Council

Wednesday, 27 June 2018
2.00 p.m.
Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Moorgate Street, Rotherham. S60 2TH
The Council is composed of 63 Councillors, who are democratically accountable to the residents of their ward.

The Council Meeting is chaired by the Mayor, who will ensure that its business can be carried out efficiently and with regard to respecting the rights and responsibilities of Councillors and the interests of the community. The Mayor is the Borough’s first citizen and is treated with respect by the whole Council, as should visitors and member of the public.

All Councillors meet together as the Council. Here Councillors decide the Council’s overall policies and set the budget each year. The Council appoints its Leader, Mayor and Deputy Mayor and at its Annual Meeting will appoint Councillors to serve on its committees.

Copies of the agenda and reports are available on the Council’s website at www.rotherham.gov.uk. The public can also have access to the reports to be discussed at the meeting by visiting the Reception at the Town Hall. The Reception is open from 8.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. each day. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain private information and these will be marked accordingly on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Council meetings. A member of the public may ask one general question in person which must be received in writing to the Chief Executive by 10.00 a.m. on the Friday preceding a Council meeting on the following Wednesday and must not exceed fifty words in length. Questions can be emailed to councilquestions@rotherham.gov.uk

Council meetings are webcast and streamed live or subsequent broadcast via the Council’s website. At the start of the meeting the Mayor will confirm if the meeting is being filmed. You would need to confirm your wish not to be filmed to Democratic Services. Recording of the meeting by members of the public is also allowed.

Council meetings are open to the public, but occasionally the Council may have to discuss an item in private. If this occurs you will be asked to leave. If you would like to attend a meeting please report to the Reception at the Town Hall and you will be directed to the relevant meeting room.

There are public toilets, one of which is designated disabled with full wheelchair access, with full lift access to all floors. Induction loop facilities are also available in the Council Chamber, John Smith Room and Committee Rooms 1 and 2.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained via the ramp at the main entrance to the Town Hall.

If you have any queries on this agenda, please contact:

Contact: James McLaughlin, Head of Democratic Services
Tel.: 01709 822477
james.mclaughlin@rotherham.gov.uk

Date of Publication: 19 June 2018
COUNCIL
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Council Meeting
Agenda

Time and Date:-
Wednesday, 27 June 2018 at 2.00 p.m.

Venue:-
Council Chamber - Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham. S60 2TH

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

To consider any announcements by the Mayor in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3(2)(ii).

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive the apologies of any Member who is unable to attend the meeting.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Any communication received by the Mayor or Chief Executive which relates to a recommendation of the Cabinet or a committee which was received after the relevant meeting.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS (Pages 1 - 46)

To receive the record of proceedings of both parts of the annual meeting of the Council held on 18th and 23rd May, 2018 and to approve the accuracy thereof.

5. PETITIONS

To report on any petitions received by the Council received by the Council and receive statements in support of petitions in accordance with Petitions Scheme and Council Procedure Rule 13.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To invite Councillors to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or personal interests they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting, to confirm the nature of those interests and whether they intend to leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions from members of the public who may wish to ask a general question of the Mayor, Cabinet Member or the Chairman of a Committee in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12.
8. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Mayor, to consider excluding the press and public from the meeting in relation to any items of urgent business on the grounds that private information is likely to be divulged.

There are no such items at the time of preparing this agenda.

9. LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

To receive a statement from the Leader of the Council in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.

10. MINUTES OF THE CABINET AND COMMISSIONERS' DECISION MAKING MEETING (Pages 47 - 78)

To note the minutes of the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting held on 16th April, 21st May and 11th June, 2018.

11. RECOMMENDATION FROM CABINET - ROTHERHAM LOCAL PLAN: ADOPTION OF THE SITES AND POLICIES DOCUMENT (Pages 79 - 91)

To consider a recommendation from Cabinet to adopt of the Sites and Policies Document of the Rotherham Local Plan.

12. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - ORGREAVE PARISH COUNCIL - IMPLEMENTATION OF FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (Pages 92 - 107)

To approve the making of the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order following the review requested by Orgreave Parish Council.

13. NOTICE OF MOTION - US STEEL TARIFFS

That this Council notes:-

1. With alarm the decision of the US President Donald Trump, to impose a 25% tariff on imports of steel from the European Union, including the UK, to the USA, and a 10% tariff on aluminium.
2. That the UK sells approximately £360 million of steel to the USA annually.
3. That when the USA last imposed tariffs on EU steel imports under President George W. Bush in 2002, they cost the US economy an estimated 200,000 jobs – more than the entire US steel production workforce at that time.
4. The continued importance of steel production to the Rotherham economy, with 12% of revenue to Liberty Speciality Steels in Rotherham reportedly coming from exports to the USA.

This Council believes:-

1. That the imposition of US tariffs will be harmful both to the US and global economies.

This Council resolves:-
1. That the protectionist policies of the current US administration be condemned.
2. That the government be urged to make the strongest possible representations on behalf of the UK steel industry.
3. That the Community Union’s “Stop Trump Tariffs” campaign be supported.

Proposer:- Councillor Sansome Seconder:- Councillor Cusworth

14. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES, PANELS AND BOARDS
To approve the following membership changes to Committees, Panels and Boards:-

- Councillor Short to fill the UK Independence Party Group vacancy on the Standards and Ethics Committee.

15. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD (Pages 108 - 115)
To receive and consider reports, minutes and recommendations of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
To confirm the minutes as a true record.

16. PLANNING BOARD (Pages 116 - 120)
To receive and consider reports, minutes and recommendations of the Planning Board.
To confirm the minutes as a true record.

17. LICENSING (Pages 121 - 123)
To receive and consider reports, minutes and recommendations of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee.
To confirm the minutes as a true record.

18. MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS TO DESIGNATED SPOKESPERSONS
To put questions, if any, to the designated Members on the discharge of functions of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority and South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11(5).

19. MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN
To put questions, if any, to Cabinet Members and Chairmen (or their representatives) under Council Procedure Rules 11(1) and 11(3).

20. URGENT ITEMS
Any other public items which the Mayor determines are urgent.
The next meeting of the Council will be on Wednesday, 25th July 2018 at 2.00 p.m. at the Town Hall.
COUNCIL MEETING
18th May, 2018


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

172. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Councillor Alan Buckley be elected Chairman of the Rotherham Borough Council for the ensuing Municipal Year and that he be entitled to the style of Mayor by virtue of Section 245(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Mover:- Councillor Taylor
Seconder:- Councillor McNeely

Councillor Buckley thereupon made and subscribed the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

(Councillor Buckley assumed the Chair)

173. VOTE OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING MAYOR (COUNCILLOR EVE ROSE KEENAN)

Resolved:- That the Council tender its sincere thanks to Councillor Eve Rose Keenan for the excellent manner in which she has carried out all her duties as Mayor of the Metropolitan Borough of Rotherham and that the best thanks of this Council be recorded for the kind and admirable way in which Mr. Pat Keenan performed the duties of Consort.

Mover:- Councillor Hoddinott
Seconder:- Councillor Clark

174. PRESENTATION OF THE PAST MAYOR’S PENDANTS

The Mayor asked the Council to join him in offering his sincere thanks to Councillor Eve Rose Keenan for the excellent manner in which she has carried out all her duties as Mayor and formally presented her and the Consort with their past Mayor’s pendants.
175. **ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Resolved:- That Councillor Jenny Andrews be elected Vice-Chairman of the Rotherham Borough Council for the ensuing Municipal Year and that she be entitled to the style of Deputy Mayor by virtue of section 245(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Mover:- Councillor Rushforth Seconder:- Councillor Brookes

Councillor Andrews thereupon made and subscribed the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

176. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B. Cutts, Hague, Marles, Price, Jarvis and Vjestica.

177. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

178. **APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR’S CADETS**

The Mayor formally announced the names of his Cadets for the Municipal and Civic Year 2018/19 to the Council:-

- Army Cadets - Lance Corporal Owen McCloud.
- Sea Cadets - Able Cadet Kimberley Smelt.
- Air Force Cadets (218 Squadron) - Flight Sergeant Matthew Symms.

The Mayor invited each Cadet down in turn to receive their Mayor’s Cadet badge and framed certificate.
COUNCIL MEETING
23rd May, 2018

Present:- The Mayor of Rotherham (Councillor Alan Buckley) (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Allcock, Andrews, Atkin, Bird, Carter, Cooksey, Cowles, Cusworth, B. Cutts, D. Cutts, Elliot, M. Elliott, R. Elliott, Ellis, Evans, Fenwick-Green, Hoddinott, Ireland, Jarvis, Jones, Keenan, Khan, Lelliott, McNeely, Mallinder, Marles, Marriott, Napper, Pitchley, Price, Read, Reeder, Roche, Russell, Sheppard, Short, Simpson, Steele, Taylor, John Turner, Tweed, Vjestica, Walsh, Williams, Whysall, Wyatt and Yasseen.

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

179. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor was pleased to announce he and the Mayoress had already attended three engagements since his inauguration a few days ago. He confirmed he would continue with issuing a written report on his activity between Council Meetings.

The Mayor also confirmed he would be working for the betterment of Rotherham and asked all Members to observe the rules of debate and ensure the code is adhered to. All Members had a duty to match up to public perception and he made it clear from the outset that he would do his best to ensure every Member had the opportunity to express views where appropriate and looked forward to working in an atmosphere with mutual respect.

180. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allen, Beaumont, Beck, Brookes, Clark, Hague, Jepson, Rushforth, Sansome, Senior, Julie Turner, Watson and Wilson.

181. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications received.

182. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 28th February 2018, be approved for signature by the Mayor.

Mover:- Councillor Read    Seconder:- Councillor Alam
183. **PETITIONS**

The Mayor reported receipt of 2 petitions but they had not met the threshold for consideration by Council, and would be referred to the relevant directorate for a response to be prepared:

- Containing 40 signatures calling on the Strategic Director of Children and Young People’s Services to issue a statement regarding the return of 1,400 copies of a publication.

  An adult survivor, on behalf of the lead petitioner, addressed the Council as part of the presentation of the petition requesting the Strategic Director of Children and Young People’s Services to issue a statement regarding the return of 1,400 copies of a publication.

- Containing 38 signatures from users accessing Swinton Youth Club and their support.

  Councillor Wyatt addressed the Council as part of the presentation of the petition outlining the continued support for Swinton Youth Club and confirmed he would be the contact for the appropriate response.

184. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

185. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Mr. D. Smith stated that he understood that the portfolio for Neighbourhoods had been given to the Deputy Leader and asked could he be told what his remit was and what did the Deputy Leader hope to achieve?

The Leader confirmed the Deputy Leader had taken responsibility for neighbourhood working and would be responsible for the new Neighbourhood Working Model about how Councillors engaged in their local communities taking over the good work that had commenced by Councillor Yasseen.

This work would focus on enabling Councillors to be effective champions in their communities and Wards and deliver and release benefits to facilitate community activity.

In a supplementary question Mr. Smith asked when Councillor Yasseen had neighbourhood working in her portfolio she chaired the Town and Parish Council Liaison Committee. Councillor Watson had delegated this to someone else. Councillor Yasseen also set out to meet the Town and Parish Councils in the Rotherham area by attending their council meetings. Would Councillor Watson carry this on or had this been delegated too.
The Leader confirmed he himself determined the Cabinet Member portfolios so Councillor Watson had not delegated responsibility to anyone else. The responsibility for Town and Parish Councils liaisons would sit in the new portfolio taken on by Councillor Allen. The Leader had discussed with her about engagement and Councillor Allen would chair the Town and Parish Council Liaison Committee. The Leader was sure that if Parish Councillors had any specific requests in her capacity Councillor Allen would be more than happy to consider those in the course of her work.

(2) Mr. Harron referred to a previous question he had submitted to Council on the 26th January, 2018 and the correspondence by email he had had with the Leader which had still not resolved the matter. He referred back to what he had previously said about Ian Thomas’ Deputy, Jean Imray, who had sat in this Chamber in September and presented a report. Councillors were aware that Jean Imray claimed that a so called independent expert gave her reasons for Rotherham returning 1,400 copies of the publication “Voices of Despair, Voices of Hope” 3 years ago and he asked again would the Leader please provide all Councillors and himself with the name and position of the so called independent expert who allegedly gave the reasons to Jean Imray and Ian Thomas.

The Leader confirmed again, as he had in the email reply, that he did not know the identity of that person so was unable to share this information with Councillors or Mr. Harron.

In a supplementary question Mr. Harron referred back to the response on the 26th January, 2018 where the Leader had indicated the information did not exist. Mr. Harron had sent the Leader an email with the name redacted and he believed the Chief Executive knew the name of the person as he had tried to write to them. He, therefore, asked now Ian Thomas had left, this provided an important opportunity for Rotherham to change direction because the direction taken in September, 2015 was futile and had any thought been given to a restructure given that there was a vacancy to separate out the care with dedicated officers of adult survivors of CSE in Rotherham given their mental health and counselling from Children’s Services and Adult Services.

The Leader confirmed it had not. He did not fully understand the premise of Mr. Harron’s question; the Council did commission long term support survivors of child sexual exploitation in the usual way in consultation with officers in both adult and children’s services.

The Council would be looking at the contract as to whether the right services were commissioned over the coming year. The Leader did not accept the premise that by creating another internal highly paid role a better service would be offered to those people that needed it. As part of the contract review process it was important that survivors would wish to have their views, comments and experiences heard and this would be taken on board and considered.
186. **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, that should the Mayor deem if necessary the public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that any items involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of schedule 12(A) of such Act indicated, as now amended by the Local Government (Access to information) (Variation) Order 2006.

187. **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL’S STATEMENT**

The Leader wished to give formal notification of the Cabinet Member details and confirmed this had been publicised accordingly. He confirmed:-

- Councillor Gordon Watson Deputy Leader – responsibility for Children and Young People’s Services, Neighbourhood Working Model and Member Development
- Councillor Saghir Alam Corporate Services and Finance
- Councillor Denise Lelliott Jobs and the Local Economy
- Councillor David Roche Adult Social Care and Health
- Councillor Beck Housing
- Councillor Hoddinott Waste, Roads and Community Safety
- Councillor Allen Cleaner Greener Communities – responsibility for Streetpride Services.

The finer detail regarding which services fell into the remit of each Cabinet Member was still being finalised and would be circulated to all Members in due course.

The Leader wished to place on record his thanks and appreciation to Councillor Yasseen over the last 18 months for the work that she had undertaken.

The Leader also wished to report on the motion passed in January, 2018 regarding the overnight cover of the Rotherham 2 fire appliance in Rotherham and how this had been considered in detail at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The view had been to request the Leader to raise the concerns with the Fire Minister, Nick Hird, which had been done.
One of the recommendations made by Scrutiny had also been for minutes of joint authorities being included on the agenda at full Council meetings and these had today been included in the agenda packs.

In January the Leader had given an update on the Fusion Bid and the joint request with the partnership to support child sexual exploitation survivors coming through the Operation Stovewood process. A partnership meeting was held on the 22nd May, 2018 at the Town Hall. Unfortunately, progress had not been made as it was hoped at this time, but the work would continue with Central Government for funding now there was greater understanding about the situation in Rotherham, the services required and the knock on consequences. Agreement had not yet been reached with Central Government over what they would fund to move Rotherham forward, but the Council would continue to bang the drum for the Rotherham survivor community.

The Leader was also pleased to report on the great community sporting events over the last few weeks, which included the Tour de Yorkshire, Rotherham’s first 10k race and the UEFA Under 17 football tournament. Rotherham United were also at the play off finals at Wembley this weekend and it was requested that, in accordance with the flag protocol, the Rotherham United flag be flown over the weekend in support.

Councillor Atkin reminded all Members that Wath Rugby Club was also successful at Twickenham and won the Senior Shield.

The Leader confirmed arrangements were in hand for them to visit the Town Hall to mark their achievement accordingly.

188. MINUTES OF THE CABINET AND COMMISSIONERS’ DECISION MAKING MEETING

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet/Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting held on 19th February and 12th March, 2018, be received.

Mover:- Councillor Read Seconder:- Councillor Lelliott

189. RECOMMENDATION FROM CABINET - WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 133 of the meeting of the Cabinet/Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting held on 16th April, 2018, consideration was given to the report which proposed changes to introduce kerbside plastic collection as soon as practicable, and introduce an all year round green waste chargeable service from October 2018. The lid colour of the new residual bin had also been open to public vote and this was now confirmed to be pink.
On this basis it was proposed that the capital costs of the purchase of vehicles and bins be added to the Capital Programme.

A number of Members expressed their views regarding the cost of the replacement green bins, the lack of any trial for the new collection service in multi-occupancy properties, seeking best practice advice and visits to other Local Authorities and the U-turn on the recycling of plastic which were answered by the Cabinet Member. The decisions were based on learning from others and how the consultation process and the Service had listened to the views of local residents.

Resolved:- Councillor Hoddinott Seconder:- Councillor Alam

190. MEMBERSHIP OF POLITICAL GROUPS ON THE COUNCIL, POLITICAL BALANCE AND ENTITLEMENT TO SEATS

Consideration was given to a report which detailed how Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 placed on local authorities the duty to allocate seats to political groups and set out the principles to be followed when determining such allocation following formal notification of the establishment of political groups in operation on the Council.

There was a requirement to annually review the entitlement of the political groups to seats on the committees of the Council.

The allocation of seats must follow 2 principles:-

(a) Balance must be achieved across the total number of available seats on committees; and

(b) Balance must be achieved on each individual committee or body where seats are available.

There were presently 2 political groups in operation on the Council – the Labour Group and the UK Independence Party Group – with two non-aligned Councillors (Members who were not in a political group).

There were 169 seats available on committees, boards and panels and under the calculation the Labour Group was entitled to 129 seats and the UK Independence Group entitled to 35. This left 5 seats which could not be given to members of the political groups and should be allocated to the 2 non-aligned Councillors.

Resolved:- (1) That the operation of two political groups on the Council and the detail of their designated Leaders be noted.

(2) That the entitlement of the membership of the political groups be agreed and such entitlements be reflected in Council’s appointments of members to committees.
(3) That approval be given to the appointment of Members to committees, boards and panels, and the appointment of Chairs and Vice-Chairs, as set out on the schedule tabled at the meeting as follows:-

EXECUTIVE

Leader of the Council Councillor Read
Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services and Neighbourhood Working Councillor Watson
Cabinet Member, Social Care and Health Councillor Roche
Cabinet Member, Job and the Local Economy Councillor Lelliott
Cabinet Member, Waste, Roads and Community Safety Councillor Hoddinott
Cabinet Member, Cleaner, Greener Communities Councillor Allen
Cabinet Member, Housing Councillor Beck
Cabinet Member, Corporate Services & Finance Councillor Alam

REGULATORY BOARDS

Standards and Ethics Committee:- (8 Council Members)

Councillor Brookes Councillor McNeely (Chair)
Councillor Clark (Vice-Chair) Councillor Simpson
Councillor Fenwick-Green Councillor Vjestica
Councillor Ireland (One UKIP Vacancy)

Independent Members:-

Mr. P. Edler 3 Vacancies
Ms. J. Porter

Parish Council Representatives:-

Councillor D. Bates Councillor R. Swann
Councillor D. Rowley
Licensing Board:-
(21 Members)

Councillor Beaumont (Vice-Chair)  Councillor Reeder
Councillor Buckley               Councillor Rushforth
Councillor Clark                Councillor Senior
Councillor Elliott              Councillor Sheppard
Councillor Ellis (Chair)        Councillor Steele
Councillor Fenwick-Green        Councillor Taylor
Councillor Hague                Councillor Wyatt
Councillor Jones                Councillor Vjestica
Councillor Mallinder            (One UKIP Vacancy)
Councillor McNeely              (one non-aligned Vacancy)
Councillor Napper

Licensing Committee:-
(15 Members drawn from Licensing Board)

Councillor Beaumont (Vice-Chair)  Councillor Napper
Councillor Buckley               Councillor Reeder
Councillor Clark                Councillor Senior
Councillor Elliott              Councillor Steele
Councillor Ellis (Chair)        Councillor Taylor
Councillor Fenwick-Green        Councillor Vjestica
Councillor Hague                (One non-aligned Vacancy)
Councillor Jones

Planning Board:-
(15 Members)

Councillor Andrews       Councillor Sheppard (Chair)
Councillor Atkin         Councillor John Turner
Councillor Bird          Councillor Tweed
Councillor D. Cutts      Councillor Walsh
Councillor M. Elliott    Councillor Whysall
Councillor Fenwick-Green Councillor Williams (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Ireland      Councillor Vjestica
Councillor Sansome

Substitutes
Councillor Brookes
Councillor Khan
Councillor Mallinder

Audit Committee:-
(5 Members)

Councillor Cowles  Councillor Walsh (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Evans   Councillor Wyatt (Chair)
Councillor Vjestica
SELECT COMMISSIONS

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

Councillor Brookes
Councillor Cowles (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Cusworth
Councillor Evans
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191. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Consideration was given to a report proposing approval of amendments to various parts of the Council’s Constitution following the external review of Executive Procedure Rules, Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and Access to Information Procedure Rules undertaken by the Association of Democratic Services Officers.

The report also proposed a minor amendment to the Council Procedure Rules to clarify and ensure consistency in respect of provisions for invoking a right to reply for proposers of amendments to motions.

The proposals had been reviewed and supported by the Constitution Working Group.

Councillor John Turner expressed his frustrations on the rules of debate and was advised by the Leader that the rules had been made clearer to avoid any confusion in the future.

The Mayor also confirmed that once the proposals were agreed he would ensure that a copy of the Council Procedure Rules be provided for all Members.

Resolved:-

1. That the proposed amendments to the Executive Procedure Rules, Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and Access to Information Procedure Rules be approved.

2. That Council Procedure Rule 18(30) be amended to read “Once an amendment has been determined, the proposer of the amendment does not have the right of reply at the conclusion of the debate on the original or substantive motion”.

3. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Legal Services to make any consequential amendments to the Constitution arising from the changes agreed by Council.

Mover:- Councillor Read Seconder:- Councillor Steele

192. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - ORGREAVE PARISH COUNCIL - FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Further to Minute No. 110 of the Council meeting held on 13th December, 2017, consideration was given to the results of the consultation exercise undertaken on the modified terms of reference for the Community Governance Review for Orgreave.
The issue which has prompted a community governance review was whether the continued expansion of the Waverley settlement and the increasing numbers of residents living there warranted changes to the arrangements for parish councils in that area. At present the Waverley settlement was split between the parishes of Orgreave and Catcliffe by a boundary which did not relate to any features on the ground.

A consultation process was initiative and local residents asked their views on 4 options:-

- No change to the existing parish arrangements.
- Reducing the existing parish of Orgreave to cover only the settlement of Orgreave, and to create a new parish to cover the southern part of the Waverley settlement. This option was proposed in the original petition.
- Creating a new parish for the whole of the Waverley settlement. The parish of Orgreave would then cover only the settlement of Orgreave and the parish of Catcliffe would cover only the settlement of Catcliffe.
- Creating a new area covering the whole of the Waverley settlement without a parish council. The parish of Orgreave would then cover only the settlement of Orgreave and the parish of Catcliffe would cover only the settlement of Catcliffe.

The consultation period finished on 16th April, 2018 and the outcome of these responses were set out in detail as part of the report where it was recommended that a new parish for Waverley be constituted. However, the process required the Council apply to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for consent to the Final Recommendations insofar as they related to “protected electoral arrangements” for the purposes of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. If consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England was then forthcoming, the Assistant Director for Legal Services would then be authorised to publicise the Final Recommendations in accordance with Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

It was further requested that a further report be brought to Council to advise Council on the decision of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and to seek approval of the Reorganisation of a Community Governance Order required to bring the Final Recommendations into effect.

Members were confident that this was the best possible solution for the Waverley new community and would lead to the best arrangements moving forward, but requested this be expedited in order to coincide with the election process in 2019/2020.
Resolved:- (1) That Council makes the following Final Recommendations for the purposes of Part 4 Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007:

1.1 A new parish, comprising the Waverley North and Waverley South polling districts shall be constituted and:

- The name of the new parish should be Waverley
- The new parish shall have the alternative style of Community
- The Waverley North polling district shall cease to be part of the existing parish of Catcliffe and shall become part of the parish of Waverley
- The Waverley South polling district shall cease to be part of the existing parish of Orgreave and shall become part of the parish of Waverley
- There shall be a parish council for the parish of Waverley with 7 members
- The altered parish of Orgreave shall continue to have the name “Orgreave”, shall continue to have a parish council with 7 members and shall not be divided into wards
- The altered parish of Catcliffe shall continue to have the name “Catcliffe”, shall continue to have a parish council with 9 members and shall continue to not be divided into Wards
- The election of all parish councillors for the parishes of Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley shall be held on 2nd May, 2019
- The term of office of every parish councillor elected on 2nd May, 2019 for the parishes of Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley shall be 5 years

(2) That the Assistant Director for Legal Services shall apply to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for consent to the Final Recommendations insofar as they related to “protected electoral arrangements” for the purposes of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

(3) That if consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England is forthcoming, to authorise the Assistant Director for Legal Services to publicise the Final Recommendations in accordance with Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

(4) That a further report be brought to Council to advise Council on the decision of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and to seek Council’s approval of the Reorganisation of Community Governance Order required to bring the Final Recommendations into effect.

Mover:- Councillor Read Seconder:- Councillor Lelliott
193. **SCRUTINY REVIEW - DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICES**

Consideration was given to the scrutiny review report which set out the main findings and recommendations from the cross-party spotlight scrutiny review of Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Recovery Services for Adults undertaken by the Health Select Commission.

Evidence was gathered by presentations, interviews seminars and a visit to the treatment centre at Carson House. Thanks were paid to everyone who provided evidence for the review and in particular Anne Charlesworth, Ruth Fletcher-Brown, Louise Hayter and Teresa Roche from RMBC, Diane Graham and Matt Pollard from RDash, Gemma Hewitt from the CCG, Members of the Health Select Commission and Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for their input and shaping the lines of enquiry.

The negative impact of drug and alcohol abuse not only affected the individual but also their families, children and communities. For the Members that took part the knowledge of drug and alcohol misuse was enhanced and presented a detailed analysis about drug and alcohol dependency and suicides. The findings were laid out in detail along with a comprehensive set of recommendations.

The report was presented for information to share the review findings with the wider membership of the Council. Following this meeting, the Cabinet and Commissioners would be required to respond formally to the recommendations and indicate agreement or otherwise and what action would be taken to implement the recommendations, together with details of timescales and accountabilities.

Members welcomed the report and its recommendations which would be looked at in due course. Councillor Roche wished to refer to Recommendation 3 relating to the work in the south of the Borough which was excellent and which ought to be extended. This was funded by what was the then Wentworth Valley Area Assembly and he had Ward Members welcoming them considering from their Ward funds this work continuing. He welcomed people in getting in touch with the Cabinet Member or Terri Roche.

Councillor Steele, on behalf of Scrutiny wished to thank Councillors Evans and Short and the rest of the Members for their work on this review. This highlighted the role of Scrutiny in policy decisions and that the work undertaken the Cabinet Members appreciate this and hoped this could be supported fully.

The Leader pointed out that this was the opportunity for a group of Councillors to influence and shape the policy in public. He thanked the group for the work and others on the work they had done and the need to raise awareness of such an important issue.
Resolved:- (1) That the report and recommendations in respect of Drug and Alcohol Treatment Services be noted.

(2) That the response of Cabinet be reported back to the Health Select Commission.

Mover:- Councillor Evans Seconder:- Councillor Short

194. SCRUTINY REVIEW - USE OF INTERIM, AGENCY AND CONSULTANCY STAFF

Consideration was given to a report which presented the views of a cross-party review group on the Authority’s use of agency, interim and consultancy staff following concerns about the forecasts of overspend.

The purpose of the review was to seek assurance that the Council measured performance and value for money in its use of agency staff and consultants and was taking appropriate action to maintain spend within acceptable limits. The recommendations made by Members were based on information and evidence collated during the course of the review and their challenge of existing practices and developing protocols.

The recommendations made by Members were based on information and evidence collated during the course of the review and their challenge of existing practices and developing protocols. The Workforce Management Board (WMB), led by the Assistant Chief Executive and attended by Assistant Directors from all Directorates, had been set up shortly before the commencement of this review to introduce a control process, with the use of agency staff requiring explicit Directorate and Board sign off.

It was helpful that the review coincided with the development of the Workforce Management Board as Members were able to hold officers to account and see evidence of its work with associated improvement in performance; increased oversight and reduction in spend. Through this regular dialogue, Members were able to influence the development of procedures and clarification of definitions and reporting routes which has meant that some of Members’ recommendations were implemented during the course of the review.

The report was presented for information to share the findings with the wider membership of the Council. Following this meeting, the Cabinet would be required to respond formally to the recommendations and indicate agreement or otherwise, what action, would be taken to implement the recommendations, along with details of timescales and accountabilities.

Councillor Cowles was happy to second and concurred with Councillor Steele. He commended him for the in-depth work that was undertaken and the avenues pursued and challenges being faced.
Resolved:— (1) That the report and recommendations in respect of use of agency, interim and consultancy staff, as outlined in Section 4 of Appendix 1, be noted.

(2) That the report is forwarded to Cabinet and its response to the recommendations be fed back to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Mover:- Councillor Steele  Seconder:- Councillor Cowles

195. NOTICE OF MOTION - GENDER EQUALITY

Proposed by Councillor Hoddinott and seconded by Councillor Pitchley:-

This Council notes:-

- That 100 years ago, the Representation of the People Act was passed allowing women over the age of 30 to vote for the first time. This followed a sustained campaign by women across the country, including many women in Rotherham.

- The first female Councillor for Rotherham County Borough was Councillor Mary MacLagen, who was elected in 1924 to represent Clifton ward. She was an active feminist, and was secretary of the Rotherham Branch of the National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies.

- That it took another 19 years to elect our first female Mayor, Councillor F. L. Green in 1943. Our first female MP for Rotherham, Sarah Champion was elected in 2012 and the Council's first female Chief Executive, Sharon Kemp, was appointed in 2015.

This Council believes:-

- We are indebted to those that have fought for gender equality and remember those women who died, suffered and sacrificed for a woman’s right to vote today.

- That a healthy democracy reflects the people it represents; all elected bodies should strive for equal representation of men and women.

- That this is still much to campaign for to achieve equality – less than a third of MPs are female, more than 90% of limited company executives are male, and in 2017 in the UK, men earned 18.4% more than women.
This Council resolves:-

- To erect a plaque to Councillor Mary MacLagen, the first woman Councillor in Rotherham and suffragette, in a prominent position in Rotherham Town Hall, to be paid for by public subscription.

- To seek a blue plaque for Councillor Mary MacLagen’s home on Broom Lane, Rotherham.

- To encourage the next generation of women to play their part in politics in Rotherham, by reviewing carers, maternity and paternity arrangements for Councillors through a member's working group.

- To provide a political voice for women in Rotherham by ensuring that issues that matter to them such as equal pay, bullying and harassment, sexual violence, and domestic abuse are heard within the Council.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

196. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Roche Seconder:- Councillor Mallinder

197. PLANNING BOARD

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meetings of the Planning Board be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Atkin Seconder:- Councillor Tweed

198. STAFFING COMMITTEE

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meeting of the Staffing Committee be adopted:-

Mover:- Councillor Alam Seconder:- Councillor Read

199. STANDARDS AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meeting of the Standards and Ethics Committee be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor McNeely Seconder:- Councillor Andrews
200. RECOMMENDATION FROM STANDARDS AND ETHICS COMMITTEE - MEMBERSHIP OF THE STANDARDS AND ETHICS COMMITTEE AND THE APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

Further to Minute No. 62 of the meeting of the Standards and Ethics Committee held on 1st May, 2018 consideration was given to the report in respect of its membership and the appointment of Independent Persons under the Localism Act 2011.

Resolved:– (1) That the appointment of the current Town and Parish Council representatives be confirmed until further nominations are received from the Town and Parish Councils.

(2) That the appointment of the current Independent Members of the Committee be confirmed until the end of the 2018/19 municipal year.

Mover:– Councillor McNeely Seconder:– Councillor Andrews

201. LICENSING

Resolved:– That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee be adopted.

Mover:– Councillor Ellis Seconder:– Councillor Sheppard

202. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY

Resolved:– That the minutes of the meeting of the South Yorkshire Combined Authority be received.

Mover:– Councillor Read Seconder:– Councillor Lelliott

203. SOUTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

Resolved:– That the minutes of the meeting of the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority be received.

Councillor Atkin pointed out that with regards to Minute No. 12 it was noted that the Stronger Safer Communities Research Sprinkler Fund had been set up from reserves that partners could bid into to make buildings safer. Rotherham had been successful in securing £138,765 towards fitting sprinkler systems into some two storey accommodation for elderly and vulnerable people namely at Dawson's Croft, Hampstead Green and Shaftsbury House.
Councillor McNeely welcomed the information given that Shaftsbury House was in her Ward. She had recently been involved in a meeting regarding new build properties where she had asked them to make enquiries with the Fire Service about putting the sprinkler system in before they were built.

Mover:- Councillor Atkin          Seconder:- Councillor Taylor

### 204. SOUTH YORKSHIRE PENSIONS AUTHORITY

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the meeting of the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority be received.

Mover:- Councillor Ellis             Seconder:- Councillor Wyatt

### 205. SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel be received.

Mover:- Councillor Steele             Seconder:- Councillor Roche

### 206. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO DESIGNATED SPOKESPERSONS

Councillor R. Elliott asked, having been re-appointed to the Fire Authority, could he trust Councillor Atkin to remember this Chamber’s wishes for the second pump to be reinstated at Rotherham fire station.

With a predicted underspend of £2.2m, please confirm that you won’t accept no for an answer and you will push for its immediate reinstatement?

Councillor Atkin gave his assurance that he had already made it plain the Council’s position to the Fire Authority, and he would continue to do so, alongside Councillor Taylor.

This did not, of course, guarantee that the Authority would agree with the Council for the reasons discussed over the last few months, but he and Councillor Taylor would do what they could to persuade them.

In a supplementary question Councillor Elliott referred to the last Council meeting where Councillor Atkin stated that the second pump at Rotherham could be manned in an emergency by retained fire fighters by way of a 5 minute response call. In such an emergency, as these personnel would be coming from Dearne and Birley Stations, was Councillor Atkin able to tell him the length of time it would take before the engine was active and started on the second pump.
Councillor Atkin confirmed when a pump was on retained duty fire fighters had 15 minutes to get active. South Yorkshire was particular busy last night. There was a major fire at Dinnington at a plastics factory. This involved 8 ground appliances and one air appliance. The fire was contained at 5.30 p.m. At approximately 9.00 p.m. there was a further fire incident involving Fosters Garden Centre which required 5 ground appliances, 2 were recalled back. This showed that 11 pumps were working in Rotherham and highlighted the resilience across South Yorkshire.

207. MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN

(1) Councillor Short asked what steps did the Council take to ensure the “Hand Car Wash” firms which operated in our town did not exploit workers?

The Independent Anti-Slavery Commission had concerns that car wash workers were being paid less than the minimum wage, were kept in squalid housing and subject to possible modern slavery.

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed this was an issue that affected many people including foreign nationals and UK victims. Following the Modern Slavery Act and new legislation a national system was set up for dealing with victims called the national referral mechanism. There was more information about referrals and the types of referrals coming through. The Commissioner had quite rightly highlighted the use of car washes, nail bars and other cheap services as actually fuelling modern slavery and people were being trafficked and put into forced labour.

Work was taking place with partners to co-ordinate a response to modern slavery and at the next meeting of the Safer Rotherham Partnership this would be considered and plans put in place.

With regards to car washes and enforcement, the Police and Council would react to any concerns by the public or Councillors. The service was aware of a couple of incidents and premises had been inspected based on reports. Consideration would need to be given as to what could be done, how to be more proactive and raise awareness of the issue amongst the public. This would be raised at the next meeting of the Safer Rotherham Partnership.

In a supplementary question Councillor Short made reference to a visit he had made to a car wash during a particular cold spell during the winter. The young men working had no protective clothing, their clothes were sodden and they were shivering and shaking. The owner, who was usually chatty, when asked why his workers were not suitably equipped indicated he did not understand and walked away. Councillor Short believed those who were licensed should comply with the relevant regulations and on this basis he wished to propose that a cross-party meeting look at this area to see if something could be done further. He
was aware of an initiative by Luton Council and how the Government’s Audit Committee was due to receive a report on this shortly.

Councillor Hoddinott further explained that incidents should be shared with the Police and officers so they could be looked into. It was pointed out that if any member of the public or councillor had circumstances where they were particularly concerned they could telephone the national modern slavery hotline and make reports anonymously which would be picked up by the Police. The points about cross-party working were welcomed and Councillor Hoddinott was more than happy to put this in place to see what more could be done.

(2) Councillor Cowles asked, in light of the recent planning decision to allow Yorkshire Water to build a new reservoir in Boston Park as they requested, did the Leader accept that Labour could not now be trusted to preserve public assets and green spaces for the benefit of residents as they were intended?

The Leader confirmed he did not accept the comment made.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles confirmed he had managed to obtain a copy of the 1903 Covenant which confirmed the use of the land as open green space and should be used solely for the purposes of public recreation ground. Page 6 stipulated that the said lands should only be used for the purposes of a public recreation ground. It further set out that urban authorities should maintain public parks and pleasure grounds and not in 2018 change our mind as it suits. The Covenant further stipulated that any work to the 1903 water reservoir should be well fenced from the public recreation ground. It would seem that RMBC Planning Department was in breach of the 1903 Covenant by agreeing a land swap with Yorkshire Water. The family of the Earl had been contacted and they were not aware of what had taken place. It would seem that Legal Services had failed to seek permission from the Earl or other living descendants and were prepared to go ahead with the outcome expecting the family or others to bear the cost of a legal challenge, which could be expensive. Once this land had been lost it had gone for 80 years so Councillor Cowles, therefore, asked if the Leader knew if the site or the surrounding routes were visited by the Chair of the Planning Board before the decision was taken. Councillor Cowles himself had sent a letter into Planning for this to be read out at the meeting, but it was not done so. In light of all this, the Leader was asked if he wanted to reconsider his response and that he was in fact not fit to manage the green spaces.

The Leader was not certain why this particular question was directed at him as any Member knew the Planning Board had a regulatory function and decisions were made. The Leader could not confirm if the Board had actually visited the site. It would be wrong for him to be intervening in a particular Planning decision and if he claimed Labour Party members had a view about a particular planning application, there would be claims that
decisions were pre-determined and pre-judged. If Councillor Cowles wished to ask these types of questions to the Chair of the Planning Board he may be in a better position to answer.

In terms of this particular site a planning application had been received, followed due process and a decision made. If there were legal issues that arose they would be addressed in due course. The Leader was aware and sympathetic that if Yorkshire Water did not undertake necessary works to the reservoir this threatened the water supply to 20,000 people and Rotherham District General Hospital.

(3) **Councillor Cowles** asked, following the collapse of ‘Carillion’ did the Cabinet Member have any concerns at the decision by your partner SYPTF in the selection of ‘Interserve’ as the prime contractor for the relocation and development of the bus station?

Councillor Lelliott explained SYPTF was aware, that although Interserve recently issued a profits warning they selected this contractor following a competitive process and they offered significantly better value for money than the nearest competitor. SYPTF have undertaken due diligence and did not have any concerns in this respect, however they have also taken out a bond to insure Rotherham should there be any issues of this nature when they would be covered.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles pointed out the Council should be concerned. He read some of the comments from the press about profit warnings so if there was a company failure and results in major delays to the project, Councillor Cowles was sure the public would not understand why this happened. These delays could take months or even years. The tram train was an example of another failure so would have thought due diligence would have been taken and asked had the Cabinet Member taken any due diligence.

Councillor Lelliott pointed out that it was for SYPTF to conduct its affairs and business how it saw fit. This was the same for the tram train. The Council could advise and guide, but was unable to dictate how SYPTF managed its projects. However, the Cabinet Member would be concerned if there was an impact on Rotherham, but was sure with the due diligence undertaken by SYPTF this would not happen.

(4) **Councillor M. Elliott** asked who determined that the appropriate time to close the multi-storey car park on Wellgate should be 7.00 p.m.?

Councillor Lelliott confirmed this was an historic decision, but was reviewed every year. Consideration had been given to extend the opening hours in Wellgate Multi Story Car Park in June 2017, but on the data received it would at a net cost to the Council. In and around the Wellgate centre there was a decline in usage after 6.00 p.m. and customers would be much more likely to use the alternative on and off street parking places which were widely available.
In a supplementary question Councillor Elliott understood the reasons, but had seen Members dashing from the Town Hall to get to the car park before it closed and secondly Rotherham United last Wednesday night was involved in a very important football which was attended by more than 11,000 supporters. People were driving around the town searching for suitable parking and to see the multi-storey closed and empty was extremely annoying. He asked if the opening hours could be reviewed.

Councillor Lelliott reiterated that the opening hours were reviewed annually and it would not be viewed favourably if it was kept open purely for Members. In terms of the football matches Councillor Lelliott would be more than happy to look and discuss opening the car park, but this had never been requested.

(5) Councillor Cowles often heard in the chamber that residents were listened to. He asked could the Cabinet Member then explain why when market traders were asked whether recently vacated space should be used for new business development or another seating area, traders requested new business development that it was decided to provide another seating area?

Councillor Lelliott formally thanked officers for the hard work that had been taking place in the market building. Councillor Lelliott confirmed she and officers met regularly with the Market Traders and have also worked with them to set up a new Traders Federation. Through both these meetings there had been traders that supported the removal of the empty stalls and provision of extra seating with very few traders against the idea.

In addition, the Council had made a £20,000 a year saving through this work which in turn had assisted the Council to reduce rents by 10% for a full year as some traders were struggling.

Traders also requested free parking on Drummond Street and an additional 36 spaces were provided. In addition, they asked for additional seating areas so this was provided which was further evidence that the Council was listening. If there was a particular trader who was unhappy with the decision Councillor Lelliott was happy to meet and work through the issues.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles was happy the Cabinet Member had brought up some of those figures. Speaking to people there were already 4 seating areas in the market so providing a fifth was hardly promoting the development of the market.

He further brought to the Cabinet Member’s attention a report on Look North that Rotherham was in the top ten list of worst town’s in England for retail so the Council’s track record was not looking that great. Footfall continued to decline so footfall figures were no longer published. This action on a further seating area was only the Council’s way of shrinking the market area as it was an easy way of filling the space.
Mansfield was £6.00 per stall with a further 20% off during winter months. St. John’s in Liverpool was free for 3 months. By comparison Rotherham’s 10% reduction for 12 months was the equivalent of £1.80 a stall and on a Tuesday market rents had been raised by a £1.00 plus £1.00 of build out per two feet. Could the Cabinet Member explain what kind of incentive this really was.

Councillor Lelliott explained Rotherham market was half the price of its Sheffield neighbour so compared competitively. In terms of the seating areas, having a downstairs seating area for those who had mobility difficulties was an excellent idea. In addition a stall would be opening shortly for consultation proposals with Clifton Park and the Market to get ideas moving forward. This would ensure that any points and issues could be raised by market traders.

(6) **Councillor Carter** asked what progress had been made with enacting the Town Centre Masterplan since the consultation last year?

Councillor Lelliott confirmed that considerable progress had been made on delivering the masterplan, for example:-

- The £10.5m University Campus at Doncaster Gate was well on the way and would be up and running by September.
- The Transport Interchange was now being refurbished and a newer facility would be much better for the people of Rotherham.
- The Council had selected a development partner to bring forward 3 Town Centre Housing sites which will deliver 182 new houses.
- Work was due to start on a £10m revamp of Westgate Chambers.
- The George Wright Building was now open after redevelopment.
- Forge Island had invited 3 potential development partners to submit detailed development proposals.

In a supplementary question Councillor Carter referred to the masterplan and the proposals to increase the provision in terms of increasing a night time social economy and asked for an update. He also asked about the plan for the many empty retail outlets and shops.

Councillor Lelliott confirmed the deadline for completed Stage 2 submissions for Forge Island was the 29th June and a development partner would be selected by September. Exact details would be provided in writing.

In terms of the town centre the Council did not actually own many of the empty retail outlets. The Town Centre Business Growth Board were looking at having vinyls being erected in the meantime, but every effort was being made to develop the masterplan further.
(7) **Councillor Napper** explained, as reported on Channel 4 Dispatches 26.03.2018, groups called C.A.G.E. and M.E.N.D. want anti-terrorism laws abolished and the Prevent Campaign stopped. He asked had any of the Rotherham Labour Group shared a stage with the Leaders of these groups as they had only good things to say about Jihadi John?

The Leader confirmed that neither he nor the Council actually kept a record of when a Labour Councillor had spoken alongside any groups. Anecdotally he was aware that some of these groups had actually been involved in some broad based anti-racism campaigns and some Labour Councillors have also been involved on the odd occasions in those meetings. These events also included speakers from other political parties and a whole range of views and it would be a long shot to say that they shared views about terrorism. If there were any suggestion that any Labour Councillors shared these more extreme views this was extremely laughable.

In a supplementary question Councillor Napper referred to the Labour Leader, Jeremy Corbyn sharing a stage with these people. However, in terms of community cohesion these type of groups tended to do the opposite and were not always conducive to communities.

The Leader confirmed the Labour Party was persistently anti-racist and it would continue on a cross party to pursue this agenda. However, it did not necessarily always agree with all the views of people that took part in those campaigns.

(8) **Councillor Cowles** repeatedly heard that austerity was the cause of all the Council’s ills, yet despite this, during the past 3 years 15/16, 16/17, 17/18 numbers of FTE’s employed had fallen yet the overall salary bill had risen significantly and he asked could this be confirmed.

The Leader explained about the nature of employment law and the way Local Government employment worked. The detail in the press about the annual salary bill confirmed there was a slight increase over the 3 year period and if the cost of employment, agency and temporary works was included there was a small cash decline in staff. The reason this happened was due to the reduced reliance on agency staff and at the same time the retained staff, which had reduced by 400 people over the 3 year period, were entitled to annual pay awards and additional increments. There were increases in the employers’ rate of superannuation and national insurance contributions. If the steps taken had not been implemented the wage bill would have been much more expensive and not affordable.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles referred to the annual wage increase and the fact that employees were asked to take 3 days leave without pay. In comparison terms this was the equivalent to about 1% and accounted for the pay rise. The Council had lost 400 members of staff, but if you compared this with the salary increase it still went up by
£680,000 and the following year rose by another £200,000. He, therefore, asked what was the average salary across the authority, the average salary outside Rotherham generally and how many staff were employed at a salary of £65,000 and above.

The Leader confirmed he did not have numbers to hand. He pointed out average salaries were included in the annual pay statement which was recorded and published on the Council’s website. The Council had a tighter budget which meant, sadly, the staffing complement had to decrease and difficult decisions taken in order to reduce the funding gap. He confirmed he would ask officers to assemble the factual information and send this forward in writing.

(9) **Councillor B. Cutts** would receive a written reply to his question.

(10) **Councillor Carter** asked would the Council add to its Minimum Standards Charter, that all new contracts would have to offer the Joseph Rowntree Living Wage, in line with Council employees?

Councillor Alam confirmed that whilst the Council would encourage all commissioned Council service providers to pay the Proper Living Wage, it was estimated that the rough cost of compelling them to do so would be around £10 million per year. This was not an affordable option at the moment.

In a supplementary question Councillor Carter asked could the Council not be more aspirational and for the employees of contractors to receive the same living standards. Many Councils had already commissioned or were looking to introduce the Living Wage in contracts and asked would the Cabinet Member look at this and include this in the future.

Councillor Alam would like to ask the commissioning providers to pay the Living Wage, but with this being £10 million worth of contracts this was quite challenging and to implement this it would be more expensive. The Council could only encourage providers it could not be enforced.

(11) **Councillor Napper** referred to the Government proposing guidance for scrutiny committees, in that, committees should have full access to financial matters and should not be restricted due to commercial sensitivity regarding contracts. He asked when would this happen?

Councillor Read confirmed the changes had already been made and Members to have access to all reports and exempt information making the process more open and transparent.

(12) **Councillor Cusworth** asked what was the Council doing to help reduce chronic homelessness within Rotherham?
Councillor Roche confirmed homelessness and sleeping rough was a national problem and had been caused by both the current Tory and Coalition Governments, the trend of which was a national disgrace.

Rotherham under a Labour admission had an excellent track record of tackling homelessness and undertook a wide range of activities to prevent homelessness often involving partnership working. A dedicated Homelessness Team sat alongside Property Allocation officers and the recently established Financial Inclusion Team. This ensured the Council met its statutory duties and carried out as much preventative action as possible. This included money management and benefit advice, referrals to employment solutions and tenancy affordability assessments.

Officers were also providing support to help tenants sustain their tenancies in the public and private sector and support resettlement programmes with the prison and probation services. The number of homeless preventions for the last year was 451.

Rough sleepers were supported by a variety of agencies including the Council with a dedicated worker recently appointed through a sub-regional grant funded programme. Rotherham participated in the National Rough sleeper count in November, 2017 and recorded 2 people rough sleeping.

There were loads of other examples in the way the Council was working to help solve this problem. The Cabinet Member was happy to provide a full list if this was requested.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cusworth referred to a programme Housing First being rolled out in other authorities and asked if Rotherham was involved.

Councillor Roche confirmed this was handled via the Housing Team, but he would ensure a written reply would be provided by the Cabinet Member for Housing.

(13) Councillor Carter asked how many families in Rotherham were affected by the collapse of Home Start South Yorkshire, and what was the Council doing to support these families in a difficult time?

The Cabinet Member for Housing was unable to attend the meeting today so a reply would be provided in writing.

(14) Councillor Carter asked the Cabinet Member for Housing how many homes within the Town Centre Masterplan will be funded by the HRA as privately occupied homes to then be sold on the open market?

The Cabinet Member for Housing was unable to attend the meeting today so a reply would be provided in writing.
(15) Councillor Fenwick-Green asked since its introduction 2 years ago, could the Cabinet Member tell her what improvement the Eastwood deal had made to Eastwood village?

Councillor Hoddinott thanked Rotherham East Councillors for the work they were doing with the Eastwood Deal and the work taking place to review it. A great deal of work had taken place in the first 2 years on how to address the immediate concerns and looking at some of the longer term issues. A number of different approaches had been tried and partners had moved to working closely together with joint team meetings and co-location. A medium focus had been on the built environment with particular attention on enforcement.

In 2017/18 there were 340 fixed penalty notices issued which was an increase from just 7 in 2016/17. There had also been 210 enforcement notices issued for more complex cases around anti-social behaviour and seven prosecutions as a result. The year before there had been 208 enforcement notices with three prosecutions.

Selective licensing had made a big impact improving the private rented sector and officers, just in the last few years, had been in over 500 properties in Eastwood to inspect. A number of cases had been raised with 53 warnings in the last year about waste in gardens and noise nuisance.

Overall, with the continuous enforcement as a whole there had been a 28% decrease on the same period in the previous year. In the longer term the regeneration in the area and changes to the housing stock would continue. It was recognised there was more to do as fly tipping and rubbish in gardens continued to be a problem. Neighbourhood working would continue to be encouraged and initiatives by Ward Councillors would go a long way to addressing some of the engagement and community working going forward.

(16) Councillor Cusworth explained in Swinton, Ward Members were tackling the issue of school parking by setting up Travel Plan Working Parties in Primary Schools and arranging, for example, themed walks to school, park and stride car parks and working towards ModeSHIFT Stars Active Travel accreditation and asked if the Council supported this approach?

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed she did and anything that could be done of tackle congestion was welcome. In Swinton she welcomed the initiatives and was happy to look to see how this could be supported across the borough.
(17) **Councillor Carter** referred to residents in Rotherham expressing frustration with the early closure of burial services mid-afternoon and asked was it fair that Sheffield residents got a better deal than Rotherham’s residents who paid extortionate fees for a worse service from the contract with Dignity?

Councillor Hoddinott agreed it was not fair and had expressed her frustration about the shortcomings in the contract. She had raised the issue around the cost with Dignity and was pleased that they had confirmed they would be freezing their prices until October, 2018. She would, however, make representations and look into the issue of early closure. Sheffield did close later, but Barnsley and Doncaster actually closed earlier when comparing times with neighbours. She confirmed she would continue to push for changes.

In a supplementary question Councillor Carter asked if he could be informed and be given the representations to Dignity about what steps had been taken as a Council.

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed she would be happy to provide correspondence.

(18) **Councillor Cowles** explained whenever any enforcement for littering or other types of anti-social behaviour had been suggested for implementation in Eastwood he had been made aware that Councillor Hoddinott had thus far blocked the use of such enforcement and he asked could the Cabinet Member confirm whether or not this was the case?

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed this was not the case.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles believed the situation with the Eastwood Deal had got worse not better despite the monthly cost of cleaning up the area. He received the photos and the emails each week and believed the Cabinet Member had requested they not be sent to her. He reminded her doing nothing was not a viable option. Every time he walked around with Mr. Kirk he had gardens brimming with rubbish and asked why. If selective licensing was such a success why were the gardens accumulating rubbish. The Council now knew who owned these properties so why were there any yards with rubbish in as these should be dealt with as soon as it appeared. He asked why had greater enforcement not been employed to stop some of the concerns happening down there.

Councillor Hoddinott outlined the progress and she had spoken to residents who believed it was better. There was more to do and she urged residents to talk to their Ward Councillors. She received the numerous emails and photos which were reported and acted upon. In terms of enforcement appropriate action was taken where necessary with moves towards prosecutions, which often meant some of the rubbish in gardens, was not cleared as quickly as this often provided as evidence.
(19) Councillor Napper asked when would R.M.B.C. look at reducing the speed limit on sections of Moor Lane North and South, Braithwell Road, Hollings Lane, Magna Lane and Far Magna Lane?

Councillor Hoddinott explained officers were looking at the representations on reducing speed limits on these sections. The Cabinet Member was more than happy to share the detailed work on this and a meeting was to be scheduled shortly to look at reasons for the speed limits and the accidents in the areas, which were not always speed related.

Around the Thrybergh area following representations the school would be having a 20 mph zone introduced in the next few weeks. She was happy to look at other areas with Councillor Napper.

In a supplementary question Councillor Napper explained in the last 5 years there had been 22 accidents on Moor Lane North, on Hollings Lane 3 deaths in the last 2 years, 14 vehicles overturned on Magna Lane and 2 accidents on Far Magna Lane at the crossroads near the Joker pub pedestrian crossings, but this was a 40 mph stretch. Down near Ravenfield School it was recommended that lights come up 20 mph, but this was not recognised by drivers.

The roads were classified as “B” and “C” and pointed out that in rural areas where roads linked the larger villages and HGV generators to strategic and main distribution networks and heavy pedestrian activity these types of roads should have 30 mph. Many of the roads described had speed limits of 40 mph. Officers had indicated that they had to wait until someone died before they could take action and he asked why there be a delay and someone hurt when they could not take responsibility. He believed this was wrong and it was time that action was now taken. He welcomed attendance at Ravenfield Parish Council meetings.

Councillor Hoddinott found it unacceptable that action could not be taken until someone died in an accident. She shared Councillor Napper’s concerns and was happy to sit down to see what action could be taken or what opportunities there were to take this forward. Some of the accidents were related to the camber of the road on Hollings Lane and the surface on Magna Lane. Some Members had used their devolved budget to look at speed measures that could be used in some areas and this was something the relevant Ward Members may wish to consider.

(20) Councillor Napper referred to Rotherham being in the spotlight for all the wrong reasons with the Chief Constable and 200 officers on T.V. regarding Eastwood arresting 12 people, impounding 3 cars and dismantling 2 cannabis farms and asked when was the Council going to get a grip of this place.
Councillor Hoddinott explained that action was taken where needed. She had spoken to the Police who confirmed this was in relation to Operation Duxford. The 200 officers were across Rotherham and not just in Eastwood. It was an important operation with the Police acting on community information in that area.

As supplementary information Councillor Napper pointed out that when the Chief Constable reported on television that he had 200 officers in the area this was considered a serious problem. However, many of these problems were continuing and it was hoped the Police would look into them further.

(21) Councillor B. Cutts question would be responded to in writing.

(22) Councillor Cusworth explained the Government was currently running a consultation on 'Transforming the Response to Domestic Abuse' and asked how had Rotherham Council engaged with this?

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed the Government was conducting quite a large scale consultation how Local Authorities responded to domestic abuse. This consultation would close at the end of May, 2018. Work had been taking place with partners about what it was they wanted to see with some important questions being asked about the definition of domestic abuse and how domestic abuse work was being funded. They had been protected so far in Rotherham, but if this was a priority it needed to be funded properly.

Councillor Hoddinott thanked Councillor Cusworth for leading on the engagement with Members and for chairing a session around the Government consultation. All this was being brought together and would feed into the representations around those areas. Councillors having read the response gave some good feedback and how to recognise the non-physical domestic abuse and the mental and financial abuse just as much.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cusworth referred to Amber Rudd, the then Home Secretary, concluded her forward to the consultation by saying “We are optimistic by working together we can better prevent, protect and support all victims of domestic abuse” so how can we as a Local Authority prevent, protect and support victims of domestic abuse during such times of Tory austerity.

Councillor Hoddinott explained it was difficult as these services have been affected by the austerity and the Council would do all it could to protect as far as possible.
Councillor Hoddinott paid tribute to the Housing Team success in gaining various national grants to assist local services. It was a shame, however, the Council had to rely on this ad hoc funding for such a core service and it was key that this should form part of the consultation when this was a priority and should be funded appropriately.

(23) Councillor B. Cutts would receive an answer to his question in writing.

(24) Councillor Cusworth explained the need for mental health care was in the news daily and asked could the Cabinet Member please tell her what RMBC were doing to support and care for people in Rotherham who may have mental health care needs?

Councillor Roche explained the health and wellbeing was important to everybody in Rotherham, enabling people to live fulfilling lives and to be actively engaged in their community. Mental health was crucial.

Last Monday he launched the Five Ways to Wellbeing as part of Mental Health Awareness Week (14th - 20th May) and he confirmed a survey had shown that the people of Rotherham recognised the importance of looking after their mental health and wellbeing. The launch covered that everyone had mental health, just like physical health it was important that steps were taken to look after it. The following steps, known as the ‘Five Ways to Wellbeing’ were easy and could be incorporated into our daily lives almost straight away. The simple things such as:-

1. Be Active.
2. Connect.
5. Take Notice.

The support and services that were provided range from individual personalised support, group work, support within the home and support with social inclusion and were all based on a prevention, enablement and recovery model. The main focus of support was to maximize independence and to support people to become part of their local communities.

Services provided within Rotherham were universal, targeted and specialist. For people with longer term needs the Council worked with Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust (RDaSH) with Social Workers and approved mental health professional staff working together to provide appropriate support.

The staff were currently “integrated” into multi-disciplinary teams which provide services to people with mental ill health.
Yesterday the Local Government Association had visited who praised Rotherham for its integrated services and rated as one of the best in the country.

RDaSH provided elements of rehabilitation, crisis, acute and home treatment, assertive outreach, early intervention in psychosis and day services. The Trust also provided psychological therapies and primary care mental health services.

The team supported a 24 hour crisis intervention service alongside providing mental health act assessments when required in a timely manner.

RMBC and RDaSH worked closely with the Voluntary Sector who also provided a wide range of support, services and community options, including Voluntary Action Rotherham MIND and Rotherham United. Part of this included the newly developed mental health social prescribing which had been seen to be a national leader. In addition to these areas there were a number of initiatives in schools including a dedicated website to help people improve their mental health.

Work was also undertaken as part of social inclusion to improve mental health like the projects at Wellgate Court. In the near future the Cabinet Member hoped to present a new project on loneliness which was a key determinant of mental health and if more could be done to reduce loneliness this would aid to improve the mental health of people.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cusworth referred how in the U.K. between 2003 and 2013 over 18,000 people took their own life and asked what work was being done with regards to suicide prevent in the Borough.

Councillor Roche outlined the work being undertaken in this area and praised the lead officer, Ruth Fletcher-Brown. This included work in the south of the Borough with Councillor Ellis, professionals, local staff and members of local parishes in order to make people more aware. This included the local public houses allowing designed beer mats to be circulated “Don’t let silence kill you”. Anything that could be done to get people to talk about their problems and issues would help and the Cabinet Member urged Ward Members to introducing this campaign in their areas. There was an active strategic officer group which includes agencies such as the Samaritans and the Police to see what could be done about suicide in the Borough. This could be improved further as this was not just a local but a national problem.

208. URGENT ITEMS

There were none.
Councillor Carter.

Dear Councillor Carter,

Council – 23rd May, 2018

Further to your question at full Council where you asked in a supplementary question about the masterplan and for an update on the proposals to increase the provision in terms of increasing a night time social economy and the plan for the many empty retail outlets and shops.

I can confirm the updated Stage 2 timeline for the proposals for Forge Island as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue of Invitation to Bid (Stage 2)</td>
<td>w/c 23/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder Meeting 1</td>
<td>w/c 14/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder Meeting 2</td>
<td>w/c/ 04/06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Deadline</td>
<td>22/06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for completed Stage 2 submissions</td>
<td>29/06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>25/06/2018 – 06/07/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (if required)</td>
<td>w/c 02/07/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Contract Award</td>
<td>w/c 23/07/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Contract Award and exchange</td>
<td>w/c 03/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please note that this is an indicative timetable and is subject to potential changes.

I trust this answers your question, but if I can help further in any way please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

**D. Lelliott**

Councillor Denise Lelliott,
Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy.
Hi Victoria,

We have started a pilot in April 2018 for the Housing First model in Rotherham in partnership with SYHA and Target Housing who are providing up to 20 units of accommodation in their existing stock.

They have taken some of the accommodation that has previously been used to provide short term accommodation to test whether the Housing First pilot reduces homelessness for those who have complex needs and delivers positive outcomes.

It is funded via Housing Related Support for 20 places and the policy is based on providing the housing first and then wrap the appropriate support around the person – the difference is that the support provider is more tolerable if things go wrong e.g people are given 2nd chances etc and the person has to want to engage to turn their life around.

The homeless team are making the referrals and are formalising a written referral process.

Hope this helps. In essence it is something we are embracing!

Dom
11th June, 2018.

Councillor Carter.

Dear Councillor Carter,

Council – 23rd May, 2018

Further to your question at full Council where you asked how many families in Rotherham are affected by the collapse of Home Start South Yorkshire, and what is the Council doing to support these families in a difficult time?

I can confirm this organisation was primarily based in Sheffield and Rotherham, and as far as Council officers are aware, no Rotherham residents are affected by its collapse.

Children and Young People’s Services (CYPS) do not currently commission any services from Home Start South Yorkshire. The last time CYPS funded Home Start was in 2012-13 when it was Home Start Rotherham. Home Start Rotherham subsequently closed in 2014.

The Sheffield branch of Home Start South Yorkshire widened their remit to Rotherham in 2015 after receiving some funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

I trust this answers your question, but if I can help further in any way please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

D. Beck

Councillor Dominic Beck,
Cabinet Member for Housing.
11th June, 2018.

Councillor Carter.

Dear Councillor Carter,

Council – 23rd May, 2018

Further to your question at full Council where you asked How many homes within the town centre Masterplan will be funded by the HRA as privately occupied homes to then be sold on the open market?

A range of housing development schemes are currently being planned on Council owned sites in the town centre.

It is only legally possible for the HRA to be used for the construction of private dwellings if this is part of a wider scheme that includes Council housing, and where it can be demonstrated that there will be no financially detrimental impact on the HRA and that sales receipts will be used to build more Council homes. This is the case with the Council’s Site Clusters partnership with Wates, through which 217 homes are being funded by the HRA, including 83 homes for sale in Maltby.

As things stand there are no plans for open market sale homes to be funded from the Housing Revenue Account. Of course when formal decisions come to be made these will be proposed and scrutinized in the usual way.

I trust this answers your question, but if I can help further in any way please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

D. Beck

Councillor Dominic Beck,
Cabinet Member for Housing.
Councillor Cowles.

Dear Councillor Cowles,

Council – 23rd May, 2018

Further to your question at full Council where you asked in a supplementary question what was the average salary across the authority, the average salary outside Rotherham generally and how many staff were employed at a salary of £65,000 and above.

I can confirm the average pay is published in the Council's Pay Policy Statement.

The lowest pay rate in the authority (excluding apprentice rates) equates to a full time equivalent annual salary of £16,969 and can be expressed as an hourly rate of pay of £8.75. This pay rate and salary was determined by the authority as part of a pay scale for employees employed on Local Government Services Terms and Conditions.

The highest paid salary in this authority is £161,600 which is paid to the Chief Executive.

The ratio between the two salaries, the 'pay multiple' is 9.5 to 1. Against the median salary of £20,138 this multiple reduces to 8 to 1 and against the average salary of £23,804 to 7 to 1.

The Hutton review considered the multiple should be no greater than 20 to 1 (lower is better) and based on the current situation the Council falls well below this threshold. The authority does not have a policy on maintaining or reaching a specific 'pay multiple', however the authority is conscious of the need to ensure that the salary of the highest paid employee is not excessive and is consistent with the needs of the authority.

These pay rates may increase in accordance with any pay settlements which are reached through their respective national negotiating bodies.
Information is at the end of March 2018, but at that same point we had 114 employees receiving a full time equivalent salary £50k plus, 25 of whom were on full-time equivalent salaries £65k plus. Currently these numbers have reduced to 113 and 24 respectively.

I trust this answers your question, but if I can help further in any way please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

S. Alam

Councillor Saghir Alam,
Cabinet Member for Finance and Customer Services.
26 June 2018

Dear Councillor Cutts

Further to your question at full council where you asked about the number of new foreign nationals "registered" in Rotherham according to Migration Yorkshire.

I can confirm the numbers in your question relate to foreign nationals who have registered for National Insurance in Rotherham. There is no process for de-registration so we have no idea how many of these people have returned to their country of origin or moved to another area within the UK. People from all of the countries listed are free to move around within the UK and do not have to register with local police.

However, we can say that the number of people registering from overseas in Rotherham has fallen by 23% since 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>571</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>4,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I trust this information answers your question.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Councillor Chris Read
Leader of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Leader of the Council - Councillor Chris Read  
Riverside House  
4th Floor, Wing B  
Main Street  
Rotherham  
S80 1AE

☎ (01709) 822723
✉ chris.read@rotherham.gov.uk

Councillor Brian Cutts  
Town Hall  
The Crofts  
Moorgate Street  
ROTHERHAM  
S60 2 TH

26 June 2018

BY EMAIL

Dear Councillor Cutts

Further to your question at full council where you asked “The Leader will recall attending the seminar on Tuesday, 3rd April chaired by Councillor Hoddinott and give by the Chief of South Yorkshire Police and Commissioner”

A situation was raised about a 90 year old Rotherham widow illegally broken into, constrained and property damaged. Do you have a progress report?”

I can confirm any action in relation to this case would clearly be taken by South Yorkshire Police. In these circumstances, it would not be appropriate for me to provide an update via Full Council. I have requested that the Divisional Commander provides an update to you directly.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Chris Read  
Leader of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

www.rotherham.gov.uk
Councillor Brian Cutts  
Town Hall  
The Crofts  
Moorgate Street  
ROtherham  
S60 2 TH  

26 June 2018  

BY EMAIL  

Dear Councillor Cutts  

Given that you had to leave Full Council on 23rd May before you were able to ask your question “Now with successful CSE prosecutions against RMBC, what is the current financial situation with respect to compensation claims etc.?”. Please find below my response:–  

There have not been any prosecutions against the Council in relation to CSE and we are not expecting that there will be any. There have, however, been a number of successful criminal prosecutions against perpetrators of CSE.  

I’m afraid that at the moment, the answer to your question is similar to the last time that you asked: It is important that we protect the confidentiality of victims and survivors and therefore we will not make public the total costs until we have resolved a greater number of claims.  

In relation to compensation claims against the Council, a number of claims relating to child sexual exploitation have been received. Our lawyers have been working constructively with lawyers for the claimants and several of these have now been settled alongside South Yorkshire Police. As the authority is still in the process of dealing with outstanding claims it would not be appropriate to provide any detailed or specific information at this point in time.  

Yours sincerely  

Councillor Chris Read  
Leader of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  

www.rotherham.gov.uk
Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Commissioner Kenny, Councillors Alam, Beck, Hoddinott, Roche, Watson and Yasseen.

Also in attendance was Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Apologies for absence were received from Commissioner Bradwell, Commissioner Ney and Councillor Lelliott.

The webcast of Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meetings can be viewed at:-
https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcasts/enctag/Executive%252BArea

130. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

131. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from members of the public.

132. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Resolved:- That the minutes of the Cabinet and Commissioners’ Decision Making Meetings held on 19th February and 12th March, 2018, be agreed as true and correct records of the proceedings.

133. WASTE COLLECTIONS SERVICE REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 70 of the meeting of the Cabinet and Commissioners held on 13th November, 2017, consideration was given to a report which set out details of the outcome of the waste consultation exercise and proposed the introduction of changes to the Council’s waste collection service. The proposed changes were to introduce kerbside plastic collection as soon as practicable, and introduce an all year round green waste chargeable service from October, 2018.

Details of the different options assessed by the Council, along with the potential impact on recycling and the costs of each option were highlighted. The recommended option was 1B which would result in a replacement 180ltr residual bin with two stream recycling, the introduction of an all year round green waste chargeable service from October, 2018 and a plastic collection from the household waste stream as "Phase 2" of the implementation process which would be subject to tender and would be introduced at a later stage.
Cabinet Members were in support of the proposals and believed the enhanced recycling opportunities would work in collaboration with a smaller general waste residual bin.

However, in accepting the proposals it was suggested that clear information be provided identifying what plastic could be recycled at the kerbside, what material could be placed in which bin, preferably in pictorial format, and the introduction timescales for each phase.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations subject to a trial being initiated for different types of households and for this to be evaluated to ensure the proposed changes were feasible and households were not adversely affected by the proposals.

In addition it was also suggested that there be some exploration as to the feasibility of communal facilities for waste disposals and recycling particularly for high density housing and new developments and that the details of the communications and engagement strategy be provided to Improving Places Select Commission for their input and monitoring.

Councillor Hoddinott, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, agreed with the principle, but confirmed a trial could not be supported. Any opportunity for volunteers to feed back any findings on performance was welcomed and this in turn would be reported back to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in due course.

However, any further exploration of waste and recycling options in high density community housing was welcomed. The communications and engagement strategy would be submitted to the Improving Places Select Commission as part of the work programme.

Resolved:- (1) That the cessation of the free garden waste collection service be approved with effect from 26th October, 2018 and be replaced with an optional, all year round, chargeable garden waste collection service from 29th October, 2018.

(2) That the operating policies in paragraph 6.2 and 6.15 of this report be approved.

(3) That the fee for the garden waste collection service be set at £39 for an initial subscription period from 29th October, 2018 until January 2020, with the price of future annual subscriptions subject to review each year.

(4) That the introduction of a two-stream recycling service be approved that included the collection of plastic materials at the kerbside from early 2019 - Option 1(b) – with the specific date to be confirmed as part of the procurement exercise. New 180 litre residual bins will be provided to all households in time for the launch of the two-stream recycling service to
enable the existing 240 litre residual bins to be used for recycling plastic, tin cans and glass thereby reducing capital expenditure.

(5) That the Council be recommended to add the capital costs of the vehicles and bins at an estimated cost of £5.54m to the Council’s Capital Programme.

(6) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Community Safety and Street Scene to make all necessary arrangements for the smooth introduction of the revised waste collection service including the purchase of bins and refuse vehicles.

(7) That officers develop a comprehensive communications and marketing plan, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, to sit alongside the implementation plan for the revised waste collection service.

(8) That the feasibility of communal facilities for waste disposals and recycling particularly for high density housing and new developments be explored further.

(9) That further details of the communications and engagement strategy be provided to Improving Places Select Commission for their input and monitoring.

134. HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY

Further to Minute No. 42 of the meeting of the Cabinet and Commissioners held on 11th September, 2017, consideration was given to the report which provided the outcome of the consultation on the Home to School Transport Policy for Rotherham, including post-16 students and children with Special Educational Needs or Disability (SEND) and provides recommendations for the service provision.

The revised Home to School Transport Policy (Appendix 1) provided advice and guidance for families regarding the support available to them relating to a range of transport options for young people in Rotherham and would seek to develop and promote independent travel training as a central service in Rotherham and apply it particularly at transitional stages.

Any changes proposed to these services would ensure the continuation of suitable, safe, home to school travel assistance for eligible children in accordance with the Council’s statutory duties, taking into account an individual’s assessed needs. The policy must also contribute to the Council’s priority of ensuring every child had the best start in life.

Cabinet Members welcomed the proposed Policy, especially the transition to independent travel training whilst complying with the statutory duty to transport children to and from school.
This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to further investigation into the the cost/benefit feasibility of operating an in-house service for those requiring home to school transport rather than reliance on taxis and for a further report on the policy’s implementation being submitted to Improving Places Select Commission in six months' time.

Councillor Hoddinott, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, was happy to initiate an investigation into operating an in-house home to school service as an operational alternative and where possible initiate efficiencies.

Resolved:- (1) That the Home to School Transport Policy 2018-19 be approved.

(2) That the Home to School Transport Assessment Matrix be approved.

(3) That approval be given to the introduction of a formal annual review of transport provision, which includes engagement with families.

(4) That an assessment of existing service users be conducted to review their circumstances to enable participation on a voluntary basis ahead of the introduction of the formal annual review;

(5) That approval be given to the introduction of a personal travel budget scheme to provide transport support to families of children with special educational needs and disabilities.

(6) That post-16 transport travel arrangements be revised to replace direct transport as a first option with personal travel budgets for those students with special educational needs and disabilities.

(7) That approval be given to the consideration of alternative methods of support for particular groups or individuals such as walking bus, cycle or moped schemes, when appropriate.

(8) That approval be given to the introduction of independent travel training as a central resource in Rotherham to support arrangements currently delivered by Special Schools for children from the age of 14+ to enable independence and that travel training commence from June 2018 for appropriate young people.

(9) That personal travel budgets for all students making new applications for post-16 travel be instigated from 1 July 2018, and existing users of the post-16 service are permitted to apply on a voluntary basis from 1 May 2018.
(10) That a transition period to validate the Transport Assessment Matrix be effective from 1 May 2018, with the full implementation of the policy for all new applicants with effect from 1 July 2018.

(11) That children and young people in need of home to school transport, and including transport operators, be engaged as part of the transition and implementation process.

(12) That any amendments to the Transport Assessment Matrix, resulting from the transition period, to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Community Safety and Street Scene.

(13) That an investigation be initiated into the cost/benefit feasibility of operating an in-house service for those requiring home to school transport rather than reliance on taxis.

(14) That a further report on the policy’s implementation be submitted to Improving Places Select Commission in six months’ time.

135. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Consideration was given to the circulated report, the contents of which were included as part of the relevant items and the details included accordingly.

136. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:– That the next Cabinet and Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting would take place on Monday, 21st May, 2018 at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.
Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Hoddinott, Commissioner Kenny, Lelliott, Roche, Steele and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allen, Beck, Commissioner Bradwell and Commissioner Ney.

The webcast of Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meetings can be viewed at:-
https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcasts/enctag/Executive%252BArea

137. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

138. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) A member of the public explained she had only learnt of these proposals on the 8th May, 2018 of the action to be taken with the closure of Parkhill Lodge. She expressed shock the family had faced when learning the accommodation used by her sister may be closing. She had attended a meeting at the Holiday Inn, but there appeared to be no one advocating for service users against the closures or proposing alternative options or repairs to buildings.

She was passionate for her sister’s welfare as she would struggle with any proposed move from Parkhill Lodge due to her health and being institutionalised. She appreciated that some changes needed to be made, but wanted to ensure that her sister would continue to receive the highest level of care she had always received.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, confirmed Parkhill Lodge had been added late into the report and due to this it was recommended by Scrutiny that further consultation was required on Parkhill Lodge’s future.

In a supplementary question the member of the public expressed her concern as she had read recommendations that the home would close during 2019/2020, but because of findings in April closure may be initiated sooner. She requested that as part of the further consultation all family members of service users should be fully informed.

Councillor Roche confirmed an earlier closure had been talked about, but this was due to some issues with some of the utilities. Once the recommendation to further consult on the future of Parkhill Lodge had been accepted, families and service users would be informed.
(2) A member of the public asked what had been the response and reactions to the recommendations in the report by people with learning disabilities and autism, the service users.

Councillor Roche confirmed the report set out the consultation details and involved in a series of mediums talking to service users.

Janine Moorcroft, Head of Service, confirmed the details of the consultation process which involved talking about various options with stakeholders, service users etc., including proposed closure of some facilities, the timelines and what may happen. Following the publication of the report it was not considered appropriate to engage with service users further until a decision had been made. However, once a decision was made on the recommendations of the report it was planned to create an easy read version that would be cascaded to service users and their families and to work closely as to what this would mean to them.

In a supplementary question the member of the public asked about the timeframes and if this would include feeding back to the service users with learning disabilities and autism as she was fearful services would start to be closed and service users would be unaware what was happening.

Janine Moorcroft explained that once the meeting had concluded and able to take recommendations forward there would be further communication with service users and families to ensure proper plans were put in place to full ascertain what was needed in the future.

The Strategic Director for Adult Care, Housing and Public Health explained that if and when any decisions were taken individual assessments would take place. This would involve discussions with the individual and people involved in their lives within an individual process rather than a group process alongside work by provider services.

(3) A member of the public, who was a relative of a person residing in Parkhill Lodge and attending Addison Day Centre, asked if consideration had really been given to service users’ health and wellbeing and the impact this would have on their lives if these services closed. It was disgraceful that there had been little communication at Parkhill as this was a massive decision that affected people’s lives. Other Councils had tried this approach and come full circle. The decision focused around finances, but it was far more expensive to run direct payments and in addition there was very limited availability for personal carers.

Councillor Roche had explained the position with regards to Parkhill and could not pre-judge the Cabinet’s decision. He was in support of further consultation. The member of the public had referred to all Councils trying this approach and reverting back; this was not the case and some Councils had actually put their day care services out to tender. The Council was simply recommending decommissioning of buildings and
providing individual services instead. With regards to direct payments being more expensive to run this was not the case and only one option that would be available.

In a supplementary question the member of the public asked if service users could be advised of alternatives for day care with a proper list on what was available with full costs as some of these services were not affordable to people on benefits.

Councillor Roche confirmed details on agencies would be made available, but emphasised this was not about cost or care.

The Strategic Director for Adult Care, Housing and Public Health addressed the concerns about the health and wellbeing of service users and the need for empathy which was central to everything being undertaken. It was important to the service to ensure this process was done right with the transition being done properly and sensitively with work with the individual and family members.

Carers strongly asked for a directory and this had been taken as an action from the Carers’ Meeting on Thursday and would be produced over the next few weeks so all service users could access. Decisions could then be made as Councillor Roche indicated direct payments were not for everyone.

(4) A member of the public wanted to speak up for Quarryhill, which was an excellent facility and well run by staff. This building was not old, but fit for purpose. There had been plans to extend the building with hoist rooms, but these plans have clearly been shelved.

Councillor Roche pointed out that this report was not about closing Addison and Oaks it was about how the Council could work with people with learning disabilities to help improve the service, to improve their lives and raise aspirations. It was not primarily about the buildings at all.

(5) A member of the public referred to her own son who attended Addison Day Centre and Kiveton Outreach. She pointed out that closing date centres and respite care did not make financial sense and in the longer term could cost the Council more money. She made reference to Page 5, Appendix B and drew comparisons of 64 young people who lived at home with parents attending Addison 5 days a week for a minimum of 35 hours at a cost of £7.00 and those in residential care for 7 days a week which was over 168 hours. This was 5 times more and at a much greater cost. The shared lives options would not work and various points had been made at the meeting about this on Thursday. This would transfer the care of these young people back onto parents as carers, which could leave them exhausted.
The member of the public also drew comparisons with her own son who also attended Treefields for respite care. At Treefields there were 6 beds. This was a fit for purpose venue which was refurbished in 2010 and looked after 50 people. There was no comparison against the cost of 6 beds in full time residential care and it took a lot of effort and energy to look after someone with a disability. The member of the public asked if the Council could please reconsider the options and look again as the decisions being made as this would devastate people’s lives.

Councillor Roche confirmed he had visited the 2 respite centres being mentioned and had been advised by staff that they were unsuitable, not just for wheelchair use, but in caring for the people who used those centres effectively. They were fine as ordinary homes, but the majority of the respite care was commissioned from other centres. There were sufficient respite places already in the community. In financial terms the cost for these places to the customer was subsidised by the Council and transport was also provided. This decision was not about finance, but about providing an individualised approach.

The Leader asked if further information could be provided on the capacity for shared lives and how this would be increased to ensure places were available over the next few years.

Councillor Roche was aware a shared lives event was to be arranged in the Maltby/Wickersley area, but pointed out that shared lives was only one approach within the report.

The Strategic Director further explained that over the next 12 months a campaign would be launched with the Shared Lives Team providing more insight into how people were employed/trained and the options available. Some local authorities had the shared lives work as an external offer, but Rotherham had theirs as an internal offer and would ensure that the information was widely shared and made available.

In a supplementary comment the member of the public urged Cabinet Members to have some compassion for the young people and the carers before everything was shut in 18 months’ time.

(6) A member of the public described how her son attended Oaks Day Centre and had done so for the past 9 years. This change in future of day services commenced about 20 months ago and in that 20 months nothing new had been heard and no alternatives had been offered. Upon personal investigation there appeared to be very little available for families other than Angel Nook.

The member of the public expressed her frustration over wasted money and resources with little outcome. She had come to this important meeting, but was sad to learn she was no further on or wiser for the future of the young people, many of whom had complex needs and would struggle with plans to integrate as part of the community.
The member of the public thought today she would have clearer answers, but 2 years on she was still living within this uncertainty for the young people’s futures. She found it soul destroying and only those that were involved with the care of these young people knew the actual impact on people’s lives if these services were closed. Her own son had a happy persona, but would not cope with community-based provision. He had made friends at his building-based provision, which he would now lose. Oaks was a happy place and it was inevitable that places would be lost. It all boiled down to money. She was interested in the list of provision because as far as she could see there were very little choice available.

The Leader noted the valuable point made by the member of the public about the availability of other services in the community and asked if the Cabinet Member could elaborate on about the plans to assist families like hers.

Councillor Roche confirmed there were a number organisations being run by former members of staff from Addison and Oaks and would ensure a directory of services was provided. He shared information about a number of case studies of people with learning difficulties and their involvement in the community catalyst programme and the positive messages coming forward.

Janine Moorcroft, Head of Service, confirmed the community catalyst project was now in its second year and there had been some success in terms of the alternative provision now available for customers to move into.

She shared information on the 30 Oaks customers who had moved onto other provision. There had been some discussion at the meeting on Thursday with regard those people with more complex needs and how some would still require safe-building bases. The report did identify that this kind of provision would still be required, but would require further development on what shape and form this would take to meet the needs of those individuals. Community catalyst projects would be closely worked with commissioning colleagues to ensure the market was ready and part of the process.

Councillor Roche pointed out the report did make it clear and recognised that there would still be people with complex needs requiring a building-based approach.

(7) A member of the public referred to the numbers of housing developments in Rotherham and the new ones coming forward. This year marked the 10 year anniversary of when Chesterhill Avenue, Thrybergh was knocked down and even longer since Whinney Hill was demolished. At the time Councillor Sue Ellis, Cabinet Member, made a number of promises about the regeneration. In 2013 Keepmoat were brought forward as partners and a plan put forward to build 260 homes including 15 Council homes. On the website it indicated that building was due to start in 2016 and he asked what was happening and why the delay.
Councillor Read confirmed no-one was available to answer the question, but would ensure the member of the public received an appropriate answer in writing.

In a supplementary question the member of the public asked in the intervening 2 years since 2016 Dalton/Thrybergh had lost its last public house. A few hundred yards away from this development the Dalton Progressive Club had closed, on the edge of the development the last Post Office had closed and at the centre the closure of the Thrybergh Legion Club. There were many businesses that were struggling to survive that could do with the extra 600 people that this development would bring and asked given the delay how the Council was going learn from it and what it was going to do to support the businesses in Thrybergh who were struggling with the delay.

Councillor Read confirmed that a full response on the details of the housing development would be provided in writing.

139. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16 APRIL 2018

Resolved:- That the minutes of the Cabinet and Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting held on 16th April, 2018, be agreed as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

140. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That under Section 100(A) 4 of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the agenda item 9 on the grounds that the appendix involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of such Act indicated, as now amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

141. CUSTOMER ACCESS STRATEGY

Consideration was given to a report proposed a new Customer Access Strategy to replace the now expired Strategy.

The Customer Service and Efficiency Board was established in September 2017, to deliver a strategic approach to service delivery and support the Council in the realisation of significant efficiencies.

The Board’s Customer Service and Efficiency work programme included a comprehensive range of projects and was highlighted in the report as well as responsible for the Council’s Customer Access Strategy.

It was important that all customers continued to have access to the services they needed irrespective of their personal situation and that the information and advice they received was simple and easy to understand.
The purpose of the Strategy was to set out how the Council aimed to achieve such building on the Council’s values to strengthen customer relationships and improve service delivery.

The new Strategy formed the framework for the way customers accessed services and the way the Council delivered them, cutting across all areas of business to deliver greater efficiency, make better use of resources and improve customer experience.

The new Strategy was aligned to the Council Plan and the Council’s Digital Strategy. It had a greater digital focus to reflect the vision for a modern, efficient council that made best use of available resources and provided value for money, customer-focused services.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress of the Customer Service and Efficiency Board work programme be noted.

(2) That the Customer Access Strategy be approved for publication.

(3) That any significant changes required following annual reviews of the Strategy be subject to further reports for Cabinet consideration and approval.

142. FREE PUBLIC WI-FI FOR ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE

Further to Minute No. 72 of 12th September, 2016, consideration was given to a report seeking approval to enable the delivery of a free public access Rotherham Town Centre Wi-Fi service as part of implementing the Digital Council Strategy and at no cost to the Council.

The project would provide a public access Wi-Fi service in public spaces and public buildings within Rotherham’s Town Centre area to make it more vibrant and an attractive place for citizens, visitors, businesses and shoppers in order to increase footfall and to help local businesses thrive and grow. This had also been requested by local businesses.

It was proposed that the Council undertake a competitive procurement for a concession contract for the provision of a service and, subject to the required objectives set out in the report being met, to enter into a concession contract for the provision of those services.

Resolved:- That the delivery of a public access Wi-Fi across Rotherham Town Centre be approved.

143. REVIEW OF COUNCIL PLAN INDICATORS FOR 2018/19

Consideration was given to the report which detailed the proposed annual review of the Performance Indicators included within the 2017-2020 Council Plan.
Since the publication of the 2017-2020 Council Plan work had taken place alongside Cabinet Members and performance leads to refine the headline measures for the 2018-2019 financial year. At the same time, Service Plans had been refreshed for 2018-2019.

The proposed revised Council Plan Indicators for 2018-2019 was attached at Appendix A of the submitted report. It now included a total of 70 measures (reduced from 72 in the previous version) which formed the priority actions under each of the 4 themes of the Council’s vision as well as the fifth, cross-cutting corporate commitment to operate as a modern and efficient Council.

Appendix A included green highlighting where a change was proposed compared to 2018-2019. In total 47 individual target measures had been revised, with a number showing a tightening of targets from 2017-2018.

The 2017-20 Council Plan included 25 measures which were highlighted as headline priorities, informed by discussions with the Leader and Cabinet. This highlight had been removed from the 2018-2019 revised Council Plan Indicators for 2018-2019 to ensure all measures were perceived as priorities.

In total 8 Indicators had been removed compared to 2017-2018; 4 had been added and 12 had been replaced by 14 refreshed Indicators.

Cabinet Members highlighted particular indicators within the suite that had either been added, refreshed and readily understandable or removed, including the percentage of looked after children in family based settings, domestic abuse, licensing and reliance on external annual data for anti-social behaviour and hate crime.

Resolved:- That the Council Plan Indicators for 2018-2019 be approved.

144. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS RATES DISCRETIONARY RELIEF

Consideration was given to a report which detailed two applications for the award of a discretionary business rate relief for Dinnington School of Swimming and Fitness CIC and Rotherham and District Citizens Advice Bureau. This was in accordance with the Council’s Discretionary Business Rates Relief Policy (approved 12th December, 2016).

Resolved:- (1) That discretionary relief for Dinnington School of Swimming and Fitness CIC, Unit 6 Brooklands Park, Brooklands Way, Dinnington, Sheffield be refused.

(2) That 20% discretionary top up rate relief for the period 1st April, 2017 to 31st March, 2018 to Rotherham and District Citizens Advice Bureau, 5 Eastwood Lane, Rotherham be awarded.
ENABLING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Consideration was given to a report containing an overview of proposals for the future enablement of School Improvement in Rotherham and proposals to bring together key strategic partners to create a Rotherham Strategic Education Partnership Board to set and oversee Rotherham Education priorities and avoid duplication.

The report considered the wider aspects of school improvement in Rotherham for consultation and had been circulated widely to all Head Teachers, Chairs of Governors, Chief Executives of Teaching School Alliances, Diocesan Authorities and other stakeholders including sub-regional partners and a period of consultation with key stakeholders had taken place between 7th February and 23rd March, 2018.

The report outlined a range of models implemented by other local authorities that were assessed against the educational needs of Rotherham.

It was proposed that the single overarching Strategic Education Partnership Board would give schools and key education partners even greater ownership and responsibility for setting the priorities for improvement and leading the work to deliver them. It would bring together directly or indirectly the expertise of staff employed directly by the local authority, individual schools, teaching schools and other school-to-school support providers. It would establish an even stronger education system for all children, shared by political, Council and school leaders, building stronger connections with other key partners in the region such as the Regional Schools Commissioner and senior Ofsted Inspectors.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to members of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet being appointed to the Rotherham Strategic Education Partnership Board to ensure that the voice of young people was heard, that the governance arrangements be clarified to include provision for oversight by non-executive Members and that reports from the Board on progress made against priorities be presented to Scrutiny Members on as and when basis.

Resolved:- (1) That the outcome of the consultation on Enabling School Improvement be noted.

(2) That the commitment to working with individual settings, schools and strategic partners with pace, pride and passion to further develop good and outstanding provision be noted.

(3) That the establishment of a Rotherham Strategic Education Partnership Board, as set out in section 4 of the report submitted, to create opportunities to exploit synergies; identify both gaps in provision
and duplication and create greater strategic coherence and help to secure improved outcomes, be endorsed and include members of Rotherham Youth and/or Looked After Children Council to ensure that the voice of young people is heard.

(4) That the proposal to recruit to the substantive post of Assistant Director (Education) recognising this may be through a permanent appointment or a fixed term full-time/part-time seconded appointment, be noted.

(5) That the governance arrangements be clarified to include provision for oversight by non-executive Members, with reports on progress made against priorities presented to Scrutiny Members on as and when basis.

146. REVISED ROTHERHAM MBC CODE OF PRACTICE FOR HIGHWAY INSPECTION AND ASSESSMENT

Consideration was given to a report proposing a revised Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment which included policies for both Highway Safety Inspection and Skidding Resistance.


The new code varied significantly from the current reliance on specific guidance and recommendations to a more flexible risk-based approach to highway asset management. The purpose of the new risk-based approach was that highway safety inspections determined the scale and likelihood of the risk presented by a highway defect and used this to determine 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 and training of the Highway Inspectors would now commence in readiness to meet the October, 2018 implementation.

The report had been considered by the Improving Places Select Commission on 14th March, 2018.

It was also noted that customer satisfaction rates for work already completed had been very positive.
Resolved:- (1) That the revised Rotherham Borough Council Code of Practice for Highway Inspection and Assessment (Appendix A) be approved and implemented by October, 2018. This would ensure that Rotherham’s highway network was safely maintained thereby safeguarding users.

(2) That a further update, incorporating additional performance management data, be submitted to the Improving Places Select Commission and Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety.

147. REMOVAL OF THE PUBLIC PHONE BOX AT THE JUNCTION OF STUBBIN ROAD AND CORTWORTH LANE, NETHER HAUGH

Consideration was given to a report regarding the request for the removal of the public telephone box at the junction of Stubbin Road and Cortworth Lane, Nether Haugh.

Under Ofcom guidance the Council was required to undertake a 2 stage public consultation on the proposal. After considering any consultation responses the Council must then make a final decision as to whether it agreed or objected to removal of the telephone box. The final decision must be made within 90 days of the Council being notified of the proposal by BT.

It had not been possible within the 90 day timeframe for the Council’s final decision to be made by Cabinet. The final decision to agree to the closure and removal of the telephone box was made in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy. The decision took into account an assessment of the telephone box against a number of criteria, that the request for the removal had come from the community and not a cost cutting exercise from BT and that no consultation responses had been received objecting to the removal.

Resolved:- That the final decision agreeing to the proposal to permanently remove the public telephone box at the junction of Stubbin Road and Cortworth Lane, Nether Haugh, be noted.

148. THE TRANSFORMATION OF SERVICES AND SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH A LEARNING DISABILITY

Consideration was given to a report which set out the details for the next steps in the transformation of services and support for people with a learning disability in line with the Learning Disability Strategy, vision and the learning from the consultation with people and families.

The needs of people with a learning disability were continuing to change and were becoming more diverse. People and families had higher expectations of what it meant to have an independent life in their community and wanted more control over their lives.
The challenges facing the Council were being recognised and the review of the Learning Disability Services which began in 2015 had resulted in a number of reports and consultation with the people who used the services.

The review was integral to the Council's overall vision for transforming Social Care and built on the principles of the Care Act 2014 with the need to move away from traditional building-based support. This would result in Oaks Day Centre, Addison Day Centre, Treefields and Quarryhill being decommissioned with further consultation on the future of Parkhill Lodge.

The Council fully understood that changes could create anxiety and would be respectful of this and would consider and take into account the learning from the consultations that have taken place to develop a robust communication and engagement strategy. This would be to ensure people with learning disabilities, their families and carers, received reliable and timely information and were fully engaged and included throughout the development of plans.

Moving forward all service users would undergo a person-centred approach thorough individual assessment of need before alternative provision was put in place.

Cabinet Members acknowledged the sensitivity around this Service, but reflected on the lessons learnt from other local authorities and welcomed the opportunities that may arise for Service users from within their own communities. However, Members, families and Service users were reassured that needs would be carefully looked at by a dedicated team and that no changes would take place until a full assessment had been undertaken.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to monitoring reports being submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and/or Health Select Commission 6 months after implementation of the Strategy and underlying work streams, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health consider how non-executive Members could become involved in the evaluations of client experience in the delivery of the Learning Disability Strategy, visits to other authorities that have implemented a similar approach be arranged for Members and carers to observe the benefits outlined within the report and that prior to any decision on the future of Parkhill Lodge being made, a specific and formal consultation exercise is carried out on the proposed closure.

Resolved:– (1) That the draft Learning Disability Strategy and future stakeholder engagement be approved.
(2) That the development of a Rotherham Supported Living and Better Days Framework as detailed in the Learning Disability Strategy (Appendix C) be approved.

(3) That the transformation of the Learning Disability Services over the next 2 years, which will see the Services move from existing building-based locations to alternative care and support that will be situated as close to the person as possible in their local community, using and developing existing resources and community buildings i.e. leisure centres and community provision, be approved. Oaks Day Centre, Addison Day Centre, Treefields and Quarryhill will be decommissioned with further consultation on the future of Parkhill Lodge.

(4) That the Council continue to provide a service to people with high complex needs. The Elliott Centre and Maple Avenue buildings will be reviewed and may be moved to more suitable alternative premises should they become available.

(5) That the delivery plan which sets out how the Council will make sure all people with a learning disability have access to community-based services that promote independence, wellbeing and social inclusion be approved. This will ensure that:-

- Each person with a learning disability has a review based on a person centred approach, which will inform the support and services the Council needs to provide to meet their individual needs by 2020. A dedicated team of social workers with the support of the existing staff will undertake the reviews. This will also include advocacy support and engagement with carers.

- Each person will have the opportunity to make sure every day in their life is meaningful, of value and leads to them having a ‘Good Day’. Doing things which have a purpose; being in ordinary places doing things most other people in the community would be doing; doing things that are for the individual; making sure they receive the right amount of support; and are in touch with local people, developing friendships.

- More people have the opportunity to participate in paid employment.

- A strength based approach will be taken to develop a range of opportunities, including shared lives, use of personal budgets, develop skills for independent living provide support when the carer needs it and making sure more people have their own front door.

(6) That monitoring reports be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and/or Health Select Commission 6 months after implementation of the Strategy and underlying workstreams.
(7) That the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health consider how non-executive Members could become involved in the evaluations of client experience in the delivery of the Learning Disability Strategy.

(8) That visits to other authorities that have implemented a similar approach be arranged for Members and carers to observe the benefits outlined within the report.

149. PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE OF ROTHERHAM INTERMEDIATE CARE CENTRE (RICC)

Consideration was given to proposals for the future of Rotherham Intermediate Care Centre (RICC) at Badsley Moor Lane.

The RICC was delivered in partnership by the Council and The Rotherham Foundation Trust. It contributed to the aims, objectives and outcomes set out in the Intermediate Care Service specification and Better Care Fund Plan 2017-19.

The Centre was jointly commissioned by the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and the Council through a Section 75 Agreement under the Better Care Fund to provide rehabilitation and community integration facilities within a day setting for residents of Rotherham or who were registered with a Rotherham GP practice.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to the Health Select Commission receiving updates on the performance of re-designed Intermediate Care Service to ensure there was no negative implications for the client experience.

Resolved:– (1) That Option 2 of the report submitted be approved i.e. to move the provision of rehabilitation out of the building base (RICC at Badsley Moor lane) and re-provide within the community.

(2) That Health Select Commission receive updates on the performance of re-designed Intermediate Care Service to ensure there was no negative implications for the client experience.

150. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINITY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Consideration was given to the circulated report, the contents of which were included as part of the relevant items and the details included accordingly.
Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Commissioner Kenny, Councillors Alam, Allen, Beck, Hoddinott, Lelliott, Roche and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Commissioner Bradwell and Commissioner Ney.

The webcast of Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meetings can be viewed at:- https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcasts/enctag/Executive%252BArea

151. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest to report.

152. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from members of the public.

153. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That under Section 100(A) 4 of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for agenda items 9 and 11 on the grounds that the appendix involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of such Act indicated, as now amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

154. THE HOUSE PROJECT

Consideration was given to a report which detailed how the House Project (HP), a Department for Education (DfE) Social Care Innovation Fund Project, looked at creating a new model of supported housing for young people leaving care which had been initiated in Stoke-on-Trent.

The project was the first of its kind for care leavers in the UK and involved young people having a lead role in developing and running the overall project, as well as choosing and refurbishing their own tenancy and identifying the support needed to sustain it.

The key elements of the project were the offer of suitable, safe and long-term post-care housing alongside a holistic and bespoke package of training and support that focused on increasing young people’s independent living and personal skills and their participation in education, employment and training (EET).
A key aim of the project was to reduce the feelings of isolation and powerlessness that many care leavers could experience after leaving care.

The House Project (HP) was based on a tenant-managed housing co-operative model, run for, and by, young people aged 16-18 who were leaving care. The aim was to secure 10 properties at any one time, replacing allocated properties when they reverted to the Council alongside a bespoke package of support until the young person was considered ready and able to transition out of the project, at which point they and their home reverted to a standard long-term Council tenancy.

Rotherham had been approached by the DfE to become part of the next phase of Innovation projects and attracted £370,000 of DfE funding so was at no cost to the Council.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to the governance arrangements being clarified to include provision for oversight by non-executive Members, the Leaving Care Team linked into the Scrutiny Review of Modular Housing Solutions to examine how care leavers could be involved in its development and how care leavers with additional needs were included in the project.

**Commissioner Kenny agreed:-**

(1) That Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) become part of the next phase of DfE Innovation Funded Projects to explore the feasibility of developing an alternative housing solution for Care Leavers in Rotherham.

(2) That it be acknowledged that Rotherham Care Leavers will be responsible for the design, development and delivery of the project and will be supported by a range of officers from across the Council to ensure the project is delivered within the principles and practices of RMBC as well as the vision and principles of the project.

(3) That the following recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be accepted:-

   (i) That the governance arrangements be clarified to include provision for oversight by non-executive Members.

   (ii) That the Leaving Care Team links to the Scrutiny Review of Modular Housing Solutions to examine how care leavers can be involved in its development.

   (iii) That consideration be given to how care leavers with additional needs are included in the project.
**155. APPOINTMENT OF COUNCILLORS TO SERVE ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

Consideration was given to the report which set out the nominations received and the appointments of those nominees to the various organisations and partnerships.

**Resolved:** That Councillors be appointed to serve on Outside Bodies, as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Body</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.D.R Joint Waste Board</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety: Councillor Emma Hoddinott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Stuart Sansome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.D.R. Property Limited</td>
<td>Mr K. Billington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Canal Partnership</td>
<td>Councillor Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Canal Steering Group</td>
<td>Ward Members for Anston &amp; Woodsetts: Councillors Jonathan Ireland, Clive Jepson &amp; Katherine Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Members for Wales: Councillors Dominic Beck, Gordon Watson and Jenny Whysall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Commission Group</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health: Councillor David Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Commission Group Working Groups:</td>
<td>Councillor Ken Wyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Heart Town Self-Harm and Suicide</td>
<td>Councillor Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington Resource Centre and Recreation</td>
<td>Councillor Jeanette Mallinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground – Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Mrs. J. Havenhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Catchment Working Group</td>
<td>Councillor Stuart Sansome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Planning Shared Services</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy: Councillor Denise Lelliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherham and Sheffield) Joint Committee</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Finance: Councillor Saghir Alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection UK – Yorkshire</td>
<td>To be appointed by the Improving Places Select Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Humberside Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Commission</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Finance: Councillor Saghir Alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association/Board/Group</td>
<td>Chair/Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</strong></td>
<td>Chair of the Health Select Commission: Councillor Simon Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Disability Partnership Board</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Jayne Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government Association:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly Meetings</td>
<td>Leader of the Council, Deputy Leader of the Council and Councillor Bob Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Group – SIGOMA (Special Interest Group of Metropolitan Authorities)</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Finance: Councillor Saghir Alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitute: Councillor Ken Wyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government Yorkshire and the Humber – Health and Wellbeing Group</strong></td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health: Councillor David Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Association of British Market Authorities</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Stuart Sansome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Association of Councillors</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Ken Wyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Coal Mining Museum for England – Board</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Jonathan Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phoenix Enterprises Ltd.</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Denise Lelliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robin Hood Airport Consultative Committee</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Denise Lelliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitute: Councillor John Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham and Barnsley Chamber of Commerce</strong></td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy: Councillor Denise Lelliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Citizen’s Advice Bureau – Trustee Board</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Brian Steele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Diversity Festival Steering Group</strong></td>
<td>Waheed Akhtar, Voluntary Sector Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Holiday Aid</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Christine Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Together Partnership Board</strong></td>
<td>Leader of the Council (Chair of the Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of the Children’s Trust Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Jeanette Mallinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Allen Cowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Together Partnership – Business Growth Board</strong></td>
<td>Councillor Denise Lelliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Together Partnership – Health and Wellbeing Board</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health: Councillor David Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Jeanette Mallinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Together Partnership – Children and Young People’s Partnership</td>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Together Partnership – Safer Rotherham Partnership</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety: Councillor Emma Hodinott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber Foundation Health Trust Partner Governor</td>
<td>Councillor Jayne Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>To be appointed by the Health Select Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Ethnic Minority Alliance Board</td>
<td>Councillor Tajamal Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waheed Akhtar, Voluntary Sector Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Foundation Health Trust – Council of Governors</td>
<td>Councillor Pat Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Licence Watch Steering Group</td>
<td>Chair of the Licensing Board: Councillor Sue Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Safeguarding Board Local Adults</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health: Councillor David Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Safeguarding Board Local Children</td>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Schools’ Forum</td>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSH House Management Committee</td>
<td>To be appointed by Improving Places Select Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority</td>
<td>Leader of the Council: Councillor Chris Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitute: Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Gordon Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority – Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board: Councillor Brian Steele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Peter Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority – Audit Committee</td>
<td>Chair of Audit Committee: Councillor Ken Wyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Allen Cowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Leader or Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership</td>
<td>Leader of the Councillor: Councillor Chris Read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| South Yorkshire Joint Committee on Archaeology | Councillor Amy Brookes  
Councillor Ken Wyatt |
| South Yorkshire Joint Committee on Archives | Councillor Amy Brookes  
Councillor Ken Wyatt |
| South Yorkshire Joint Waste Procurement Board | Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety: Councillor Emma Hoddinott |
| South Yorkshire Leaders’ Meeting | Leader of the Council: Councillor Chris Read  
Substitute: Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson |
| South Yorkshire Roads Partnership | Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety: Councillor Emma Hoddinott  
Substitute – Councillor Robert Taylor |
| Trans-Pennine Properties (Wakefield) Ltd – Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation | Councillor Alan Atkin |
| Trans-Pennine Trail | Vice-Chair of Planning Board: Councillor John Williams |
| Trent Regional Flood and Coastal Committee | Lead Councillor from Doncaster  
Substitute Member |
| Unity Centre Steering Group | Waheed Akhtar, Voluntary Sector Liaison Officer |
| Voluntary Action Rotherham | Councillor Christine Beaumont |
| Women’s Refuge | To be appointed by Improving Places Select Commission |
| Women’s Strategy Group | Councillor Taiba Yasseen |
| Yorkshire and Humber (Local Authorities) Employers Association | Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Finance: Councillor Saghir Alam |
| Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Migration Group | Two Members appointed from South Yorkshire (currently Councillor J. Platts from Barnsley and Councillor G. Jones from Doncaster) |
| Yorkshire and Humberside Grid for Learning – Foundation Board | Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Gordon Watson  
Head of Performance and Quality – Sue Wilson |
156. COUNCIL PLAN 2017/18 QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE REPORT

Consideration was given to the report which confirmed how the Council Plan represented the core document that underpinned the Council’s overall vision, setting out headline priorities, indicators and measures that would demonstrate its delivery. Alongside it sat the Council’s Performance Management Framework which explained to all Council staff how robust performance monitoring and management arrangements were required to ensure effective implementation.

To ensure that the delivery of actions and their impact was assessed, formal quarterly performance reports were required to be submitted to the public Cabinet and Commissioners’ Decision-Making meeting, with an opportunity for pre-Scrutiny consideration in line with new governance arrangements. This report was the fourth and final report in the 2017/18 reporting cycle covering quarter 4 (1st January 2018 to 31st March 2018).

The Performance Report and Performance Dashboard/Scorecard (Appendices A and B) provided an analysis of the Council’s current performance against 14 key delivery outcomes and 72 measures.

This report was based on the current position of available data, along with an overview of progress on key projects and activities which also contributed towards the delivery of the Council Plan.

At the end of the fourth and final quarter (January to March 2018) 25 measures had either met or had exceeded the target set in the Council Plan. This represented 43.9% of the total number of indicators where data was available or where targets have been set. The direction of travel was positive for 32 (49.2%) of the indicators measured in this quarter.
Priority area with the highest proportion of targets met was Priority 4 (Extending Opportunity and Prosperity).

Cabinet Members provided an update in accordance with current performance for service areas:-

Councillor Beck, Cabinet Member for Housing, confirmed the measure relating to number of new homes delivered during the year had seen an increase of 10% from the previous year with the delivery of 479 homes, which was 162 properties below target. There were a couple of external factors why this measure had not been met, but it was hoped with the approval of the Rotherham Local Plan developers would be more confident in bringing sites forward. A new indicator would be introduced next year that would more specifically measure and report the number of new homes delivery that were as a result of direct Council intervention.

In terms of Measure 4.B2 property standards were continuing to improve and all housing stock owned and rented to tenants by the Council now met minimum standards of decency.

87% properties eligible to register under the Selective Licensing Scheme have registered and 90% of these properties have been inspected to test landlord compliance. 94.2% of these properties are compliant with the standards set for private landlords renting accommodation in the Borough.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, confirmed the data for 2.A1(a) and (b) was of concern and whilst it had seen some improvement, this was still outside the local comparators top quartile. A new provider was now in place and work would take place with them to improve services.

For Adults 8 of the 9 measures had seen improvements when compared to the previous year. Targets have not been achieved for 5 of the indicators, but the direction of travel was positive. 2.B1 and 2.B2 had achieved their targets and had improved performance on previous quarters.

2.B8 had not met its performance target of 351 with only 315 admissions.

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, reported on the Families for Change cohort and how the increase in demand was affecting the targets for the Children in Need rate, reduction in the number of children subject to a Child Protection Plan and the reduction in the number of Looked after Children.

Improved performance in Early Years was pleasing in line with the national average. There had been a dip in NEETS which was 0.3% below target. Services were working hard to improve performance.'
Councillor Hoddinott, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, reported the positive outcome of the measures relating to 3.B4 number of missed bin collections and 3.B5 recycling. There was a need to ensure this continued when the new waste management changes came into operation.

In terms of roads, measure 3.B1 (a) and (b) percentage of principal and non-principal roads in need of repair, the latest information confirmed the Council currently had 2% and 5% of the adopted highway that were in need of repair. Unfortunately, in terms of 3.B1 (c) the Council’s unclassified roads were currently not in as good condition as the national average. This had been recognised and the Council was at the start of the second year of a 3 year award of investment to address the deterioration of the unclassified road network.

This quarter had again been affected by system changes by South Yorkshire Police to gather the statistics to form the basis of the Council’s measures in tackling anti-social behaviour, hate crime and domestic abuse.

The Licensing Service continued to progress towards 100% compliance in all 4 components of the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy.

Effective enforcement action had been taken where evidence was found and had resulted in 42 fly-tipping prosecutions and 6,673 fixed penalty notices being issued in the Council’s efforts to combat fly tipping and other environmental crime.

Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Cleaner Greener Communities, confirmed more than 3.2 million visits had taken place during the baseline year for 2017/18.

21 complaints have been received in Quarter 4 bringing the cumulative figure 9 above the target for the year of 75. Although the target had not been achieved there was a very small margin for change with the number of operations undertaken by the services.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, confirmed the total number of businesses in the Borough had risen by 420 over the year.

Rotherham was also narrowing the gap to the UK average on the rate of the work age population economically active in the Borough.

Rotherham’s Planning Service also continued to determine 100% of the applications received within the specified periods.

Business Centres continued to perform well with average occupancy figures of 90%.
The Leader himself highlighted that whilst efforts to reduce the use of agency staff would continue, this had reduced by 18%. The Workforce Management Board would continue to challenge and scrutinise the use of agency workers across the organisation and expenditure was expected to fall further in next 12 months.

In terms of sickness absence, performance had improved from 10.97 to 10.26 days this meeting the target of 10.3 days. Performance was also at 93% against a 95% target for the completion of PDR’s.

Resolved:- (1) That the overall position and direction of travel in relation to performance be noted.

(2) That those measures which have not progressed in accordance with the target set and the actions required to improve performance, including future performance clinics, be discussed

(3) That the performance reporting timetable for 2018/19 be noted.

157. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS RATES DISCRETIONARY RELIEF

Consideration was given to the report which set out detail of 2 applications for the award of a business rate discretionary relief.

Resolved:- That 20% discretionary top up relief is awarded to Headway Rotherham, Rawmarsh CLC, Rosehill Road, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 7HJ for the period 31st May 2017 to 31st March 2019 and to Open Minds Theatre Company (South Yorkshire), Rotherham Underground, Corporation Street, Rotherham S60 1NG for the period 6 February 2018 to 31st March 2019.

158. STRATEGIC PROPERTY - LAND OFF STOCKWELL AVENUE, KIVETON PARK

Consideration was given to the report which sought approval to the joint disposal of approximately 24 acres of land off Stockwell Avenue, Kiveton Park, in partnership with the Rotherham North Notts Group (RNN). This site was allocated as a residential development site in the Local Plan that would potentially deliver 268 homes.

The options for disposal of this land were set out in detail as part of the report, including further information regarding the ransom strips which formed part of the considerations.

Relevant Ward Members had been consulted on the proposal and were supportive of the recommendations.
Resolved:- (1) That the disposal of a strategic property as shown edged in red and hatched in pink at Appendix 1 and as detailed within Option 1 of this report, be approved.

(2) That if the necessary verification is not obtained in relation to Option 1 then Option 2 be approved.

(3) That the Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration and Transport negotiates and agrees the terms and conditions of the proposed disposal, with the Assistant Director of Legal Services negotiating and completing the necessary legal documentation.

159. ROTHERHAM LOCAL PLAN - ADOPTION OF THE SITES AND POLICIES DOCUMENT

Consideration was given to the report which sought approval for the Sites and Policies Document to be referred to Council for formal adoption as part of Rotherham’s Local Plan.

The document had been examined by an independent Planning Inspector and found to be “sound” subject to some changes. The Inspector’s final report sets out these changes, known as Main Modifications.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to specific briefings in respect major planning developments be delivered to Ward Members on a ward-by-ward basis and for Equality Impact Assessments to be explicitly referenced in the cover report of all items submitted for Cabinet and Pre-Decision Scrutiny.

Resolved:- (1) That the Inspector’s final report and the recommended Main Modifications be noted.

(2) That the Sites and Policies Document, as modified, be referred to Council for formal adoption as part of the Development Plan for Rotherham.

(3) That the following recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be accepted:-

(i) That specific briefings in respect major planning developments be delivered to Ward Members on a ward-by-ward basis.

(ii) That Equality Impact Assessments be explicitly referenced in the cover report of all items submitted for Cabinet and Pre-Decision Scrutiny.
160. FORGE ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Further to Minute No. 44 of the meeting of Cabinet held on 11th September, 2017 consideration was given to the report which detailed how the Council was currently out to the market to secure a development partner for Forge Island. Stage 1 of the process had already been completed and the Council had since invited 3 potential development partners to submit detailed development proposals. The deadline for proposals to be received was 29th June, 2018.

To allow a scheme to progress as quickly as possible it was proposed that the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, and the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services be given the appropriate authority to select a development partner from among the bids submitted in June.

In addition, authority was requested to complete outstanding property purchases at Riverside Precinct and to progress with the flood defence work required for development to take place.

This report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the pre-scrutiny process who were in support of the recommendations, subject to how it would hold decision makers to account for exercising delegated powers in respect of the Forge Island redevelopment aspects of the Town Centre Masterplan, for quarterly updates to be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on decision making and the implementation of the project for the flood alleviation programme to be referred to Improving Places as part of its powers to scrutinise flood risk management functions.

The Cabinet welcomed the developments on Forge Island and were advised by the Cabinet Member that she was fully involved in the robust arrangements which would be reported back to Cabinet as a matter of course.

Resolved:- (1) That the decision to appoint a development partner for Forge Island and the terms of that appointment be delegated to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy.

(2) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment be delegated authority to use the powers available to the Council to agree the purchase and terms of the leaseholds at Riverside Precinct and that funding for these acquisitions be provided from the Town Centre Investment scheme within the approved Capital Programme.
(3) That, subject to an assessment of the financial viability of the proposed final terms of the development agreement, the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, in consultation with the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services, be delegated authority to commit resources from the Town Centre Investment scheme within the approved Capital Programme to deliver a preferred scheme for the development of Forge Island.

(4) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, in consultation with the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services, be delegated authority to instruct Legal Services or a third party legal provider to negotiate and complete the necessary legal documentation to give effect to the recommendations above.

(5) That approval be given to implement the flood defence works and the funding for implementation is taken from the allocated Town Centre Investment scheme.

(6) That Cabinet receive information on the Town Centre Investment scheme spend profile at appropriate trigger points.

(7) That the following recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be accepted:

(i) That Cabinet be recommended to confirm how it will hold decision makers to account for exercising delegated powers in respect of the Forge Island redevelopment aspects of the Town Centre Masterplan.

(ii) That the quarterly updates are provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on decision making and the implementation of the project.

(iii) That the flood alleviation programme be referred to Improving Places Select Commission, as part of its powers to scrutinise flood risk management functions.

161. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Consideration was given to the circulated report, the contents of which were included as part of the relevant items and the details included accordingly.
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Executive Summary
The report seeks approval for the Sites and Policies Document to be referred to Council for formal adoption as part of Rotherham’s Local Plan. The document has been examined by an independent Planning Inspector and found to be “sound” subject to some changes. The Inspector’s final report sets out these changes, known as Main Modifications.
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1. That the Inspector’s final report and the recommended Main Modifications be noted.

2. That the Sites and Policies Document, as modified, be referred to Council for formal adoption as part of the Development Plan for Rotherham.
List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1  The Inspector’s final report on the examination of the Sites and Policies Document (including the recommended Main Modifications).

Appendix 2  Publication Sites and Policies Document (the version submitted for examination)
http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/localplanexamination/downloads/file/2/sd02_publication_sites_and_policies_-_september_2015

Appendix 3  Schedule of Minor Modifications to the Sites and Policies Document

Background Papers
The Rotherham Sites and Policies Document examination website provides further detail of the process and hosts all related documents.

http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/localplanexamination

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel
No

Council Approval Required
Yes

Exempt from the Press and Public
No
Rotherham Local Plan: Adoption of the Sites and Policies Document

1. Recommendations

1.1 That the Inspector’s final report and the recommended Main Modifications be noted.

1.2 That the Sites and Policies Document, as modified, be referred to Council for formal adoption as part of the Development Plan for Rotherham.

2. Background

2.1 The Council is preparing a Local Plan for Rotherham. This is the Development Plan for the Borough. This is both a statutory requirement and a pro-active approach to meeting the need for new homes and jobs, promoting economic growth and continuing the regeneration of the Borough. The Local Plan underpins other key Council strategies, such as the Economic Growth Plan and the Housing Strategy.

2.2 The two key documents contained within the Local Plan are the Core Strategy (adopted September 2014), and the supporting Sites and Policies Document.

2.3 The Sites and Policies Document allocates land to meet the targets for new homes and jobs, fixed in the adopted Core Strategy. Most new development proposed will be focused in the Rotherham Urban Area (including at Bassingthorpe Farm) and the three Principal Settlements for Growth at:

- Wath upon Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton
- Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common, and
- Bramley, Wickersley and Ravenfield Common.

3. Key Issues

Inspector’s final report

3.1 During 2016 and 2017, a Government Inspector has carried out an independent examination of the Sites and Policies Document. The Inspector issued his final report to the Council in April 2018, setting out his conclusions. He has taken into account the Council’s evidence, and submissions from others, and decided that limited changes to the plan are required to make it sound and able to be adopted in due course. “Sound” means that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
3.2 The Inspector’s changes (known as “Main Modifications”) are set out in his final report, which is available at Appendix 1. The Publication Sites and Policies Document (the version submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination) is available at Appendix 2. Officers have also identified a number of minor changes and updates required to the document during the examination. The Inspector has confirmed these do not affect the soundness of the plan and can be changed as Minor Modifications, before publication of the adopted version. This Schedule of Minor Modifications is available at Appendix 3.

3.3 The Inspector’s final report has been published on the Council’s Local Plan examination website and interested parties have been notified. The examination is now closed.

3.4 The Inspector’s changes are fairly limited and he has accepted almost all of the proposed development sites in the plan. Key highlights are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All legal requirements met</th>
<th>The Inspector has confirmed that the plan meets all the legal requirements, such as compliance with the local development scheme, consultation requirements, duty to cooperate, sustainability appraisal, habitats regulations assessment, national planning policy (NPPF), and the relevant Act and Regulations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vast majority of sites accepted</td>
<td>Nearly all the development sites proposed in the plan have been accepted by the Inspector. These can now come forward to provide the new homes and jobs the Borough needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windfalls accepted as housing supply</td>
<td>Windfalls are new homes built on unallocated sites. Being able to include windfalls as additional flexibility in meeting the housing target avoids allocating more land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Green Belt land at Thorpe Hesley</td>
<td>Land at Thorpe Hesley has been protected by including it in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller needs met</td>
<td>The plan’s proposals to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs have been accepted by the Inspector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoting growth

3.5 Adoption of the Sites and Policies Document, and the release of development land, will give a boost to the new homes and jobs the Borough needs. Over the plan period from 2013 to 2028, the plan provides for:
| 83 sites for new homes | Along with existing planning permissions, and housing sites under construction, these new sites will provide enough land for **958 new homes** a year to meet the Core Strategy target of around 14,000 new homes over the plan period. Some other sites allocated for mixed use will also provide some housing. |
| 36 sites for employment use | These employment sites allow for expansion and inward investment to potentially create around **21,000 new jobs** over the plan period. This includes two sites identified as part of the Bassingthorpe Farm Strategic Allocation, a Special Policy Area at the former Maltby Colliery and three sites for mixed use development which will contribute towards the employment land requirement. |
| 1 site for Gypsy & Traveller use | This allocated site meets the need for Gypsy and Traveller provision identified for Rotherham. |
| Bassingthorpe Farm | Within the plan period, Bassingthorpe Farm should deliver over 1,100 new homes and 11 hectares of employment land. In total, this strategic site will eventually provide around 2,400 new homes. |
| Waverley New Community | The plan allocates Waverley as a Special Policy Area. It should continue to deliver around 180 new homes a year during and beyond the plan period. The site has planning permission for 3,890 new homes, of which 750 have been built to date. |
| Safeguarded land | In addition to these development sites, there are 15 areas identified as “safeguarded land”. This is land taken out of the Green Belt but held in reserve and not developed in this plan period, i.e. not before 2028. Identifying safeguarded land helps to retain the Green Belt boundary beyond the plan period. Any consideration of safeguarded land for development would require a review of the Local Plan. |

**Protecting the environment**

3.6 Along with promoting growth, adoption of the plan will also help protect the Borough’s environment. The Sites and Policies Document contains development management policies grouped under seven themes designed to meet the main aims of the Core Strategy, these are:

- To implement a strategy that **delivers new development in sustainable locations.**
To deliver housing developments which **create mixed and attractive places to live.**

To support developments, including business, industry, retail, leisure and tourism which **support a dynamic economy**, including Rotherham’s network of retail and service centres.

To **support movement and accessibility** within Rotherham through successful public and private transport networks, as well as encouraging walking and cycling.

To **manage the natural and historic environment** to protect and enhance Rotherham’s green infrastructure, bio and geo-diversity and water environments, as well as guide minerals related development and deal with flood risk.

To **create safe and sustainable communities** by supporting safe, healthy, sustainable and well-designed places, as well as the delivery of renewable energy and appropriate community facilities.

To **ensure that the necessary new infrastructure is delivered** to support the plan’s spatial strategy and that decisions are taken with regard to the national presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4. **Options considered and recommended proposal**

   **Option 1: The Council adopts the Sites and Policies Document as modified by the Inspector’s Main Modifications**

4.1 The Council has received the Inspector’s final report, setting out the Main Modifications required to make the plan sound. The Council can now proceed to adopt the plan as modified. The Sites and Policies Document will then become part of the statutory Development Plan for Rotherham.

4.2 Adoption of the plan will enable the release of the development sites chosen by the Council as the most appropriate to promote the sustainable growth of Rotherham. This will significantly boost the supply of new homes and jobs that Rotherham needs and support the delivery of the Council’s Economic Growth Plan and Housing Strategy. Crucially, it will also help ensure a five year supply of housing land to protect the Council against speculative development on other non-preferred sites.

4.3 Adoption of the plan will also bring into force the development management policies designed to protect and enhance the environment. This policy protection is required to complement the plan’s growth ambitions and ensure new development is delivered in a sensitive manner.
Option 2: The Council does not adopt the Sites and Policies Document

4.4 The Inspector’s Main Modifications are required to make the plan sound and enable the Council to adopt it in due course. The Council could, however, decide not to accept these changes and not adopt the plan.

4.5 The Inspector’s Main Modifications are required to make the plan sound. Without making these changes the Council cannot legally adopt the plan. Not accepting the changes and not adopting the plan would lead to uncertainty in the determination of planning applications. It would restrict the Council’s ability to provide for the new homes and jobs the Borough needs. It would risk diverting the inward investment the Council seeks to secure for Rotherham. This could give rise to the following situations:

- **Failure to provide new homes** – It would be impossible to achieve Rotherham’s new homes target without adopting the Sites and Policies Document. The target of 958 new homes a year is fixed in the adopted Core Strategy in 2014, and supported by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

- **Failure to deliver new jobs** – The Rotherham Economic Growth Plan includes a target to increase the amount of industrial and commercial floor space in the Borough. A lack of suitable new space is a barrier to businesses growth and investment when companies are unable to find the premises they need to locate and grow in Rotherham.

- **Loss of planning appeals on greenfield and Green Belt sites** – The Council would not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. This would result in a significant risk of losing planning appeals on speculative development on greenfield and potentially on Green Belt sites, as has recently been demonstrated (e.g. the Council’s refusal of a residential application at Blue Mans Way, Catcliffe was won on appeal due to the lack of a five year supply). The wider risk is that the Council is unable to direct the housing needed onto properly planned and sustainable sites; and that the lack of developer certainty in the absence of an up-to-date Local Plan harms overall housing delivery.

- **Loss of planning appeals on Gypsy and Traveller sites** – The Council would not be able to demonstrate adequate provision for Gypsy and Traveller needs. This would expose the Council to the risk of losing planning appeals on speculative Gypsy and Traveller sites. The Council has recently successfully defended an appeal on a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site in the Green Belt at Aston, partly due to the fact that the Sites and Policies document allocates a preferred site for Gypsy and Traveller needs.
• **Risk of intervention by the Secretary of State** – The Secretary of State has a default power under section 27 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) to prepare or revise and approve a development plan document for a local planning authority. If the Secretary of State considered that the Council were “failing or omitting to do anything it is necessary for them to do in connection with the preparation, revision or adoption of a development plan document”, he has the power to impose a plan on the Council. The Council would also have to fund this intervention.

**Recommended proposal**

4.6 Option 1 is recommended, so that the Sites and Policies Document, as modified, is referred to Council for consideration for adoption.

5. **Consultation**

5.1 The Sites and Policies Document has been subject to extensive public consultation, over a number of years. Consultation has been tailored to each stage of the process but has typically involved a variety of methods, including press adverts, radio interviews, letters, emails, public drop-in sessions, member and parish briefings, web content, and hard copies in libraries. The Inspector has concluded that the Council has complied with all the legislative requirements on consultation.

5.2 At each stage of plan preparation, officers have considered both the results of public consultation and the ongoing Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) of the draft plan. Where consultation comments and the IIA have raised material planning considerations, officers have made appropriate changes to the draft policies and site allocations.

5.3 Following approval by Council, the Sites and Policies Document was submitted to central Government on 24 March 2016 (Council Meeting 16/9/15, minute 55 refers). The document has been examined by an independent Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Public hearings for the examination were held from July to December 2016.

5.4 After the hearings, the Inspector required the Council to identify and consult on additional housing sites in the Wath upon Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, and West Melton area. This was to remedy a shortfall against the Core Strategy housing target for this area that came to light as part of the examination. This consultation was approved by Cabinet (Cabinet 26/6/17, minute 8 refers) and was carried out between 3 July and 14 August 2017.

5.5 Having held a further hearing session on 19 October 2017 to consider the comments made on the Wath area consultation, the Inspector accepted the two additional housing sites consulted on and included them in his Proposed Main Modifications.
5.6 Consultation on the Inspector’s Proposed Main Modifications was approved by Cabinet (Cabinet 11/12/17, minute 88 refers) and was carried out between 8 January and 19 February 2018. All comments received on this consultation were forwarded to the Inspector.

6. **Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

6.1 The Inspector has considered all duly made representations to the Proposed Main Modifications consultation and taken them into account when writing his final report. The report recommends that the Sites and Policies Document can be made sound, by applying the Main Modifications set out. The Council is now able to proceed to adopt the Sites and Policies Document, as modified.

6.2 The timetable below shows the significant stages in the Local Plan process to date. Dates shown for future stages are indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Meeting of the Council adopted the Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October/November</td>
<td>Public consultation on the Final Draft Sites and Policies Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Meeting of the Council approved publication and submission of the Sites and Policies Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/November</td>
<td>Sites and Policies Document published for statutory six week consultation prior to submission to Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Sites and Policies Document submitted to Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/December</td>
<td>Inspector held public hearings to examine the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Council received Inspector’s letter setting out Proposed Main Modifications to the plan, including the requirement to identify additional housing sites in the Wath upon Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Council’s Cabinet approved public consultation on additional housing sites in the Wath upon Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/August</td>
<td>Public consultation for six weeks on additional housing sites in the Wath upon Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Inspector held further public hearing on additional housing sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Council received Inspector’s letter confirming Proposed Main Modifications for public consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Council’s Cabinet approved public consultation on the Inspector’s Proposed Main Modifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January/February</th>
<th>Public consultation for six weeks on Proposed Main Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Inspector issued final report to the Council confirming Main Modifications required to make the plan sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Council’s Cabinet to consider recommendation to Council to adopt the plan as modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Meeting of the Council to consider adoption of the plan as modified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Finance and Procurement Implications**

7.1 There are no specific implications associated with the decisions in this report. The costs associated with the adoption of the Sites and Policies Document will be approximately £2,500. This mainly relates to printing and postage costs and will be met from existing approved revenue budgets.

8. **Legal Implications**

8.1 The preparation of the Local Plan has complied with the relevant legislation and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Once adopted, the Sites and Policies Document will form part of the statutory Development Plan for Rotherham and will be used to guide the determination of future planning applications.

8.2 On adoption, the Sites and Policies Document will also replace the remaining saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, which will be superseded in its entirety.

8.3 Article 3 of the Constitution sets out that the Development Plan is part of the policy framework. The approval or adoption of plans and strategies making up the policy framework is a function of the Council. As such, only a meeting of the Council can adopt the Sites and Policies Document, as it will form part of the Development Plan for Rotherham. Cabinet is asked to note the Inspector’s final report and recommended Main Modifications. Cabinet is then asked to refer the Sites and Policies Document, as modified, to Council to consider its adoption as part of the Development Plan.

8.4 If the recommendations are accepted, the report to Council will recommend that the Sites and Policies Document, as modified by the Inspector’s Main Modifications and the Minor Modifications, is adopted as part of the Development Plan for Rotherham. Council will then be asked to resolve that officers make the necessary changes to the Sites and Policies Document required by the Main Modifications, the Minor Modifications and any consequential changes to numbering, formatting and images prior to publication of the adopted Sites and Policies Document.
9. **Human Resource Implications**

9.1 There are no Human Resource implications arising from this report.

10. **Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults**

10.1 There are no implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults arising from this report.

11. **Equalities and Human Rights Implications**

11.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken during the preparation of the Sites and Policies Document as prescribed by legislation. This assessment has been considered by the independent examination as part of the Integrated Impact Assessment of the plan.

12. **Implications for Partners and Other Directorates**

12.1 Partners and other Directorates have been fully involved in the process of formulating the Local Plan.

13. **Risks and Mitigation**

13.1 The Council may be open to legal challenge should the Local Plan not be prepared in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations. Legal advice has been sought at appropriate stages, to minimise any risks.

14. **Accountable Officer(s)**

Damien Wilson, Strategic Director of Regeneration & Environment

Approvals obtained on behalf of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Named Officer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Director of Finance &amp; Customer Services</td>
<td>Jon Baggaley</td>
<td>10/4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Legal Services</td>
<td>Dermot Pearson</td>
<td>8/5/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Procurement (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Kay Handley</td>
<td>10/4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Human Resources (if appropriate)</td>
<td>John Crutchley</td>
<td>10/4/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report Author: Andy Duncan, Planning Policy Manager*

01709 823830 or andy.duncan@rotherham.gov.uk
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Executive Summary
At its Annual Meeting on 23 May 2018 the Council received a report on the outcome of the public consultation on the Community Governance Review for Orgreave and made Final Recommendations, including the establishment of a new parish of Waverley. The consent of the Local Boundary Commission for England was required before those recommendations could be implemented and has now been granted. The recommendations have been publicised in the local press and on the Council’s website. The purpose of this report is to confirm the decision of the Commission and to seek the approval of Council for the making of the Reorganisation of Community Governance Order required to bring the Final Recommendations into effect.

Recommendations
That Council approve the making of the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order and associated map which form Appendices 1 and 2 to this report.
Appendices

Appendix 1  Draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order
Appendix 2  Draft Map
Appendix 3  Letter from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England dated 7 June 2018
Appendix 4  Calculation of the budget requirement for the proposed parish of Waverley
Appendix 5  Chart showing Band D Council Tax for parish and town councils in Rotherham for 2018/19

Background Papers

- Report to the meeting of Council on 3rd June, 2015 - “Community Governance Review Orgreave Parish”
- Model Community Governance Reorganisation Order
- A Guidance Note and Checklist for Newly Established Local (Parish and Town) Councils [National Association of Local Councils]
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Community Governance Review - Orgreave Parish Council

Review of the Constitution

1. Recommendations

1.1 That Council approve the making of the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order including the associated map which form Appendices 1 and 2 to this report.

2. Background

1.1 At its Annual Meeting on 23 May 2018 Council received a report setting out the results of the consultation exercise, which finished on 16 April 2018, and made recommendations as to the outcome of the Community Governance Review. Council made Final Recommendations, including the creation of a new parish of Waverley.

1.2 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has now given its consent to the making of a Reorganisation of Community Governance Order to implement the Final Recommendations. The Commission’s decision letter forms Appendix 3 to this report.

1.3 The Final Recommendations have now been publicised, as required by law, by an advertisement in the local press and a notice on the consultation part of the Council’s website. The members of the public who asked to be kept informed of progress on the community governance review have been sent a link to the update and documents on the Council’s website.

3. The Draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order

3.1 The Draft Order at Appendix 1 is a draft of the Order required to implement the Final Recommendations made by Council at its Annual Meeting. The Order sets out the new arrangements for community governance, including the electoral arrangements and the figure for the budget requirement for the new parish of Waverley. The map associated with the Draft Order forms Appendix 2.

3.2 Local Town and Parish Councils normally set their own precepts to cover their annual expenditure. This is then collected on their behalf by the Council as part of the annual Council Tax bill. If the Draft Order is approved, Waverley Community Council will have no elected members until after the elections in May 2019 and will therefore be unable to set its own precept for the 2019/20 municipal year. The Draft Order therefore includes a figure for the budget requirement for the new community council for 2019/20.

4 Key Issues

4.1 As above, the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order at Appendix 1 and the associated map at Appendix 2 would implement the Final Recommendations made by Council at its Annual Meeting.
4.2 The Draft Order must include a figure for the budget requirement for the new community council for 2019/20. At Appendix 4 is a schedule showing the calculations for the budget requirement for the proposed parish of Waverley which draws upon “A Guidance Note and Checklist for Newly Established Local (Parish and Town) Councils” issued by the National Association of Local Councils. The schedule identifies expenditure relating to the establishment and administration of the new community council. The budget figure proposed for the parish of Waverley is £43,950 for 2019/20 which would be equivalent to a Band D Council Tax liability of £66.00. The current additional Band D liability for the parish of Catcliffe is £105.50, which is being paid by Waverley residents who live in the Waverley North polling district, and the current additional Band D liability for the parish of Orgreave is £38.76, which is being paid by Waverley residents who live in the Waverley South polling district.

4.3 The chart at Appendix 5 shows the current additional Band D liabilities in 2018/19 for all the town and parish councils in the Borough with the proposed figure for Waverley included for comparison. Waverley would be different from other parishes in that significant numbers of dwellings will continue to be built each year until the current planning consents have been implemented with the consequent increase in the numbers of residents liable to pay Council Tax. The residents of Waverley are members of a not-for-profit management company which is responsible for the public areas of the Waverley site and its role includes inspecting, maintaining, cleaning and landscaping those areas. The management company collects an annual service charge [which cannot exceed £175 pa until January 2022] from each household.

5. Options considered and recommended proposal

Option 1

5.1 To approve the making of the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order required to implement the Final Recommendations. This is the recommended option because the Final Recommendations were informed by the consultation responses received from local people and organisations.

Option 2

5.2 To not approve the making of the draft Reorganisation of Community Governance Order. This would leave the arrangements for community governance for Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley as they are at present, notwithstanding the views of local people and organisations as expressed in the consultation. This option is not recommended.

6 Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

6.1 If approved the Reorganisation of Community Governance Order will be executed on behalf of the Council. The law requires the decision to make the Order to be published together with the reasons for making the Order and the Council to take such steps as it considers sufficient to secure that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of that decision and those reasons.
6.2 A copy of the Order and its map must be placed on deposit at the Council’s principal office together with a map which shows the effects of the order in greater detail than the map included in the order and must be made available for inspection at all reasonable times. The Council must publicise that the documents are available for public inspection.

6.3 The Council must also inform the following of the making of the Order:

- the Secretary of State;
- the Local Government Boundary Commission for England;
- the Office of National Statistics; and
- the Director General of the Ordnance Survey;

7 Financial and Procurement Implications

7.1 Section 4 of this report and Appendices 4 and 5 set out relevant information in relation to the calculation of the budget requirement for the proposed new parish of Waverley.

7.2 The costs shown at Appendix 4 are the estimated costs of operating the parish for 2019/20. Primarily they consist of salary costs for a clerk and associated running costs, following guidance issued by the National Association of Local Councils. It should be noted that several day-to-day running costs of being in business are unknown and can only be estimated, including office accommodation. These costs have been estimated by using figures published by similar parish councils in the borough.

The Band D Council Tax liability of £66.00 has been calculated based on a projected Band D taxbase for Waverley.

7.3 The cost of parish council elections are normally recharged to the parishes concerned.

8 Legal Implications

8.1 The legal implications arising from this report are set out in the body of the report.

8.2 Where an area is being transferred between an existing parish to a new parish, as is proposed in the Final Recommendations, the Reorganisation of Community Governance Order should deal with the distribution of property, rights and liabilities of parish councils affected by the Order. However in this case Catcliffe and Orgreave Parish Councils have confirmed that they do not have property, rights or liabilities in the Waverley North and Waverley South polling districts respectively.

9 Human Resources Implications

9.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.
10. Implications for Children and Young People

10.1 There are no direct implications for children and young people arising from this report.

11. Equalities and Human Rights Implications

11.1 There are no equalities and human rights implications arising from this report.

12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

12.1 There are implications for existing Parish Councils as set out in the body of this report.

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 The budget requirement for the proposed new parish must be set at an appropriate figure otherwise either the new community council will not have sufficient resources to be effective or local residents in the new parish will be paying more in Council Tax than is required to fund the activities of the community council. This risk is mitigated by the calculation being informed by the National Association of Local Council’s guidance and by taking into account the levels of Council Tax in other parishes within the Borough.

13.2 If the draft Order is made there is the risk of legal challenge from anyone aggrieved by the outcome of the community governance review but that risk is mitigated by the thorough consultation exercise which has been undertaken.

13.3 There is a further risk that, notwithstanding the support from local people for a new parish for Waverley, that as and when elections are held there may be insufficient people willing to stand for election to the new parish council. The Council’s officers will be engaging with relevant local organisations including the parish councils to support the community of Waverley to prepare for the establishment of the new parish council.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

Dermot Pearson, Assistant Director of Legal Services
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN HEALTH ACT 2007

The Rotherham (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order (2018)

Made - - - - [day] [month] 2018

Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)

Rotherham Borough Council (“the council”), in accordance with section 83 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 ("the 2007 Act"), has undertaken a community governance review and made recommendations dated May 2018.

The council has decided to give effect to those recommendations and, in accordance with section 93 of the 2007 Act, has consulted with the local government electors and other interested persons and has had regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identities and interests of the community and is effective and convenient.

The council, in accordance with section 100 of the 2007 Act, has had regard to guidance issued under that section.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, by a letter dated 7 June 2018, gave consent to the making of this Order in so far as it relates to “protected electoral arrangements” for the purposes of the 2007 Act.

The council makes the following Order in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 86, 98(6) and 240(10) of the 2007 Act.

Citation and commencement

1.—(1) This Order may be cited as the Rotherham (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order 2018.

(2) [Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4) below, this Order comes into force on 1st April 2019.

(3) Articles 8, 9 and 10 shall come into force on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2019.

(4) For the purposes of:

(a) this article,

(b) article 5; and

(c) proceedings preliminary or relating to the election of parish councillors for the parishes of Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley, to be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2019, this Order shall come into force on 15th October 2018.
Interpretation

2. In this Order—

“borough” means the borough of Rotherham;

“existing” means existing on the date this Order is made;

“map” means the map marked “Map referred to in the Rotherham (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order 2018” and deposited in accordance with section 96(4) of the 2007 Act: and any reference to a numbered sheet is a reference to the sheet of the map which bears that number;

“new parish” means the parish constituted by article 4;

“ordinary day of election of councillors” has the meaning given by section 37 of the Representation of the People Act 1983; and

“registration officer” means an officer appointed for the purpose of, and in accordance with, section 8(c) of the Representation of the People Act 1983.

Effect of Order

3. This Order has effect subject to any agreement under section 99 (agreements about incidental matters) of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 relevant to any provision of this Order.

Constitution of a new parish

4.—(1) A new parish, comprising the area outlined with a blue line on the map, shall be constituted within the borough.

(2) The name of the new parish shall be Waverley.

(3) The new parish shall have the alternative style of community.

(4) In consequence of paragraph (1) of this article, the area of the new parish shall cease to be part of the existing parishes of Catcliffe and Orgreave.

Calculation of budget requirement

5. For the purposes of regulation 3 of the Local Government Finance (New Parishes) (England) Regulations 2008 there is specified in relation to the parish of Waverley the sum of £43,950.

Parish council for the parish of Waverley

6.—(1) There shall be a parish council for the parish of Waverley.

(2) The name of that council shall be “The Community Council of Waverley”.

Parish elections

7.—(1) The election of all parish councillors for the parishes of Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley shall be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2019.

(2) The term of office of every parish councillor elected on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2019 for the parishes of Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley shall be five years.

(3) Where any provision of an Order made before the making of this Order requires an election of parish councillors for a parish mentioned in paragraphs (1) and (2) above to be held on a date other than that for which paragraph (1) provides, it shall cease to have effect to that extent.

Number of parish councillors for the parish of Catcliffe

8. The number of councillors to be elected for the parish of Catcliffe shall be nine and the parish shall not be divided into wards.

Number of parish councillors for the parish of Orgreave

9. The number of councillors to be elected for the parish of Orgreave shall be seven and the parish shall not be divided into wards.

Number of parish councillors for the parish of Waverley

10. The number of councillors to be elected for the parish of Waverley shall be seven and the parish shall not be divided into wards.

Annual meeting of parish council

11. The annual meeting of the new parish council in 2019 shall be convened by the Chief Executive of the Council of the Borough of Rotherham. The meeting shall take place no later than 14 days after the day on which the councillors elected to the new parish council take office.

Alteration of parish areas

12.—(1) The area coloured and designated by the letter “A” on the map shall cease to be part of the parish of Catcliffe and shall become part of the parish of Waverley.

(2) The area coloured and designated by the letter “B” on the map shall cease to be part of the parish of Orgreave and shall become part of the parish of Waverley.

(3) Each area coloured and designated by a letter on the map and specified in column (1) of the Schedule shall cease to be part of the parish specified in relation to that area in column (2) of the Schedule and shall become part of the parish specified in relation to that area in column (3) the Schedule.

Electoral Register
13. The registration officer for the borough shall make such rearrangement of, or adaptation of, the register of local government electors as may be necessary for the purposes of, and in consequence of, this Order.

Transitional provision

14. Until the councillors elected to the council of the new parish of Waverley at the elections to be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2019 come into office, the new parish shall be represented by those persons who immediately before 1st April 2019 are the elected councillors for the borough wards of Brinsworth & Catcliffe and Rother Vale.

Order date

15. 1st April 2019 is the order date for the purposes of the Local Government (Parishes and Parish Councils) (England) Regulations 2008.

Sealed with the seal of Rotherham Borough Council on the [ ] day of [ ] [2018]

[Signed]

[Signatory]
## SCHEDULE

### Article 12

**ALTERATION OF AREAS OF PARISHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Parish from which omitted</th>
<th>Parish to which added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A”</td>
<td>Catcliffe</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“B”</td>
<td>Orgreave</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms S Kemp  
Chief Executive  
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
Riverside House  
Main Street  
Rotherham  
S61 2AQ

7 June 2018

Dear Ms Kemp,

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 - Consent to make Reorganisation of Community Governance order

I refer to the letter dated 24 May from the Assistant Director, Legal Services to the Commission in which the consent of the Commission is sought to enable the Council to make a Reorganisation of Community Governance Order implementing the Final Recommendations of the Catcliffe, Orgreave and Waverley Community Governance Review.

The electoral arrangements for Orgreave Parish Council are protected by s86 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, having regard to the Rotherham (Electoral Changes Order) 2018.

In considering the Council's request for consent, the Commission notes the final recommendations of the Community Governance Review.

The Commission has no objection to the provisions recommended by the review.

By this letter, the Council has the consent of the Commission to make a Reorganisation of Community Governance Order.
Should your Council decide to make the order, I would draw your attention to the provisions of s96 of the 2007 Act (as amended by Schedule 4, s32 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009) concerning the publicising of the outcomes of the review and the bodies to be notified that an order has been made.

Yours sincerely

Jolyon Jackson CBE
Chief Executive
Jolyon.Jackson@lgbce.org.uk
0330 500 1290
# Calculation of Budget Requirement

**Administration costs for the local council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerk salary and oncosts</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk expenses</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ expenses/allowances</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/stationery etc</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecoms and broadband</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support and Equipment</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Communications</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration Costs</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>24,750.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Establishment costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recharged RMBC costs</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Creation</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecoms and Broadband</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Clerk</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Establishment Costs</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>17,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURE**: **43,950**
## Appendix 5

### Band D Council Tax of Parish and Town Councils in Rotherham 2018/19

#### Additional Charges for parishes within the Rotherham Borough 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Charge (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hooton Roberts</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letwell</td>
<td>30.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellaby</td>
<td>35.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>36.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgreave</td>
<td>38.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenfield</td>
<td>40.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Salvin</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby</td>
<td>51.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiston</td>
<td>56.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersley</td>
<td>56.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley</td>
<td>57.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Bierlow</td>
<td>59.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firbeck</td>
<td>60.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughton en le Morthen</td>
<td>60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treeton</td>
<td>65.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>65.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley (proposed)</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston-cum-Aughton</td>
<td>66.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todwick</td>
<td>67.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrybergh</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harthill with Woodall</td>
<td>79.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgarton</td>
<td>82.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakes</td>
<td>85.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulley</td>
<td>92.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anston</td>
<td>95.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington St John's</td>
<td>97.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catcliffe</td>
<td>105.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodsetts</td>
<td>113.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinsworth</td>
<td>128.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD
16th May, 2018

Present:-
Councillor David Roche Cabinet Member, Adult Social and Health
(in the Chair for Minutes Nos. 71-77)
Dr. Richard Cullen Strategic Clinical Executive, Rotherham CCG
(in the Chair for Minutes Nos. 78-80)
Helen Dobson Chief Nurse, The Rotherham Foundation Trust
(representing Louise Barnett)
Chris Edwards Chief Operating Officer, Rotherham CCG
Sharon Kemp Chief Executive, RMBC
Carole Lavelle NHS England
AnneMarie Lubanski Strategic Director, Adult Care, Housing and Public Health
Dr. Jason Page Governance Lead, Rotherham CCG
Terri Roche Director of Public Health, RMBC
Janet Wheatley Chief Executive, Voluntary Action Rotherham

Also Present:-
Steve Adams South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Kate Green Policy and Partnership Officer, RMBC
Polly Hamilton Assistant Director Culture Sport and Tourism
Gordon Laidlaw Communications Lead, Rotherham CCG
Steve Turnbull Public Health, RMBC
3 Members of the Public

Report Presenter:-
Richard Hart Health Protection Principal, RMBC

Observers:-
Julie Dale Rotherham CCG
Becky Hall Adult Social Care

Apologies for absence were submitted from Louise Barnett (TRFT), Tony Clabby (Healthwatch Rotherham), Councillor Mallinder (Chair Improving Places Select Commission), Mel Meggs (Strategic Director Children and Young People’s Services), Kathryn Singh (RDaSH), Councillor Short (Vice-Chair Health Select Commission) and Councillor Watson (Deputy Leader).

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.
72. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

A member of the public asked if Rotherham was doing anything to celebrate the 70th Anniversary of the NHS?

The Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group’s Annual General Meeting was to be held on the 4th July at the New York Stadium. There was a full day planned involving the Youth Cabinet and looking back at the NHS successes.

A member of the public stated that the NHS had been under severe pressure from the cuts and Rotherham had lost its Stroke Unit and Netherfield Court which was a great service. What consultation had been carried out with the public regarding these cuts?

The Chair reported that he was extremely pleased to be able to report that there was nothing within the Hospital Review that the public of Rotherham should be concerned about. All the hospitals within the area were going to stay as full hospitals with every single one having an A&E.

The decision with regard to the Stroke Unit was not a budget cut but rather an investment in service which would see an improvement in the outcomes for Rotherham people. There were 5 Hyper Acute Stroke Units in South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw with Rotherham and Barnsley’s staffed by locums and resulted in patients being diverted to other facilities. It had been decided, as a long term plan, to centralise 3 Hyper Acute Units. A Rotherham resident suffering a stroke would now receive the first part of their treatment in a specialist hospital and then return to Rotherham’s Stroke Unit.

A full public consultation had taken place using all the traditional methods of consultation. Healthwatch Rotherham had also been tasked to run some public events in Rotherham.

The members of the public’s feedback would be appreciated.

Dr. Richard Cullen reported that his practice had provided the medical services to Netherfield Court and still did; the rehabilitation service was still provided but in a different location.

73. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 14th March, 2018, were considered.

Arising from Minute No. 66 (Update from Aim 2), it was noted that the Ferns Ward had been nominated for a Parliamentary Award.

It was reported that Voluntary Action Rotherham’s Social Prescribing had also been nominated.
Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14th March, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

74. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair reported that the Health and Wellbeing Board would feature as a case study of good practice by the Local Government Association (LGA).

Representatives of the LGA would be in Rotherham on 22nd May to carry out interviews.

75. DRAFT HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY ACTION PLANS

Kate Green, Policy and Partnership Officer, presented the first draft of the action plans which were being developed to demonstrate the activities that would take place contributing to achieving the priorities under each Aim.

Work would be undertaken to develop the plans further including other activity that would take place, timescales, milestones and indicators with a further report submitted to the July Board meeting.

Discussion ensued on each of the Aims with the following comments made:-

**Aim 1 All Children get the best start in life and go on to achieve their potential**
- Consideration of including Signs of Safety training and rollout – this was mentioned under Priority 3
- Inclusion of glossary

**Aim 2 All Rotherham people enjoy the best possible mental health and wellbeing and have a good quality of life**
- Update Priority 1 to reflect that 5 Ways to Wellbeing Campaign had been launched on 14th May – change of word “launch” to “implement”
- Discussions had taken place between Polly Hamilton and Ruth Fletcher-Brown with regard to the connection of the Culture Strategy to the 5 Ways to Wellbeing Campaign
- Priority 4 – Amend to read “Local All Age Autism Strategy” and separate line for “Adult Learning Disability Strategy”

**Aim 3 All Rotherham people live well for longer**
- Some may be operational issues and not for the Board
- Priority 4 – pleased to see that carers now had their own Aim
Aim 4 All Rotherham people live in healthy, safe and resilient communities
- Priority 1 – inclusion of all workforces becoming part of the Workplace Wellbeing Charter and encouraging healthy workforces
- Priority 4 – amend to “green spaces, leisure and culture assets”
- Priority 4 – ‘daily mile’ was an ambition of Ray Matthews to get all the schools signed up
- Priority 5 – should it also include “use of community buildings” rather than “how libraries can be best utilised within local communities in tackling loneliness”?

Resolved:- (1) That the high level activity identified as contributing towards the Strategy priorities be noted.

(2) That the comments above be incorporated into the revised plans.

(3) That Polly Hamilton, Assistant Director Culture Sport and Tourism, revisit the connections between the Aims.

ACTION:- Polly Hamilton

(4) That the full plans be submitted to the July Board meeting, together with the attendance of each Aim sponsor, followed by each individual Aim plan submitted to subsequent Board meetings.

ACTION:- Kate Green/Terri Roche

76. INTEGRATED CARE PARTNERSHIP AND PLACE PLAN

Sharon Kemp, Chief Executive RMBC, and Chris Edwards, Chief Operating Officer RCCG, presented an update on Integrated Care.

A presentation on Integrated Care had been made to an All Members on 20th April, 2018.

The presentation had highlighted:-

- Development of integrated care in South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw particularly in Rotherham
- Integrated Care System ICS context
- Current position in South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw
- National direction of travel
- What ICSs were expected to do
- Rotherham’s Integrated Care Partnership (Place)
- The journey so far – governance, principles
- What is/will be different
- How could we work differently
- Issues to consider

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-
The Integrated Care Plan was a positive way forward to ensure full integration of all the areas that were of importance e.g. Social Prescribing, Health Villages, Walk-in Emergency Care Centre, with the respective organisations working together in partnership.

All partners had signed up to the Partnership and engaged.

What happened at South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw level was different to what happened at local level.

Regardless of Legislation/Policy, working together at local level provided residents with a better experience and simpler pathways/access to the services they needed within the Borough.

Integration was making the best use of the resources available.

Need to ensure members of the public were fully aware.

Resolved:- (1) That the update be noted.
(2) That the Place Board minutes be included on future agendas for information.
Action: Kate Green

77. ROTHERHAM INTERMEDIATE CARE CENTRE

AnneMarie Lubanski, Strategic Director of Adult Care, Housing and Public Health, presented a report giving a strategic overview of the proposals relating to the reconfiguration of the Rotherham Intermediate Care Centre, a day rehabilitation service provided by the Council and The Rotherham Foundation Trust.

The primary driver was in terms of people getting the right service enablement at home where it was known that patients recovery improved. The service was not changing; most of the staff would move with the service into the community.

Resolved:- That the report be noted and the approach taken endorsed.

The Chair left the meeting at this point in the agenda.

Dr. Richard Cullen assumed the Chair.

Dr. Cullen in the Chair.

78. HEALTH PROTECTION ANNUAL REPORT

Richard Hart, Health Protection Principal, presented the Health Protection annual report 2017 which highlighted the joint successes and challenges over the year as identified by the Health Protection Committee.
The organisations represented on the Health Protection Committee collectively acted to prevent or reduce the harm or impact on the health of the local population caused by infectious disease or environmental hazards, major incidents and other threats.

The Health Protection Committee, on behalf of the Director of Public Health, would continue to meet on a quarterly basis to oversee and discharge the Council’s Health Protection duties.

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

- The incidence of Diphtheria had occurred this year so would feature in next year’s annual report. The mass immunisation outbreak plan had been applied very successfully. No source had been identified. A debrief had been held to share learning

- The logos on the covering page did not include that of The Rotherham Foundation Trust

Resolved:- That, subject to the inclusion of The Rotherham Foundation Trust logo, the report be noted.

ACTION:- Richard Hart

79. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH ANNUAL REPORT

Terri Roche, Director of Public Health, introduced the 2017 independent annual report. The 2015 and 2016 annual reports had been the first 2 in a series of 3 planned annual reports that worked through the life course, focussing on key health issues at different stages of life.

Living well was important for individuals and the population as a whole to ensure a good quality of life throughout the life course. Living a healthy life could increase life expectancy and making the right lift choices could reduce the likelihood of premature death and suffering certain long term conditions.

The 2017 annual report focussed on living and working well and was broken down into chapters on:-

- Mental Health, Wellbeing and Loneliness
- Dealing with Drug and Alcohol Misuse
- Tackling the Issue of Domestic Abuse
- Looking after Sexual Health
- Towards a Smoke-free Generation
- Addressing Obesity
- Physical Activity
- Long Term Conditions
- Environments and Health
The key recommendations in the report were:

- Work and health in partnership – to help more people back into work with stronger health and employment connectivity with links to emotional wellbeing. Continue to deliver the Workplace Wellbeing Charter for those in work

- Making Every Contact Count (MECC) – working with partners to deliver MECC (Healthy Chats) which was a key component of the Rotherham Integrated Health and Social Care Strategy

- Mental Health – Public Health to lead on the implementation of the Better Mental Health For All Strategy with a specific focus in year one on Suicide Prevention and Five Ways to Wellbeing

- Physical Activity – Public Health will work with the Team Rotherham Partnership to increase physical activity across Rotherham using opportunities such as the Authority’s award winning parks (green spaces), promoting active travel and working the Planning Department to develop obesogenic environments

- Continue to deliver on South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw wider partnership to deliver on the Health and Social Care Plan

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

- Further work was required to understand the reasons why healthy life expectancy in women had consistently deteriorated compared to men

- The age range of 25 to 69 years for the diagnosis of new cancer cases was a national data set

- It was a public facing document and would be distributed to key stakeholders. The document would be presented to Voluntary Action Rotherham for discussion

- The document was disseminated within Council Directorates to discuss how they could help delivery

Resolved: That the report be noted.
80. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Wednesday, 11\textsuperscript{th} July, 2018, commencing at 9.00 a.m. to be held at The Spectrum, Voluntary Action Rotherham.
PLANNING BOARD
10th May, 2018

Present:- Councillor Tweed (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bird, D. Cutts, M. Elliott, Fenwick-Green, Jarvis, Taylor, John Turner, Walsh and Whysall together with Councillors Mallinder (as substitute for Councillor Vjestica) and Sheppard (as substitute for Councillor Price).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkin, Ireland, Price and Vjestica.

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

84. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

85. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH APRIL, 2018

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Regulatory Board held on Thursday, 19th April, 2018, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

86. DEFERMENTS/SITE VISITS

There were no site visits nor deferments recommended.

87. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Resolved:- (1) That, on the development proposals now considered, the requisite notices be issued and be made available on the Council’s website and that the time limits specified in Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 apply.

In accordance with the right to speak procedure, the following people attended the meeting and spoke about the following applications:-

– Conversion, restoration and partial demolition of Firbeck Hall (formerly hospital) to form 21 apartments, conversion and restoration of the stable block to form 3 apartments, the creation of 8 No. new build dwellings in place of the demolished annex, the creation of one dwelling within the walled garden as enabling works, including landscaping and the external works to the Firbeck Hall site at Firbeck Hall, New Road, Firbeck, for Sophia Property Developments Ltd. (RB2017/0875)
Listed Building Consent for conversion, restoration and partial demolition of Firbeck Hall (formerly hospital) to form 21 apartments, conversion and restoration of the stable block to form 3 apartments at Firbeck Hall, New Road, Firbeck, for Sophia Property Developments Ltd. (RB2017/0890)

Mr. M. Gibbs (applicant)
Mr. C. Stanton (objector)

Erection of 8 No. apartments at land at 40 Morthen Road, Wickersley, for Habbin Builders Ltd. (RB2017/1777)

Statement read out on behalf of Mr. Habbin (Applicant)
Councillor S. Ellis (Objector)

(2) That application RB2017/0875 be:-

(a) Referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(Direction) 2009.

(b) That subject to the application not being ‘called in’ the applicant enters into a Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the purposes of securing the phasing of the development.

(c) That subject to the satisfactory signing of the Section 106 Agreement, the Council resolves to grant permission for the proposed development subject to the conditions set out in the report.

(3) That Listed Building Consent be granted for application RB2017/0890 for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the relevant conditions listed in the submitted report.

(4) That application RB2017/1777 be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the relevant conditions listed in the submitted report.

88. UPDATES

The following update information was provided:-

(a) Construction of a well site including the creation of a new access track, mobilisation of drilling, ancillary equipment and contractor welfare facilities to drill and pressure transient test a vertical hydrocarbon exploratory core well and mobilisation of workover rig, listening well operations, and retention of the site and wellhead assembly gear for a temporary period of 5 years on land adjacent to Common Road, Harthill, Rotherham at Land adjacent Common Road Harthill for INEOS Upstream Limited (RB2017/0805)
The public enquiry by the Planning Inspectorate had now finished and the outcome was awaited in the next four to six weeks.

No appeal had yet been submitted for a similar application at Woodsetts, which had been refused.

(b) Completed Developments Tour

A date had been finalised for the Completed Developments Tour around the borough on Friday, 22nd June, 2018, departing from the Town Hall at 9.00 a.m.

It was envisaged that nine sites would be visited during the day with a stop off for lunch. These included:-

- Wath Wood Drive, Wath
- Ruscon Site, Parkgate
- Westfield Road, Parkgate
- Chapel Field Lane, Thorpe Hesley
- Black Lion Site, Firbeck
- Front Street, Treeton
- Hepworth Drive, Aston
- Manor Road, Kiveton Park Station
- Barn Conversion, Woodall

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

89. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Planning Board take place on Thursday, 31st May, 2018 at 9.00 a.m.
PLANNING BOARD
31st May, 2018

Present:- Councillor Sheppard (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Bird, D. Cutts, M. S. Elliott, Fenwick-Green, Sansome, Walsh, Whysall and Williams.

Also in attendance: Councillor Jarvis.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ireland, R.A.J. Turner and Tweed.

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

90. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

91. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10TH MAY, 2018

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Regulatory Board held on Thursday, 10th May, 2018, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

92. DEFERMENTS/SITE VISITS

There were no site visits nor deferments recommended.

93. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Resolved:- (1) That, on the development proposals now considered, the requisite notices be issued and be made available on the Council’s website and that the time limits specified in Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 apply.

(2) That applications RB2018/0494 and RB2018/0569 be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the relevant conditions listed in the submitted report.

(3) That consideration of application RB2018/0527 be deferred until the next meeting.

94. UPDATES

The following matters were discussed:-
(1) Members were informed of the success of the Council’s Planning Service in being named winner in the category for Local Authority Planning Team of the Year at the Royal Town Planning Institute’s Awards for Planning Excellence 2018.

Members placed on record their appreciation of the work of the Planning Service and their success in gaining this Award.

(2) Members were reminded of the arrangements for the Planning Board’s tour of completed developments, scheduled to take place on Friday, 22nd June, 2018.
LICENSING BOARD-SUB-COMMITTEE
21st May, 2018

Present:- Councillor Ellis (in the Chair); Councillors Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Hague and McNeely.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beaumont and Clark.

67. 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 the Police Act 1997 and Paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (business affairs and prevention of crime).

68. APPLICATIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS’ LICENCES

The Sub-Committee of the Licensing Board considered a report, presented by the Licensing Manager, relating to applications for the review of hackney carriage/private hire drivers’ licences in respect of Messrs. B.T., M.Y.K, A.H. and G.M.

Messrs. B.T., A.H. and G.M. attended the meeting and were interviewed by the Sub-Committee.

Resolved:- (1) That consideration of the review of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. M.Y.K. be deferred and he be afforded the opportunity of attending a future meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee.

(2) That the hackney carriage/private hire drivers’ licences in respect of Mr. B.T, A.H. and G.M. be revoked.
LICENSING BOARD-SUB-COMMITTEE
11th June, 2018

Present:- Councillor Ellis (in the Chair); Councillors Jones, McNeely, Reeder and Steele.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Beaumont.

69. HOUSE TO HOUSE COLLECTION

Further to Minute No. 45(2) of the meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee held on 18th December, 2017, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Licensing Manager, concerning the following application for the grant of a promoter’s permit to carry out house-to-house collections:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Children's Trust</td>
<td>Whole of the Rotherham Borough area</td>
<td>Average of five days per month from the date of approval until 31 December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolved:- That the application be approved and a promoter’s permit be granted in respect of the above organisation, for the dates from the issue of the permit until 31st December, 2018.

70. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the Police Act 1997 and Paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (business affairs and prevention of crime).

71. APPLICATIONS FOR THE GRANT/RENEWAL/REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS’ LICENCES

The Sub-Committee of the Licensing Board considered a report, presented by the Licensing Manager, relating to applications for the grant, renewal and review of hackney carriage/private hire drivers’ licences in respect of Messrs. M.Y.K, M.L.M., R.M.A., S.W.M. and B.H.W.

Messrs. M.L.M., R.M.A. and S.W.M. attended the meeting and were interviewed by the Sub-Committee.
Resolved:- (1) That, further to Minute No. 68(1) of the meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee held on 21st May, 2018, consideration of the review of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. M.Y.K. be deferred and he be afforded the opportunity of attending a future meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee.

(2) That the application for the grant of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. M.L.M. be approved and he be granted a licence for a period of three years.

(3) That the application for the renewal of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. R.M.A. be refused.

(4) That the application for the grant of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. S.W.M. be approved and he be granted a licence for a period of three years, with an additional condition imposed on this licence such that any misdemeanour or transgression by this licensed driver shall immediately result in him being required to appear before the Sub-Committee and answer to his conduct.

(5) That, in the circumstances now reported in respect of the application for the grant of a hackney carriage/private hire driver’s licence in respect of Mr. B.H.W., the applicant be required to attend a meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee.