeavour to maintain a robust professional approach to policing the march and demonstration, as well as engaging with and providing reassurance to the general public; the use of the muster points and the specific march route would minimise the amount of disruption to the general public who wished to move around the town centre as they would usually do;

**REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 24/02/17**

: reference was made to the legal implications of a Supreme Court judgement affecting the policing of marches and demonstrations in Northern Ireland;

: it was noted that the conditions which the Police could impose on the marches and demonstrations had to be both reasonable and proportionate;

: the overall intention was that, on Saturday 25 February 2017, ordinary citizens and the businesses should be able to go about their daily business unhindered in the Rotherham town centre, that the march and demonstration should pass peacefully and without incident, enabling the Police resources to be withdrawn as soon as possible after the march and demonstration have ended.

Members thanked the South Yorkshire Police representatives for their contribution to this meeting.

**APPEAL PANEL  
2nd March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Wyatt.

Also in attendance:- Councillor Alam (Observer)

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**APPEAL - D1/03/17 - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered the appeal by D1/03/17 against her earlier dismissal. She was represented at the hearing.

The Panel confirmed the finding of the disciplinary hearing and rejected the appeal against dismissal.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL  
20th March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Commissioner Ney, Councillors Beck, Cowles, and Read.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT APPLICATIONS - ADULT CARE AND HOUSING**

The Panel considered three applications for flexible retirement from employees in Adult Care and Housing.

Resolved:- That the applications be approved.

**RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Children and Young People's Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Children and Young People's Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
21st March, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Atkin (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Pitchley); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Beaumont, Brookes, Buckley, Cooksey, Cowles, Cutts, Cutts, Elliott, Ellis, Jarvis, Mallinder, Marriott, Napper, Pitchley, Russell, Sansome, Senior, Sheppard, Simpson, Walsh, Williams and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson, Khan, Reeder, Rushforth and Julie Turner.

**SOUTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE INTEGRATED RISK  
MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Councillor Atkin, the Council's representative on the South Yorkshire Fire Authority, welcomed Members to the seminar and introduced Jamie Courtney, Chief Fire Officer, and Martin Blunden, temporary Deputy Chief Fire Officer, who gave the following presentation on the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP):-

What is an IRMP?

Every fire and rescue service is required to produce plans which

- Set out the resources we need and steps we are going to take to reduce fires and make people safer
- Accurately reflects different types of local risk
- Are publicly available and reflect consultation with local people
- Delivers our services within a balanced budget

Funding Comparison 2010-2020

Funding	2010/11 £M	2019/20	(Reduction) /Increase %	(Reduction) /Increase %
Central Funding	36.770	24.140	(12.630)	(34.3)
Council Tax	22.972	25.122	2.150	9.4
Total	59.742	49.262	(10.480)	(17.54)

Duty Systems

Whole time Duty System

- One appliance immediately available 24/7. Staffing is typically 28 personnel

Close Proximity Crewing (CPC)

- One appliance immediately available. The station crewing changed from 28 personnel to 14 personnel. Savings circa £400,000 per station per year

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 21/03/17

Day Staffing

- Two appliance station crewing changed from 48 to 40. One appliance is immediately available 24/7; the second is immediately available during the day and available during the night on a retained basis. Savings circa £300k per station per year

Retained Duty System

- Staff are at home or at their place of work and called in to crew the appliance as and when required. Response times typically 5-15 minutes

Our funding context

Since 2010 funding cuts mean we have already:

- Reduced management costs by cutting executive team and senior manager numbers
- Carried out two reviews of support services, reducing staff costs to protect frontline services
- Reviewed non-pay spending across the service to become more efficient
- Removed second appliances at three full time fire stations (Elm Lane, Darnall and Mansfield Road)
- Replaced Mosborough, Mansfield Road and Darnall fire stations with new ones at Birley Moor and Parkway
- Removed the 'retained' appliance at Edlington
- Closed Royston fire station
- Disbanded the Technical Rescue Unit

Our change journey so far

Other changes to the way we work include:-

- Launched schemes at Rossington, Stocksbridge and Dearne fire stations which mean firefighters attend some types of medical emergencies
- Introduced smaller response vehicles (Small Incident Units) at Cudworth and Birley Moor
- Provided four new fire engines (Heavy Rescue Pumps) to give us enhanced capability at specialist incidents
- Introducing a different crewing system at four fire stations, reducing costs with minimal impact on our immediate 999 response from those stations
- Made the second appliances at Barnsley and Rotherham fire stations day staffing

IRMP 2013-17

Approved by the FRA in 2012, the last remaining commitments not yet implemented are:-

- The aerial vehicle at Doncaster will become retained in 2019. Currently it is switch crewed
- The second appliance at Doncaster will become day staffed, night time retained in 2019

## IRMP 2017-20

### Key Principles

- To deliver an equitable service to the people of South Yorkshire
- To have five firefighters on the first available fire appliance all of the time by managing leave in a different way
  - It is the best way of providing our service to the people of South Yorkshire
  - It is the safest way of working for our firefighters
- To keep the same number of fire stations and fire engines. Other than the changes already outlined, we are not proposing any further significant changes to our core 999 services
- To change our prevention work to ensure we are making the biggest difference to those most at risk
- To proactively explore collaboration opportunities with blue light services as the new statutory duty now makes it a requirement for us to do

### What are we proposing?

#### Emergency response

- Have five firefighters on the first available fire appliance all of the time by managing leave in a different way
- Make the second appliance at Central day staffing, night time retained but with a commitment to keep it as a wholetime if our funding allows
- Add two additional second appliances (day staff, night time retained) at stations in South Yorkshire. This meets the Government's requirement for greater use of retained firefighters
- Rebuild Barnsley fire station with consideration for the opportunities this may provide to enhance our community safety work
- Diversify our workforce by recruiting firefighters to maintain our resources in line with our retirement profile

#### Making people safer

- Change our Home Safety Checks Service so that it is only offered for free to those we know are most at risk of fire
- Expand the delivery of Safe and Well checks across the county so that our work to 'make South Yorkshire safer' extends to more than preventing fires
- Greater use of third sector organisations to deliver prevention work on our behalf either through referral partners or charities
- Expanding our intervention work with young people by extending our Princes Trust Team Programme to the whole of South Yorkshire
- Bolder advocacy of sprinklers in high risk homes to protect the most vulnerable from fire

#### Collaboration

- Proactively exploring opportunities for collaboration is now a legal duty for us and will extend to all areas of the organisation



REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 21/03/17

- The LIFE team is a good example of where we are already working with 999 partners and our vision is for that team to extend to the rest of the county
- Shared physical assets, such as joint police and fire station in Maltby, will now be considered at every opportunity
- Other opportunities will include joint delivery of community safety work and opportunities which may exist within support services

Timeline and consultation

- Our draft plans were presented to Fire Authority members in February who instructed us to begin formal consultation on their contents
- We are currently in a formal consultation period on the draft plans which ends on 27<sup>th</sup> March
- The feedback from public is being analysed and a final plan will be presented to Fire Authority members in April for their formal approval

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

- The Service had seen a £10m budget reduction since 2010/11. Every year since the austerity measures there had been a reduction in fire fatalities until last year. The Government had now fixed the funding for three years
- An impact assessment had been carried out on the time difference between the first and second appliance attending an incident (21 seconds)
- First appliance attendance times were measured and getting better at hitting the target time on a more regular basis
- The Service worked with the Yorkshire Ambulance Service who provided the clinical governance and training at their cost. Every call the Service attended was charged to the Ambulance Service
- The Service worked across borders and had had no problem with attendance time but the First Responder Scheme tended to operate within its own station. It was only mobilised where it could make a difference e.g. heart attacks
- Consultation on the 2017-20 IRMP had taken the form of writing to all partners, local newspapers, social media and public events. The current IRMP was consulted upon in 2012/13 which had contained proposals to change the way fire appliances were crewed, attendance times and standards. There had been similar consultation/feedback on both IRMPs

- The Community Safety Team attended the four Dementia Cafes which were held on a monthly basis. A request could be made for the attendance of a Fire Community Safety Officer to any community event
- The aim of the second appliance becoming day crewed in addition to the two additional pumps during the day was to provide more capacity during the day to enable more prevention work to be carried out
- The national standard of fire cover had been removed by Government some time ago. Currently South Yorkshire had four firefighters on an appliance but working towards five. It was hoped to have the new system in place by January 2018 of less appliances but more firefighters
- Statistics showed that fire deaths predominantly occurred during the day. Those at night tended to be worse because they took longer to discover. However, attendance times were generally quicker due to there being little traffic on the roads
- One hundred fire fighters were being recruited. Fire fighters under the pre-2015 pension scheme retired after thirty years services; after 2015 they retired after forty years' service
- In Rotherham, the previous week, four fire stations, five appliances and two shifts, in seven days had been called out fifty-five times. The Rotherham fire station had turned out thirty-one incidents across seven days and two shifts – eighteen during the day and thirteen at night

Councillor Atkin thanked Jamie and Martin for their presentation and Members for their attendance.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
18th April, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Hoddinott (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Allen, Andrews, Atkin, Beaumont, Bird, Buckley, Clark, Cooksey, Cowles, Cusworth, Cutts, Cutts, Elliott, Jarvis, Jepson, Jones, McNeely, Mallinder, Napper, Read, Sheppard, Simpson, Steele, Taylor, John Turner, Vjestica, Walsh, Williams and Wyatt.

**ENFORCEMENT**

Councillor Hoddinott, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety and Chairman, welcomed Karen Hanson, Assistant Director for Community Safety and Streetscene, and Lewis Coates, Head of Enforcement, who gave a brief overview of the services within Regeneration and Environment, and the functions within Community Safety and Streetscene.

It was, therefore, noted that this seminar would provide a whistle stop tour and bring together the enforcement functions of the Council, highlight what the Council could do, the powers afforded and who to contact.

With the aid of powerpoint and several photographs the presentation highlighted:-

- Regeneration and Environment – legislative compliance and visible and invisible enforcement.
- Enforcement teams.
- Statutory nuisances and prejudice to health including noise, waste, dog faeces, fly posting and littering.
- Private sector housing enforcement – health and safety concerns.
- Public health concerns relating to filth and verminous, courtyards and passageways and pest control.
- Public health concerns relating to air quality and vehicle pollutants, industrial pollutants, contaminated land and closed landfill.
- Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and the Policing Act, 2014.
- Business regulation including food hygiene and safety, infectious diseases, unfit food and health and safety, Trading Standards and animal health.
- Planning enforcement under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- Parking enforcement including Blue Badge fraud and Penalty Charge Notices.
- Strengthening enforcement.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- Enforcement rules around parking on grass verges, roads and pavements.

- Noise nuisance associated with barking dogs.
- Disposal of noise making equipment and whether this could be donated to charitable organisations.
- Illegal parking on double yellow lines and regular hot spot areas.
- Proposed service station at junction 33 of the M1 and levels of pollution.
- Pest control and current services both chargeable and non-chargeable.
- Perception of fly tipping numbers increase and strategy for combatting the blight in rural locations.
- Increases in fly posting and separating the legitimate from those erected illegally.
- Responsibility on landowners for removal of waste dumped on private land.

The Chair thanked Members for their attendance, officers for their informative presentation and welcomed any further suggestions for future seminars.

Details of the fixed penalty pilot along with pest control services was also to be circulated to all Members and any specific hotspot area details within wards forwarded on.

**APPEAL PANEL  
25th April, 2017**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and McNeely.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**APPEAL - D1/04/17 - ADULT CARE AND HOUSING**

The Panel considered the appeal by D1/04/17 against his earlier dismissal. He was represented at the hearing.

The Panel confirmed the finding of the disciplinary hearing and rejected the appeal against dismissal.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**  
**16th December, 2016**

**Present:-**

**Barnsley MBC**

Councillor D. Griffin

**Doncaster MBC**

Councillor J. Healy

Councillor C. McGuinness

**Rotherham MBC**

Councillor S. Sansome (in the Chair)

**Sheffield CC**

Councillor J. Drayton

Councillor J. Otten

**Co-opted Members**

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. S. Chu

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B. Cutts (Rotherham MBC), R. Frost (Barnsley MBC), T. Hussain and M. Rooney (Sheffield CC).

**F32. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2016**

The Chair reported that Councillor Brian Cutts (Rotherham MBC) had written to indicate that he did not consider the minutes to be accurate in respect of his statement under Minute F27 and wished for the minutes to be amended to record that he had observed every protest march in Rotherham, rather than attended. The Chair indicated that he had watched the webcast of the previous meeting, where Councillor Cutts had indicated that he had attended every protest march in Rotherham, and could not recommend that the proposed amendment be incorporated within the minutes.

**Resolved:-**

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 28 October 2016 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 16/12/16

**F33. TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE PRESS AND PUBLIC SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF ANY PART OF THE AGENDA.**

The Chair indicated that there were no items for consideration on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

**F34. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEM WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.**

The Chair indicated that there were no items requiring the urgent consideration of the Panel.

**F35. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE PANEL**

It was reported that no public questions had been received.

**F36. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL TO THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER**

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11 (General Questions from Members of the Panel), the following questions were put with responses from the Police and Crime Commissioner:

Mr Alan Carter put the following question:

*“Is the PCC sufficiently concerned about the issue of human trafficking and modern day slavery to use his influence to ensure that access to adequate funding may be prioritised to ensure that there are resources sufficient to enable the South Yorkshire Police and their various partners to be able to comprehensively address this apparently growing problem in our communities?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery is a growing area of concern and all forces in the UK recognise that. I am meeting with the non-governmental organisation (NGO) and Force lead on the 16 December to discuss a multi-agency partnership. At that meeting I want to discuss the deliverables one might reasonably expect from such a partnership including, but not limited to, the development of a Countywide Partnership Strategy.

In addition to which I have provided some funding to a NGO to provide training to partner agencies first responders - for example housing officers or similar. The training will be free to access and will in the first instance address some of the knowledge gaps we are aware exist in terms of spotting the signs, understanding responsibilities around and reporting mechanisms for victims of modern slavery.

You are right to say that this is a multi-agency issue and responsibility and I welcome this opportunity to further raise the profile of this heinous crime.”

Mr Alan Carter had also given notice of a second question:

*“As Police and Crime Commissioner, would you please advise the Police and Crime Panel on your personal involvement in and influence to date upon the releasing and directing for community benefit of assets seized or recovered from criminals’ ill-gotten gains, pursuant to the provisions of The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002? In particular, could you report upon the extent to which money returned to the public purse from this source assists in aiding good community causes and engaging ex-offenders in activities to benefit the wider community in South Yorkshire?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (“POCA”) sets out the legislative scheme for the recovery of criminal assets with criminal confiscation being the most commonly used power. Confiscation occurs after a conviction has taken place. Other means of recovering the proceeds of crime which do not require a conviction are provided for in the Act, namely civil recovery, cash seizure and taxation powers.

If associated with a criminal investigation / prosecution and conviction this is regarded as an asset in the confiscation process for which the police receive only 18.5% back from the incentivisation fund. In cases of cash seizure, detention or forfeiture the police receive 50% of the amount back through the incentivisation fund.

It is complex and difficult to obtain funds through the Proceeds of Crime Act and can take 5 – 6 years to come through. Because of these complexities we do not rely on POCA money to fund any particular activities because it is not a stable or consistent funding source.”

In response, Mr Alan Carter indicated that communities in West Yorkshire were benefiting from funding from a Proceeds of Crime Fund and enquired whether any monies coming into South Yorkshire were being used for the benefit of local communities.

The Police and Crime Commissioner answered that it was unlikely that the funds being distributed were from the proceeds of organised crime, but rather that the local PCC had given a pot of money the name “Proceeds of Crime Fund”. He committed to look further into the issue. .

Councillor Joe Otten asked the following question:

*“Who do you understand to be ultimately responsible for taking the decision to go ahead with the 17th November police and Amey operation on Rustlings Road, Sheffield, to fell trees in the early hours?”*



POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 16/12/16

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“The decision to go ahead with the 17 November operation on Rustlings Road was a matter for Sheffield City Council. As I understand it, this was part of a larger contract to resurface roads and make good pavements that included the felling of some older trees whose roots were affecting street maintenance. If memory serves me correctly, this policy was welcomed by all parties on Sheffield City Council at the time. They wanted a coherent plan to tackle the city’s potholes and put the streets and pavements into better order so as to minimise future costs in a time of austerity. The Councillor might like to ask the city council how many claims there were for tripping over poorly maintained pavements in the past few years.”

Councillor Joe Otten asked a second question:

*“It has been claimed that decision for the early start to tree felling was “on police advice”. Is this correct and what was that advice?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“It would not be the role of the police to tell the local council when to undertake its work, but it would be its role to give an assessment of what the impact might be.”

Councillor Joe Otten asked a third question:

*“It has been claimed that a vehicle containing police dogs was on Rustlings Road for a time on the 17th November. Can you confirm or deny this?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“No police dogs were requested, utilised or present during the tree felling exercise on Rustlings Road.”

Councillor Joe Otten submitted a fourth question:

*“A council's powers to close roads and tow vehicles are limited by regulations requiring notification and signage intended to prevent a premeditated ambush of parked cars such as we saw. What are the consequences of police assistance in this aspect of the operation should it be shown to be unlawful?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

The road closures as outlined above are the responsibility of the Local Authority. The police only have powers to close in respect of emergencies. Whilst the Local Authority need to secure the road closure orders only the police can enforce them if required.

In respect of the operation on the 17<sup>th</sup>, the police were advised by the Local Authority that road closure orders were in place and would accept this as being the case. Even if it was subsequently discovered that these were not in place or were not lawfully obtained, the fact that the police acted in good faith would negate any liability for the police for any actions taken. The police did not have any involvement in obtaining authorisation for the road closures for the 17<sup>th</sup> and the removal of vehicles were arranged and undertaken by council contractors.

To speak about 'a premeditated ambush' is not helpful and seems designed to heighten emotions in a quite gratuitous fashion. This emotive language was also employed by the MP for Hallam, Nick Clegg, when he spoke about people being 'dragged from their beds' by the police. This undermines trust in the police service and I hope he will think twice before uttering such nonsense in the future."

Councillor Joe Otten asked a fifth question:

*"What changes have been or will be made to SYP policy in regards to tree protests as a result of these events?"*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

"I have asked the Chief Constable to keep me informed of any operations that might see a repetition of what happened on Rustlings Road and also to ensure, as far as possible, that officers are not drawn into carrying out any activity that properly is a matter for the city council and the contractors – such as knocking on doors to ask people to move their cars."

As a supplementary question, Councillor Otten enquired whether police dogs were held in reserve. The Police and Crime Commissioner responded to indicate that the information given to him stated that there were no police dogs in the vicinity.

Councillor Joe Otten asked a sixth question:

*"What was the cost (not additional cost, but actual cost of police time etc as normally accounted for) of the police operation on Rustlings Rd on the 17th November?"*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

"The resources deployed were all in duty time and no additional costs were incurred. Total staffing time was 72 hours. At £15.47 per hour (mid-level constable rate) this was £1,113.84."

As a supplementary question, Councillor Otten enquired whether the Commissioner would confirm that the figure of twelve officers was correct. In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated that he could only tell Councillor Otten what he had been told by the force.

## POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 16/12/16

Councillor Joe Otten asked a seventh question:

*“Do South Yorkshire Police intend to run a 'close pass' initiative to improve the safety of cyclists, similar to the one that West Midlands Police and other forces are now doing?”*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“I am aware of this scheme and only a couple of weeks ago, the Assistant PCC, Sioned-Mair Richards attended a meeting with representatives of Sheffield Cycle groups as well as the city council about this.

Key roads are targeted and police cyclists ride the road. If someone drives too close to them then colleagues, including someone from the local authority waiting ahead are notified and the offending vehicle is stopped and either prosecuted or given education input. A similar scheme is run in Humberside - Operation Achilles applies the same principles except for motorbikes. The educational input is delivered by a local authority representative using an educational mat. The cost of this mat is approximately £900.

Chief Inspector Glen Suttwood has provided me with the statistics from the Safer Roads Partnership concerning collisions involving cyclists in South Yorkshire:-

	CRA SH	CJ U	CJ U
PEDAL CYCLE	<u>2016</u>	<u>20</u> <u>15</u>	<u>20</u> <u>14</u>
FATAL	1	1	1
SERIOUS	52	45	56
SLIGHT	200	25 8	27 5

Clearly one death per year is one too many, however, deaths involving cyclists in South Yorkshire are no where near the levels that they are in the West Midlands or other parts of the country. Whilst it is clear that the scheme has been well received in the West Midlands and is a good approach to tackling a key priority, this needs to be balanced against priorities that are Force specific. The main cohorts in relation to road deaths or serious injuries in South Yorkshire are centred on pedestrians and car users - drivers or passengers - where SYP have seen a continual rise over the past 2 years. That said, West Midlands Police are hosting a workshop in Birmingham on 13 January and officers from SYP are looking to attend.

In addition to this, given the challenging demand that the police service is currently facing as a result of austerity, resources are carefully deployed to target specific activity. I understand South Yorkshire Police are not aware of any specific location (s) that is prominent for pedal cyclist Road

Traffic Collisions. Neither, have any officers who are trained and equipped in the use of pedal cycles brought any concerns to the attention of Chief Inspector Suttwood.

Enforcement should probably be used as a last resort to improve road safety, the most sensible solution would be to look at addressing the root causes of the problem – one of which is the layout of the roads. By creating segregated or shared cycle/pedestrian routes, improving lighting, awareness and signage, cyclists can use the roads with the confidence that they are safe to do. Some of this is being progressed in the county already:-

#### Sheffield

- Next development at Meadowhall, segregated cycle route.
- The new Ikea is to have cycle routes and crossings to it, as is the upcoming Charter Square improvements.
- The Connect 2 route is a fairly recent cycle route between Halfway and Killamarsh mainly segregated from traffic.

#### Rotherham

- Centenary Way and Canklow roundabout have all recently been upgraded to cater for cyclists. A cycle route has been created on the Waverley development to a Highfield Springs.

#### Doncaster

- A number of crossings have been converted to Toucan crossings along with a new one on Leger Way to link the Bawtry Rd commuter route to town. Also a new cycle lane on Bennethorpe.

#### Barnsley

- A cycle to work route has been built to service the large Asos factory at Grimethorpe.
- Also a new route is being built currently from the Trans Pennine Trail at Pontefract Rd into the town centre.

Whilst naturally, all Force areas will see a decline in cyclists on the roads during the winter, I understand Chief Inspector Suttwood is discussing the prospect of delivering some educational workshops in schools for future drivers and cyclists with local LPTS during Spring 2017 following attendance at West Midlands Police's workshop."

Mr Steve Chu submitted the following question:

*"Does the Commissioner know whether South Yorkshire Police has received any reports of current or historic child sexual abuse connected to professional football clubs, or any other sports clubs? Is it appropriate to seek to review current child protection procedures at local sports clubs? If so, who should do this?"*

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“SYP has received 3 reports to date of sexual abuse relating to football clubs – all are historic (one from the 1960s and the other 2 from the 1980s), with only one relating to a professional club, the others are local non-professional clubs.

It would not be appropriate to share further details with the Panel at this time about the on-going investigations. The child protection procedures with sports clubs and other organised activities with children are a matter for the relevant Local Authority or the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board.”

Mr Steve Chu referred to his disappointment to learn through the media that the same question had been aired at the Public Accountability Board on 15 December 2016 and queried whether the Commissioner had used the Panel’s questions to inform discussion at that meeting or whether it was coincidental. In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that it was coincidental, but given the prominence of the subject in the national media in the past weeks it was an important issue to be discussed.

**F37. PCC'S GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

Consideration was given to a report detailing the interim governance arrangements of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The report set out the number and role of independent assurance panels that the Police and Crime Commissioner had established, as well as providing information on the role of the Public Accountability Board.

It was noted that the following bodies had been established:-

- Joint Independent Audit Committee – shared between South Yorkshire Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Independent Ethics Panel
- Independent Advisory Panel for Minority Communities
- Independent Policing Protests Advisory Panel
- Independent Custody Visitors

The Panel thanked the Police and Crime Commissioner for sharing the detail of his governance structure. Members raised concerns in respect of the role of a number of the independent panels which they considered to be performing functions that should fall within the remit of the Police and Crime Panel. Having recently attended a national conference for Police and Crime Panels, Members referred to practice in other police force areas whereby Police and Crime Panels performed a more proactive and supportive role in the development of policy in respect of policing and community safety issues. Concern was expressed that the South

Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel had not been given the opportunity to undertake a similar role.

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner reiterated the statutory provisions in respect of his role in holding the Chief Constable and South Yorkshire Police to account, which he discharged through Public Accountability Board meetings. He also set out the statutory provisions in respect of the role of the Police and Crime Panel in holding him to account.

Discussions focused on the relationship between the Police and Crime Commissioner's governance structure and the role of the Police and Crime Panel. Members made clear their willingness to take on more work to support the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner as a "critical friend".

The Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that Panel Members would be welcome to attend meetings of the Public Accountability Board and he would be happy for officers to make arrangements for Panel Members to observe other panel meetings.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted.

**F38. HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE OF CONSTABULARY (HMIC) UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner which detailed Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) PEEL (Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy) inspection regime.

It was reported that it was the role of HMIC to independently assess police forces and policing across a wide range of policing activity. HMIC decides on the depth, frequency and areas to inspect based upon their judgement about what is in the public interest.

Section 55(5) of the 1996 Police Act requires Police and Crime Commissioners to prepare comments on any of HMIC's published reports that relate to their Force, and then publish these in the manner they see fit. Section 55(6) required Police and Crime Commissioners to send a copy of these comments to the Home Secretary.

Members noted that the Police Efficiency 2016 report was published on 3 November 2016. The inspection considered the extent to which the Force is efficient at keeping people safe and reducing crime. The three questions considered by HMIC were:

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 16/12/16**

1. How well does the Force understand the current and likely future demand?
2. How well does the Force use its resources to manage current demand?
3. How well is the Force planning for demand in the future?

South Yorkshire Police had been assessed as requiring improvement in respect of the efficiency with which it keeps people safe and reduces crime. The Panel noted the Chief Constable's response to the report.

The Effectiveness Inspection took place in South Yorkshire on 17 October 2016. This would seek to give a rating on how effective South Yorkshire Police are at keeping people safe and reducing crime, previously the Force were rated as requiring improvement. The Police Effectiveness Report will be published in Spring 2017.

It was noted that HMIC had published its rating for Leadership for South Yorkshire Police on 8 December 2016 which had indicated that improvement was required.

Panel Members reflected on the Peer Review undertaken earlier in the year following the suspension of the former Chief Constable. The Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that he considered the peer review process to have been more agile and insightful than the approach of HMIC and many of the issues identified by HMIC had long been identified by the Force and plans had been developed and were being implemented to address those issues.

Panel Members identified that reviewing performance was an area where they could add value and support the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Whilst Members did not wish to duplicate any existing performance monitoring activity, the Panel should seek assurances in respect of areas where issues had been identified and that measures were implemented to address underperformance.

The Panel reiterated its wish to see the proposals being developed by the Chief Constable in respect of reforming neighbourhood policing in South Yorkshire. The Police and Crime Commissioner acknowledged the significant contribution that local Councillors would have to make to support a new neighbourhood policing model, as part of the drive to strengthen trust and confidence in the police.

In response to a comment, the Police and Crime Commissioner set out his position in respect to the Police and Crime Bill's provisions to enhance collaboration between emergency services, specifically between Fire & Rescue and the Police. There was provision within the bill for the Police and Crime Commissioner to have a role within the Fire Service, but in South Yorkshire there was no intention to merge blue light services, but there would be a need for further collaboration in future.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That a report be submitted in February 2017 detailing trends and volumes in respect of contact through 999 emergency calls and 101 non-emergency calls.
3. That a report be submitted in February 2017 profiling the police staff numbers by rank, gaps in numbers, the retirement profile of the force and the strategy to backfill or boost those numbers in the future.

### **F39. BUDGET POSITION FOR 2016/17**

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner detailing the budgetary position for 2016-17.

It was reported that there was a reduction in funding for the 2016-17 financial year from Government amounting to approximately £1m compared to 2015/16. As part of the Finance Settlement for 2016/17, the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was given the flexibility to increase the council tax by 3.3%: this generated additional council tax income of £2.4m largely as a result of an increase in the council tax base.

The total level of revenue funding - including Government grant and council tax income - amounted to approximately £242m. The majority of that was allocated to the Chief Constable to finance Force running costs, including employee costs. In order to keep within the amount allocated and to meet the costs of demand and cost pressures, reductions of at least £6m were agreed as part of the budget process.

It was forecast that there would be an overall underspending of £4.2m in the current financial year. It was noted that a projected underspend of £2.7m sat within the Chief Constable's operating budget. It was reported that the Chief Constable had taken steps to reduce expenditure in the current financial year in order to have resources to carry forward for use in meeting expenditure in 2017/18. One of the largest single variations related to Police Staff costs where there was a projected £2m underspend due to vacancies and staff turnover.

The overall position included a spending variation in respect of the costs of Operation Stovewood: this would be conducted by the National Crime Agency into historic allegations of child sexual exploitation. When the budget was agreed it had been assumed that Special Grant funding would be received from Government and that this would involve the application of a "1% rule": the Home Office have in the past expected the Force to meet an amount equivalent to 1% of the budget with the Government



providing the balance. The actual Special Grant award for 2016/17 had put a ceiling of £1m on the costs met by the Force.

It was further reported that one of the assumptions underpinning the 2016/17 budget was that any further costs that may potentially arise from legacy issues would be largely met from special grant allocations from Government. The nature and extent of any liability that may arise and the degree to which it should be set against the 2016/17 budget, had yet to be finalised.

Panel Members sought assurance in respect of the reserves strategy for the Force and noted that the forecast underspend would be used to supplement reserves. General reserves were recommended to be set around a minimum of £12m.

Recognising the difficult decisions that lay ahead, the Panel indicated that it would be willing to informally engage with the Police and Crime Commissioner to discuss the detail behind proposals for setting the budget. Panel Members indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to monitor the financial position throughout the year and to enter into a regular dialogue to better inform their scrutiny of precept proposals on an annual basis.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that the Government had not offered a four year financial settlement the police, unlike that available to local authorities. The PCC also referred to the various approaches made by South Yorkshire to the Government for special grants for legacy issues.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted.

#### **F40. HOME OFFICE GUIDANCE - SCRUTINY OF PRECEPTS**

Further to the previous report in respect of the financial position of South Yorkshire Police, consideration was given to the Home Office's guidance in respect of the Panel's role in scrutinising the precept proposal from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was noted that the Panel would be required to hold a meeting on a date between 1 February and 8 February 2017, having received notification of the Police and Commissioner's proposal.

Clarification was sought in respect of the provisions for the Panel to exercise a veto and recommend a higher increase in council tax, which would necessitate a local referendum on a proposed increase. As the guidance was not sufficiently clear, it was agreed that a response would be provided outside of the meeting.

It was suggested that it would be helpful for Panel Members to meet in advance of the formal precept proposal discussion and the Police and Crime Commissioner committed to do whatever possible to accommodate the Panel's wishes.

Resolved:-

1. That the guidance be noted.
2. That clarification be provided in respect of the veto process and any potential referendum requirement arising from a veto.
3. That an informal meeting between Panel Members and the Police and Crime Commissioner be arranged to informally discuss the budget and precept proposals ahead of a meeting in the first week of February 2017.

#### **F41. COMPLAINTS UPDATE**

Consideration was given to an update report in respect of complaints submitted by the host authority for the Police and Crime Panel.

The Panel recalled that it was reported to the last meeting of the Panel that the two complaints which had been received in respect of the previous Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had been referred to the Clerk to the Home Affairs Select Committee. The Panel were informed that the matters have now been referred to the Metropolitan Police, by the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC). After taking legal advice, the HASC concluded that the allegations referred to (deliberately misleading the Committee) would if proved constitute a criminal offence, which is contrary to the conclusion of the IPCC. The progress of the matter will be reported back to a future meeting of the Panel.

It was reported that a complaint had been received whereby the complainant was dissatisfied with how South Yorkshire Police (SYP) had dealt with his complaint. He appealed their decision to the IPCC who upheld SYP's decision. The complainant then wrote to the PCC. The initial complaint related to how a crime is recorded.

It was noted that the PCC was not responsible for complaints against officers and staff of SYP or for operational matters, these were the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner initially wrote to the complainant explaining that there was nothing further that the PCC could do to assist him in the matter, but the complainant was dissatisfied with that response, and as such submitted a complaint. It was noted that a review was carried out by the OPCC as to whether the correct policies and procedures had been followed. The outcome of this review and further information as to the recording of criminal offences had been provided to the complainant. It was reported

that confirmation from the complainant was awaited that this had satisfactorily concluded the matter.

Panel Members sought assurances that the Complaints Procedure that had been agreed earlier in the year had been implemented. It was reported that the new procedure, which involved the initial screening of complaints by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner with the two independent co-opted members of the Panel, had been implemented on 1 December 2016.

Panel Members indicated that they would wish to review the effectiveness of the procedure in the new municipal year.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Complaints Procedure be reviewed at the first meeting of the 2017-18 municipal year.

#### **F42. FUTURE ACTIVITY AND DATES OF MEETINGS**

Consideration was given to a report detailing the emerging work programme for the Police and Crime Panel and outlining prospective dates of meetings for the 2017-18 municipal year.

It was reported that Panel Members had held an informal work planning session on 18 November 2016 where the following had been identified:

- the Governance Arrangements of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- the financial position of South Yorkshire Police and the Office of the PCC
- the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Peer Review of South Yorkshire Police
- Scrutiny of the Police and Crime Plan

Other items on the agenda for the meeting had dealt with the first three items identified and it was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner had sought the views of Panel Members and other partners and the public in developing themes for the new Police and Crime Plan. It was noted that this would be brought to the Panel Meeting schedule for 24 February 2017.

The report set out a number of dates for meetings to take place in the 2017-18 municipal year and authority was sought to consult on those dates with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was noted that work in preparing a Memorandum of Understanding was underway with a view to submitting a draft to the meeting on 24 February 2017, following consultation with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Further to this, it was suggested that regular meetings be arranged between the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That Panel Members confirm with the host authority their availability for the proposed meeting dates in the 2017-18 municipal year.
3. That the host authority liaise with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to arrange dates for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel to meet with the PCC on a regular basis.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
7th February, 2017**

Present:-

**Barnsley MBC**

Councillor R. Frost

Councillor D. Griffin

**Rotherham MBC**

Councillor B. Cutts

Councillor S. Sansome

**Sheffield CC**

Councillor J. Drayton

Councillor J. Otten

Councillor M. Rooney

Councillor T. Hussain (in the Chair);

**Co-opted Members**

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. S. Chu

Apologies were received from Councillors J. Healy and C. McGuinness. (Doncaster MBC).

**Also in attendance:-**

Dr. A. Billings

Mr. A. Rainford

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner

Chief Finance Officer – Office of the Police and Crime  
Commissioner

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Mr. Alan Carter, Co-opted Member, declared a personal interest in Minute No. 51 on the grounds that it involved his membership on the Panel and left the room whilst the item was discussed.

**44. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEM WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY**

The Chair indicated that there were no items for consideration on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

**45. TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE PRESS AND PUBLIC SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF ANY PART OF THE AGENDA**

The Chair indicated that there were no items requiring the urgent consideration of the Panel.

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

It was reported that no public questions had been received.

**47. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL**

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11 (General Questions from Members of the Panel), the following question had been submitted and the response from the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

From Mr. Alan Carter:-

*"In common with the most urban areas throughout the country, South Yorkshire's local highway authorities are increasingly introducing 20 mph zones in our towns and cities as road safety measures, especially in residential areas and in the vicinity of schools.*

*20 mph zones are claimed to be self-enforcing due to traffic calming measures which are often introduced along with the change in the speed limit. Speed humps, chicanes, road narrowing, planting and other measures are typically used to both physically and visually reinforce the shared nature of the road.*

*These new lower limits are usually enforced through mobile (rather than fixed) speed cameras and, in some places, drivers already risk fines of £100 and three penalty points for exceeding the new limits.*

*Accepting that it is for local authorities to set speed limits, nevertheless it falls ultimately to the Police to decide how best to enforce them.*

*Given the reduction in Police manpower and the clear need for prioritisation of the operational use of available resources, where does the Commissioner stand on this issue of 20 mph speed limit enforcement?"*

Answer:-

People in many parts of South Yorkshire are anxious about speeding.

The growing use of 20 mph limits are decisions for the local authority rather than the Police. It is for them to decide in the end how effective they are. I would hope that the local authorities would work closely with the Police to ensure that where they are introduced there is a clear case.

The most effective means of reducing speed are, however, material measures such as speed humps and chicanes, not 20 mph speed limits.

Having said that, South Yorkshire Police will enforce speed limits whenever they are in a position to do so, given the pressures on resources. This may mean targeting some particular places where the public are most at risk – such as outside schools – and where drivers are wilfully or repeatedly ignoring them.

The ultimate aim of all policing activity is – as it says in the Police and Crime Plan – to keep the people of South Yorkshire safe.

In a supplementary question Mr. Carter asked if the inclusion of “outside care homes on main roads”, as well as outside schools, could be added where the Police were targeting particular places where the public were at significant risk.

The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed he would pass this onto South Yorkshire Police.

**48. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16 DECEMBER 2016**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2016.

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings, subject to a further paragraph relating to the letter from the Police and Crime Commissioner to Safeguarding Boards in relation to grants (wording to be confirmed).

**49. PROPOSED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2017-18**

In accordance with Paragraph 2 of Section 5 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 consideration was given to the report which set out details of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s proposed revenue budget and council tax for South Yorkshire for 2017/18.

The Police and Crime Commissioner reported that whilst the proposed council tax represented an increase of 10p per week for a Band D property, the majority of properties were in Band A which would see an increase per week of 6p if the proposed increase was agreed. Without increasing the council tax by the maximum amount allowed, any future requests made to the Home Office for special grant funding for the costs of legacy issues would not be counted. The potential impact of a reduction in funding (£1.7 m) would equate to the cost of reducing the workforce by 34 officers or 57 police staff.

This Budget was based on certain assumptions, but that it maintained current workforce numbers. The flat cash funding position and reduction of £2.5m in Government grant would be offset by an increase in the precept income.

In addition, following the peer review, a new force operating model would provide better strategic focus on demand so that an effective and efficient policing model could be resourced. This would need to be fully integrated to maximise impact for the public and staff and serve as the foundation for all future changes and prevent further risk to service delivery.

Attention was also drawn to saving proposals which had been identified to offset additional costs, including reductions in spending in 2016/17, proposed to be carried forward as contributions from reserves.

In terms of reserves the proposed budget for 2017/18 relied on a contribution from general reserves of £7.8m to achieve a balanced budget. Management of the 2016/17 budget had been to reduce spending so that reserves would be available at the end of the year and be carried forward for use in financing expenditure in 2017/18.

Consultation on the budget proposals had taken place both online and face to face with 93% and 77% respectively, from the two separate samples, being in favour. All comments received would be taken on board.

The Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer echoed the comments by the Police and Crime Commissioner and confirmed the grant settlement figures were now confirmed and if the inclusion of the council tax requirement was confirmed would represent an increase of approximately £0.3m (or 0.13% compared to 2016/17). Clarity was provided on the contributions from reserves, which provided for some development of the force operating model and the identification of savings for future years.

Panel Members sought clarification on a number of issues and were advised accordingly:-

- Without the increases to the precept workforce numbers would have to reduce. Value for money would be demonstrated through best practice and learning from the past, but this would continue to be closely monitored.
- Investments in new technology, buildings and equipment in the capital programme for 2017/18 included improvements to some station buildings and potentially some joint location collaboration between South Yorkshire Police and South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue. As requested further narratives on the capital programme would be provided in future reports where appropriate to do so.



## POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 07/02/17

- Whilst assumptions could only be made on the potential legacy issue costs, it would be unlikely that any underspend on funding could be used as part of the Police and Crime Plan. However, it was pointed out that whilst a collaborative judgement could be assumed the actual costs when realised could increase beyond any assumptions. Work on the workforce plan was a complex operation following the peer review, but work was taking place to ensure the force was capable and resourced to meet current and future demands.
- Use of savings to put into reserves, yet using approximately £4.1 m was an approach to manage the 2016/17 budget so that reserves would be available at the end of year and be carried forward for use in financing expenditure for 2017/18.
- Details on the Force strategy delivery plan for the operating model were still being consulted upon and work was taking place to develop a meaningful performance framework to underpin the plan.
- Public perception from removing Police buildings from use was taken into account, whether this building was used or not.
- Success of the recent prosecutions of individuals involved in child sexual exploitation and the need for continued transitional support for victims and survivors following convictions.
- Grant support to local organisations, which were to be maintained in the budget, which also included local Safeguarding Boards, who were historically responsible for dividing funds.
- Recognition for different modern crime policing roles rather than the traditional visible beat presence. Continuation of Operation Duckford concentrated on specific areas and executing warrants.
- Increases in public poverty for working and non-working families as a result of the Government's cuts to public spending and the shortfall pushed to be found locally.
- Contributions from reserves amounting to £11.5m, with a contribution from the general fund of £3.9m from underspends in 2016/17 to be carried forward to meet expenditure in 2017/18. This contribution of £3.9m would meet potential one-off severance costs associated with savings proposals of workforce replenishment. i.e. allowing higher paid staff to leave and recruiting new staff at a lower level. A provisional assessment suggested that further savings of around £3m would be required in 2018/19, which could change as a result of the delivery of savings assumed in 2017/18 and cumulatively savings of around £13m would be required over four years beyond 2017/18.

**Resolved:-** That the proposed annual increase in council tax for 2017/18 of £5 for a Band D property (a 3.26% increase) to £158.16 be approved.

**50. HOST AUTHORITY ARRANGEMENTS**

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update on the host authority arrangements for the Police and Crime Panel from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2017 onwards. Transitional support from Rotherham would continue beyond April, 2017, including the legal provision.

It was noted Rotherham became the host authority for the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel following the establishment of the Police and Crime Panels under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act. At the time that the Panel was established it was agreed that this arrangement would continue for four years. In that time, the Panel had undertaken significant work responding to local issues that have also attracted national attention.

The Leaders of the South Yorkshire Councils recently considered a proposal for the South Yorkshire Joint Governance Unit, located at Barnsley MBC, to assume responsibility as the host authority for the Police and Crime Panel. The paper presented to the Leaders reflected the significant work that the Panel has undertaken during the current municipal year and noted the aspirations of Members for a more proactive approach towards scrutiny of policing and community safety issues in South Yorkshire.

The Leaders agreed to the proposal for the South Yorkshire Governance Unit to assume responsibility for the administration and support of the Police and Crime Panel from 1st April, 2017.

Assurances were provided to the Panel that various matters relating to complaints, governance and the website would be addressed in the near future and resolved before and as part of the transitional arrangements.

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

**51. INDEPENDENT CO-OPTED MEMBER - TERM OF OFFICE**

In accordance with Schedule 6 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 consideration was given to the report which outlined how the Panel currently had two co-opted independent Members and invited the Panel to consider how it wished to proceed in respect of the upcoming vacancy when Mr. Alan Carter's term of office ceased in September, 2017.

The Panel considered the options available to them as set out in the submitted report and were in agreement that Mr. Carter should be invited to extend his term of office given his involvement and level of experience. However, further discussion should take place with Mr. Carter should he

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 07/02/17**

be in agreement with continuing as to his likely term of office up to a maximum of four years.

**Resolved:-** That the term of office for Mr. Alan Carter, independent co-opted member, be extended for a period of up to four years and that this be confirmed in due course.

(Mr. Alan Carter, Co-opted Member, declared a personal interest and left the room whilst the item was discussed)

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

**Resolved:-** That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel take place on Friday, 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 at 11.00 a.m.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**  
**24th February, 2017**

**Present:-**

**Barnsley MBC**

Councillor D. Griffin

**Doncaster MBC**

Councillor J. Healy

**Rotherham MBC**

Councillor B. Cutts

Councillor S. Sansome

**Sheffield CC**

Councillor T. Hussain (in the Chair)

Councillor M. Rooney

**Co-opted Members**

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. S. Chu

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R. Frost (Barnsley MBC), C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC), J. Drayton and J. Otten (Sheffield CC).

**Also in attendance:-**

Dr. A. Billings

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner

Mrs M. Buttery

Chief Executive – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner  
for South Yorkshire

**53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2017**

**Resolved:-**

That, subject to the inclusion of the attendance of the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire and Mr Allan Rainford (Chief Finance Officer to the PCC), the minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2017 be approved as a true and correct record.

**54. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - 24/02/17**

**55. TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE PRESS AND PUBLIC SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF ANY PART OF THE AGENDA**

The Chair indicated that there were no items for consideration on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

**56. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEM WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY**

The Chair indicated that there were no items requiring the urgent consideration of the Panel.

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

The Chair reported that no public questions had been submitted for the Panel.

**58. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL**

The Chair reported that no questions had been received from Panel Members for the Police and Crime Commissioner.

**59. SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2017/2021**

Consideration was given to a new draft of the Police and Crime Plan for the period from 2017-2021, which was presented by the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire.

It was reported that the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 made provision for the Commissioner to issue a new plan as soon as possible after elections, in consultation with the Chief Constable and any recommendations from the Police and Crime Panel, to respond to issues and priorities which could emerge during the life of the Plan.

The Commissioner reported that he had listened to the views of a wide range of stakeholders, including community groups, local authorities and the voluntary sector and had identified that all had shared a similar view around wishing to be safe and feel safe. There had been a consensus to retain the existing priorities for South Yorkshire:

- Protecting vulnerable people
- Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour
- Enabling fair treatment

The Commissioner indicated that there had been a recognition of the need to change emphasis in some of the outcomes in order to reflect new and evolving policing and crime demands, identified through consultation with the public and partners, as well as results from needs and threats assessments.

It was reported that the Commissioner had included seven requirements in the plan:

- For South Yorkshire Police to intervene earlier with vulnerable people to prevent them becoming repeat victims or victims of more harmful crime.
- For South Yorkshire Police to work alongside partners, other agencies and the community and voluntary sector to develop a plan showing how they will prevent and protect vulnerable people from further, more harmful crimes.
- For the public of South Yorkshire to be satisfied that their views and opinions on the policing of their local area have been listened to and considered by South Yorkshire Police and they understand the reasoning behind local policing decisions that are made in their community.
- For the public of South Yorkshire to have trust and confidence in the way they contact South Yorkshire Police and when they make contact to be satisfied that they will be listened to, taken seriously and kept informed throughout any investigation, including being told about the result of any action taken.
- For South Yorkshire Police to demonstrate how they will respond to regional and national policing requirements detailed by the Home Secretary in the Strategic Policing Requirement.
- For South Yorkshire Police to demonstrate effective prevention and action to tackle those areas of crime and anti-social behaviour listed in the Strategic Intelligence Assessment (SIA) that have been assessed as Very High Risk.
- To secure an efficient and effective use of resources on behalf of the public of South Yorkshire, ensuring value for money of policing services.

In presenting the Plan for comments by the Panel, the Commissioner reiterated his ambition to remove the silo working approach within South Yorkshire Police and establish a joined up approach to delivering of policing in the force area.

The Panel welcomed the overall presentation of the Plan and were particularly pleased with the style of language used, remarking on the presence of Plain English throughout the document. The priorities and requirements of the Commissioner were also endorsed by Panel Members and the view was expressed that it would be beneficial for the Panel to develop its understanding of the measures of success against the Commissioner's requirements, with a specific focus on how satisfaction and confidence will be measured.

In respect of the requirement to work alongside partners, the Panel referred to the potential for a more centralised approach in the delivery of local policing and the need to communicate and engage with local communities in the introduction of the new neighbourhood policing model. The Commissioner indicated that this was an area that could be looked at further and the language on page 23 of the Plan could be clarified. He reiterated that South Yorkshire Police was redesigning its approach to Neighbourhood Policing, which must involve and engage communities. The Commissioner added that he would urge councillors across the force area to become involved in the conversations developing the approach. It was suggested that the Commissioner could give more thought to how ward councillors across the Force Area could be used as an interface for engaging with local communities, for example, through surgeries or other local community events.

A specific query was raised by Councillor B. Cutts in respect of a meeting that had taken place in Rotherham earlier that morning concerning a forthcoming march by the English Defence League (EDL). Councillor Cutts expressed disappointment at the misinformation that had been provided by the Police, despite being pleased at the attempt at engagement between the Police and the Council. In response, the Commissioner indicated that he found it hard to believe that South Yorkshire Police had not communicated with Rotherham MBC, but reiterated that the main point was that, in advance of any protest march, it was important for the police to have a prior dialogue with the community and the local authority.

The Panel indicated that it would like to understand how the plan would translate into action and welcomed the Commissioner's suggestion to receive a paper on the thread between the Police and Crime Plan and the Force's operational plans.

With regard to organisations funded by the Commissioner, the Panel indicated that it would be of interest to understand which organisations had not been successful in their bids or requests for funding. Whilst recognising that this would not be appropriate for inclusion within the Police and Crime Plan, it was felt that it would be useful information for Panel Members to have sight of.

With reference to the opening of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, Panel Members commented that would be helpful to signpost readers to further information on this important resource.

On page 13 of the plan, the Panel indicated that it would support the inclusion of the words "hate crime" under the heading "Protecting Vulnerable People". Panel Members also noted the absence of narrative to support the requirement in respect of demonstrating effective prevention and action to tackle areas of crime listed in the Strategic Intelligence Assessment.

Panel Members also asserted their support for the Commissioner's intentions with regard to closer working with the Fire Authority in the context of the government's policy of collaboration and integration between Police and Fire Services.

In conclusion, the Panel thanked the Commissioners and his staff for preparing the Plan and fully responding to Members' queries. The Panel recommended that Chief Constable Watson be invited to a future meeting to elaborate further on the development of the Neighbourhood Policing Model.

**Resolved:**

1. That the Police and Crime Commissioner be advised of the Panel's support for the Police and Crime Plan 2017 – 2021.
2. That authority be delegated to the Panel's Support Officer to formally respond and convey the Members' comments to the Police and Crime Commissioner on behalf of the Panel.
3. That a report be submitted to a future meeting outlining how the Police and Crime Plan will align to the workforce plan of South Yorkshire Police.
4. That Chief Constable Watson be invited to attend a future meeting of the Panel to outline the developing approach to Neighbourhood Policing in South Yorkshire.

**60. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROCEDURE**

Consideration was given to a report which proposed an amendment to the Panel's Rules of Procedure to include a protocol in respect of the filming and recording of Panel meetings by the press or public.

It was reported that The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 had permitted entry to meetings of specified local government bodies for the purpose of reporting and to allow the results of reporting to be published or disseminated. As the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel was a joint committee of the constituent local authorities established under section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, it was covered by the regulations.

The report proposed the adoption of a protocol to give clear advice as to how filming practices which could be construed as disruptive to the purposes of the meeting, for example, audible commentary, moving around causing general disturbance and other potentially intrusive behaviour) could be avoided.



**Resolved:-**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Rules of Procedure be amended to incorporate a Protocol as an appendix to make provision for the filming and recording of Panel meetings by the press or public.

**BARNSELY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD**  
**27th January, 2017**

Present:- Councillor P. R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) (in the Chair); Councillor S. Allen (Rotherham MBC) and Councillor C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC), together with Mrs. L. Baxter, Mrs. K. Hanson and Mr. R. Flint (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC), Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC ) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC), Councillor B. Lodge (Sheffield City Council) and Mrs. G. Charters (Sheffield City Council).

**25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 2016**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 30th September, 2016.

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**27. BDR JOINT WASTE PROJECT - MANAGER'S REPORT**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham (BDR) Joint Waste Manager submitted a report which highlighted and updated the following issues relating to the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI), for the period September to December, 2016:-

- Governance;
- Internal Audit – a copy of the 2015/16 Internal Audit report was considered by the Joint Waste Board;
- Recycling and Diversion of Waste from Landfill;
- Complaints;
- Health and Safety;
- Events;
- the facilities at Ferrybridge and at Grange Lane, Barnsley;
- a summary of the BDR PFI Budget for 2016/17;

- training;
- South Yorkshire Waste Strategy – continuing preparation of the technical document for this strategy.

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

(2) That the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board shall ensure that the necessary action is taken in response to the recommendations included within the internal audit report 2015/16, as now submitted.

## **28. BDR JOINT WASTE PROJECT - CURRENT ISSUES**

Further to Minute No. 19 of the meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board held on 30th September, 2016, it was noted that an opinion had been received from the Environment Agency in relation to the issue of noise at the Bolton Road facility at Manvers.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

## **29. RISK REGISTER**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI risk status report (risk register) which had been maintained during the various stages of the joint waste project. The report stated that thirteen risks are registered, with none being added nor deleted since the last Joint Waste Board meeting held on 30th September, 2016. There had been one downward movement in 'current' risk score, since the September, 2016, meeting, in relation to the Environmental Impact risk, which was due to the mitigation measures used by the contractor relating to the issues of noise and flies affecting the Bolton Road site.

Discussion took place on aspects of the insurance risk.

Agreed:- (1) That the updated information on the risk status report, as now submitted, be received.

(2) That, currently, there are no risks to be added to, nor deleted from the BDR PFI risk register.

(3) That, within future reports, any movements should be accompanied by information about the explicit issue.

**30. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**31. AMEC SERVICE REVIEW - UPDATE**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham (BDR) Joint Waste Manager gave a comprehensive presentation about the Waste Service Review undertaken during 2016 by Consultants Amec Foster Wheeler.

Agreed:- (1) That the presentation about the Waste Service Review be received and its contents noted.

(2) That, arising from the Waste Service Review, a Memorandum of Understanding be drafted in accordance with the principles of the existing Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA.3), for consideration both at the next meeting and at subsequent meetings of the Joint Waste Board.

**32. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 17th March, 2017 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m. and an invitation be extended to the representatives of Sheffield City Council to attend this meeting.

(2) That the annual meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on a date to be arranged during June, 2017.

(3) That the next following meetings of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on dates to be arranged during September and December, 2017 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.