

## **ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION**

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

**Date:** Wednesday, 23rd May, 2018

**Time:** 2.00 p.m.

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

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 18)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 19 - 39)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 40 - 68)
4. Reports for Information (Pages 69 - 74)
5. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board (Pages 75 - 77)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION**  
**1st March, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Evans (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Ellis and Jarvis.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Keenan) and from Councillors Allcock, Bird, R. W. Elliott, Marriott, Rushforth, Sansome, Short, Whysall, Williams and Wilson.

There was no webcasting of this inquorate meeting.

**70.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ellis declared a personal interest in Minute No. 75 (Improving Access to General Practice) as a registered patient at one of the GP surgeries listed within the submitted report. Having declared that interest, Councillor Ellis remained in the meeting and participated in the discussion on that item.

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

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

**72.       COMMUNICATIONS**

The following matters were discussed:-

(1) Visit to Carnson House – Members of the Health Select Commission had made a very informative visit to this drug and alcohol recovery service on Wednesday, 14th February, 2018.

(2) Health Select Commission Work Programme 2018/19 – Members were requested to inform the Chair of any items they wished to be considered for inclusion in this Select Commission's work programme for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

**73.       MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 18TH JANUARY, 2018**

Consideration of this item was deferred until the next meeting.

**74.       CARERS STRATEGY UPDATE**

In accordance with Minute No. 50(5), Jo Hinchliffe, Change Leader for Adult Social Care, presented a progress report on the implementation of the Carer's Strategy delivery plan including response to the five recommendations made at the 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2017, meeting of the Select Commission. Further information was provided by Sean Hill (RMBC Children and Young People's Services) and Kevin Hynes (Barnardo's).

The original delivery plan had been co-produced with input from a range of carer organisations containing 21 tasks all clearly mapped through to the Carers Strategy Outcomes. Many of the actions had not had an owner or timescale for completion. In consultation with partners, it was felt that the original plan content was still relevant but the timescales should be refreshed and streamlined with clear action owners allowing better oversight and outcomes for carers.

The refreshed plan was more thematic with the following areas agreed:-

1. Carers Support
2. Young Carers
3. Unknown Carers
4. Publicity and Promotion
5. Training Offer
6. Quality Assurance

It was anticipated that the period September to December, 2018 would allow the Strategy Group to monitor the impact/difference made and allow for discussions to take place in relation to any new pieces of development work that may need to be captured in a workbook refresh

The report stated that an excel workbook had been devised, entitled "Caring Together Revised Action Plan January 2018". This workbook captured the themes and tasks from the original plan for the carers strategy.

Members noted that a full presentation of the Caring Together Strategy and the workbook should have taken place later on 1st March, 2018 at the Young Carers Council Meeting. However, that meeting was ultimately postponed because of the inclement weather conditions.

The Health Select Commission debated the following matters:-

: the imminent review of the terms of reference of the Carers' Strategy Delivery Group, including the possibility of a representative of the Rotherham hospital;

: ensuring that the 'red-amber-green' performance rating system is applied to the measurement of progress with the carers' strategy delivery plan and recommendations, with additional columns in the workbook showing when actions commenced and clear evidence showing completed actions as well as those in progress;

: the availability and effectiveness of the 'bite size' training for carers (further details of the training offer will be made available for Members of this Select Commission);

: ways of ensuring that the GP surgeries maintain up-to-date registers of carers;

: discussions with schools about young carers who are school pupils and whose caring responsibilities might impact upon school attendance or lead to exclusions; the possible introduction of a memorandum of understanding in respect of young carers;

: the forthcoming discussions between the Council and the voluntary and community sector consortium about a potential bid for funding to increase educational attainment for Looked After Children and young carers;

: alternative ways of monitoring the experiences of young carers; and capturing data on young carers for actions YC7 and YC8 in the delivery plan; initially, there would be sampling with known young carers; this linked to developing the Quality Assurance Framework and establishing baseline data, also using data from the Early Help Service, Barnardo's and the Lifestyle Survey questions for young carers;

: the need for continuing scrutiny of the implementation of the carers' strategy delivery plan and recommendations, as well as the procurement of services from external agencies (eg: Barnardo's).

Recommended:- (1) That the report and presentation be received and their contents noted.

(2) That the refreshed carers' strategy delivery plan and progress with the implementation of the recommendations since November 2017 be endorsed.

(3) That the additional information suggested by Members of this Select Commission be included in the "Caring Together Revised Action Plan January 2018" workbook.

(4) That a further progress report on the implementation of the carers' strategy be submitted to a meeting of the Health Select Commission during the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

## **75. IMPROVING ACCESS TO GENERAL PRACTICE**

Further to Minute No. 80 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 2nd March, 2017, Jacqui Tuffnell (Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group) gave the following presentation on improving access to General Practice (doctors):-

**We said:**

**We would introduce telehealth across Rotherham – We have:**

- Implemented Memory Jogger (Mjog) across Rotherham practices
- Small number were using to enable patients to report results
- 30 practices were using to message patients e.g. flu campaign appointment reminders
- 1,400 appointments per month were released back from patients advising they are no longer attending and these were available for booking within fifteen minutes.

**We said:**

**Access would be a significant element of our Quality Contract – We have:**

- Access improvement was a significant element of our quality contract and a requirement of all 31 practices from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017. Spot checks had confirmed compliance as per self-declaration to date
- Now implemented 3 weekend hubs for extended access:  
Dinnington – Saturdays  
Broom Lane – Saturday, Sundays and 6.30-8.00 p.m. Monday-Fridays  
From July, 2018 the CCG would be funded for providing extended access
- Utilisation was improving

**We will:**

- Increase the extended hours offer to meet demand on Monday-Fridays
- Implement nurse appointments
- Implement e-consultation
- Implement NHS 111 online
- Implement an “App” for patients that could ultimately lead to a telephone consultation or face-to-face appointment
- Implement a capacity and demand tool when NHSE make it available

**We have:**

- Patient online numbers have significantly improved over the last year. The CCG and NHS England were working with practices who were struggling with their uptake of patient online
- We continue to look at ways of raising the profile of the availability by workshops to support new users
- Facilitated all practices to undertake the productive general practice programme
- Facilitated additional resilience monies to 10 practices
- Facilitated the creation of a GP Federation – Connecthealthcare Rotherham – including medical and nursing leadership
- We have funded the Federation to recruit 11 HCA Apprentices for practices to increase this workforce
- We have funded nurse training and development, nurse educator roles and development roles from other sectors into primary care

- Provided funding for locality based workforce
- Commenced work with Rotherham Foundation Trust on joint roles for Associate Physicians and Associate Nurses
- Implemented care navigation into 18 practices
- 6 services patients could be referred to without needing to see a GP:
  - Physiotherapy
  - Pharmacy
  - Smoking Cessation
  - Maternity
  - IAPT (Improving Access to Psychological Therapies)
  - Sexual health
- We were working to develop the following services for care navigation:
  - Audiology
  - Single point of contact – RMBC
  - Minor eye conditions

### **Annual Patient Survey**

- Overall experience of GP
  - Rotherham CCG score of 86% (good/very good) compared to national average of 85%. This was in line with the past 4 years
- Ease of getting through on the phone
  - 69% rated this easy or very easy and was in line with national figures and previous years. Across Rotherham there was huge variation – Wickersley (29%) was considerably lower than other practices. Other outliers were Treeton, Blyth Road, High Street, Dinnington, Brinsworth, who had all taken steps to improve their telephony. Magna achieved 96% with Broom Valley, Village and Brookfield as close comparators
- Helpful receptionists
  - RCCG score was 86%. This was in line with the national average and previous years
- Getting an appointment
  - RCCG score was 86% the same as previous years and the national average. At 97% Mage Group was a high outlier. The lowest rate was 69% (Wickersley) with Greasbrough another low outlier
- Appointment convenience
  - RCCG score was 92% the same as the previous year and national average. Variation in Rotherham was low; there were 3 low outliers at around 83% (Parkgate, Wickersley, Broom Lane). Magna achieved 100%
- What patients did when unable to get an appointment/offered an inconvenient appointment
  - All local paths were very similar to national data. Over 1/3 of people went to the appointment offered, 4% weren't to A&E, 2% saw a pharmacist, however, almost 1/3 (27%) did not see or speak to anyone or thought they might contact the surgery later
- Overall experience of making an appointment
-

- RCCG score was 71% the same as the previous 2 years and just under the national average of 73%
- Waiting times in surgery  
RCCG score was 61% similar to previous years and slightly higher than the national average of 58%
- Satisfaction with opening hours  
RCCG score was 76% the same as previous year and national average

The following issues were highlighted during discussion:-

: 1.5 million appointments per year in GP practices in the Rotherham Borough area;

: quality standards, eg: same-day appointments for medical emergencies and routine appointments with a GP within five days of the patient making the request;

: the availability of GP surgeries at weekends, for all patients (the locations of these surgeries are Broom Lane, Dinnington and Kimberworth);

: the planned extension of the availability of GP surgeries in the evenings (Monday to Friday);

: the 'intelligent appointment' system being piloted in Birmingham;

: the possible use of other modern systems (eg: Facetime) for patients' medical appointments;

: the skills mix changes in general practice and the focus on care closer to home;

: the success of care navigators in freeing-up GP time – 39 hours per week;

: the recruitment of apprentices and associate nurses into Health care roles and the possible use of associate physicians, a system which has operated for many years in the USA;

: pressure on specific GP practices (eg: Clifton; Wickersley);

: the reliability of surveys of patients because of the apparent reluctance of some patients to be critical of GP surgeries and services;

: the re-modelling of the Integrated Wellness Service (including the 'quit smoking' initiative) with effect from April 2018 and ensuring that there are no gaps in service provision;

: through MJOG, 100,000 messages had been sent, although letters were still used as there was patient choice for preferred means of communication

: 78% of Rotherham people had the use of smartphones and apps;

: it was hoped to see the impact of the continuing improvements reflected in future annual patients' survey results.

Recommended:- (1) That the report and presentation be received and their contents noted.

(2) That every endeavour should be made to increase the amount of information and publicity made available to the general public about the opening of certain GP surgeries in the Rotherham Borough area on Saturdays and Sundays.

(3) That, in order to make best use of modern technology and means of communication, the GP practices be encouraged to have discussions with RMBC Library and Information Services about the possible benefits of the technology being used by the Council for customer services also being available for patients of GP surgeries.

(Councillor Ellis declared a personal interest in the above as a registered patient at one of the GP surgeries listed within the submitted report. Having declared that interest, Councillor Ellis remained in the meeting and participated in the discussion on this item)

**76. URGENT AND EMERGENCY CARE CENTRE UPDATE**

Consideration of this item was deferred until the next meeting.

**77. 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 held on 29th January, 2018 were:-

(a) the Terms of Reference had been refreshed and the name of the committee amended to be the South Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Wakefield Joint Health Scrutiny Committee; questions from the public would also now be a standard agenda item at each meeting.



(b) as new NHS work streams and potential service reconfigurations emerged, the JHOSC would determine whether it was appropriate for the committee jointly to scrutinise the proposals under development; this would be based on the scope, time-frames and geographical footprint that could be affected by potential changes; each local authority reserved the right to consider issues at a local level.

(c) Implementation plans were progressing on the changes to children's surgery and anaesthesia - detailed work to agree the clinical pathways through the Managed Clinical Network and a series of designation visits to the hospitals; the expected implementation was in quarter one of 2018-19.

(d) The JHOSC also received a re-cap of the information that had informed the decision on Hyper Acute Stroke Units; an update on the Hospital Services Review; and a request from NHS partners that the JHOSC would convene to scrutinise the Hospital Services Review.

Recommended:- That the information be noted.

**78. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

The Healthwatch Rotherham representative had been unable to attend this meeting and had contacted the Chair to say that there were no issues to raise.

**79. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Health Select Commission is scheduled to be held on Thursday, 12th April, 2018, commencing at 10.00 a.m.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION**  
**Thursday, 12th April, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Evans (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bird, R. Elliott, Ellis, Jarvis, Short, Whysall and Williams.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, and Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, were in attendance at the invitation of the Chair.

Councillor John Turner was in attendance as a member of the public.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allcock, Marriott, Rushforth and Robert Parkin (Rotherham SpeakUp).

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

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

**82. COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chair reminded Select Commission Members that the deadline for comments on the Rotherham Clinical Commission's Commissioning Plan was 12<sup>th</sup> April.

Terri Roche, Director of Public Health, drew attention to an email Members would be receiving regarding a free conference to be held on 24<sup>th</sup> May, 2018, in Leeds organised through Minding the Gap which would discuss poverty and debt. Places would be limited so if any Members were interested they should respond promptly.

**83. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 18TH JANUARY 2018 AND ON 1ST MARCH, 2018**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 18<sup>th</sup> January and the inquorate meeting held on 1st March, 2018. Members noted that:-

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 18<sup>th</sup> January, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

(2) That the recommendations contained within the minutes of the inquorate meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2018, be approved.

Arising from Minute No. 64 (Integrated Locality Evaluation), it was noted that the final report on the evaluation of the Health Village was now available and would be circulated to Members. The working group established to consider the final report would meet on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2018.

Arising from Minute No. 65 (Adult Social Care – Outcome Framework), it was noted that future reporting of the Adult Social Care Outcome Framework would be discussed as part of the 2018/19 work programming.

#### **84. URGENT AND EMERGENCY CARE CENTRE UPDATE**

George Briggs, The Rotherham Foundation Trust, presented the following powerpoint presentation on the Urgent and Emergency Care Centre (UECC):-

##### **Background**

- The new Rotherham UECC opened in July 2017 on the Rotherham Hospital NHS Foundation Trust site
- The new UECC provided an integrated response to urgent care for the Rotherham population – integrating the urgent and emergency care component of what was the Rotherham Walk-in Centre, the GP Out of Hours Service and the Hospital Emergency Department
- The UECC provided one front door for all urgent and emergency care in Rotherham – it opened 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year
- The aim of the UECC was that the local Rotherham population could access the right care, first time
- It was staffed by a mixture of General Practitioners (GP), Emergency Department medical and nursing staff, Advance Nurse Practitioners, Advanced Care Practitioners and other essential non-clinical staff
- It also co-located the Care Co-ordination Centre (CCC) and had work space to facilitate multi-disciplinary working with Mental Health Workers, Social Care Worker and ambulance staff

##### **Initial Challenges**

- The original model was based on The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust as prime provider, but working in partnership with a third party provider – Care UK. This changed when Care UK withdrew from the working arrangements
- Despite doing some organisational development work, merging different cultures into single integrated service provided some initial challenge
- Clinical staffing challenges across both the Primary Care element of the Service and the Emergency Department Service
- Transferring the GP Out of Hours Service
- New ways of working for all teams – embedding change

- Increase in wait times to be sent for patients
- Communication – managing patient and public expectation

Where are we now?

- The original model has been modified as the teams have developed their ways of working
- Teams were starting to work well together – in the intended integrated way
- Recruitment was improving – 2 new Emergency Care Consultants commenced in post in November 2017 and more GPs were joining the team
- More Advanced Nurse Practitioners/Advance Care Practitioners had been appointed
- The Trust had commenced a development programme to train Senior Emergency Department Doctors which would support recruitment
- Rapid Assessment and Triage and See and Treat ways of working were starting to really become embedded
- Quality reviews had been implemented – reviews of the patient experience and outcomes

How are we doing/Performance

- The national 4 Hour Access target was that 95% of patients were seen, treated and admitted or discharged within 4 hours
- This was not being achieved locally or nationally – the national recovery trajectory was to achieve 90% by December 2018 and return to achieving the 95% target in 2018/19. The Trust was aiming to achieve 95% by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018 (81% as of 11<sup>th</sup> April)
- Rotherham was now starting to see a month-on-month improvement in performance  
November 2017 81.36%  
December 2017 85.64%  
January 2018 87.1%  
February 2017 87.25% (as at 25<sup>th</sup> February 2018)
- This compared to England performance in January 2018 for all attendances – 85.3%
- The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust currently ranked in the top 40 out of 133 Trusts

Patient Feedback

- Friends & Family response rate required was 15% of attendees – currently average was 5% per month
- Positive score target was 85% - UECC average was 92-99%
- January 2018 there were 320 responses. Of these 267 were extremely likely to recommend the Service; 50 were likely to recommend the Service, 3 were extremely unlikely to recommend the Service

- Positive feedback comments included “great staff attitude”, “staff very professional”, “staff friendly”, “team were very caring”, “excellent facilities”, “reception staff were polite and caring”, “they reassured me when I was ill”
- Negative feedback comments – “wait times – I waited over 5 hours to be seen”, “poor staff attitude”, “the waiting room was cold”

#### Current Challenges

- The development and opening of the new UECC was (and still was) a significant change management initiative
- Working together across the Primary Care, Emergency Department and GP Out-of-Hours Services needed to continue to develop
- Recruitment was improving but Rotherham would have to continue to be innovative to recruit and retain staff
- Work with patients and the public to manage demand and direct people to the right service, first time – the UECC was for urgent and emergency care
- Continuing to improve and maintain performance against the 4 hour access target was not solely attributable to the UECC

#### Future Plans

- Continue to develop a truly integrated urgent and emergency care service where teams worked effectively across all the urgent and emergency care pathways
- Further develop partnerships with Social Care, Mental Health Services, Primary Care, Voluntary Sector – project this winter working with Age UK Rotherham and the Red Cross
- More joint working between the Care Co-ordination Centre and the GP Out-of-Hours Service
- Improve the engagement with the public and patients
- Provide a first class service for urgent and emergency care for the population of Rotherham

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

- Disappointment that the presentation did not reflect the integrated work that was already taking place between the Council and the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (RCCG). The UECC came under the remit of the Health and Social Care Place Plan which in turn was under the remit of the Health and Wellbeing Board
- Care UK provided the original Out-of-Hours GP Service. It was a private company who had decided there was insufficient money in the business model so had made a commercial decision to withdraw; the Foundation Trust had stepped in and taken over the contract. Any staff who had wished to transfer to the Trust had transferred across under TUPE regulations to the NHS Terms of Conditions (approximately 30%). Over the past few months the Trust had used its Emergency Centre staff to cover the vacancies. There was the

same number, if not more, of staff than Care UK had been offering. As the RCCG were the commissioners it was not known what financial penalties, if any, there had been but Care UK had given 6 months' notice

- The figures stated in the original presentation had been correct at the time of collation i.e. 2 months ago. However, Winter Pressures had increased. Over the past 6-8 weeks the number of patients through the door and attendance at the Emergency Department had increased. The flow through the Hospital had not improved as one would have predicted and the additional Winter capacity would not close until the end of May. Performance of 87.25% had been very good for February with 84.9% for the year. The national average was 88-89%. The figure in Rotherham for March had been 83% which was a drop from the previous month but this was unsurprising given the snow and the number of respiratory illnesses. Whilst disappointing, nationally the position was the same with Rotherham still in the top 40-50 Trusts in the country but it needed to improve
- The patient feedback data was a national indicator with the associated method of collection that Rotherham was compared against across the NHS. The NHS had a duty to collect that data with an expectation that 85% would fill in the survey to say they were happy with the service. Rotherham scored 92% but it was acknowledged as a very rough measure
- Performance was monitored against a number of factors e.g. how the hospital treated patients, how it discharged patients etc. If the Trust had difficulties due to access to Mental Health/Social Workers, it shared the responsibility
- "Safer" was a national initiative about discharging people earlier in the day, making sure they had the right care at the right time by the right partner earlier in the day. It was about the way Ward rounds were done making sure consultants/junior doctors were appropriate, that TTOs and discharge letters were written in the morning and the plan of discharge done the day before so that patients would be moved out of the organisation in the morning. The national target was 35%; the Trust was at 19% some days and 12% on others. There was a long way to go to get discharges out in the day. An issue that was affecting that performance currently was the 40 extra beds that could not be staffed. It was the plan over the next 3-4 weeks to close as many of those additional beds as possible and get the medical and nurse teams back to their Wards so they could implement "Safer". They could not discharge patients any earlier if they were undertaking what were known as "safari ward rounds".

- There were 3/4 national initiatives:–
  - PJ Paralysis - making sure patients were not left in their nightclothes and in the morning get them up, dressed, talk to them and treat them as if fit to go home.
  - Red-Green – looking at a patient's pathway and journey. A Red Day – a patient has been sat in Hospital waiting for something e.g. CT scan, test result – if they have been waiting 2/3 days the Trust was not doing anything for them but if they got the result early they could be progressed to a Green Day. A Green Day - do something for a patient and move them through the hospital in a safe and appropriate way
  - Safer – see above point
  
- The partnership worked mainly on the Admissions Medical Unit (AMU) rather than in the UECC. If the UECC Team/GPs/Nurses/Emergency Consultants, decided that a patient required some extra support and was not ready to go home there and then (within 4 hours), they would send the patient through for assessment in the AMU where they would be seen by a Consultant, Junior Doctor, Red Cross, Frailty Team etc. and a view taken as to whether they could get the patient home there and then (within 8-12 hours) or within 12-24 hours. If the person was very frail they would have a comprehensive assessment and if in need of something else they would have an assessment by Occupational Therapist, Physiotherapist, Red Cross, any voluntary organisation the Trust could pull into help, involve family and friends, all within 10-12 hours of coming through the door. If it was clear that it was not going to be suitable to move that day an assessment would take place the following day
  
- The Trust found that 90% of patients were elderly frail. Recently a Care of the Elderly Consultant has moved into the AMU who would work between the AMU, Emergency Department and UECC to try and see those patients earlier. The Frailty Team would be increased to work alongside the Consultant and it was hoped that in 6 months' time the AMU would become a Frailty Assessment Unit. The emphasis had to change and required Age Concern, Red Cross, Therapists and Frailty Team to work together along with Mental Health Teams and Social Care Teams to ensure Social Services Teams were included within the AMU and Frailty Team in order to turn more people around at the door rather than admit them to hospital.
  
- There was a National course for Advanced Nurse Practitioners and courses that were funded by Health Education England. The Trust had recently submitted a bid for 6. There were 8 members of staff going through training and 6/7 that were fully trained. It was a problem in that the more trained qualified experienced nurses were pulled out of the Wards the standard of care decreased on the Ward, however, there was an issue around the recruitment of junior doctors; the Trust's vacancy rate around middle grade doctors was

phenomenal and it was trying to balance the act somehow. The Team had been asked to submit a bid for more training places

- It was hoped to develop the Trust's Hospital at Night Service so it would be available 7 days, 24 hours a day and that would be made up of Practitioners who would support and maintain the organisation. In the next 2 years there would be a need for approximately 30+ Advanced Practitioners which would make a big difference
- Typically across England a consultant had 1/2 Junior Doctors on the Ward round and started at one end of the Ward and worked their way through. The full Ward round was taking too long and at the end the Consultant would send the Junior Doctors back to manually write up the medication and letters. There was no electronic prescribing service or system in Rotherham, although one had been discussed. There was a national programme to change Ward rounds and it was planned to get them to visit Rotherham to change the method i.e. the first 6 patients were seen, the Consultant left the Junior Doctor behind to complete the paperwork and moved onto the next 6 taking an Advanced Practitioner/Junior Doctor and then left them to complete the paperwork with the first Junior Doctor rejoining for the next 6 and so on. In theory at the end of the Ward all patients should have their paperwork complete apart from the last 6 patients
- The Trust had space for Mental Health Teams and Mental Health practitioners and had very good facilities for patients with Mental Health needs but what it did not yet have was 24 hours 7 day Mental Health cover. A national project, Core 24, which Rotherham would be part of, would identify, recruit and place a core team of Mental Health practitioners in acute hospitals 24 hours a day so that anyone who needed care, support and treatment from a Mental Health Team could be done. It was Mental Health Commissioner-led with Mental Health, Acute and commissioners working together to provide the service for which there was national funding for it. There may be an issue with regard to the recruitment of nurses and practitioner from a Mental Health point of view because they were scarce
- The Trust had made the decision that if someone arrived at the UECC who had an illness/a need to see someone they would be seen but the message would be reinforced that, if their symptoms could have been treated by their GP, that was where they should have gone

The Chair thanked George for his presentation.

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

(2) That the Scrutiny Officer contact Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group with regard to further information regarding Care UK's withdrawal from the UECC contract.



**85. SCRUTINY REVIEW - DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICES**

The Chair presented the main findings and recommendations from the cross-party spotlight Scrutiny Review of Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Recovery Services for Adults.

A spotlight review had been undertaken to ensure that the Service, which would be operating within a reduced budget, would provide a quality safe service under the new contract from April 2018.

The detailed overview of substance misuse in Rotherham had been received noting that the majority of Service users were male and white British. Although numbers in Service were declining over time, there were a number of older long term drug users many of whom now had associated physical health issues.

The bringing together of various aspects of the Service together under a single contract, including having treatment and recovery services available in one location, may facilitate a more personalised and holistic approach to treatment and recovery.

The members of the Review Group were thanked for their work on the Select Commission's behalf on this issue.

The Review's eight recommendations were as follows:-

1. That Public Health and Change, Grow, Live (CGL) present an overview of how the new service is progressing, including a summary of progress on the key performance indicators, to the Health Select Commission in Autumn 2018.
2. That Public Health ensure robust performance management is in place for the new contract from the outset in 2018, including exception reporting and a mid-contract review (to report back to the Health Select Commission).
3. That the Suicide Prevention and Self-Harm Group revisit the suicide prevention awareness raising work in Wentworth Valley in 2018-19 and roll it out more widely through sharing resources and learning, particularly in hotspot areas identified through the National Drug Treatment Monitoring Service.
4. That Public Health consider strengthening the messages under Making Every Contact Count around safe alcohol consumption and where to go for help, when it is refreshed.

5. That future commissioning of services by RMBC that exceed the Official Journal of the EU threshold, especially Public Health and Social Care Services, includes soft market testing with providers/potential providers in advance of going out to tender to ensure a successful process first time.
6. That drug and alcohol pathways and signposting, including protocols for links to other processes such as the Vulnerable Adults Risk Management process, are reviewed by RMBC and partners in 2018, to minimise any risk of people not being able to access support.
7. That in their initial assessments and reassessments with service users CGL include the additional risk factors identified from the RDaSH analysis into suicides from April 2018.
8. That Public Health and CGL continue to take a proactive approach to safety concerns in the service, including incorporating any lessons learned from elsewhere and the findings of any Serious Case Reviews when published.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, expressed concern with regard to recommendation No.3. Wentworth Valley Area Assembly had funded the good work that had been delivered. All Members had been sent a letter regarding rolling out the work to all Wards but they would have to provide funding. However, no Members had responded to the request.

It was suggested that once the geographical data was analysed that might trigger some specific work and lead to discussion on communications and an operational structure.

Resolved:- (1) That the Review findings be endorsed and the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Review report at Appendix 1 be approved.

(2) That the report be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board for consideration prior to submission to the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting.

(3) That the response from the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting be reported back to the Select Commission.

## **86. SOUTH YORKSHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND WAKEFIELD JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

The Scrutiny Officer reported that the Committee had not met since the last update.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 12/04/18**

The report on the outcome of the Hospitals Review was due to be finalised towards the end of the month and would be submitted to the Select Commission during the new Municipal Year as well as an update on Stroke Care and Children's Care and Anaesthesia Services.

**87. CAMHS UPDATE**

The Commission noted a report that had been considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board at its meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018.

**88. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

No issues had been raised by Healthwatch Rotherham.

**89. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2018, were noted.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, reported that a meeting had been held the previous day of partners to look at the new Strategy for the Place Plan which now came under the remit of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

**90. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2017, commencing at 10.00 a.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**13th March, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Clark (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Brookes, Cooksey, Cusworth, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Jarvis, Khan, Pitchley, Senior and Short.

Councillors Watson and Steele were in attendance at the invitation of the Chair.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hague, Marles and Marriott.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**116.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

There were no members of the public present at the meeting. The Member of the press present did not wish to ask any questions.

**118.       COMMUNICATIONS**

Councillor Cusworth gave the following updates:-

**Performance Sub-Group**

The Performance Sub-Group had met with officers the previous week to discuss Safeguarding, performance data and how it was captured, benchmarked and monitored. A further meeting would be held to consider Early Help performance data.

**Corporate Parenting Panel**

An update had been circulated to Select Commission Members.

**119.       MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23RD JANUARY, 2018**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2018, and matters arising from those minutes.

Further to Minute No. 109(2) (Adult Learning), it was noted that a spotlight review had taken place. A report would be submitted to the April meeting.

Further to Minute No. 109(3) (MASH Visit), it was noted that not all Members of the Select Commission had been able to take part in the visit. Consideration should be given to holding a further visit in the new Municipal Year.

Further to Minute No. 110(4) (Domestic Abuse Update), it was noted that the Chair had been interviewed as part of the Peer Review.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2018, be approved for signature by the Chairman.

**120. CHILD AND YOUNG PERSON FRIENDLY BOROUGH 2018-2025**

Shokat Lal, Assistant Chief Executive, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

“For Rotherham to be a great place to grow up in; where children, young people and their families have fun and enjoy living, learning and working”

Why are we doing this?

- Ambition to become a child friendly borough – result of CSE report and Council’s Fresh Start Improvement Plan
- The Council wanting to improve the Borough for all children and young people – not just focusing on ‘Children’s Services’

Our Approach

- Established a local Child Friendly Board providing governance and help steer the work. This ensured:  
Local leaders were engaged: Elected Members, Chief Executives and Senior Managers  
Partners were engaged who already work with children and young people:  
Voluntary and community sector  
Health, Police and Education

Our Approach

- Children and young people engaged from the start
- Ensured it was not ‘adult-led’ but children and young people had their voices heard and acted on
- Feeding this into everything we do in the Council
- Influencing other partners

Who we spoke to

- We spoke to around 4,000 children and young people using a range of methodologies:-  
Attending meetings (Youth Cabinet/Youth Parliament)  
Events and activities led by young people  
Embassy for Reimagining Rotherham consultation and manifesto  
Online survey  
Lifestyle survey for schools  
Rotherham Show

What children, young people and their families told us

- Children and young people feel positive and proud of where they live
- Enjoy opportunities to be with friends and family and celebrate their cultural diversity
- Enjoy what was on offer – just wanted to have a bit more “fun”!
- Adults much more likely to be negative, critical and concerned about diversity and lack of things to do

Reimagining Rotherham Project – The Reimagined Rotherham Town Plan

- Park – everyone should be able to go to the park to relax or get active
- Art – an arts centre would show off the town’s talent as well as how cultural Rotherham is
- Museum – help people learn about things in an enjoyable way
- Cinema – watching films helps you be more imaginative
- Café – we would like a café where people can gain work experience

Four Themes for ‘Child Friendly Rotherham’

- Analysis of all consultation and CF Board workshop highlighted 4 themes:-
  - A vibrant borough with age-appropriate, fun things to do
  - Places in Rotherham to be safe, clean and welcoming
  - All children and young people have a voice and are listened to
  - Opportunities to bring together and celebrate Rotherham’s diverse communities

‘Our Rotherham’: Achieving the ambition to be a Child and Young Person Friendly Borough 2017-2025

- Using consultation responses and event the board and young people co-produced an action plan
- Plan for 2018-2025 in line with other key strategies and plans
- CF Board identified champions for each theme

‘Child Friendly Rotherham’ already in action

- Young people influencing town centre masterplan
- Influenced ambition to be Children’s Capital of Culture 2025
- Influencing policy and strategic agendas e.g. Safer Rotherham Partnership and Building Stronger Communities Forum
- Continuing to work with the Different but Equal Board and Grimm & co as key partners
- Community journalist project and ‘Our Rotherham’ website <https://www.ourrotherham.com>
- Programme of workshops/events being developed throughout the year

What Next

- Continue to use this initiative to influence everything we do always asking “what is the impact on children and young people?”
- Ensure co-production and meaningful engagement is the norm

- Not just focusing on what children and young people want but using their influence to make Rotherham great for all ages
- Where can you contribute to the agenda?

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Acknowledgement that there was a risk of over reliance on consulting the same young people and community groups from existing forums which may lead to an in-built bias in responses. An example of how this was being addressed was the Different but Equal Board; work had been undertaken to ensure that the views of a wide range of children and young people were represented. It was recognised that, because of age or circumstances, some young people would only be involved for a limited period of time, therefore, it was important that as many children and young people were given an opportunity to participate and contribute. Methods of consulting had include an online survey and use of some of the voluntary sector groups to widen participation
- With regard to the right balance of engaging young people and children on their own terms, lessons were being learnt on how this engagement should take place and how those discussions were facilitated with the use of the experts e.g. Children's Services, the Different but Equal Board, Grimm & Co. and Defeye Creative & Co.
- The consultation had taken place with children and young people from 6-16+ years with 4,000 participants. The views of a 7 year old would differ hugely from a 13 year old so mindful that when consulting/engaging it was across the whole range to ensure that different views were captured
- The 4 key themes within the plan had been broken down into issues that were more relevant to particular groups for consultation purposes
- The online survey had asked questions with regard to race, age and gender for which there were statistics available. The consultation was also supplemented with other engagement such as the Lifestyle Survey which highlighted issues around health and wellbeing
- The resident survey had revealed that adults were more negative and critical about the areas where they lived; that had not been put to children and young people
- The consultation on the Reimagining Rotherham Town Plan had taken place in the pop up shop in the Town Centre where young people had come in and talked about what they would like to see. It had been an open question about how they would develop Rotherham Town Centre

- It was believed that, in terms of some of the work that had been carried out so far, some of the most difficult to reach young people and children had been involved
- From a Council point of view, it was felt that the Child Friendly Borough Board had the correct representation i.e. Assistant Directors, Heads of Service and Children and Young People's Services and there was a good level of commitment. The same applied to the voluntary sector. Work was taking place through the Rotherham Together Partnership in terms of having decision makers on the Board from SYP, CCG, Hospitals, Fire Service, College etc. Representation had not been pursued until it was felt that there were examples of good practice. The clearly defined action plan would help organisation develop their own work and show exactly what being child friendly was and how it sat alongside the work of their organisation. The Rotherham Together Partnership was very well represented, supportive and hugely committed to Rotherham as a whole and the challenge of making the Borough child friendly
- It was clear that the young people celebrated diversity and felt that there was no place where they could meet children of different backgrounds and spend time with them. The Town Centre was not seen as a place where they could come and do that. The Reimagining Rotherham work had looked at how this could be addressed
- One of the big differences between the Reimagining Rotherham consultation with children and young people and the adult consultation on the Rotherham Town Centre Master Plan had been that the adult consultation spoke about the retail offer and shops. The children and young people responses differed from this focusing more on the availability of leisure activities. This had been used to influence the Town Centre Master Plan in terms of leisure, entertainment and places to meet and talk rather than just shop
- Leeds had engaged 750 child friendly city ambassadors from the business and voluntary sector. However, there was a high level of support resource required in terms of training, activity and managing it. In Rotherham there were the Rotherham Pioneers; discussions were to take place as to whether some of the child friendly work could be embedded within their work
- Quite a number of the children and young people were on the Child Friendly Board which met on a quarterly basis at Grimm & Co. That membership would continually change. They would receive feedback on consultation, how things had changed and work through the different agencies



- Activities were planned with local town centre businesses about engaging young people. There had been some activity with other groups with regard to business sponsorship in the town centre but the Council had not necessarily actively led on it
- Work was underway to link Reimagining Rotherham into neighbourhood working and other Council priorities. The 4 key themes were now clear and based on what children and young people had said. The Directorates, through their Service Planning process, now needed to think about what their priorities would be for the next financial year and how they could build in the child friendly work and the 4 key themes. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would receive quarterly monitoring reports and would have the opportunity to question what Service was doing in relation to child friendly borough

Shokat was thanked for his presentation.

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

(2) That a workshop be held in 6 months on the Child and Young Person Friendly Borough action plan.

(3) That Strategic Directors be invited to Select Commission meetings to discuss what work their Directorate was undertaking to make Rotherham a Child Friendly Borough.

## **121. ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

It was noted that the actions for the implementation of recommendations from the Select Commission's cross-party review group on the range of Alternative Management Arrangements (AMAs) for Children's Services had been considered by the Cabinet and Commissioners meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2018 (Minute No. 109 refers) and also at the meeting of the Council held on 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2018 (Minute No. 161 refers).

Appendix A of the report provided detail in respect of whether the recommendations were agreed, not agreed or deferred and, where agreed, what action would be taken, by when and who would be responsible.

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, stated that was an excellent example of work where Elected Members had added a lot of value to the organisation and had been really useful to the Service. He felt that the quality of the report and thought processes that had gone into it should be held up as an example to all Scrutiny work groups.

Councillor Steele endorsed the Deputy Leader's comments.

**Resolved:-** (1) That the Cabinet's response to the Scrutiny Review of Alternative Management Arrangements for Children and Young People's Services in Rotherham be approved.

(2) That the draft performance dashboard be submitted to the May meeting of the Select Commission.

(3) That the Select Commission request that the Performance Board consider submitting their reports to the Commission.

## **122. COMPLEX ABUSE PROCESSES**

Vicky Schofield, Head of Service for First Response, presented a report on the Complex Abuse procedures used within the Authority.

The procedures were used in cases where there were believed to be issues of connected, organised or multiple abuse of children. Complex Abuse investigations were governed by the same legislative principals as all other investigations of Child Abuse (Section 47, Children Act 1989 and Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015). The local authority, therefore, had a duty to investigate where there were reasonable grounds to believe that children were suffering or likely to suffer significant harm, taking all necessary action to ensure their welfare as a result.

Currently there was one large scale ongoing Complex Abuse Inquiry in Rotherham using the multi-agency procedure in place under the Rotherham Safeguarding Board. A bespoke Social Work Team had been established with connected Health, Police and Early Help colleagues. During the recent OFSTED inspection Inspectors had been impressed with the "forensic" and "tenacious" approach in place specifically identifying the quality of assessments and the impact that Social Workers were having in very challenging circumstances.

Organisational learning arising from the current inquiry had been significant; a learning review had been undertaken in parallel to the operational work in children's cases setting out specific developments in practice that go beyond the work on the particular cases.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- There had been learning and development from the current complex abuse work being carried out including historical complex abuse inquiries in Rotherham that was multi-faceted. This included:-
  - working together across the partnership to share information and challenging each other in terms of securing the right outcomes for children
  - how to articulate the information to the South Yorkshire Court, the way in which the Service advocated in individual cases and sometimes challenged within the Court process

- learning around the way in which the Service understood information when people had been resident in other countries and developing the processes to ensure that information was shared effectively to gain histories/backgrounds
  - some specific learning about families that may be mobile and may move around the UK/across borders to understand where the families went and not lose touch with them/identify where they had moved to
- 
- Brexit – Social Work agencies across the world had to have at some level some sharing of information and protocols. The assistance of Embassies would still be required as it was now to negotiate on the Authority's behalf. There was experience in the Social Care sector of working in non-EU countries and these principles would be applied once the UK had left the EU
  - The Service had been described by Ofsted as “tenacious” and “forensic”. The current complex abuse work could be described in that way for the work done to understand the extent of the issue, using information within the Service and proactively seeking out information and continually pressing for the best outcome for the child. A child would not be left in circumstances that the Service was not uncomfortable with
  - A real strength had been the engagement of partners
  - There were powers under the Local Safeguarding arrangements which could call agencies to account if they were not fulfilling their Safeguarding duties. The Director of Children's Services also had a statutory duty and powers to call to account agencies that were not fulfilling their duties. Neither had had to be used in Rotherham
  - The challenge for the Service was children moving across Council boundaries and ensuring that when they did move they were not lost to agencies. Work had been carried out locally to develop protocols to identify where children moved to/back into the Borough. Children who moved across internal boundaries had also been a feature of the work
  - In terms of “gaps” it was difficult to fully understand the history of children when they had not always lived in the UK as currently within the EU there was not one central place that provided all the information. That piece of work was still ongoing and trying to find a better resolution in that regard; the information could be found but it took time

- Work was taking place with the South Yorkshire Courts to ensure that when there was complex and complicated information it could be shared in such a way that enabled the right decisions to be made. However, it had to be balanced against a person's Human Rights and the right of privacy as well as the need to share information about numerous people in Court proceedings
- It was not known what effect the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) would have when working across countries and boundaries with regard to the sharing of information. Currently the Service was able to utilise the local legislation to enable the protection of children and, until tested in law, the change would not be known
- The Team was a relatively small team and very well supported given the area of work it was dealing with. They had additional input from Advance Practitioners in Children's Social Care
- Social Workers were supervised regularly through scrutiny of performance on a fortnightly basis with the supervision also quality assured
- The Principal Social Worker role was also utilised. This was a Social Worker who did not have management responsibility but was of sufficient seniority to raise issues with the workforce. It was an important role in terms of helping to make sure Social Workers were able to escalate if they felt any stresses and strains. Sickness absence was monitored and continuing to reduce
- There was a culture of sharing information and staff across partnerships feeling comfortable to raise issues
- There was a Detailed Quality Assurance Framework within Children's Services as well a monthly programme of quality audits that look at multiple cases across the whole organisation. All managers were involved in quality assurance activities on a monthly basis as information were re-audited and the quality of audits checked. The learning from the audits was then reviewed and fed back into the Service
- On a monthly basis a Team was selected at random and an announced visit made to look at practice and, with the permission of families, sit in on cases. The Team would be revised 3 months later with the feedback
- The Service was part of a regional Peer Review. As well as the Service being reviewed it had the opportunity to look at other local authorities. It was envisaged that a Peer Review would take place at some point during the next cycle to look particularly at Looked After Children

- Approximately 70 children had come into the care of the Authority as a result of the inquiry

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

(2) That consideration be given to a further report being submitted in the new Municipal Year to include the data protection changes and any ensuing impact.

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

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2018, commencing at 5.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
24th April, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Clark (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Brookes, Cooksey, Cusworth, Fenwick-Green, Ireland, Jarvis, Khan, Marles, Marriott, Pitchley and Senior.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Elliot, Hague, Short, Julie Turner and Jones (GROW).

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-  
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**124. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Cusworth declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 128 as she was a Governor at a Rotherham school.

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

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

**126. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) As it was the last meeting of the Municipal Year, the Chair wished to place on record her thanks to Members of the Select Commission and every Officer who had attended and also to Caroline Webb (Senior Adviser) for her support during the year.

(2) The inaugural meeting of the Pause Board had taken place on 20<sup>th</sup> April to agree its Terms of Reference. The next meeting would be held in June.

(3) Councillor Cusworth reported that the Corporate Parenting Panel had not met since the last meeting of the Select Commission.

(4) Councillor Cusworth reported that the Performance Sub-Group had met to discuss the Early Help scorecards. The Sub-Group would meet quarterly to consider the data and briefings submitted to the Performance Board.

**127. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13TH MARCH, 2018**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2018, and matters arising from those minutes.

Further to Minute No. 119 (Adult Learning), it was noted that the report would be submitted to the June Select Commission meeting.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2018, be approved for signature by the Chairman.

## **128. 2017 EDUCATION PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES**

Del Rew, Head of Education, presented an overview of the educational outcomes of children and young people in primary, secondary schools and academies in Rotherham for the academic year ending in the summer of 2017 in comparison to statistical neighbours, regional Yorkshire and Humber authorities and national averages for the same period of time. The report also made comparison with Sheffield's results and whilst not a statistical neighbour, provided a further sub-regional context.

The Department for Education (DfE) had made significant changes in the Key Stage 1 (KS1) Teacher Assessment (TA), Key Stage 2 (KS2) TA and Test Outcomes and Key Stage 4 (KS4) and Key Stage 5 (KS5) examinations in 2016 and further changes in KS4 and KS5 in 2017. It was not, therefore, possible to make comparison to historical data prior to 2016 at KS1 and KS2 and prior to 2017 for the majority of the thresholds at KS4 and KS5.

The report detailed:-

- A summary of outcomes
- School Ofsted Inspections
- Early Years Foundation Stage Profile
- Key Stage 1
- Key Stage 2
- Key Stage 4
- Key Stage 5
- Rotherham 2017/18 Overall Priorities

The following strengths were highlighted:-

- Early Years Foundation Stage – the good level of development had continued to rise above the national average. This was a well established trend and was first compared to statistical neighbours and joint second within the region
- Phonics – At the end of Year 1 (5/6 year olds) had shown an improvement but this was 2% below the national average. Last year 79% of Rotherham's children gained the Phonics Screening requirement compared with 81% nationally. . The authority was joint 5<sup>th</sup> against its statistical neighbours and 7<sup>th</sup> out of 15 regional local authorities

- KS1 was strong and for the first time Rotherham was above the national average
- KS2 was in line with the national average with particularly good progress in writing (girls) and mathematics (boys). The Higher Standard at the end of KS2 for more able children was below national average and needed to improve
- KS4 average attainment score was broadly in line with the national average.
- KS5 was above the national average

Areas of improvement included:-

- Performance of disadvantaged children from Foundation through to secondary stage
- Performance of Gypsy/Roma/Traveller children had fallen below the national average
- Reading in KS1 and KS2, although above the national average in the combined score, it was below in reading
- The higher ability children at the end of KS2
- For secondary schools, the new measures introduced last year around grades for English and Mathematics

It was noted that the assessment for KS1, 2 and 4 had changed so it was difficult to compare like for like.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The description of a “disadvantaged child” in the report was as defined by the DfE and all the statistics collated were in accordance with that criteria. There was to be consultation by the DfE around this definition and collecting data about children who are not Looked After and may not fit the criteria
- Do we know what we are doing at early years compared with later key stages were greater improvements have to be made - The School Improvement Service had a Traded Services Offer to schools which was mainly geared towards primary aged children, with Special schools also accessing the offer. There are fewer secondary schools accessing the Local Authority School Improvement offer



- To encourage schools to work together, the Service attended meetings of the secondary Head Teachers looking at the data; the Head Teachers were keen to work together. There was some very strong collaborative working practices from groups of schools in the secondary sector
- A few years ago secondary schools had been at the national average or above and it had been the primary schools that had been below. However, there had been a breakthrough and for the first time primaries were in line or above and secondaries, against the new measures, were below
- A report was to be submitted to Cabinet proposing the establishment of an Education Improvement Board
- Training had been delivered training to some of Rotherham's school leaders. It had been a one day course held earlier in the school year, attended by 35 people, who had received accreditation and resources to enable them to carry out Pupil Premium Reviews in other schools. In the new Traded Services School offer from September 2018, if schools bought back into the Service, they could have a Pupil Premium Review which included 2 appropriately trained accredited reviewers going into their school and carrying out a forensic analysis of how the Pupil Premium money was spent, what they were doing with it, and the evidence of the impact it had. They would receive a written report and a follow-up visit 6 months later with the "so what". The school would take it to its Governing Body and compile an action plan, supported by the reviewers, which was checked through and monitored. 3 schools had already taken up the offer.
- The performance of disadvantaged children had been a focus at Head Teacher meetings using data of where schools have either improved the performance of their disadvantaged children or had a strong record of their disadvantaged children doing very well. It had been looked at in terms of context and those who had been successful requested to hold a mini workshop to show what they did, the impact etc. There was also the opportunity within the Traded Services Offer to see it in action with a couple of schools opening up their doors and inviting other schools to observe what they were doing, see the extra interventions and how the disadvantaged children were targeted with questioning in lessons. It would be a big priority next year and looking at work with school leaders on a strategy for closing the gap
- The vast majority of Rotherham's secondary schools were academies and did not buy the School Improvement Offer. A reason for the proposed establishment of an Education Improvement Board and the work with the Regional Schools Commissioner was to influence those who were not maintained by the Local Authority to address some the issues being found around performance. The Local Authority had an influencing role and obviously wanted to make sure that it had a

Traded Services Offer that was attractive that schools wanted to spend their budget on. School Improvement was something that was bought rather than enforced

- The 2018/19 Traded Services Offer had been sent to all schools. The new Offer had been highlighted to secondary schools with the hope that it would be of more interest to them and something they would want to be engaged with such as the Outstanding Teaching Programme and Outstanding Teaching Assistant
- The Authority had a statutory duty with regard to any school that was not performing well. If it was a Local Authority maintained school it would be brought into the Schools Causing Concern process. The Local Authority had a responsibility for the education for all children in all Rotherham settings. The vehicle would be via the Regional Schools Commissioner. Termly meetings took place with the Regional Schools Commissioner's Office where discussions would take place on schools, whether they be academies or Local Authority maintained schools, that were potentially underperforming and what was happening with them. Similarly the same happened with the senior HMI Ofsted lead for the region
- The Traded Services Offer was for all schools. A number of academies bought fully back into the Traded Services Offer and some Local Authority maintained schools that only bought certain parts
- Although the percentage of Gypsy/Roma/Traveller pupils achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) had increased by 13%, it remained below the national average. This cohort was a vulnerable group of pupils nationally and in terms of their education performance. In Rotherham they were centred around a small number of primary and secondary schools in the Town Centre. There were a range of reasons why they were not achieving some of which centred upon their language being less developed and expectations for formal education in this country. A representative from Rotherham's Virtual School had contacted Doncaster who had set up a virtual school for Gypsy/Roma/Traveller children and had had some success
- School attendance was an issue for the Gypsy/Roma/Traveller children. Work was taking place in the schools in terms of working with parents and instilling the importance of good attendance
- Research showed that a focus on Early Years was the best opportunity to address issues that would impact upon social mobility in later years. An intention of free nursery education was in part to help parents to establish good trends at an early stage and prepare children for school.

- It was known that in terms of social mobility children that came from low income households did not perform as well and often found it much more difficult to achieve and attain in the longer term. Good quality Early Years provision was fundamental to supporting children to develop the right skills to learn and enjoy learning. It was important that the focus was around speech, language and communication. Proposals were being considered for a Speech Therapist to be included within the Virtual School for children in care along with the teaching staff
- Schools that were below the floor standard were Brookfield Academy, Dinnington Primary Academy and St. Joseph's Dinnington Academy. There were no secondary schools below the floor standard
- The Rotherham coasting schools were Dinnington Primary Academy, Brookfield Academy, Maltby Lily Hall Academy and Ferham Primary School and Dinnington High School (Academy)
- There was a set cost for the Traded Service Offer. The 3 Early Years settings received a reduced set cost which is fully subscribed.. For primary schools there was a full subscribed offer of £25 per pupil, as calculated on the October Census and the number on roll, which enabled them to access absolutely everything. The larger schools with the corresponding larger budgets paid more. Other schools bought certain things at a certain price on a "pay as you go" but it had been found that that method was more expensive. All the special schools and nurseries fully subscribed, the majority of primaries with secondary schools buying back certain items
- Are there other ways of measuring Children's performance beyond the academic core curriculum for example sports, health, fitness and wellbeing. In terms of other areas of the curriculum, work was taking place with primary schools in particular around the importance of accessing areas beyond the core curriculum. There was a national concern from Ofsted around the narrowing of the curriculum with the focus on English and Mathematics but so that children did not miss out on opportunities to shine and thrive in other areas. The new lead of Ofsted had made a speech on such and guidance, together with examples of where things were going well in terms of the broad balance curriculum offer, was to be issued
- There was no strategy in connection with Brexit and school turbulence as yet although the Local Government Association would work with local authorities as to how they were preparing for it
- Within the Early Years setting it was imperative to be supportive of both boys and girls to develop the skills they needed. Boys often required help to develop expressive communication and to be able to develop their language skills

- The bid for additional funding to the Education Endowment Foundation to extend the Improving Outcomes for Boys in the EYFS project had not been successful. A lot of work had been undertaken in the last 2 years to engage boys into language. There had been 12 schools engaged in Cohort 1 of the project with another 12 in Cohort 2. There was also a new project with the National Literacy Trust to support parents and carers to prepare their children for school and which activities could develop children's vocabulary and language (targeted at parents of boys in particular)
- Forge Teaching School was the newest teaching school in Rotherham, led by the Head Teacher at Wath C. of E. School, and consisted of a group of schools who were keen to work with other schools in Rotherham, to be a part of the improvement agenda and to work across faiths. The Service was working with them and had been a partner in their bid for a project which was based on Bedrock Learning.

Bedrock Learning was around language acquisition and vocabulary, all based on research, and had identified that, particularly for disadvantaged children, the lack of academic aspirational academic language limited their educational performance. Bedrock Learning was a structured approach to teaching key vocabulary designed to help them in terms of their comprehension of the things they heard but also what they read. Reading comprehension with the way the curriculum was set up in the country at the moment and it was important that children develop this skill from an early age for later academic success.

Currently Bedrock Learning consisted of 30+ schools in Rotherham mainly primary but some secondary, and was about structured systematic teaching of academic vocabulary. Bedrock Learning visited every term to check progress. Children used digital technology so they could either do it at home or in school lessons and consisted of basic tests with words missing and learning what the words meant

It was targeted at Years 4-9 because that was what the company had developed, however, they were currently working on developing something for Years 1, 2 and 3 but it had not been published as yet. Some of the Rotherham schools had chosen to use it with Year 3 because they wanted it as a whole Key Stage. All the children had completed a baseline reading test to give a starting point as Bedrock Learning was keen to prove how it increased children's vocabulary with a similar test at the end. The company visited every term to answer any questions.

As well as Bedrock there were other personal development opportunities and ways of teaching vocabulary which would be open to all Rotherham schools

This was not part of the Traded Services Offer. It was a successful bid to the DfE Strategic School Improvement Fund for which there was an eligibility criteria. The DfE had a list of schools in terms of their performance and data that they wanted to improve. At least 70% of the schools had to be from that list with the remaining 30% of schools who were interested and committed to taking part

- No work had been carried out as yet on the impact of the roll out of Universal Credit as to whether it would increase the numbers of disadvantaged children or not. Feedback from some areas was that numbers had decreased due to the eligibility for Free School Meals but it may have an impact on Pupil Premium numbers
- There had been some really positive feedback to the Service's proposals around Re-enabling School Improvement. A number of the academies had engaged in the consultation and there had been lots of feedback about wanting to work collaboratively through the School Improvement Partnership Arrangement

The Chair thanked Del for his presentation

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

(2) That a further report be submitted once the work around the possible impact of Universal Credit had been completed.

## **129. OFSTED SINGLE INSPECTION FRAMEWORK RECOMMENDATIONS**

Sue Wilson, Head of Performance Planning, presented a report on the Ofsted Single Inspection Framework recommendations.

The Ofsted report with the findings from the November 2017 Single Inspection Framework (re-inspection) had been published on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2018, and found that overall services for children and young people in Rotherham were Good. The report detailed 8 recommendations across the Framework where the Service still needed to make additional improvements; these would be monitored as part of the routine Service Planning and reported to the Children and Young People's Service monthly Performance Board.

An action plan had to be submitted to Ofsted by 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 (70 working days from the publication date of the report) in relation to the recommendations as part of their Single Inspection Framework.

A named Lead Officer had been allocated to each of the 8 Ofsted recommendations to ensure that the Service was accountable for the actions that needed to be in place to fully undertake the recommendations. The Officers would be held to account as part of the quarterly Service Plan Performance Clinics and monthly Performance Board meetings.

The Audit Committee continued to review an overview of progress from recommendations from external inspections and as such progress against them would be included in the regular report on a 6 monthly basis.

Inspection readiness continued to be a priority in Children's Services as the Framework for the Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services had now been published and included an annual self-assessment (which would need to cover progress against the 8 recommendations) and an annual conversation which was a visit from an Ofsted HMI to discuss the progress being made and any risks and issues. These together determined when the next inspection would take place.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- There were an additional 8 specific actions regarding the Looked After Children Service with the aim of moving it from Requires Improvement to Good and beyond
- There was a process of Quality Assurance Framework across the Service which included Social Care, Early Help and just about to embed some Education Services. There were approximately 30-40 audits undertaken on a monthly basis by Team Managers. The Team selected cases for which Early Help and Social Care Managers undertook a detailed audit which included providing an Ofsted style rating e.g. inadequate etc. A report was then compiled and submitted to the monthly Performance Board. In addition there were monthly Ofsted style visits – practice learning days – where a team of staff from the Director down to Business Support went out and conducted an Ofsted style visit, observed practice, looked at performance, held a focus group for staff. The Director would return and provide feedback
- The performance measures were reviewed on an annual basis, however, if something cropped up during the year it would be added. A refresh of the measures and targets that were to be included in the Council Plan had just taken place to ensure the Framework and Plan coincided. There may be specific pieces of service/of work that may need a score card developed as a result
- For Looked After Children, particularly those for whom permanence was achieved outside of their family, life story work was fundamental to enable them to be able to progress. It was also something that was looked for in the audits
- When conducting the mini Ofsted visits a similar approach would be adopted to that of the Ofsted Framework. The definition of Outstanding was that children were making sustainable progress i.e. do we exceed what the minimum requirements are and evidence that children were making sustained progress. The key word was “sustained” to be Outstanding

- The auditors were asked to speak to the child and the family as part of the audit as well as the people who worked with them. It was a fairly new practice (October 2017) so there was a small body evidence of what child/children thought about the work that was being carried out
- There had not been a case found “Critical” or “Inadequate” for 14 months although there was still work that was believed not to meet standards. There was a tracker for those cases and they were monitored on a fortnightly basis in performance meetings to make sure that changes were being made to get cases up to at least “Requires Improvement”. Due to the number of “Inadequate” cases being low, the same would now apply to those cases that “Requires Improvement” and would be entered onto the tracker, managers would have oversight and be clear to staff what needed to be done to get it to “Good”
- There were 2 areas that were particularly challenging. Firstly Exclusions and the obligation to try and reduce the vulnerability that being excluded from school had for children and secondly the Rotherham Family Approach which was the implementation of Signs of Safety and restorative practice. To fully embed and implement Signs of Safety, it was reliant upon Liquid Logic to be able to reflect that in the forms. Work was taking place with colleagues in IT around the next phase of its implementation.

Sue was thanked for her presentation.

The Chair also wished to place on record her thanks to Mel Meggs who had been the Link Officer from the Directorate to the Select Commission. Mel was to be the Acting Strategic Director of Children and Young People’s Services due to Ian Thomas’ leaving the Authority until a new postholder was appointed.

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

(2) That a copy of the 8 specific additional actions for the Looked After Children Service be circulated to the Select Commission for information.

(3) That a presentation on Signs of Safety be included in the 2018/19 work plan.

(4) That the Select Commission’s thanked be placed on record to Ian Thomas, Strategic Director of Children and Young People’s Services, and best wishes for the future.

## 130. VICE-CHAIR

The Chair thanked Councillor Cusworth for her Vice-Chairmanship during the 2017/18 Municipal Year and all her support and encouragement.

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

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Tuesday, 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2018, commencing at 5.30 p.m.



**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**7th February, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Allen, Atkin, Buckley, Elliot, Jepson, Jones, McNeely, Price, Reeder, Sheppard, Taylor, Julie Turner, Vjestica, Walsh and Wyatt along with Mr. P. Cahill and Mrs. L. Shears, Co-optees.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Albiston and B. Cutts.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**105.        DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

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

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

**107.        COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chair was pleased to welcome Mel Staples from the Police and Crime Commissioner's Communications Team as an observer today.

**108.        MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 3RD JANUARY, 2018**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 3rd January, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

**109.        GOVERNANCE AND PERFORMANCE - REPAIRS AND INVESTMENT CONTRACT**

The Chair was pleased to welcome Mark Nearney, Head of Service for Contracts, Investment and Compliance, Adult Care, Housing and Public Health, to the meeting who conducted a short presentation on the Governance and Performance for the Repairs and Investment Contract.

The presentation, with the aid of powerpoint, highlighted:-

- Background to the contracts.
- Governance framework.
- Challenge and change via Scrutiny.
- Performance and partnership working.
- Key Performance Indicators.
- House Mark Report 2017 – Value for money

- Corporate Social Responsibility.
- Photographs – Shiloh.
- Photographs – Brayshaw Bungalows.
- Residents.
- Apprenticeships.
- Mears Apprenticeship Awards.
- Partners' Workforce.
- Safeguarding.
- Outsourcing Model.
- Rotherham Federation – Strengthening Communities.
- Rotherfed Feedback.
- National Recognition.
- Mears financial viability.
- Fortem financial viability.

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

- Length of the contract and when this was due for re-tender.
- Detail of the target times for action and delivery of the service.
- Selection process for the Star Survey of residents and sample testing.
- Number of complaints and complaint categorisation.
- Identification around vulnerable residents by call centre staff, and the benefits to sharing information to avoid second visits.
- Method of calculation for gap savings headlines.
- Age range of apprentices.
- Promotion of the national initiative to increase women into construction.
- Sub-contracting procedures and use of local businesses and tradespersons by Fortem and Mears.
- Key Performance Indicator monitoring of sub-contracting activities and whether this could be shared with the Select Commission.
- Administration relocation by Fortem and the creation of other employment opportunities through the Northern Support Hub.
- Call centre staff training and sharing of information for operatives.
- Safeguarding referrals and electronic updates for operatives.
- Performance, financial monitoring and service resilience following organisational change.
- Organisational outsourcing and procurement processes.
- Reporting of vulnerability concerns of residents.
- Rotherfed review and feedback and future monitoring by Scrutiny.
- National recognition and nomination processes.
- Organisational financial viability statements.
- Risk and uncertainties following the changes from Morrison and Wilmot Dixon and the concerns around corporate separations and branding.
- Invitations to senior management of Fortem and Mears to attend future scrutiny meetings.

- Investments into community projects, development opportunities and how this funding was allocated.
- Contract re-tendering and commissioning activity and involvement of other partners in this process.

**Resolved:-** (1) That Mark Nearney be thanked for his informative presentation, with support from Councillor Beck, Cabinet Member for Housing.

(2) That Key Performance Indicator activity be shared with the Improving Places Select Commission.

(3) That consideration be given to a member of the Improving Places Select Commission being involved in the retendering/commissioning process of contracts.

#### **110. TEMPORARY RELOCATION OF ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE BUS STATION**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Ian Ashmore, Transportation Highways and Design Manager, and Gavin Bland, Principal Project Manager from the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, which detailed a proposal to allow the full closure of the Interchange to facilitate the refurbishment works. This had been determined as the most appropriate interim location for displaced bus services and to use a temporary Interchange constructed on the Forge Island site, with a small number of services moved to on-street locations on Corporation Street during the period of time that the Interchange and multi-storey car park was refurbished. This is subject to obtaining planning permission.

A planning application had been submitted for the temporary bus station and tenders have been issued for the construction of the works, estimated to cost £300,000. The programme to enable the Forge Island site to become operational, aligned to the Interchange and wider town centre regeneration initiatives meant a decision on the preferred contractor would be required by early February, 2018.

Details of the scheme proposals were referred to in the report and outlined and access to the site for pedestrians and wheelchair users would be retained from Bridge Street and the existing footbridge to Corporation Street to allow pedestrians and wheelchair users to access the town centre.

It was noted the temporary bus station would be staffed with two people and along with CCTV and secured access to the site would enable the bus station to be secured out of operational hours.

The Bus Operators have been consulted on the location of the stands and revised on-street facilities and also with the Health and Safety aspects of the arrangements. The operators have confirmed they were content with the arrangements.

A Communications Plan and full timetable had also been drafted to keep all stakeholders informed about these changes as work progressed.

Members of the Select Commission welcomed the report, but asked a number of questions and sought clarification on a number of points. These included:-

- Whether a copy of the Communications Plan could be provided for the Select Commission.
- The timeline for the Temporary Bus Station Works as listed in the report, which showed start and finish times on the same day with a request that these were accurate.
- Information sharing for travellers who did not use the interchange on a regular basis.
- Involvement of the Council's Health and Safety Team in the arrangements.
- The need for clear and appropriate signage.
- Continuation of the car parking on Forge Island.
- Whether equality impact assessments had been completed for those users who were vulnerable, elderly or infirm.
- Access to toileting facilities on Forge Island and whether temporary portaloos would serve as an alternative.
- Access to disabled parking in the locality.
- Whether the lease of Forge Island for the temporary interchange included a penalty clause should the infrastructure works be delayed and the impact this may have on the Town Centre Masterplan.
- Cost of the lease and whether this would impact on income for car parking.
- Feasibility and delivery of the contracted timetable.
- Impact on local businesses and free car parking on Forge Island.
- Trends and variations in bus users.
- Road safety and access/egress from the temporary bus station for all road users and pedestrians.

- Temporary signage to Riverside House and other Council facilities.
- Access to the bus apron frontage and whether an additional safety barrier may be required for the public.
- Relocation of temporary bus stands on Corporation Street and the capacity/conflict with taxi ranks should these be relocated on the opposite side of the road. This could also inconvenience retailers should loading access be compromised by queuing taxis.
- Signage to indicate the temporary nature of the relocation to avoid raising public expectation of the close proximity to the railway station.
- Project costs and street works on Corporation Street.
- Impact on the flood alleviation scheme on Forge Island.
- Traffic light sequencing for access/egress of the temporary bus station.

The representatives took on board all the comments made and gave assurances that copies of the Communication Plan would be circulated, that there would be a continuous accurate flow of information, safety of users of the site had been included given that the Passenger Transport Executive was a corporate public body and appropriate signage would be clearly installed.

It was noted that every effort was being made to mitigate the impact of the interchange's relocation and a meeting had been arranged to resolve any accessibility issues that may arise as a result. However, in terms of accessing toileting facilities, clear signage would identify the location of toilets in the existing interchange which would remain open and those in All Saints' Square. Whilst no toilets were intended to be available for public use within the temporary interchange this would be looked at with regards to its feasibility. It was noted that car parking provision for disabled users would remain unaffected. Appropriate signage would also identify the works were of a temporary nature and would be kept under review.

Consideration would also be given to suggestions for appropriate signage to indicate the location of Riverside House and other Council facilities.

Whilst it was noted that Forge Island was a prime site for regeneration, discussions had taken place with the Passenger Transport Executive on the refurbishment programme. However, in the event of no developer coming forward as part of the Town Centre Masterplan the proposals would remain in situ for the site to be returned to temporary car parking.

There would be some loss of car parking on Forge Island, but the free parking that had been in operation in the Red Zone would remain. There was adequate car parking provision in the town centre.

Loss of town centre retail trade and bus operator performance data would be closely monitored for any variations.

Details of all access arrangements for pedestrians and wheelchair users would be retained from Bridge Street and the existing footbridge to Corporate Street. The site's internal layout had been designed to accommodate all bus manoeuvres to circulate and access the bus standing areas and to encourage pedestrians to travel along the eastern edge of the site. The site would be temporarily staffed during operating hours with CCTV and secured access. However, this would be closely monitored.

In terms of the relocation of the taxi rank on Corporation Street this would be rechecked in order to prevent access to the Minster and Market Street being compromised.

All costs associated with the temporary relation of the bus interchange would be funded by South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

In terms of the flood alleviation scheme on Forge Island the temporary arrangement of the bus station was not likely to have any impact.

**Resolved:-** (1) That officers be thanked for their attendance and the report.

(2) That the proposal for the temporary bus station at Forge Island be noted.

(3) That officers be asked to give some further consideration to:-

- Temporary toileting facilities on Forge Island.
- Signage to Riverside House and other Council facilities.
- Any health and safety issues.
- Conflict caused by the relocation of the taxi rank on Corporate Street.

(4) That the Improving Places Select Commission be forwarded a copy of the Communications Plan and bus operator traveller figures.

#### **111. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission take place on Wednesday, 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 at 1.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION  
14th March, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allen, Buckley, B. Cutts, Elliot, Jepson, Jones, McNeely, Price, Reeder, Sheppard, Steele, Taylor, Julie Turner, Vjestica, Walsh and Wyatt and also Mrs. L. Shears, Co-opted Member.

Also in attendance was Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Councillors Hoddinott and Lelliott, Cabinet Members, for Minute Nos. 117, 118 and 119.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Atkin.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-  
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**112. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report

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

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

**114. COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chair was pleased to welcome Paul Whitehouse, BBC Local Democracy Reporter, and also Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to the meeting.

The Commission were also encouraged to attend the development session on Strengths for Asset Based Approaches to Community Development taking place on Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 in the John Smith Room commencing at 2.00 p.m. till 4.00 p.m. and repeated at 4.30 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.

**115. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 7<sup>th</sup> February, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

Reference was made to Minute No. 109 (Governance and Performance - Repairs and Investment Contract) and whether there had been any further consideration to a member of the Improving Places Select Commission being involved in the retendering/commissioning process of contracts.

This would be followed up and ascertained.

With regards to Minute No. 110 (Temporary Relocation of the Bus Interchange) information requested was to be shared.

**116. REVISED "ROTHERHAM MBC CODE OF PRACTICE FOR HIGHWAY INSPECTION AND ASSESSMENT"**

The Chair introduced Councillor Hoddinott, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, who presented the report proposing a revised "Rotherham MBC Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment", including policies for both Highway Safety Inspection and Skidding Resistance.

The revised "Rotherham MBC Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment" took account of recommendations within a report commissioned by the Department for Transport named "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" (A Code of Practice). This new code will replace "Well-maintained Highways", "Management of Highway Structures" and "Well-lit Highways" in October 2018.

The new code significantly changed from the reliance on specific guidance and recommendations to a risk-based approach to highway asset management. The purpose of a risk based approach for highway safety inspections was to determine the scale of the risk presented by a highway defect in order to prioritise the appropriate category of response.

The introduction of a risk-based approach to highway inspection moved away from a highway inspection system based on specific defect intervention/repair levels and replaced it with a system that required risk assessment to determine the need for repair works. Therefore, the proposed "Rotherham MBC Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment" had been developed taking into account the change in national guidance.

Councillor Hoddinott invited Colin Knight and Andrew Rowley to give a presentation on the Revised Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment.

The presentation drew attention to:-

- Rotherham MBC Road Network.
- Guidance and the programme of highway maintenance.
- The existing Code of practice for highway inspection and assessment.
- National Guidance - 'Well-maintained Highways 2005.
- The New National Guidance - 'Well-managed Highways Infrastructure'.
- Highway Inspection Policy and its Objectives.
- Developing a Revised Code for Rotherham.
- Determining Frequency of Inspections for Carriageways and Footways.



- Minimum Investigatory Levels.
- Defect Identification and Evaluation - Risk Based Approach.
- Highway Defect Risk Matrix.
- Response Times/Repair Types.
- Defect Categories.
- Skidding Resistance Policy.
- Guidance and Training for Officers.

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

- If there was any methodology with regards the location and benefits of trees and with the management of the root action close to highways and footways.

Whilst the primary objective was to keep the tree safe as it grew within the community it was important to liaise with the Tree Section to maintain the safe passage on highways and footways. The Cabinet Member was briefed on the trees in the Borough and additional funding to address condition of the footpaths had been secured. Work to look at tree lined routes within Rotherham would take place in the longer term.

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety confirmed there were no plans for tree removal. Each area was different and concerns and risks would be assessed and mitigated as and when they arose.

- The Highways Section was commended for the work it undertook across the Borough and the work it did on the pavements in the town and districts. Page 13 of the report referred to implications for other partners and it was asked if there were any collaborative partnership work with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive where bus routes were changed on to routes that were less suited to vehicles resulting in damage to kerbs that required replacing.

All bus routes were determined by the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and operators and, as long as there was no damage to highway, Rotherham was supportive of the usage. If there was a problem liaison would take place and this would involve the Ward Member.

- Had there been any consideration of fitting electronic survey devices to waste collection vehicles which could then download data to a central database.

Electronic surveys undertaken were different to those that could be undertaken by a waste refuse vehicle. However, pathways were also being considered and being looked into further.

- Were there any plans to look into in-house resurfacing teams to be reactive to potholes and increase general resurfacing of complete roads.

Additional highway works were all carried out by the Council's own Highway Teams. The Teams had been invested into through the development of the apprenticeship programme which included a mixture of college attendance and onsite practical experience. From those that had completed the course the Council had successfully appointed to positions and wherever possible utilised within the Highways Team.

- Had there been any assessment of impact or cost implications through changes within the Policy.

This was to be monitored. There was no huge change from the existing code of practice based on rigid guidance. There was some discretion to carry out repairs with no fundamental change in the numbers.

- Evaluation of highway safety and consideration of demographics and population in certain areas and whether it was cost effective to wait until a pothole worsened and it got bigger.

Defects in the highway were assessed against investigatory level depth in line with specifications, intervention levels and sizes. A large section of potholes were inspected post-repair to gauge the lifespan of the pothole. This work was undertaken by the Highway Supervisor and in 95% of all cases the repair was still successful. Work did take place to identify works areas that were starting to develop before they turned into potholes.

Whilst consideration was given to defects within certain populated areas, there was no consideration of an individual's circumstances.

- Training programme timeframes for Highway Inspectors.

Training timescales were currently being arranged with the provider for all Highway Inspectors to be trained in line with recognised standards before the implementation in October, 2018.

- How would it be known if the Code had been implemented effectively, when would the implementation be reviewed and were there any major implications to changes to working practices.

Performance management information data was to be collected and analysed on a quarterly basis, which not only included potholes, but insurance claims. The Code of Practice would also be updated every year in accordance with the Council's insurers and solicitors.

In terms of the capacity of the Highway Inspectors, this comprehensive role was designed as a single point of contact related to highways within Wards and from a customer perspective. This would be monitored and discussed on a monthly basis for any workload changes, but no major changes were envisaged.

- Page 17 detailed how the Code applied to adopted highways, but what justification was there, if any, on any unadopted roads.

Work on unadopted highways was limited as responsibility lay with who owned the highway frontage. The Council was happy to provide support, advice and guidance where applicable and would work with Ward Members to keep areas safe. The Council was under no legal obligation to resurface an unadopted road.

- Page 29 referred to street lighting routine inspections and clarification was sought if there were any legal timeframes.

This would have to be deferred to the Street Lighting Engineers.

- Page 30 related to highway drainage and road gullies and clarification was sought on those gullies that were persistently blocked.

There was an inspection regime for maintenance of the 45,300 gullies across the Borough. Over 90% of the gullies were kept free and working correctly. There may be occasions when a gully was blocked, but the system was designed for this to be bypassed and for surface water to travel to the next one. The team were happy to respond to concerns or requests. The team did struggle to inspect every gully as occasionally they were blocked by a vehicle.

- Page 32 detailed a grid of action for verge maintenance and advice was sought on verge overgrowth obstructions and the requirement for road signs to be visible to road users.

Any obstruction of road signs would be inspected and vegetation removed where necessary.

- Page 88 referred to the performance management framework and measures, their publication and would this be scrutinised.

Performance management and the sliding scale for the condition of the highway network was monitored quarterly. More operational type measures relating to potholes, vegetation etc. were published on the Council website along with customer satisfaction surveys. On the completion of schemes affected residents were written to and notified accordingly.

- Page 71 detailed when other road safety measures or additional routine maintenance had been identified were relevant departments advised of the performance of other departments and would there be an obligation to respond to those inspections.

Performance management data for highways was published. It was not known how other Departments published their own data.

- Page 19 (3.1) referenced unclassified routes and residential state roads when the biggest problem was when rural roads were populated by HGVS. Was this reported and could any statistics be broken down into Ward areas for any particular issues.

On unclassified routes, as long as vehicles were not damaging the highway nor were there any weight restrictions, then HGVs had a right to use the highway.

Whilst data was not broken down into specific Wards, the team would be happy to sit down and extract some reports that may be relevant.

- Street signage and the legal requirement for illuminated signs.

There was some legislation related to illumination and clarification would be sought from the Street Lighting Engineer.

- How do we ensure adopted footways and highways owned by Housing were also inspected and made safe and subject to the same rigid inspections under this Code.

Services were responsible for their own area to ensure footways etc. were safe and in good condition and the responsibility of asset owners.

- Was there any consideration to upgrading the laser based scanner system to do more surveying to a higher standard for less money.

The scanner was only available for certain mechanical vehicles. This service was bought in collectively across the region as a joint consortium to minimise cost.

- Once information was recorded was it analysed to determine the effectiveness of repair techniques.

There were inspectors in-house looking at defect material and data. The use of historical information was used to build highway schemes, frequency numbers and condition data.

- Page 20 referred to highway structures being inspected every 2 years and in principle between 6-12 years and questioned whether this should say months.

Clarification would be sought from the Structures Team.

- Page 66 related to highway authorities of South Yorkshire and any roads that crossed over boundaries and whether there was any cost savings from any collaborative work, especially around level crossings.

All Local Authorities consulted with their neighbours, but due to costs involved may not always join up with their work.

In terms of level crossings only the approaches were the responsibility of Highways. The crossing itself was the responsibility of Network Rail.

The Chair thanked Councillor Hoddinott, Colin Knight and Andrew Rowley for their very informative presentation and suggested that any further questions be forwarded on.

**Resolved:-** (1) That the revised “Rotherham MBC Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment” (Appendix A) to ensure that the highway is safely maintained, thereby safeguarding users of Rotherham’s highways be supported.

(2) That performance management data published on the website be shared with the Improving Place Select Commission Members.

(3) That feedback be provided on the areas requiring further clarification.

(4) That a further update be provided in due course and for this to incorporate resident satisfactory survey data, identification of any savings and if there were any reduction in accidents.

## **117. STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PROPERTY REVIEWS**

The Chair introduced Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy who introduced this presentation. This involved the Strategic Asset Management Plan which formed part of the Council’s health check.

Paul Smith and Louise Murray from Asset Management gave a PowerPoint presentation which drew specific attention to:-

- Background information.
- Strategic Asset Management Plan.
- Policy and Strategy.

- Objectives.
- Action Plan and Delivery.
- Operational Property Review.
- Non-Operational Property Review.
- Surplus Properties.
- Community Buildings Review.
- Other Reviews.
- Next Steps.

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

- Would Ward Members be involved in the report for more specific information for the Community Buildings Review which would be submitted to the Asset Management Board.

Ward Members would be consulted. Only 12 buildings were affected so did not involve each of the Borough's Wards.

- Was there any criteria to retain buildings of benefit to the Borough for non-operational properties.

There was some criteria, but this depended upon the benefit to the community and the use and demand for those properties. Consultation would take place with Ward Members and all interested parties on the use of those properties going forward.

- In the objectives it referred to supporting economic growth and the town centre regeneration. Would this include outlying town centres as well. The building asset list circulated to Ward Members was also out-of-date.

Comments on the building asset list were welcomed and this would be updated with a more comprehensive representation in due course.

In terms of town centres, consideration was being given to Swinton and Wath and others going forward.

- Objective 4 related to developing growth income for non-commercial activities and a smart action plan. Could clarification be provided on quantitative measures, figures, direction of travel, financial targets and delivery outcomes.

From a savings point of view there was to be £1 million this year and next year combined. The planned reviews would assist, make better use of facilities and development of working practices was key.

There were some income targets with growth in academy income. The trading income was looking at a larger planned investment strategy in developing other property. For example the site in Manvers next to the business incubation centre may be developed on a commercial basis and invested in by the Council to provide much needed jobs and provide income. A report on this commercial approach was to be submitted to the Asset Management Board.

- Did it cost anything to be members of CIPFA and were officers able to provide a challenge to service areas on how to use buildings more effectively and deliver a better service, are they able to do this through this strategy.

The Council did have CIPFA membership. Challenges to service areas were primarily to do with building usage and not delivery of the services within it. WorkSmart initiatives would be reinvigorated to help reduce the building catalogue.

- Anston Library is a building that appeared to be in Council ownership, but was in fact owned by the Parish Council. Consideration needed to be given to land and property and any asset transfers to other interested bodies, including Parish Councils, before disposing of land.

This Asset Management Review formed part of the process and Parish Councils would be added to the stakeholder list before decisions were made to dispose or declare buildings surplus.

Clarification was provided on the differences between the Community Asset Register and the Community Right to Bid for Community Asset Transfers.

- Was there any obligation under the One Public Estate to consult others when properties were to be disposed of to ensure agreement.

The One Public Estate included all Councils in the Sheffield City Region, the Fire Authority and NHS. This was run by the Joint Asset Board chaired by the Chief Executive and it was this Board that decided on the delivery of the funding. There was no clawback feature.

- If there were surplus properties in a Ward and community benefit could be proven was there any reinvestment into that area from the proceeds of any disposal.

Proceeds from asset disposal could not be ring-fenced and was included within the capital fund. The capital fund target was £2 million within the MTFs; some of which went back into the revenue budget.

- The Wingfield Community Buildings Review had identified 23 accessible buildings and questions were asked how the asset lists were compiled.

The list was compiled from information held by the Terrier Section. Hopefully Ward Members would assist as they were the ones that really knew their areas. This would assist in compilation of more accurate lists.

**Resolved:-** (1) That Councillor Lelliott, Paul Smith and Louise Murray be thanked for their informative presentation.

(2) That any material be forwarded onto the Parish Councils to maintain information flow.

## 118. ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN

The Chair introduced Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy who introduced this presentation which formed an overview of the Town Centre Masterplan and following the consultation the process of moving forward.

Officers from RiDO gave a PowerPoint presentation which drew specific attention to:-

- Masterplan Overview and the Approach.
- Shaping Strategy.
- Masterplan Recap.
- Forge Island.
- Riverside Residential.
- Indoor and Outdoor Covered Markets and the view from Drummond Street.
- Guest and Chrimes.
- Bus Interchange and Multi-Storey Car Park.
- Streets and Spaces for Improvement.
- Results of the Consultation.
- Town Centre Transformation – Achievements and Progress.
- Forge Island Development Timetable and Flood Defences.
- Markets Investments.
- Public Realm.

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

- Welcomed investment into the town centre and the need for quality developments with the impacted businesses given adequate notice.



Careful consideration would be given to developments to ensure future problems did not occur. Some business were affected and any relocation would be supported to the benefit of the town centre.

- The need for good quality well designed buildings in the town centre to replace those lost.

This would be controlled by the development agreement and written into the agreement to control quality and design. The end product had to be high quality and attractive from a user point of view and include linking through to Forge Island and the Minster Gardens.

- The shaping strategy referred to quality drinking. It was hoped the right balance of establishment could be easily managed and for this to be family orientated to prevent the risk of anti-social behaviour.

The phraseology could have been better. The plan was for more leisure and food outlets. This was very much a quality family destination not a set of bars. The competition stage 1 tenders had been sent out inviting a number of developers to come to stage 2 and the elements would be a mix of competitive features and not just one developer or design.

- Shopping was not always the answer. Were there any plans to reduce the shops around town to avoid sprawling gaps.

The town centre was too large and drawn out with Tesco at the one end of the high street. This would form part of the Local Plan to look to shrink the town centre from Wellgate and reclassify as part of the Local Plan adoption.

- If Rotherham was to become a Child Centred Borough how was this reflected in the master plan.

Young people had been included as part of the consultation and generally liked the ideas, especially for the cinema. The Interchange had been highlighted as an area of concern and this had been taken on board as part of the redevelopment.

- Delivery of the photo montages, especially for the market, would set Rotherham on the map, but was there concern about competition from developers from areas like Sheffield.

Sheffield was a city and had high quality public realm, some of which was the best in the country. Every effort would be made to get the right level of quality and design for Rotherham. Cost had to be taken on board for initial capital and maintenance. Rotherham was different and there were plenty of developers looking for opportunities.

Whilst every effort would be made to seek a building depicted by the photo montage for the markets, it had to be DDA compliant and it had been agreed that the Guardian Centre would be demolished and the whole area opened up.

- Planning permission had been granted for residential development with some retail for Westgate Chambers which was objected to by 1915 Bar due to its close proximity.

It was a fantastic opportunity for the redevelopment of Westgate Chambers with 62 residential units. Adequate soundproofing would be required given the proximity of the public house.

- Was there any inclusion of other town centres throughout the Borough including in this masterplan.

Invitations had gone out to the market for the redevelopment of Swinton and it was not certain about other outlying town centre areas. However, officers were happy to look at other project areas.

Other town centre development could be added to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's work plan and prioritised in due course.

- Rotherham had to compete with big developments like Meadowhall who were a private concern and had to offer something completely different to other areas. Could areas of historic interest be incorporated such as the Guest and Chrimes site as part of the redevelopment.

The Council had successfully acquired Forge Island, the Magistrates Courthouse and the bridge and officers were working hard to get the best offer for Rotherham off the ground. Leases had also been secured for the cinema. The consultation feedback had also highlighted the need for a different landscape to places like Meadowhall and were to focus on keeping the masterplan local for local people who were excited about the future.

- There was a need for a clear communication strategy to advise the public on which buildings would be demolished, about the relocation of the Interchange and evidence of the landscape moving forward. The advertising hoardings would tell Rotherham's story.

The advertising hoardings were being designed following a visit to Barnsley and to learn how best to be proactive in getting the message out across the Borough. A task and finish group had also been set up regarding the town centre communication strategy.

The Town Centre Marketing Sub-Group had produced some information. This would be circulated by email to Members.

- Could the 2019 public realm proposals be shared in due course.

Public realm 2019 was being considered as part of the task and finish group public realm. These issues were important and would be shared at the earliest opportunity.

**Resolved:-** (1) That Councillor Lelliott and the officers from RiDO be thanked for their informative presentation.

(2) That information relating to the communication plan be circulated by email to Members.

(3) That feedback from the consultation process be incorporated into designs as much as possible

(4) That consideration be given to developing plans for other town centres across the Borough and for this to be included within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's work plan in due course.

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

**Resolved:-** That the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission take place on Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 at 1.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION  
18th April, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allen, Atkin, B. Cutts, Elliot, McNeely, Reeder, Mrs. L. Shears, Sheppard, Taylor, Vjestica and Walsh and Mrs. L. Shears (Co-opted Member).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Turner and Wyatt.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**120. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Albiston declared a Personal Interest in Minute No. 125 as she carried out support work with Rotherham Rise.

**121. WEBCAST**

A number of Members objected strongly that the meeting was not being held in the Council Chamber and therefore not being webcast. The meeting room was not suitable for those with hearing impairment and there was no microphone.

The Chair explained that the decision had been made in anticipation that several homeless people would be in attendance; not having the meeting webcast would give the opportunity for a full discussion to take place.

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

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

**123. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no communications to report.

**124. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH MARCH, 2018**

Arising from Minute No. 115 (Governance and Performance – Repairs and Investment Contract), it was noted that this had not been followed up.

Arising from Minute No. 116 (Revised Rotherham MBC Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment), clarification was sought if there was a reporting mechanism in place for when an inspector recommended a dropped kerb but it was not implemented.

The Scrutiny Officer undertook to get an answer to this issue from Colin Knight, Network Manager.

Arising from Minute No. 117 (Strategic Asset Management Plan and Property Reviews), Councillor Jones cited an example where he had been told that a building in his area was proposed for demolition which was the first consultation he had had.

Arising from Minute No. 118 (Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan), Councillor B. Cutts requested further information regarding the temporary bus interchange and how the location had been agreed.

It was also noted that Rotherham was a child centred borough and not as stated in the Minute.

Councillor McNeely, as a Ward Member, expressed her desire to be part of the Town Centre Marketing Sub-Group. She also felt that it should be "Town Centres" as there was more than one Town Centre in the Borough.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018, be approved as a correct record subject to the clerical correction highlighted above.

(2) That the issue regarding the non-implementation of a Highway Inspector's recommendations be forwarded to the Network Manager for clarification.

(3) That it be ascertained if any further consideration had been given to a member of the Select Commission being involved in the retendering/commissioning process of contracts.

(4) That the issue of consulting Ward Members in relation to proposals for community buildings be referred to the Head of Asset Management for a response.

(5) That the Scrutiny Officer refer Councillor B. Cutts' query regarding the temporary bus interchange to the Director for Planning, Regeneration and Transport.

(6) That the request by Councillor McNeely to be part of the Town Centre Marketing Sub-Group be forwarded to the relevant Director.

## **125. HOMELESSNESS IN ROTHERHAM**

The Chair introduced the presenters who were in attendance to raise awareness of homelessness in Rotherham and the issues that those people in housing need faced. It would also detail what actions were being taken to prevent homelessness in the Borough.

The presenters were:-

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 18/04/18**

Sandra Tolley, Head of Service, Housing Options  
Sam Barstow, Head of Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning  
Helen Caulfield-Browne, Strategic Commissioner  
Jill Jones, Homelessness Manager  
Shaun Needham, CEO Target  
Gareth Parkin, SYHA  
John McDonnell, Chairman, Shiloh Rotherham

The presentation was as follows:-

Homelessness Prevention Activity in Rotherham

Key Statistics:-

- Universal Credit – no hard and fast predictions
- Main reasons for homelessness
- Temporary accommodation
- Between April 2017-2<sup>nd</sup> February 2018
  - 122 households who were accepted as statutory
  - 714 households were prevented from becoming homeless
  - 484 homeless households on the Housing Register
- Rough sleepers – 2 counted

Homelessness Prevention Strategy 2011-2018

- The themes of the Prevention Strategy
- Loans, rent in advance
- Negotiations with landlords
- Tenancy support
- Pre-tenancy interviews and workshops
- Furnished Tenancies
- Financial Inclusion Team
- Outreach advice – hospital, prisons, Shiloh, rough sleepers

Begging

- Offence under the Vagrancy Act 1824
- Complaints mainly from businesses
- Police operation in November/December 2017 to focus on begging
- Multi-agency day of action 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 (another due in January)
- Staged approach
- 15 warnings, 4 cautions, one summons, 11 referrals made

Anti-Social Behaviour Tools and Powers

- Public Space Protection Orders – proportionate, reasonable appropriate
- Community Protection Notices
- Civil Injunctions
- Section 222 Local Government Injunctions

#### Rough Sleeping

- Official numbers are low
- The act of sleeping rough in itself was not anti-social
- Enforcement is not always the right way
- The behaviours that can sometimes be associated are anti-social and can be dealt with
- The official Rough Sleeper Count – reporting and help available

#### Changes to Homelessness Legislation

- The Homelessness Reduction Act – the changes
- Actions take in preparation for new Legislation
- Access all eligible applicants through an advisory service and agree a personalised plan
- Tailored the service to meet the needs of vulnerable people where their problems are “more than just the need for a roof”
- Advice on preventing and relieving homelessness
- October 2018 – new duty on public bodies to notify the local authority if they are aware of someone who is faced with or is homeless

#### Homelessness Funding

- Annual cost to run the Homelessness Service = £612,461  
Flexible Homelessness Support Grant

#### Burdens Funding

#### The Rough Sleepers

#### Domestic Abuse

2017/18 = £333,636

2018/19 = £314,710

2019/20 = £339,455

#### Housing Related Support

- HRS is a preventative programme providing ‘downstream’ cost-effective services and social care

#### Housing Related Support Pathways

- Complex Need  
Housing First
- Vulnerable Adults  
Emergency statutory accommodation and support  
Short term supported housing  
Floating support  
Dispersed short term tenancies
- Domestic Abuse  
Refuge  
Floating support
- Young People & Parents  
Emergency statutory accommodation and support  
Short term supported housing  
Floating support  
Dispersed short term vacancies

#### Housing First

- Unlike traditional staircase approach
- Permanent offer of a home
- No conditions other than maintaining tenancy
- Flexible, person-centred support
- Underpinned by a set of principles
- [www.youtube.com/wth?v=rPbcCA4](http://www.youtube.com/wth?v=rPbcCA4)

#### Housing First

- Unlike traditional staircase approach
- Permanent offer of a home
- No conditions other than maintaining tenancy
- Flexible, person-centred support
- Underpinned by a set of principles

#### Housing First – Complex Needs

- Many unable to access or maintain existing provision
- Entrenched, repeat homelessness and health and social care needs
- Acute and expensive public services
- Hard Edges (2015) 58,000 people in the UK with multiple and complex needs
- Strong body of evidence
- Cost effective
- Delivering strong outcomes for people with high support needs

#### Contact Details

- Reporting a rough sleeper – StreetLink 0300 500 0914
- Homelessness Manager – Jill Jones 01709 255618
- Head of Housing Options – Sandra Tolley 01709 255619
- Head of Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning – Sam Barstow 01709 254387
- Strategic Commissioner – Helen Caulfield-Browne 01709 254208

#### John McDonnell, Shiloh, gave an overview of the Service

- Drop-in day centre for the homeless and vulnerable needing support
- Christian-based charity that welcomed volunteers and guests regardless of their faith or culture
- Began over 25 years ago by 2 ladies providing soup and sandwiches to the homeless in Rotherham Town Centre
- Provided a free cooked breakfast and lunch every Monday, Wednesday and Friday 9.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. for approximately 40-65 guests each day
- Provided shower facilities, facilities to wash and dry clothes and provided clothes
- Moved into new premises at Station Road, Masbrough on 19<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 which had a hairdressing salon, dining room and social area,



outside courtyard, kitchen, medical room, 1:1 room, laundry and showers, classroom and activity rooms and a training room for volunteers/Board Room

- Looking to recruit volunteers for the reception, kitchen, befriender, cleaner, handy person, admin/HR
- In the last week there had been 9 new guests – 3 in temporary accommodation, 2 rough sleepers, 2 recently homeless, 1 sofa surfer and 1 social
- Provided motivational/mentoring
- Housing Service
- Educational Programme

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

- Sub-regional housing forum which worked across the Sheffield City Region focussing mainly on housing growth and had held its first meeting. It was hoped to hold a Homelessness Summit in Rotherham
- Crisis UK was launching a Plan to End Homelessness in Britain working across all providers
- There were 486 customers on Universal Credit with an average balance of £656 totalling £318,859. The average for customers not in receipt of Universal Credit was £378. Work was being undertaken to ensure customers understood what Universal Credit was and their responsibility to pay their rent. The Income Team now had 3 Pre-Tenancy Officers who worked closely with Housing Options as well as 8 Tenancy Support Workers who solely supported Council tenants
- There had been 82 Warrants for Eviction issued of which 66 had been carried out. This was relatively low compared to other local authorities
- A Worker had been placed within Children's Services so any family faced with eviction were referred to Early Help
- Often those with rent arrears had a long history of such arrears
- The Authority's 2017/18 target for rent collection had been £84.4M (98.9%) and had actually achieved £83.6M (99.15%). The 2018/19 target had been reduced to take into account Universal Credit
- The Homeless Team worked with private landlords to try and prevent eviction and emphasise that potentially it could offer support with regard to rent arrears

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 18/04/18**

- In 2017/18 the Authority had prevented 718 people from becoming homeless but had accepted a duty to 122, double the amount in 2015/16
- There were 6,742 people on the Housing Register – 245 in Band 1, 1,684 in Band 2, 1,674 in Band 3
- The Housing Options Team managed a temporary accommodation portfolio. Consideration was being given to a pilot using modular buildings but could potentially be used as crash pads/assessment centre
- Consideration should be given to the use of guest bedrooms in various buildings around the Borough that possibly could be utilised as temporary accommodation
- If evicted from a Council property, the tenant could not rejoin the Housing Register for 5 years. The Homelessness Team would look at applications for any intentionality; the Team had to provide advice and assistance to get customers another home and if intentionality was found that could be through a private landlord
- There was close work with the Income Team to prevent an eviction situation
- Currently once a customer was evicted the Authority did not track them. However, that had changed since the introduction of the Homeless Reduction Act (3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2018)
- Under the Housing Act a local authority did not have a duty to a customer who was not eligible for Right to Remain in the country and they would be referred to Children's Services/Adult Social Care who would work with them to either try and get them back to their country of origin or look at the Right to Remain. Once someone was eligible for public funds the Team had a duty to them
- Customers with zero income would be referred to the Income Team for advice
- The quality of private rented properties had improved and the turnover reduced since the introduction of the Selective Licensing Scheme
- The Team could signpost a customer to any private rented property but it had to be suitably affordable and energy efficient
- The Income Team had undertaken training on Universal Credit
- Should the quotas in the Housing Register bands be revisited?

- The slots for pre-tenancy interviews and workshops had been increased. The interviews had been found to be working very well but a review of the workshops was required. It was mandatory to attend and the workshops should take place prior to an offer of property was made. Every tenant had to have an interview whether they were an existing tenant or not; the workshops were for new tenants only
- A review had recently taken place of the Furnished Homes package on offer resulting in a 3 year business plan. Under the scheme, a customer never owned the furniture, however, the new business plan included options for when an individual's circumstances changed. They could return the furniture and it then be sold back to them at a price taking into account depreciation and whether the customer was in employment (because of Housing Benefit rules)
- Discussions were taking place with the Strategic Housing Team and work with private landlords regarding provision of smaller accommodation particularly in light of the Regulations for the under 35's entitlement to Housing Benefit
- Under the Homeless Reduction Act it would be easier to identify "sofa surfers" and gain a better idea of the situation in Rotherham
- External help would be sought with regard to identifying rough sleepers and consideration given to what was required in terms of support
- The staff would question a young person who presented themselves as homeless to obtain a full picture as to why that situation had arisen
- The Housing Team attended a weekly surgery with the Probation Service Team as well as meetings with the Police with regard to customers who might be causing problems. They also visited Prisons and were notified of those who were ready for release. The Team also attended Re-settlement meetings every month
- There had been 15 warnings issued for begging which had resulted in 4 cautions. There was a process, along with the Police, to avoid criminalising someone who was begging e.g. verbal warnings, appropriate referrals into partners, but ultimately action would be taken
- There had been no publicity campaigns relating to the giving of money to beggars. Consideration was being given to a Diverted Giving Campaign which explained to the public the intricacies of begging and that it was far better, if you wanted to give, to do so to a charity rather than individuals on the street

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 18/04/18**

- The Police and Crime Commissioner's Domestic Abuse Fund was limited. Discussions were taking place as to whether it could be increased
- Under the Homeless Reduction Act, the Local Authority had a duty to prevent some becoming homeless 56 days before it happened
- In October, 2018 a new duty on public bodies to notify the Local Authority if they aware of someone who was faced with or was homeless e.g. Hospitals, Prisons
- Short term housing related support could be up to a maximum of 2 years
- The Housing First was a one year pilot and would be closely monitored. The model set caseloads of no more than 5 people to allow intensive support to be delivered over 7 days a week. Other Home Support Service models were time limited (usually 12 months) but not everyone's needs could be met in that time period. Studies showed that it took between 12-24 months for a customer to become a General Needs tenant
- There were 20 places available through Housing First. There was a young person's pathway
- The housing related support was a provision for the most vulnerable in society; delivery of this different type of support would eventually drive down costs by engaging with this particular cohort
- The Service had been commissioned on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2018, and had already identified 17 people who were constant visitors to the local authority. It was hoped that this approach would break the cycle
- The advantage of working with partners that had their own housing stock was the ability of offering customers other alternatives than the Authority's stock
- An operational group was being developed consisting of key people including the Police, Mental Health Service. The wrap around support was crucial to give customers the best opportunity
- Shiloh provided assistance for their guests with the completion of forms
- Shiloh now had increased integrated working particularly with Housing Services. However, there was still an issue with Mental Health support

- The Nurse would signpost guests for such services as Chiropody and Optical but oral hygiene was a problem for this particular cohort
- Shiloh were concerned about what they described as the “second chance” guests who fell below the criteria i.e. had massive debts so would never on their own be able to sort their finances out so would never be able to gain access to Council accommodation. Could a package be put together to address the needs of that guest?
- Shiloh had received Lottery Funding and now employed 2 managers who would carry out assessments of guests and a programme of various models which could be used as per the individual's requirements

The Chair thanked all the presenters for their informative presentations.

Resolved:- (1) That a progress report be submitted to the Select Commission in 6-9 months’.

(2) That information be ascertained with regard:-

Guest Bedrooms –

- where are these located and
- how many of them are there
- could these be used in an emergency plan situation

Private Rented Sector

- what is the number of properties in this sector in Rotherham ?

**126. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING - THURSDAY, 7TH JUNE, 2018 AT 1.30 P.M.**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2018, commencing at 1.30 p.m.

**APPEAL PANEL**  
**15th February, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Alam (in the Chair); Councillors Elliot 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 G1/02/18**

The Panel considered a grievance appeal relating to G1/02/18.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL**  
**19th February, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Alam (in the Chair); Councillors Read and Watson.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor 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 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).

**EARLY RELEASE OF PENSION - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for consideration of discretionary powers under the 2014 Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations for waiving of the actuarial reduction where a member voluntarily retires early (Regulation 30 (8)) and to apply the 85 year rule for members voluntarily drawing benefits on or after age 55 and before age 60, (Schedule 2 of the Transitional Regulations) from an employee of Children and Young People's Services.

The financial implications associated with the request were considered and discussed at length.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - HUMAN RESOURCES**

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Human Resources.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES (SCHOOLS)**

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

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES (SCHOOLS)**

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

Resolved:- That the application be approved.



**EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL  
26th March, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Alam (in the Chair); Councillors Beck and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors 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).

**EARLY RELEASE OF PENSION ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS -  
FORMER FINANCE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for early release of pension on compassionate grounds due to ill health causing financial hardship from a former employee of Finance and Customer Services.

The financial implications associated with the request were considered and discussed at length.

Resolved:- That the application be refused, but a referral be made for further benefit advice where appropriate.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - FINANCE AND CUSTOMER  
SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Finance and Customer Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST - 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.

**APPEAL PANEL  
4th May, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Alam (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 D1/05/18 - ADULT CARE, HOUSING AND PUBLIC HEALTH**

The Panel considered the appeal by D1/05/18 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**  
**9th May, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Alam (in the Chair); Councillors Allen, Cowles, Read 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).

**EARLY RELEASE OF PENSION ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS**

The Panel considered an application for early release of pension on compassionate grounds due to ill health causing financial hardship from a former employee of Regeneration and Environment Services.

The financial implications associated with the request were considered and discussed at length.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD**  
**26th February, 2018**

Present:- Councillor C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC - in the Chair); Councillors S. Allen and E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC) and P. R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) together with Mr. A. Ali, Mrs. L. Baxter and Mrs. R. Fleetwood (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC), Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

**24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**25. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 4TH DECEMBER, 2017**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 4th December, 2017.

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.

**26. BDR JOINT WASTE PROJECT - MANAGER'S REPORT**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report which highlighted and updated the following issues relating to the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI), for the period November, 2017 to January, 2018:-

- Table of recycling tonnes processed (April 2017 to January 2018);
- Information about complaints (noise and flies);
- Health and Safety;
- Fire protection improvements at the Bolton Road site;
- Issues affecting the Bolton Road facility and the transfer station at Grange Lane, Barnsley;
- Community Education (and applications being made to the Renewi Corporate Social Responsibility Fund);
- Finance – the Operational Management Budget Summary 2017/18;
- Waste Compositional Analysis continues, with the first phase results being compiled and the second phase to be undertaken during April 2018;
- Resources and staffing; establishment of one new post replacing the vacant post of Compliance Officer

- China has put in place limitations on the importing of waste materials; one consequence has been a worldwide slump in the paper and cardboard recycling markets.

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

## **27. CURRENT ISSUES**

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board noted the following matters:-

### **(1) Contract Issues**

Members were informed that the contract is performing well, although appropriate action should be taken to ensure an upward trend in recycling rates.

Tenders were currently being invited for the Household Waste Recycling Centre contract.

### **(2) Complaints**

During the Winter months, there had been no complaints about flies from the Bolton Road site. The number of flies might increase during the warmer months of 2018. The contractor has augmented the fly treatment controls since 2017.

Discussions continued with a local resident about noise from the Bolton Road site.

## **28. 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 fourteen risks are registered, with one risk added and none deleted since the last Joint Waste Board meeting held on 4th December, 2017. The new risk added was in relation to recycling markets, due to restrictions on tonnage and increased quality requirements introduced in 2018 by China.

Members discussed Risk 7 (Insurance) and noted the difficulty of obtaining terms in the commercial market for insurance for waste treatment plants. There was also the requirement by the 3SE insurers for more mitigation equipment to be installed at the waste treatment site.

Agreed:- That the updated information on the risk status report, as now submitted, be received.

**29. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Brief discussion took place on the powers available to local authorities to seize vehicles used in fly-tipping (eg: Section 5 of the Control of Pollution (Amendment) Act 1989 and Section 34B of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. It was noted that Rotherham MBC had recently seized a number of vehicles used in fly-tipping.

**30. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- (1) That the Annual General Meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held at the Town Hall, Rotherham, on Monday, 4th June, 2018, commencing at 9.15 a.m.

(2) That the next following meetings of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Mondays (dates to be arranged) during September, 2018 and December, 2018 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 9.15 a.m.

(3) That an additional meeting be held during March, 2018, including representatives of Sheffield City Council, in respect of the South Yorkshire Waste Strategy.