

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

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

Date: Wednesday, 31st October, 2018

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 13)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 14 - 30)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 31 - 43)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 44 - 67)
5. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 68 - 70)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
6th September, 2018

Present:- Councillor Evans (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bird, Cooksey, R. Elliott, Ellis, Jarvis, Rushforth, Short, Taylor, John Turner, Williams and Wilson

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Albiston and Keenan and Robert Parkin (Speakup). Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member, had also submitted his apologies.

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

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

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jarvis made a non-pecuniary Declarations of Interest in relation to Minute No. 33 (The Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Priorities 2019-20) as she was a Governor of The Trust.

27. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

28. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 19th July, 2018.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th July 2018, be approved as a correct record.

Arising from Minute No. 16 (62 day wait for treatment for cancer), the Trust had focussed on addressing this atypical dip in performance and at the quarterly briefing with health partners in July reported that it appeared to be back on track so far in Quarter 2.

Arising from Minute No. 19 (savings from Integrated Sexual Health Service), it was noted that the Chair was to provide feedback to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at its 12th September meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 20 (Adult Residential and Nursing Care Homes), all Select Commission members had been emailed the recent "Guide to Residential and Nursing Care for Older People".

Arising from Minute No. 21 (Health Select Commission Draft Work Programme), it was noted that further work on co-production was taking place on the Autism Strategy so would now be submitted to the Commission later in the year.

It was also noted that Councillor Keenan would be a representative on RDaSH as well as YAS.

29. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to report.

30. UPDATE ON HEALTH VILLAGE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED LOCALITY WORKING

Nathan Atkinson, Assistant Director Strategic Commissioning, presented the following 2 powerpoint presentations, the second on behalf of Chris Holt, Director of Strategy and Transformation, TRFT:-

Health Village – Update on Integrated Working in Rotherham

Key Activity Under Development

- Integrated Point of Contact – alignment of Single Point of Access (SPA) and Care Coordination Centre (CCC)
- Integrated Discharge Team
- Intermediate Care and Reablement - “Home First” strapline
- Integrated Rapid Response – better triage
- Integrated Care Home Support – Red Bag, End Of Life pilot, named GP, links to Quality Board
- Developing Integrated Pathways as the default

What is Working Well

- Clear priorities and vision, agreed by all partners
- Shared agendas and the ‘right conversations’ taking place
- Governance framework in place
- Momentum building in a number of areas
- Changes happening on the ground (Single Point of Access, Care Co-ordination Centre, Integrated Discharge Teams, Integrated Rapid Response)
- Technology

What are we Worried About

- Balancing (often competing) priorities
- Capacity to deliver – balance of new vs existing
- Engagement, communications and language
- Organisational development across all parties
- Capturing key milestones and measures from a very comprehensive data set across the system

What needs to happen next

- Continue to develop areas of practice where joint outcomes can be achieved
- Develop an Unplanned Care Team
- Focus on Home First and new delivery models

- Preparation as a system for Winter Plan requirements to meet NHS England requirements and applying learning from 2017/18 plan outcomes

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

- There would be a multi-disciplinary team approach in the community as to which professionals would visit a client in their home, rather than a stay in a nursing home, depending upon their individual requirements. The Winter Plan would factor in the issue of capacity as it was quite a sea change. It was acknowledged that there was an element of risk as it was easier to identify a building/number of beds compared to multi-disciplinary teams in the community. Incremental steps were being taken to mitigate having sufficient resources
- Acknowledgement that capacity was an issue and there were challenges in recruitment across Health as well as the independent sector. A key piece of learning from the Health Village pilot was that you could not transform if members of staff came with existing work and caseloads that they could not exit from; a phased approach was required. Healthwatch and similar organisations were key in referring in issues/difficulties in the system
- Capacity was the biggest concern. It was known that there were gaps in the Hospital in terms of staffing and that there were challenges around recruitment. A full complement of staff within staffing budgets to deliver maximum capacity was required, at the hospital and to deliver the new models.
- It was imperative that the key milestones for the implementation of locality working were set and agreed as soon as possible because they had to be held to account and measurable; each organisation had its own particular drivers and finding the crosscutting drivers that were consistent across every piece of the pathway was the challenge
- There was a commitment from the Council and partners to influence the change for integrated working
- With regard to cohesion and coordination between services there was a commitment from the Council and partners to influence the change for integrated working but there was still a way to go. Shadowing and “stepping into other shoes” at all levels helped to build an understanding of other job roles.
- Numbers of readmissions to hospital and reasons for these – statistics to follow

Progress Report – Locality Working

What have we learned about Locality Working

- The Health Village Pilot was a great start
- There is evidence of a positive impact on emergency admissions from locality working
- All localities saw an increase of 0.7% in emergency admissions between 2015/16 to 2016/17, excluding the Health Village. The Health Village saw a 2.1% decrease however between these periods
- All localities excluding the Health Village, seeing a 3.5% and 11% increase in 65+ and 85+ respectively. Emergency admissions from the Health Village locality however saw lower increases 1.8% (65+) and 9.5% (85+)

The Emerging Model

- Re-alignment of GP practices across 7 localities
- Localities split into 3 partnerships areas
- Community Nursing working directly into 7 localities
- Adult Social Care and Community Health Teams (including Mental Health) working across 3 partnerships North, Central and South
- Information sharing via Rotherham Health Record
- Integrated Management (Partnership level)
- Integrated MDT approach – some still more virtual at present

What will be different

- Develop a joint culture of prevention – early work has been more reactive and focused on frailty and long term conditions
- ‘Blurring’ of professional boundaries
- Develop new ways of supporting Primary Care
- Enhanced Social Care Assessment and Care Management
- Management of Long Term Conditions
- Focus on the needs of Physical and Mental Health
- Work into hospital-based services to reduce length of stay
- Improved opportunities for post-discharge follow-up

Timelines and Implementation

0 to 6 Months

- Teams aligned/co-located
- Baselines agreed
- Outcome Framework agree
- Joint caseloads developed
- Ways of working outlined
- Team configuration defined
- Leadership team in place
- 1 Partnership/2-3 localities model ‘operational’

6 to 24 Months

- Pooled budget principles agreed
- Outcomes being ‘realised’
- Outlying performance addressed

- Transition model (Phase 3) being defined
 - 3 Partnerships/7 localities 'operational'
- >24 Months

- New models and transition defined
- Organisational alignment clear
- Integration of teams
- Pooled budgets and investment

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

- There were benefits from co-location but there also had to be an understanding of the pathways and dealing with the caseloads/management. There had been some real positives and relationships built up from the pilot but there had also still been some divisions because of the physical building.
- The Trust would be able to provide information as to how work had progressed on finding possible locations for hubs. The CCG were leading on colocation which was a priority.
- There was some blurring of professional boundaries but it was anticipated that a Social Care Green Paper would be announced in the autumn. Some of the legislation was in place as part of the Greater Manchester Devolution Deal but there was recognition across the system that the legislative frameworks would have to be reviewed as the agencies all operated from slightly different guidance. Some roles needed clinical supervision and required certain levels of training and health and social care assessments were different.
- To assist with the blurring of boundaries with regard to decision making, Rotherham had appointed a joint role holder to oversee the work in an attempt to remove some of the boundaries and recognise that hierarchy and matrix management would need to take place. Regarding professional boundaries, it might not be appropriate for a manager who knew absolutely nothing about a particular area or who has no clinical oversight to make a clinical decision and that was part of the challenge. There was a lot of practical things that could be done and was being done in the virtual teams but the ambition was to have new roles but it would take time
- Clear timescales were required for the implementation of locality working as the presentation only had broad blocks – detail to follow
- The Select Commission had previously recommended that it was important to capture the deeper more qualitative data based on patient experience to supplement the quantitative measures. What was presented was a systemic overview. Was this data being captured and recorded and could the Select Commission have a

formal response that summarised and presented data that the Commission could scrutinise in more detail at a later date? – to go back to Chris Holt to respond

- In terms of outcomes for the Health Village, was there evidence to show that diagnostics such as blood tests were being received quicker?
- Given the volume of different tests that must be requested, how many staff worked in the laboratories on the tests? Was there a central laboratory?

Nathan Atkinson was thanked for covering both presentations.

(1) To note the presentation and progress made on integrated working.

(2) That the findings feed into the development of the Select Commission performance sub-group's work programme.

(3) That the progress on locality working and plans for implementation be noted.

31. RDASH ESTATE STRATEGY

Dianne Graham, Director of Rotherham Care Group, RDaSH, and Rachel Cadman, Transformation Lead for Rotherham Care Group, RDaSH, presented the following powerpoint presentation:-

Rotherham Estates Consultation

- Aim – To seek stakeholder views on the two preferred options within the estates transformation plans"
- Part of wider consultation, 700 staff, service users, other stakeholders events

Outcomes

- Improved access for local people
- Aligned to GP surgeries
- Part of place based plans
- Integrated mental health, all age, Learning Disability Services
- Town centre facility
- More efficient use of resources

Present Estates

- Badsley Moor Lane – Learning Disability Services
- Ferham Clinic – Adult Mental Health
- Clifton Lane – Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT)
- Howarth House – Older Persons Mental Health (OPMH) and Dementia Clinics
- Swallownest Court – Adult Mental Health (AMH) inpatient/community

- Woodlands – OPMH inpatient

Proposed Estates

- Swallownest Court – South services
- Woodlands – Borough-wide/front end services
- Clearways – Town centre facility/clinics and base for IAPT team
- Then:
 - North Services
 - Option 4 – Badsley Moor Lane (BML) (plus Ferham annex)
 - Option 5 – Ferham (plus Ferham annex)

Buildings we will no longer require

- Reduce buildings from 6 to 4
- No longer require Clifton Lane (IAPT)
- No longer require Howarth House (OPMH)
- Impact of agile working

Options considered

- Riverside (local authority building)
- The Bank
- Rawmarsh Health Centre
- Maintain status quo

Key Messages

- Best use of Rotherham pound
- Best value out of estates
- Reducing from 6 to 4 buildings
- Providing town centre clinic based services
- Services will continue to be delivered

The estate plans were temporary with some moves for one to 2 years and further consideration with partners about a possible health clinic in the North for integrated health, mental health and social care. Savings would be around £100,000 for RDaSH but there were other benefits from co-location and greater integration and possibilities for other efficiencies, so it was a stepping stone.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Work was taking place to identify whether Ferham or Badsley Moor Lane was the best option. Both facilities compared favourably with regard to cost and both were accessible to their localities. It had formed part of the stakeholder consultation with questions asked as to what it was like for them in terms of accessibility, environment, how difficult it was to get to both places, with the outcome being that Badsley Moor Lane was the preferred building. Having said that Ferham had not been discounted. Ferham Clinic Annex would remain whatever the final option was

- Whilst recognising the ambitions behind the review in terms of joint working and close working with GPs, in the days of austerity how much was financial pressures or was it purely just reconfiguring services? It was both. RDaSH needed to be much more integrated. It was the vision that in the future all Mental Health and Learning Disability Services would be provided in every Health and Social Care setting in Rotherham. Progress had been made to provide that particularly at front end services and there were a range of examples outside the estate strategy:-
 - RDaSH was also integrated with the Care Co-ordination Centre and Local Authority Single Point of Access
 - a ward which was a joint venture between the Hospital and RDaSH for people with Dementia with physical health staff and mental health staff
 - IAPT staff were in GP surgeries working with people with long term physical health conditions as well as mental health conditions
 - working with Police in the Central Neighbourhood Team to try and integrate mental health in the Police and Local Authority
 - Peri-Natal mental health working with the Hospital, District Nurses and Health Visitors
 - Hospital Liaison Service which was an integrated service with the Hospital making sure Mental Health, Alcohol Liaison and Learning Disability Services were integrated into the Hospital
- The Efficiency Strategy was not looking at reducing staffing levels and in fact NHS England had put extra funding into Mental Health Services over the last few years as part of the 5 year plan. There was an increasing workforce but there were concerns about the change and transformation in Mental Health Services and the numbers of new people coming into the health system to cope with the pace of change

Dianne and Rachel were thanked for their presentation.

Resolved:- That the presentation be noted.

32. RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SCRUTINY REVIEW- DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICES

Further to Minute No. 25 of the Cabinet and Commissioners Decision Making Meeting held on 6th August, 2018, Anne Charlesworth, Head of Public Health Commissioning, gave an update on the recommendations and corresponding actions arising from the Scrutiny Review of the Drugs and Alcohol Service Treatment and Recovery Services.

Rotherham's new Adult Substance Misuse provider, Change, Grow, Live (CGL), had been providing the Service since 1st April, 2018. Mobilisation from a client perspective had been very smooth, staff transferred from RDaSH to CGL and they had managed the Service very well. Work was progressing on the pathways.

Monthly meetings were held with CGL to consider all the key performance indicators. Progress so far had been steady, as had been requested, for the first 3 months. 6 clients had exited the Service positively in the first few weeks of the new contract due to being drug free. It was now back to its normal 2/3 new clients a month. CGL would now be looking in more detail of who now was ready to exit the Service.

Since the new Service started, there had been 8 deaths of clients in Service; 5 had died in Hospital as a result of long term conditions and not directly their substance misuse, 2 had died as a result of overdoses but not directly attributable to the drugs they were in receipt of from the Service and the Coroner's verdict was awaited for the 8th. None of the 8 clients would have been aged under 18 as the Service was for those aged 18 years and over; and there were none who were aged under 30.

The following update was given on each of the Review's recommendations:-

1. A full suite of Performance Indicators was to be submitted to the November Select Commission meeting
2. As stated above, monthly meetings took place and so far progress was good
3. More suicide prevention and self-harm work would take place as and when funds became available
4. MECC training was going quite well; as of yesterday 215 people had attended the training so the alcohol message was getting out. There was a clear pathway that those who received MECC training understood they also got Health Rotherham services as first point of contact but then screening tool then referred people into CGL
5. As mentioned at a previous meeting, drugs and alcohol soft marketing testing had taken place but needed to ensure that it happened in all the commissioning. Work was taking place with procurement to make it part and parcel of what agencies did
6. There was a new pathway around notification of death. A concern from the NHS, if the Service was no longer a NHS Service, was that it would stop some level of scrutiny, however, CGL reported all deaths on the national template, did their own death investigation and were reporting deaths to the CQC, Public Health and the Head of Service for Safeguarding, so a decision could be made as to brief the Adult Safeguarding Board about them. There would be a written pathway by the end of September

7. CGL's processes around risk assessment for suicide were very thorough and nationally agreed. They had supplied them to Authority and were to meet with RDaSH and ensure that all bases were covered. Both RDaSH and CGL's processes followed NICE Guidance. It would form part and parcel of the pathway that was currently being agreed
8. Safety and safeguarding had already been touched upon.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Had consideration been given to using Ward-based funding rather than the Community Leadership Fund? This would be fed back.
- £500K had been awarded to South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw Integrated Care System for suicide prevention work. It was understood that some progress had been made on the devolved monies and what it could be spent on but no specific details as yet, however, Rotherham had been awarded an allocation
- Hellaby Ward had ordered the posters that contained the helpline number for people to ring and the beer mats. They were to be distributed on the Hellaby Industrial Estate
- What type of treatment was a client offered? Were they get referred to the Consultant? The CGL Service was a clinical service headed up by a Consultant Psychiatrist. Clients received the same level of clinical assessment as they would have previously. Work was taking place to agree the boundary of when someone's problem became more Mental Health than substance misuse which agency they should access to remove any uncertainty as to which Service should be leading that package of care

Resolved:- That the response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Recovery Services be noted.

33. THE ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST QUALITY PRIORITIES 2019-20

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented the following powerpoint presentation on The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust Quality Priorities 2019/20.

It was noted that TRFT was to hold a public consultation event on their Quality Priorities, however, it clashed with a meeting of the Select Commission. It had been agreed that the Select Commission's discussion would feed into the consultation.

Quality Improvement Priorities

- Every year The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust developed a set of Quality Improvement Priorities for the year ahead
- These priorities helped ensure that there was a continuous drive to improve the quality of care provided for patients
- Each of the priorities had a lead who developed the details for each and what the aims, objectives and measures would be

Reminder for 2018/19 Priorities

- Patient Safety
 - Missed or Delayed Diagnosis
 - Deteriorating Patient (including Sepsis) (new focus)
 - Medication Safety
- Patient Experience
 - End of Life Care
 - Discharge
 - Learning from the views of Inpatients (new)
- Clinical Effectiveness
 - Improving the quality of services provided through preparing for Care Quality Commission (CQC Inspection (new)
 - Mental Capacity Act (increasing staff knowledge and awareness)
 - Effective outcomes for women and baby (new)

Initial Quality Priorities for 2019/20

- Patient Safety
 - Embedding the use of the National Early Warning Score (NEWS2)
 - Improving the assurance regarding the implementation of national safety alerts
 - Improving the learning and changes in practice arising from action plans from Serious Incidents and Inquests
 - Improving the safety of care provided to patients requiring respiratory support
 - Embedding the ambition of zero avoidable pressure ulcers
- Patient Experience
 - Improvement in Patient and Public Involvement and Engagement
 - Improving the experience of children receiving care in non-paediatric focused services
 - Embedding the treatment of all patients in an equal and diverse manner
 - Improving the experience of patients transitioning from Children to Adult Services
 - To be identified following the outcome of the Patient Experience Framework (NHS Improvement June 2018) and Trust Wide Diagnostics

- Clinical Effectiveness
 - Improving the quality of services provided through implementing the findings from the CQC Inspection
 - Effective outcomes for women and babies
 - Improving conversations about public health matters
 - Improving the outcomes from the Sentinel Stroke National Audit Programme (SSNAP)
 - Improving the outcomes from a National Audit (exact audit to be confirmed)

With regard to a query regarding Sepsis, Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, reported that there had been a national focus on this, not just Rotherham Hospital, and training had taken place with YAS telephone call handlers. Janet would follow this issue up. Further information would be sought.

Councillor Andrews provided more details about the National Early Warning Score tool for recording patient observations.

Resolved:- (1) That the Select Commission feedback their views to TRFT through Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer.

(2) That the Quality Account Sub-Group meet in December to discuss the final set of priorities as part of the half year update.

34. SOUTH YORKSHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND WAKEFIELD JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented papers requested by JHOSC at its previous meeting for information regarding progress with the implementation of Children's Surgery and Anaesthesia and the designation process and an overview of the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw ICS areas of future scrutiny.

When the papers for the next JHOSC meeting were published these would be circulated to all Select Commission Members with regard to identifying any questions or issues to raise through the Chair.

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

35. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

36. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the submitted minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 11th July, 2018.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 11th July, 2018, be noted.

Arising from Minute No. 3 (Questions from Members of the Public and Press), it was clarified that the original application for a Judicial Review had been for the Hyper Acute Stroke Services which was rejected as it was also on appeal.

37. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 18th October, 2018, commencing at 10.00 a.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
18th September, 2018

Present:- Councillor Brookes (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Clark, Elliot, Ireland, Jarvis, Khan, Marriott, Price, Senior, Short and Julie Turner.

Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview Scrutiny Management Board, was in attendance at the invitation of the Chair.

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, was in attendance at the invitation of the Chair.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cusworth.

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

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

20. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

21. COMMUNICATIONS

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development) reported:-

- There was a Member Development session to be held on 20th September at 5.00-7.00 p.m., repeated on 21st September at 9.30-11.30 a.m. on "Understanding Your Communities" to be delivered by Councillor Marie Pye, Member Peer for the LGA
- A session was to be held on 27th September 2.00-4.00 p.m. on the outcomes of the Early Help consultation

Councillor Jarvis gave an update on the issues discussed at the recent meeting of the Health Select Commission which had included an update on the Health Village, RDaSH Estate Strategy and the response to the Scrutiny Review on Drugs and Alcohol Services.

22. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH JULY, 2018

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 17th July, 2018, and matters arising from those minutes.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 17th July, 2018, be approved as a correct record, for signature by the Chairman.

Arising from Minute No. 13(3) (Domestic Abuse Update), it was noted that efforts had been made to obtain the action plan and engagement timetable. The issue would be pursued and circulated to Members when received.

23. CHILDREN MISSING EDUCATION

Susan Claydon, Early Help Head of Service, presented a report on Children Missing from Education (CME) which the Authority had responsibility to ensure were identified, reported and tracked so that suitable educational providers could be found.

The term “CME” referred to children of compulsory school who were not on a school roll and who were not receiving a suitable alternative education e.g. Elected Home Education.

Until recently the CME data had had gaps and required intensive work to ensure that consistent processes and data inputting were in place across the different systems used to capture CME information.

There had been a redesigning of the reporting function and the development of a new CME Performance Scorecard. This development reduced the ability for rigorous comparative analysis to be drawn on previous years' performance, however, put Rotherham in a stronger position to understand which of its CME cohort caused the most concern. One of the key changes to CME reporting was to include predominant issues captured at the point of referral to CME to enable a better understanding of potential vulnerability.

The current position was as follows:-

- There had been 188 children, from 116 families classified as ‘new’ CME referrals during Quarter 1, an increase of 33 compared with the previous quarter
- Of the 188, 110 (58.5%) had had a previous episode of CME which emphasised that some children had recurrent issues with CME
- 78% of children were from the central area of Rotherham
- There were an additional 32 cases that remained open from previous reporting periods bringing the active caseload to 210 at the end of Quarter 1
- 134 cases had been resolved in the period
- The central locality of Rotherham had consistently higher rates of CME largely due to the mobile and transient nature of the resident population
- 40% of the children identified as CME had no known vulnerability or issues identified within the family at the point of becoming CME

- Of the newly identified children, 14% were open to Children's Social Care and 6% to Early Help
- All children, regardless of identified level of need, became subject to joint investigations by the school and Local Authority at the point of becoming CME to ensure rigorous strategies were employed to try and locate the child

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's Controlling Migration Fund had enabled extra resources to assist with key issues that affected the wellbeing of children and their progression in education. The workers would spend a considerable amount of time in central locality schools. The fund was also facilitating the recruitment of 2 Community Navigators, a shared resource between the Council and voluntary sector, which offered intensive outreach and detached work to 'find' families that were newly migrant and/or arranging to leave the UK.

As part of the Early Help Review, it was proposed that CME move to Education and Skills as the work closely aligned with school admissions. Despite the proposed change, processes would remain the same and work would continue across the operational and strategic boards to ensure that practice was scrutinised and children supported appropriately.

The Chair commented that it was disappointing that the report had not been the detailed analysis of trends expected as requested at the January meeting and of the standard of the report in terms of the spelling and grammar.

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

- "Alternative provision" could refer to a child who had come off a school roll and a separate package of support had been set up e.g. Pupil Referral Unit, Chislett
- Due to DfE rules around school admissions when someone applied for a school, because of cultural bias, they did not have to provide their ethnicity. Colleagues within School Admissions had been asked if they could ask the question on the School Admissions Form, explaining within the question that it was voluntary. This would assist the Service to understand the trends and patterns
- There were 3 Roma speaking Workers within the Early Help Service. The Controlling Migration Fund was facilitating the recruitment of 2 Community Navigators, not specifically for CME, matrix managed by Early Help and REMA, who worked in the central locality where there were greater numbers of transient families. The Workers carried out assertive outreach work to identify people as they entered Rotherham. 2 Family Support Workers were attached to the Central locality schools specifically to assist with the additional pressure faced by the community

- The Fund also supported some of the interpreting work. The Service worked hard to make sure families were not disadvantaged because of the language barrier. There were some Roma speaking Education Workers
- The Controlling Migration Fund was a much bigger fund managed through the Assistant Chief Executive. An evaluation was taking place of the Fund in its entirety and was subject to a different report but some narrative could be included in future reports to the Commission
- 188 children had been identified as CME of which there were 116 families. It was not possible to break the number down any further as it was measured in children as per the DfE requirement
- There were mechanisms in place of reporting if a child was missing from education. Schools reported the movement of children every month, reporting those who had attended and those who had left
- Previously no predominant need or presenting issue had been collated when CME data was collected. Work had taken place to ensure that at the point of referral it was captured as to whether there were any issues known in school and was now included in the referral form
- Checks would be made to ascertain if a family was known to Early Help, Children's Social Care etc. and whether there had been domestic abuse etc. What was known that in 40% of all the cases coming through, there had been no known issues with the family previously. A lot of work had taken place with schools to impress upon parents that if they were going to move they should notify the relevant authorities.
- Although data on free school meals was not included, all the risk factors that it was felt might be useful were. At the point of referral schools were asked the share with the Service on the referral form if they had any concerns and it would be recorded as a presenting issue at CME
- The issue of collecting information with regard to free school meals could be discussed at the Strategic Missing Team but consultation would be required with Education colleagues. The fact that a child was in receipt of free school meals would not be classed as a risk factor. The predominant issue would be recorded and free school meals would be a secondary measure

- There was close working with Selective Licensing usually on an individual family basis and also in strategic forums. Part of the Controlling Migration Fund work was about collaboration with wider colleagues, such as Selective Licensing, when it was known that there was a particular issue around a family, not necessarily CME, that had vulnerabilities and worries regarding their tenancy/licensing/landlords
- Several sessions had been held with the Clifton Learning Partnership
- The performance was broken down across the Early Help locality areas i.e. North, South, Central and the 9 teams within that – Clifton, Wingfield, Winterhill, Oakwood, Town Centre and Canklow, Dinnington, Maltby, Wath, Swinton, Dalton and Rawmarsh. The issue would be pursued with data colleagues to ascertain if it was possible to break the information down further, however, it was known that generally Eastwood, East Dene and Herringthorpe were the highest areas for CME
- None of the CME had presented with high risk of FGM, however, there were clear Safeguarding Board protocols to be followed.
- Safeguarding issues were shared, however, they could not be sent out to all local authorities in the United Kingdom unless there was some intelligence as to which local authority the family may have moved to
- There was a full-time CME officer. Susan was the CME strategic lead and also chaired the Strategic Missing Group
- The Operational Group that reported to the Strategic Group looked at the thematic issues and was not there to discuss individual children's plans. The Group had been refocussed to make sure there were clear reports to the Missing Group on what was working well, what they were worried about and or any issue that needed the Strategic Group to unblock
- When a child had gone missing and found/located in education there were conversations with the child and parents. If there had been previous concerns/issues they would be picked up and there would be a conversation with the school and CME Officer resulting in a possible referral. There was always a conversation with the parent with regard to the circumstances; it was often quite innocent and a matter of them not notifying the correct people, however, the fact that the circumstances of them returning to Rotherham and being found may suggest that there were new concerns. If a child was found in a school outside Rotherham concerns/worries/vulnerabilities were shared on a case by case basis

- There was no statutory responsibility for CME children below school age, however, the Service did track nursery schools and playgroups as much as possible. It was not included in the report because it was not a function of the DfE but the CME Officer had a list of children they might be worried about and their siblings. Pre-school children would show up on the Health radar. Reassurance was provided that the whole family was looked at and not just the CME child
- Currently there was one CME Officer who currently sat within the Child Social Care Triage Team. A large proportion of her interaction needed to be with School Admissions and Education and Skills so the proposed move would make no difference other than the Officer having a different strategic lead
- The Controlling Migration Fund was not directly linked to CME and there was no funding drawn down but it was part of the Early Help Service. It had been mentioned in the report because some of the things happening within that piece of work were influencing positively on some of the locality work

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

(2) That a further detailed report be submitted including:-

- the progress that had been made
- actions that had been completed, when and who by
- trends
- locality level data
- the need to understand the analysis of why children were not on the school roll
- more detail on the budget and resources,
- the outcomes, terms of reference and the new way of working of the Strategic Missing Group

(3) That consideration be given as to the appropriate arena for the evaluation of the Controlling Migration Fund.

(4) That a report be submitted to the December meeting of the Select Commission if possible.

24. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY (SEND) - UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 53 of the Commission held on 22nd March, 2017, Jenny Lingrell, Assistant Director, Commissioning, Performance and Inclusion, and Paula Williams, Head of Inclusion, presented a progress report assisted by the following powerpoint presentation:-

The Rotherham Context

- There were 45,028 children and young people attending Rotherham's schools as at January 2018 School Census (43,882 in 2016)
- 7,513 children were identified as having a Special Educational need (16.6%). A rise of 0.6% since the census of 2016. Nationally 14.6%
- 13.7% of the Rotherham's school population have needs met by a graduated response (SEN Support) in 2018 compared to the National average of 11.7%. This was a fall from 2014 when 17.3% of the Rotherham School population had needs met by a graduated response in schools in comparison to National 15.1%
- 1,333 of these children have needs met with support of an Education Health and Care Plan (2.9%). However, this only measures the school population and not those placed outside the Borough
- Current position at the end of August 2018 showed that there were 1,956 children and young people in Rotherham who had an Educational Health and Care Plan in place with approximately 354 of the children accessing an out of authority provision (18%) which is not in the Borough and 1,602 children and young people access provision for which was within the Rotherham Borough (82%). 33 of the children had their EHC Plan administered by another local authority due to being resident outside Rotherham
- The 321 children accessing an out of authority provision is split with 116 of them being statutory school aged and 205 being Post-16 aged
- Looking at those in specialist provision only: 142 children and young people as at end of August 2018, 78 of whom are statutory school aged and 64 that were post-16

Rotherham's 5 Key Themes in the SEND Strategy

- Co-Production Voice and Influence
Families and services working together to produce better outcomes for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs
There was clear and strong communication, participation, engagement and co-production with children, young people, families, practitioners and partners
- Integrated Services and Joint Commissioning
There was collective responsibility and a streamlined approach for children, young people and their families when accessing relevant assessments, services and support
- Sufficiency of Provision
There was sufficiency of provision to meet the range of needs of children and young people with Special Educational needs and/or Disability
Wherever possible, this should be within line with their choice or that of their parents and within Rotherham
- Quality of Provision, Performance and Assurance
Provision made through the graduated response and/or an Education Health Care Plan should be of the highest quality to enable the best outcomes for children and young people. This area would include

developments in the specific areas of Autism, Social Emotional and Mental Health Needs

- Value for Money and Savings
Provision made should be early, involve timely assessment and ensure the best use of funding available

What's Going Well

- A SEND Strategy (at consultation) and an established action plan focussing on 5 themes
- A co-produced action plan to develop the “Voices” of young people and parents within the planning of SEND provision
- New Assistant Director for Commissioning, Performance and Inclusion now in post
- SEND Sufficiency Plan Year 1 in delivery – all 7 projects underway
3/7 resulting in Rotherham from September 2018
2/7 resulting in provision from December 2018
2/7 projecting provision from September 2019
- Rotherham's first 19-25 provision for SEND would be in place for September 2018
- Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) mainstream resources (2 primary 1 secondary) under discussion
- Preparation continuing for a Local Area SEND Inspection
- New joint lead for Education Health and Care Assessment Team (EHCAT) and Children with Disabilities Team. Restructure of EHCAT on track for the end of October 2018. Plan in development for improved quality of Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP)
- Turning the Curve plans in place for reduction of EHCP assessment requests and reduction in Exclusions
- Over £1.5M cost avoidance projected by increased places through sufficiency
- All Age Autism Strategy in draft
- SEMH joint welling strategy underway with involvement of Social Care and CAMHS colleagues
- Proactive Health Focus Group in place
- SEND workforce training across all organisations

Areas for Development

- Budget pressure on education funding for SEND via the High Needs Dedicated Schools Grant
- Urgency to understand and agree a local tri-partite funding agreement between Education, Health and Social Care
- Co-ordination of the Preparation for Adulthood agenda
- First Tier Tribunals increasing (although remain very low)
- Request to reconsider SEND hub from Corporate Landlord
- Understanding of the commissioned service offer from health for children with SEND

- Business Support Review delaying centralisation and streamlining of Inclusion admin
- Some uncertainty when Head of Inclusion post becomes vacant

Current Actions and Timelines

- Publication of the finalised SEND Strategy – November 2018
- Co-production and Communication
Implementation of the Voices action plan
- Joint Commissioning
Joint Commissioning Strategy to be reviewed to include plans for SEND hub, EHC Panel and work with health colleagues
Health Sufficiency Plan in place – October 2018
- SEND Sufficiency
Completion of all Year One projects – 31st March 2019
Planning Year Two projects to begin on time: 1st April 2019 – March 2020
Further investigations into mainstream SEMH resources – September-December 2018
- Assuring Quality
Education Health and Care Planning
EHCP – Team Restructure - October 2018
Moderation of EHCP Quality protocol in Place – December 2018
New EHCP Assessments completed in statutory timescales at 90% - March 2019
Implementation of Turning the Curve Action Plan to reduce EHCPs - December 2018
Autism
All Age Autism Strategy finalised - November 2018
Sensory Assessment protocols and graduated response agreed with Health - December 2018
Social Emotional and Mental Health Needs (SEMH)
New SEMH Strategy incorporating all work across education, Health and Social Care in place – January 2019
Preparation For Adulthood (PfA)
Preparation For Adulthood Board to agree and monitor leads for all areas of development in line with self-assessment and feedback from young people – December 2018
- Value for Money
Development of a robust High Needs Budget monitoring group to investigate and monitor decision making – December 2018
Review to Top Up/Element Three funding
Mainstream resource funding model and commissioning agreements reviewed – December 2018
Traded Service model reviewed
Review of all posts and services funded from within the budget

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Work was currently underway on benchmarking High Needs budgets across the region. Funding had been available to schools in the School's block of the Dedicated Schools Grant higher than the national average but less money available in the High Needs Block than the national average resulting in Rotherham being quite low funded around High Needs Block. The one area that was common to Rotherham and other authorities was around SEMH. Rotherham also had the additional pressure of out of authority placements
- There was a very strong team that worked together across the voluntary service and within Inclusion, Health and Social Care. A Voices event had taken place with the young people on what they wanted to say about their provision and involvement in Rotherham SEND. An action plan had been co-produced with the young people about the things that needed to be developed from their perspective
- The SENDIASS Team had a Young People's Officer and a Children's Officer whose specific roles were to capture voices and to work with young people and make sure that their voices were heard whether on their plan or the Strategy. There had been an excellent piece of work carried out on the consultation of the SEND Strategy itself and had provided a large amount of written comments about young people's feelings and thoughts about a whole range of issues. The SEND Strategy Board had tasked the Assistant Director to feedback to the young people who had contributed to the consultation that their voices had been reflected in the draft Strategy to give them confidence that they were being listened to
- The Children and Young People Partnership Board, a multi-agency group, had agreed in principle to put in place a multi-agency funding arrangement to ensure the Voices work was sustained going forward
- Transition to adulthood was an area that traditionally had been quite difficult. The recent consultation had included a section on preparing for adulthood and it had also been highlighted by parents as the next area they wanted to help the Service with. There was now a multi-agency Preparing for Adulthood Board consisting of representatives from Adults and Children's Services, Social Care and Health, which met on a monthly basis
- A piece of work had started in October 2017, completed January 2018, and was part of a regional peer project, to assess where Rotherham was in preparation for adulthood. As the Preparing for Adulthood Board was to start developing an action plan, a new audit tool from the national body "Preparing for Adulthood" had been released so the action plan was now aligning with the audit tool which was much more in line with what young people needed and wanted. The audit tool would group work that needed to be done under the 4

areas of Preparing for Adulthood and it would be seen as Preparation for Adulthood rather than transition from Children's into Adult Services i.e. it looked at employment, how you prepared young people for employment and to do so at the age 12/13, friendships and being part of the community

- Rotherham had been offered support from the national body for Preparing for Adulthood
- Although Rotherham did not have high NEET figures, there were more post-16 young people requesting an EHCP and young people who felt they had to look outside Rotherham to get what they needed under their EHCP. This was starting to be addressed through the college provision but there was still work to do in this area.
- The 19-25 provision was based in the Broom Valley area. The situation was ideal for young people with the aim of helping them become independent in that it was near shops that they could go on their own, it was on a main bus route and was down the road from the hospital. The site had been secured for 3 years during which time consideration would be given as to whether it was the right site and area, required adapting or an alternative site
- Approximately 50 children would be in Rotherham provision from September 2018 rather than outside the Local Authority. The college provision was only for 15 young people but would make a significant difference because they were high cost placements when out of authority. There were 20 places at Abbey School, 15 at Aspire, 10 at Kelford and 10 places already in place and 15 coming on line in December at Rowan
- It had been the intention to ensure there was a range of provision within the sufficiency plan and increase the sufficiency of provision for a range of different needs especially for SEMH where it had been found most children left the local authority
- The 2 provisions that would come on line later was a special school and one for Early Years for very young children who found it difficult transferring from a F1 private provider into a mainstream environment. In Year 2 there would be a full Autism mainstream school provision for secondary age children within the new school being built on the Waverley development which would have an Autism mainstream provision for primary education

- It had to borne in mind that if children or young people were settled in their out of authority provision it was very difficult to move them. It had to be done at their annual review and had to be the best thing for that child/young person. The number had already reduced by approximately 50 as from September 2018. It was the plan to increase the college provision over the next 2 years up to a 50 place provision
- It was a new Ofsted inspection regime and the first time that local areas have been inspected around SEND and disability; it was not an inspection of the local authority but inspection of the local area undertaken by inspectors from Ofsted and the CQC. The inspectors would firstly talk to parents and the young people to hear about their experience of the local area. They would be able to ask comments on what they received from Education, Health, Social Care, Post-16, Early Years providers and look into some of the issues that they raised as well as talking to the Service
- The inspectors were approximately about half way through inspecting the local areas of England. The inspection was imminent but the Service felt prepared. Rotherham had a good story about the journey it have been on and the reforms that had been put in place since 2014. There was still work to do but there was no stone that had not been turned over and no area of improvement not known about
- There was no concern about meeting the deadlines in the action plan. There were leads identified to make sure that someone would take over that role. Handover work had also taken place to ensure the leads did complete those tasks in the way they needed to be done. The timescales for the recruitment of the post of Head of Inclusion were being agreed

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, stated that he was confident in the Service and had no areas of concern to raise. Due to the excellent way the Council had prepared for the Ofsted inspection and the issues other authorities had faced during their SEND inspection, there was a readiness for the inspection. There was confidence that it was a good story, with strategies in place and the weaknesses known but plans to deal with them.

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

(2) That a further update on the progress being made with the SEND/Inclusion agenda be submitted periodically over the next 3 years to ensure the continuation of the travel of direction and pace of developments given the change in 2 key leadership posts.

(3) That more information be submitted to the Select Commission on the High Needs budget monitoring group once established.

(4) That the Select Commission receive information regarding the regional evaluation when it was available.

(5) That the Select Commission's thanks be placed on record for the work of Paul Williams and their best wishes in her new post.

25. OUTCOMES FROM THE IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION WORKSHOP SESSION - COMPLEX ABUSE INVESTIGATION

Further to Minute No. 122 of the meeting held on 13th March, 2018, Councillor Clark submitted a briefing paper outlining the outcomes and recommendations from a workshop session held by the Select Commission on 24th April, 2018. The purpose of the workshop was to seek assurance and further understanding of the extent to which agencies were working together effectively to address complex abuse.

The following key issues were discussed:-

- In what circumstances were complex abuse procedures used
- Which agencies were involved and at what level
- How did other agencies/part of the Council which did not directly have Safeguarding powers (e.g. Housing, Licensing or Enforcement Services) contribute to the investigations
- What was the impact of the investigations on referrals to Social Care
- Engagement with Early Help Services
- Will the changes to the General Data Protection Regulation have any impact on information sharing
- How is the voice of the child captured in the investigations
- How was this work viewed in the recent OFSTED inspection

Having had the opportunity to question officers and partners, Members had been assured that the Council and its partners were working effectively within the prescribed policy for complex abuse investigations.

The recommendations from the workshop were outlined in Paragraph 9 of Appendix 1 of the report submitted:-

- That further investigation takes place to establish the low rate of neglect referrals from Dental Health Services
- That information is shared in line with existing operational protocols and on a 'need to know' basis with Ward Members for the purpose of signposting residents appropriately
- That the appropriate agencies ensure that the GDPR did not act as a barrier to the appropriate sharing of information
- That further representation be made by the Local Safeguarding Children's Board to the Crown Prosecution Service and relevant Court Services to raise the issue of how all agencies could take timely action to safeguard children at risk of flight

- That a further update be submitted to the Improving Lives Select Commission in 12 months' time.

Councillor Clark thanked officers and partners for their attendance at the meeting and assistance in the preparation of the workshop.

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

(2) That the findings be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board for consideration.

26. FEEDBACK FROM IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION PERFORMANCE SUB-GROUP

The Chair reported that at a meeting of the Performance Sub-Group further information had been requested on a number of issues relating to Safeguarding and Early Help.

Councillor Watson provided an update on each as follows:-

Safeguarding

- **High number of contacts progressing to referrals – confidence about practice**

The high number of contacts progressing to referrals was reducing. There were a high number of referrals but that could be linked to cautiousness of partners but we would not want to stop anyone referring in. What we do know was that during the improvement journey there was a high proportion that were then moved into referrals but that was now not the case and a large number were either going to universal services or Early Help

- **High numbers of children in care**

The big 2 things that affecting this were the historical and inadequate services and the Stovewood Enquiry. As more perpetrators were being identified and charged if they had their own families, that then become part of our caseloads because they become a Safeguarding issue. We do scrutinise every child coming into care and look at all the alternatives. The Right Child Right Care was having a dramatic effect on people leaving care

- **What alternative steps can be taken to avoid taking teenagers into care**

We have taken very few into care in the last 6 months. We have worked really hard on the Family Group Conferencing

- **Family contact – how is this being ‘managed’ given high demand**
This was very difficult to manage due to the high demand. We have had to employ additional contact staff and have been utilising some of the newly qualified Social Workers with the lower caseloads and some of the Workers in the Fostering Service. The ultimate goal was to return children to their birth families/extended families
- **Numbers of children leaving care and how this is reflected in performance information**
In 2018 148 children have been discharged. If this continued it would be approximately 222 for the year, however, a similar number had come into care
- **Continuing concerns about health and dental assessments**
This is one of the things that tended to improve when everyone was pulling in the right direction but it had to be as normal business. Some of it was due to late inputting by Social Workers. We were working with partners. For the Looked After population the dental assessments were more up to date than the general population
- **Concerns about care leavers in employment, education or training (related issues about quality and scope of apprenticeship offer)**
About 61% which was higher than the national average but significantly less than the general population (in Rotherham 93.5%). Significant number of the young people had health issues and not available for work. The Corporate Parenting Panel had been pushing partners to offer LAC readiness of apprenticeships. Councillor M. Elliott, on behalf of the Corporate Parenting Panel, was doing an excellent job with partners on this subject

Early Help

- **Referrals – improvement in numbers coming from schools (39% of referrals) however, very few from hospitals. What steps are being taken to address and confidence about pace**
The number of referrals from schools was very good but it was not referrals we were worried about but Early Help Assessments. Our Health partners were not carrying out as many assessments as we might expect. We have been working on this recently and agreed to reaffirm to Health Visitors, School Nurses and Midwives that they must utilise the Early Help Assessment to support children and families. We have done bespoke briefing sessions with those Services and had a pilot to create a group of professionals in the Central locality solely to work on Early Help Assessments. As Early Help Assessments become mature in an Authority partners become more confident

- **Variable quality of assessments**
We know from work we started 3 years ago in Social Care that the important thing was to get compliance and get the assessments done. There was now 100% compliance but it was tracking the quality of them and doing proper audits so auditing was now done through our Team Managers and our own Internal Audit processes, and sitting with the Worker with the report in supervision. As the re-organisation of the Service became more ingrained it was believed it would improve
- **Confidence about step-up/step-down**
Because of the co-location and co-working cases, could transferred to and from one another which helped the family and the fact that they were now co-located in the regional neighbourhood working hubs. Now the Early Help consultation had finished it could move towards implementation
- **Differentials in team performances – action taken to address this**
Action was in place to address differentials in team performance and there was no longer separate management locality meetings; they were all conducted in one place so others could benefit from others' best practice
- **Assurance sought about children missing from home pathways**
Was now working effectively with children going missing less. There were less episodes per child.

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

(2) That a progress report be submitted on dental assessments in 4 months.

(3) That a progress report on apprenticeships offer be submitted in 9 months.

27. **IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19 - UPDATE**

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development), presented an update to the 2018/19 work programme.

It was noted that at an initial meeting on Prevent had been held. A small sub-group had subsequently met (Councillors Clark, Cusworth and Brookes) had met to determine the focus of work in terms of any future work.

Resolved:- (1) That the work programme be noted.

(2) That updates be submitted to each meeting of the Select Commission on the progress of the work programme and for further prioritisation as required.

28. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Tuesday, 6th November not 30th October, 2018, as previously scheduled, commencing at 5.30 pm

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
20th September, 2018

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Fenwick-Green, Jepson, Jones, McNeely, Sansome, Sheppard, Julie Turner, Vjestica, Walsh, Whysall and Wyatt, along with Mrs. W. Birch and Mrs. L. Shears (Co-optees).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley, B. Cutts, Elliot and Khan.

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

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

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sansome declared a personal interest in Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods) on the basis that he was involved in a Neighbourhood Working Group Forum. He would remain in the room, but not participate in the debate.

Councillor Sheppard declared a personal interest in Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods) on the basis that he was involved in a Neighbourhood Working Group Forum. He would remain in the room, but not participate in the debate.

16. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

17. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair reminded the Commission about the visit to the Crematorium tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. (21st September) following the recent renovations.

The Chair also sought the Commission's agreement to the co-option of Mrs. W. Birch from Rotherfed to take the place of the previous co-optee who retired.

Resolved:- That Mrs. Birch be included on the membership of the Improving Places Select Commission as a co-optee from Rotherfed.

18. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2018

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26th July, 2018.

Reference was made to Minute No. 11 (Dignity Contract) and the positive feedback which would feed into the action plan and performance monitoring process. Further update reports would be provided to the Improving Places Select Commission in due course.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on Thursday, 26th July, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

19. ROTHER VALLEY CARAVAN PARK

Consideration was given to the report presented by Phil Gill, Green Spaces Manager, which provided current details on the construction of the new camping and caravan site at Rother Valley Country Park. The development was on track and scheduled for completion and handover in March, 2019, in line with the original project programme. This was an ambitious programme, but would be in operation from Easter, 2019.

Further information was provided on the capital costs of the programme, approval of planning permission in April, 2018 and tenders and the interest and consultation which helped shape the proposals.

The project was being carefully managed and there were odd issues cropping up which were being managed within budget.

Operation and marketing of the site moving forward was being developed, alongside the secure booking system which would be simple to use deliver best possible income. This would be subject to further evaluation and review.

Additionally, a short presentation, using PowerPoint, was provided for the Select Commission and highlighted:-

- Consultation – Elected Members and examples of comments.
- Consultation – Youth Cabinet and examples of comments.
- Consultation – Access4All and examples of comments.
- Consultation - Caravan Users and examples of comments.
- Consultation - Local Residents and examples of comments.
- Recent Progress in photo format – 5th September, 2018.

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

- Site access, disabled pitches, controlled use of showers/toilets and the possibility of caravan storage facilities.

These issues were all being addressed with disabled pitches for reservation nearer the reception and access controls to the toilet blocks. Whilst there was no independent storage space for caravans planned in the longer term consideration will be given to identifying a piece of land specifically for caravan storage to maximise business opportunities.

- Completion of groundworks and any potential risk to the project not being completed on time.

All the building work and surfaces were complete. There were no areas of concern in relation to groundworks. Work was still ongoing to roadworks to bring them up to level to get surfaced and pitches were now having topsoil, being levelled and planted.

- Page 12 of the report referred to a proposed revised scheme being submitted to Planning Board for a variation to contract and it was not clear if this had been approved.

The planning application to vary the condition had been submitted, but had not yet been considered. There were no concerns outside the main contract works.

- Procurement of the online booking system to go live before end of 2018. Could the Commission have an update on progress at its February, 2019 meeting.

An update on the booking system would be provided in February. It had taken some time to obtain the approvals needed and an order had now been placed to tailor to specific needs.

- Business opportunity for caravan owners to store caravans and then have them placed onto a pitch.

This was a helpful suggestion on a storage service and would be considered in due course.

- Seasonal pitch consideration which may alleviate some concerns for traffic at arrival/departure times.

The provision of seasonal pitches was under review, but some evaluation of demand was required, before branching into other areas. Departure and arrival times were also being closely looked at to minimise disruption on the road network, for visitors to the park and to enable necessary maintenance around pitches.

- Monitoring of shower blocks to prevent accidents and to avoid children using them as playgrounds.

It was important to maintain shower blocks to prevent abuse and any potential risks. These areas would be closely monitored by site staff.

- Had consideration been given to contracts for energy and utilities in order to contribute to the savings targets.

Further information was to be sought regarding energy and utility contracts.

- Business opportunities for storage and relocation of caravans for owners could be considered, in addition to whether or not local scout groups could use the area out of season and if discounts may be applicable.

The service remained open and enthusiastic about discounts and special deals for local groups, but would still have to be mindful how this may impact on other users.

- Operational signage plan for the whole site and whether this would specific planning permission.

Liaison was taking place with colleagues in Transportation around signage and more specifically the brown signs which were strictly controlled. These could not be provided too far from the site, but initially would be placed at the junction at Wales Bar. The site was very large and would require internal signage. Colleagues were considering how best this could be achieved.

- Were there any further plans for static caravans, any indoor entertainment and charging points for electric vehicles.

The planning permission did not allow for static caravans nor did it fit with the business model and it was aimed specifically at touring caravans, motorhomes and tents. An indoor activity would be provided within the main block and have space for a café bar, television, separate games room and some recreation.

In the longer term development of the caravan site would be explored further.

Discussion had taken place with regards to electric vehicles with some provision installed in 2019. Further information would be shared in due course.

- What were the plans for recycling within the park and were there any plans to dovetail waste plans with those across the Borough.

There were plans for special bins to be designed for the separation of waste. This would be subject to monitoring by staff and signposting information accordingly to users.

- Contingency plans following handover and the official opening for Easter, 2019.

The caravan site's completion date was 4th March, 2019 and it was hoped to then operate on a trial basis. Progress would be closely monitored should it be found bookings could not be honoured. Information already shared via social media showed that the service had already received a huge amount of interest.

- Could the Select Commission visit the site for a pre-completion check.

Details regarding a visit would be shared in due course and the appropriate arrangements made.

Resolved:- (1) That the construction of a new camping and caravan site at Rother Valley Country Park, which was on track and scheduled for completion and handover in March, 2019, in line with the original project programme, be noted.

(2) That a report be submitted early in 2019 looking at the procurement on the online booking system and progress once it was live.

(3) That an update report on progress be submitted to the Improving Places Select Commission six months after the official opening and to feedback on the impact on local residents.

20. THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Deputy Leader and Assistant Chief Executive which detailed the production of a new Neighbourhood Strategy, which would see the Wards as the building blocks that enabled partners and communities to work together to improve local outcomes.

The Strategy's aim was for the Council and residents to work together to achieve better quality of life and described the key role for Elected Members, both as champions of place and as community leaders, bringing together those who cared about the local neighbourhood. The Strategy also described how the Council would take a strength based approach drawing on existing strengths in the community and valuing the role of voluntary and community groups and assets.

The Head of Performance, Intelligence and Improvement had led on the development of the Thriving Neighbourhoods Strategy and had spoken to a whole range of stakeholders. This good piece of work had identified examples of neighbourhood activity and one of the challenges being faced was consistency rather than pockets of good activity and good practices.

The restructure of Neighbourhood Services had been lengthy, but with the support of the Trades Unions was moving forwards and the outstanding vacancies being filled. During the transitional period there had also been a review of the Neighbourhood Service to align it with the new model. A new Head of Neighbourhoods joined the Council earlier this month.

Further comments on the Strategy were welcomed as it was still draft prior to receiving formal approval by Cabinet in November, 2018.

As part of the implementation, staff were in place to work across the Council in the delivery of services. The importance of working together with Members was recognised to take the civic leadership model forward.

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

- Page 24 of the report referred to the governance and key priorities and CCTV deployment.

CCTV would be used as part of the Strategy and where this was not working it would be resolved.

- Page 25 also referred to joint working and a co-ordinated review of Housing Panels; had any consideration been given to the pooling of resources or even with the Parish Councils.

This appeared to be the only anomaly arising from the old area assembly footprint, but rather than suggesting change now it would be recommended that this be reconfigured fresh in 2020. The Cabinet Member would be receiving a report shortly.

There could be instances where both the neighbourhood group and Parish Council might have same objective and which may require some collaborative working. Each occasion would be considered on a case by case basis.

- Training on the Strategy moving forward - would this be available for both Members and officers.

Training was scheduled at the beginning of October and Rotherfed were working on more bespoke training for community organisations.

Further discussion would take place on what was available for Members and officers with joint training where appropriate.

- Was there an impact on the Strategy for 2020 with the boundary and Ward profiles changing.

With the boundary changes there would be lead in time. Some Wards may be carrying forward money, but this would not be possible into 2020.

- Could consideration be given to a more dynamic strapline.

This would be fed back to the report authors and the title considered for the report moving forward.

- Page 44 made reference to the casework management system. Whilst the system was good it was not always easily accessible for some users.

The casework management system was developing and evolving. Feedback would be taken on board and eventually link with complaints.

- Page 50 made reference to the statistical analysis and the drawing out of common themes in the north, south and central areas of Rotherham. Unfortunately, whilst parish councils were very prominent in the south there were very few in the south and none in the central areas.

The information was noted. There was a need for better clarity and relevance in reporting as the multi-agency work with the clustering of wards could be confusing.

- Could the flexibility be retained for CLF monies with ward budgets.

The future of CLF and Ward budgets were still to be considered with some concerns expressed about a potential merger.

- Could there be further training in the use of social media.

Training in this area was to be scheduled shortly.

- Had the new post of Senior Communications Officer been appointed to.

Currently this post was still vacant following a recruitment process and the advert was being reissued.

- There was some evidence of good work in Rotherham, but this was not reflected in all Wards with little or no consultation with residents and partners or multi-agency meetings. There was an asset based approach to Ward working, but the Council was just about to demolish an asset without any communication or engagement with residents.

There was some inconsistency across Rotherham, but by working with the Head of Neighbourhoods with Ward Members issues could be addressed. The example of a building being demolished in a Ward without consultation could be used as a case study moving forward.

There was merit in moving forward and whilst some Wards that had not generated work like others, there was evidence of community activity and events taking place. Some of the devolved budget was also being held back for match funding.

- There were some issues with access to community centres, the difficulty in them being hired and accessible along with misunderstandings over asset transfers and the differences between capital and revenue funding streams.

Community centres should be easily accessible for the community.

Due to the cuts from Central Government the Council had low revenue, but was more capital rich. Should the plans for Thriving Neighbourhoods move forward then this should also add to revenue funding.

- Reference was made to disused land and the land ownership map by the Council not being completed.

This was being addressed.

- There was good evidence that this great initiative was working with spending contributing and aligning with the Ward plans with clear linkage. There was little merit in changing good initiatives so the Community Leadership Fund should remain as flexible as possible.

Wards could not keep rolling forward their pooled funding as this would be absorbed into the Council finances in 2020 and the reasons for the money not being spent in Wards should be challenged by residents.

- There were still some inconsistencies or policies in place and Page 47 made reference to the formalisation of Ward meetings. How would this be monitored and by whom.

Ward meetings were not monitored at moment and it was envisaged that a consistent standard would be developed by the Head of Neighbourhoods.

Resolved:- (1) That the review the Annual Report 2017/18 Neighbourhood Working including recommendations for future delivery be noted with the comments made at today's meeting.

(2) That the Thriving Neighbourhoods: The Rotherham Neighbourhood Strategy 2018-2025 document be noted.

(3) That the required training for Members and officers in relation to the working of Thriving Neighbourhoods be undertaken as soon as possible.

(4) That progress in relation to devolved budgets, governance framework (including monitoring of progress on Ward Plans and evaluation of them) be reported back to the Select Commission in six months' time.

21. HOUSING STRATEGY REFRESH - 2019-2022

Consideration was given to the Housing Strategy Refresh 2019-2022 presented by Tom Bell, Assistant Director of Housing, which had also been considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board at its meeting on 19th September, 2018.

Sarah Watts, Strategic Housing Manager, gave a presentation using PowerPoint outlining the details of the early draft and the comments received to date which would help shape the strategy:-

- 2016-19 Strategy – The 5 themes.
- Achievements.
- The New Strategy – a chance to have your say.
- Things that have changed.
- Overview of housing in Rotherham.
- Value of new housing.
- The Vision – Three Year Strategy and Refresh.
- Structure – five key priorities.
- Timetable for refresh – phases.
- Pipeline Projects.

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

- The development of eco housing, but careful use of the term in case this had a negative effect.

- Meetings to consider Ward profiles and focus on the specific property requirements for young and active residents, but also around Adult Social Care, adapted properties and building communities.

Variations across the Wards were recognised and if specific property requirements were not reflected then evidence needed more refining to gain a better understanding of need.

- Gas servicing targets were 100%, but many householders had not yet got their documentation.

There would be investigation into the delay of households not being issued with gas certificates. Rother Living was a brand that was being attached to new housing tenures and houses for sale.

- From the key priorities how explicitly could some of the issues within Wards be addressed and could a map be made available of land for use within the Wards.

Meetings would take place to understand trends, new housing and demographics and this would be included within the Ward profiles and help to form the evidence base of any projects.

- Priorities for housing associations and working in partnership

There was a big push around home ownership and recognition that there was other tenures for people that needed affordable social housing and this needed to be retained in Rotherham for as long as possible.

Housing providers were accountable for around 5% of housing in the Borough. A forum of key providers would meet to develop projects at a City Region level.

The Service was in the process of mapping out what housing owned land Rotherham had access to and this would feed in the development pipeline. The Service would be working closely with the Council's general asset team to work together on different pieces of land and provide a greater picture of what was available.

Housing in Rotherham had been recognised as one of the top three performing social housing organisations in the country. It was also seen as an innovator in housing delivery, both of which were key to the Government agenda.

There was good consultation about right to buy with a need to feed back on the process. Rotherham was well placed to go and trial new approaches to make it work locally for building and replacing housing.

- Maintenance of existing properties and Ward walk arounds to highlight some of the problems.

A meeting would be set up a meeting with Repairs and Housing to walk around the estates with Ward members and pick up some observations. The Service was investing in more new posts for estate management providing more frontline officers on estate management issues.

- Could further information be provided on Section 106 agreements and update provided on the Community Infrastructure Ley.

Strategic housing acquisition programmes through Section 106 agreements were where the Council negotiated the purchase of properties at a discount usually around 60% of the market value. Value for money must be demonstrated and if it could not be then acquisitions were not made.

Liaison would take place with Planning and ascertain how a report could be brought back to the Select Commission.

- The Strategy referred to social value and contractors. Was there any appetite for this to include contractors paying the foundation living wage and not the Government's living wage?

Social value was incredibly important and the best deal would be sought from the investments across the Borough. £66 million was being used from the HRA for new homes.

Work was taking place with the local colleges and local schools and Waites had been appointed who distributed social value on their construction works. This would continue in terms of the thriving neighbourhoods agenda and ward priorities.

- Social mobility and health technology had advanced since implementation of Rothercare. What was the future of the phone line and were there any plans for this to be replaced.

Rothercare was facing a big journey in the digital agenda of assisted technologies to maintain independence in residents' own homes. Technology was moving at a pace and Rotherham had not kept up with this with Rothercare telecare system being thirty years out of date.

A review was being undertaken to explore options good to ensure that housing and adult care moving forward had the improvements as a specific priority in health and wellbeing.

- The vision was to revitalise the town centre and urban community, but there were more than one town centre.

In terms of the town centres it was not possible to do everything at the same time. The Council was trying to improve the residential offer in the town centre and with the resources had three sites identified. It was recognised that the Borough made up of a number of towns.

- Members would appreciate a modern complaints system and for local housing officers being involved in the first instance for people moving into rented properties. The Strategy itself referred to the need to prevent families from exploitation and financial hardship.

There were now more people in low cost home ownership/shared ownership. This could potentially help people with a lesser deposit. Consideration was being given to products around such as try before you buy rentals and then moving towards home ownership. There were some Government assistance purchase schemes. It was important that the right needs assessment was undertaken in localities where new developments were created to meet local need.

The Council's modern complaints system for housing took more enquires/interactions with customers covering thousands of repairs. Occasionally things did go wrong, but these were put right first time and where possible they would not happen again. It was with this action complaints were starting to reduce and not escalated at stage.

The Councillors' case management system was evolving and a process for making sure tenants' had a voice with involved interaction with the Repairs and Maintenance Service.

- Did the strategy meet the demand for specialist housing.

The Strategy enabled the Council to work on supported housing to meet needs best it could. There was an overwhelming demographic demand for accommodation and an accommodation plan was being used with Adult Care and Children Services so the Council was better informed about their requirements.

- Some insurance rules required a gas servicing certificate and to aid circulation could these be Ward generated and distributed with Ward leaflets.

Following last week's gas awareness week it was reported the Council were now 100% compliant with its gas safety checks. The next steps would be to start thinking about undertaking checks for private landlords.

- Had consideration been given to the installation of solar panels on new properties given the summer weather and savings that could be generated?

Action was already being taken on how to maximise income and minimise spend on areas like fuel. One key issue in the Housing Strategy helped with budgets with heavy investment into insulation and effective methods of keeping properties warm.

There were a number of problems with the Government's feed in tariffs and grants for solar panels. Whilst the use of solar panels would not be discounted in the future and smart investments revisited, consideration also had to be given to access, repairs and what happened with the equipment should tenants move to ensure householders remained safe.

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

(2) That a copy of the revised slides be circulated to the Improving Places Select Commission.

(3) That consideration be given to a future report on progress of Section 106 Agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

22. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission take place on Thursday, 1st November, 2018 at 1.30 p.m.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
1st August, 2018

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Brookes, Cowles, Cusworth, Evans, Mallinder, Napper, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Councillor Sansome

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

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

47. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 25 APRIL, 20 JUNE, 4 AND 18 JULY 2018

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the meetings held on 25 April, 20 June, 4 and 18 July be approved as true and correct records of the proceedings.

48. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

49. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no declarations of interest from members of the public or press.

50. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda which would require the exclusion of the press or public from the meeting.

51. DEVELOPING AN EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMME TO REUNIFY YOUNG PEOPLE WHO ARE LOOKED AFTER

Consideration was given to a report which was due to be considered at the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 6 August 2018 that sought approval to develop an evidence-based programme to reunify young people who are looked after.

It was reported that MST-FIT made a positive case for a model of intervention where young people could learn to behave differently whilst their families learn and are supported to resume leading their case, with the service enabling residential care to be used as an intermediate step on the journey to parents fully caring for their children.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 01/08/18

It was noted that the Life Chances Fund provided local authorities with support to explore opportunities provided by social impact bonds and outcome based commissioning. It was further reported that the Council had been awarded a grant in principle of £85k for a five year period, subject to a final project submission on 31 July 2018.

The project would close the gap in provision for existing children in care by providing a focused treatment programme with the aim of placing children back in a family environment. It was anticipated to complement the work of the Right Child Right Care Board and the suite of services which formed part of the Rotherham Edge of Care offer. Members noted that the total estimated cost of the MST-FIT service was £1.120m per annum, of which £570k was for residential provision in stage 1, which would be funded from the existing out of authority residential placement budget. The balance of £550k for the MST community team and programme management would be funded from gross savings achieved in-year. The exact amount that the Council would need to fund would depend on the financing option selected.

It was reported that the final project proposal to the Big Lottery Fund, who administer the Life Chances Fund Grant, was submitted on 15 June 2018 and a decision regarding the award would be made in early August. It was expected that the service would commence in January 2019.

In response to a query from Members concerning the risk of not receiving monies from the Life Chance Fund, it was confirmed that it was a very small risk and the Council expected to receive confirmation of the award of funding in the near future. It was for this reason that a recommendation had been made to delegate the final decision in respect of the financing method to the Section 151 Officer.

Assurances were sought in respect of the commissioned MST service with Barnsley MBC and officers explained that work had been ongoing for over six months, with a programme board in place to oversee the shared service. It was further noted that the approach was expected to deliver ongoing efficiencies and there may prove to be opportunities to spot purchase places for looked after children in future.

Members indicated some recognition that the proposals were intended to be an investment for the future and sort assurances in respect of confidence that savings would be achieved in the longer-term. In response, reference was made to the proposal being an evidence based programme, which meant that it followed a specific model, that was already operational in Leeds and had demonstrated a 75% success rate, which was being further built upon. Further assurances were provided that savings would be made based on the 12 places identified within the programme.

Members sought clarity as to whether any children across the two authorities that had implemented the model had not been able to return to their home setting and gone back to residential care. Officers confirmed that there had been cases where this had occurred and advised Members that, even if the headline outcome of returning to their birth family was not achieved, better holistic outcomes would be expected and life chances would be improved.

Members were supportive of the second option outlined in the report and indicated their support for the recommendations in the report, despite expressing some unease at delegating authority on the financial method to be used.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported, subject to the separation of recommendation 2 to read:
 - (a) That approval be given to progress with plans to set up the MST-FIT service.
 - (b) That the most appropriate method of financing be delegated to the Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services when the grant award from the Life Chances Fund is confirmed and reported back to Cabinet.
2. That Cabinet be advised that option 2 in the report 'Delivery via an outcome based contract in partnership with a social investor (using a Social Impact Bond) and with funding support from the Life Chances Fund' be supported.

52. FUTURE DESIGNATION OF SELECTIVE LICENSING AREAS

Consideration was given to a report which was due to be considered by the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 6 August 2018 submitted by the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment which proposed the future designation of Selective Licensing areas in Parkgate and Thurstcroft.

It was reported that Selective Licensing was the licensing of privately rented housing in a specific area with the aim of improving management standards. Where the Council designates an area, landlords must obtain a licence and comply with conditions, or face legal action including prosecution and financial penalties. Members noted that Selective Licensing was an important tool for the Council and partners, to drive improvements not only in the safety of homes, but to contributory issues related to deprivation.

The data in the report identified areas of Rotherham in Thurgroft and Parkgate, which met the criteria, were within the 20% most deprived areas of England, and additionally had high levels of private rented housing. The report recommended consultation on proposals to designate parts of Thurgroft and Parkgate as Selective Licensing areas, which would help combat problems associated with housing and housing conditions within areas of deprivation, and deliver improved health and social wellbeing outcomes for those communities.

Members sought clarification of the definition of “safe” and why Selective Licensing was an aid to the Council. In response, it was confirmed that “safe” covered adequate fire protection and escape routes, the risk of excess cold from poor insulation and similar examples. The Selective Licensing approach enabled the Council to identify where properties were and proactively manage them with landlords. Fundamentally, the scheme was designed to improve people’s outcomes in respect of health and wellbeing, targeting deprivation and changing the standard of properties and the economics associated with those properties.

One member indicated his understanding of the purpose of Selective Licensing to improve the internal workings and features of housing and considered that to be admirable, however he did not consider that there had been much improvement to environmental conditions surrounding housing properties in Eastwood and feedback provided to him by residents had confirmed that view. In response, the Cabinet Member for Housing suggested that it would be useful to circulate the Mid-Term Performance Report in respect of Selective Licensing, given that the authority was two and a half years in. The report set out measurable targets and detailed the progress made. It was confirmed that Selective Licensing on its own was a very specific piece of regulatory power to tackle housing conditions and could not be used for anything else. .

Members sought to understand the difference in powers through Selective Licensing as opposed to environmental health inspections. It was explained that Environmental Health officers would inspect a property where requested, however many tenants did not feel that they could invite an inspection without being victimised by their landlord. It was indicated that this had been a national concern and had been recognised by government, with a review of legislation being undertaken presently. Selective Licensing enables Environmental Health officers to undertake inspections of properties without the tenant having to make such a request in order to check the safety of a property.

A further query was raised in respect of the trigger points for the Council to address issues that cause real concern. In response, it was confirmed by the Cabinet Member that it was becoming harder and harder once landlords become compliant, but he reiterated that the report in front of Members was a proposal to broaden the Selective Licensing scheme, which had improved housing conditions elsewhere in the borough. It was further confirmed by the Assistant Director of Community Safety and

Street Scene that powers in respect of statutory nuisance were available to the Council, for example statutory nuisance in respect of noise in a property. However, if such anti-social behaviour occurred in a park, then the Council had limited powers as it would not be seen as a statutory nuisance, but rather a public order problem.

Members observed that the existing Selective Licensing schemes in the borough had been a success and queried whether the proposals were sufficiently ambitious. In response, it was confirmed that approval from the Secretary of State would be required to expand the scheme beyond 20% of the stock in the borough. However, it was acknowledged that the scheme had been a success, but it was right to proceed with caution in introducing new areas to ensure that improvements were made for the benefit of residents.

Reflecting on the timetable for consultation with residents, landlords and other stakeholders, Members sought assurance that the right people would be consulted and confirmation of the proposed implementation date. It was confirmed that the implementation date would be April 2019 and the intention was to follow the same processes for consultation that had been used for the first Selective Licensing areas. It was further confirmed that drop in sessions would be held in the proposed areas, and specific consultation would take place with tenants, landlords, and councillors and representative associations.

Resolved:-

That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.

53. CCTV PRIORITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND POLICY

Consideration was given to a report due to be determined at the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 6 August 2018 which sought to allocate £60,000 of capital funding to purchase mobile CCTV cameras and to approve amendments to the CCTV Policy and associated processes.

The Budget and Council Tax 2018-19 report to Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 19 February 2018 approved the Council's Capital Strategy to 2021/22. As part of this, £60,000 of Priority Capital Investment monies were identified for mobile CCTV cameras. The utilisation of technology to enhance the Council's drive to tackle anti-social behaviour is critical to improving the outcomes delivered by the Council and partners alike to deter and punish offenders whilst improving the quality of life of residents. It is apparent that the Council, partners and residents would benefit from increased provision of CCTV technology to provide suitable capacity, capability and flexibility, and to support ward priorities, Community Action Partnerships and Tasking meetings. Current revenue budgets are not in a position to fund increased provision, and capital funding is therefore required to deliver enhanced

capacity - the equivalent of one camera for each ward - to deliver the desired outcomes. It is estimated that the cost of each individual CCTV system will be in the region of £3,000, equating to a total cost of £63,000 for the 21 cameras sought. Whilst this is an estimate, and the actual costs will be determined through a procurement process, any potential costs beyond the £60,000 allocation will be dealt with through existing budgets. Steps will be taken via the procurement process to seek to bring the overall cost of the 21 cameras within the original £60,000 budget allocation. The cameras will be deployed in accordance with the Council's revised CCTV Policy, which has been reviewed and updated as part of this project, to ensure that the future use of CCTV is fully compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Members sought assurances in respect of the number of cameras actually required. In response, it was confirmed that the cameras would be mobile and could be deployed to different locations to respond to issues identified in localities. Whilst a case could be made for more than one mobile camera per ward, the proposals in the report moved the position forward considerably. It was further confirmed that it was intended there would be one camera allocated to each ward and there would be an option to purchase additional cameras from ward budgets.

Referring to cameras previously purchased through the former Area Assemblies, Members sought to understand whether any of those cameras could be brought back into use. In response it was confirmed that some of those cameras were not particularly reliable and the intention was to purchase a more reliable and modern product. It was confirmed that new cameras would be operated through a partnership arrangements have worked successfully in collaboration with South Yorkshire Police. Members noted the intention for the specification for the cameras to be much higher than previously had been the case.

Members thought it was important that the public be informed that there continued to be a need to report issues even with cameras in place. Officers acknowledged that this was an important issue and the location of cameras would be reviewed.

Members also sought assurances in respect of maintenance costs, training and review. In response it was acknowledged that the cameras would breaking, but there would be a degree of maintenance required. It was confirmed that operators of cameras would need additional training, but this could be delivered in-house, so no additional cost implications would be anticipated.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That all Members be notified of the arrangements and process for re-locating cameras in their wards.

3. That arrangements be made to notify residents of deployment and use of mobile cameras.
4. That a report reviewing the use of the cameras be submitted to Improving Places Select Commission six months after implementation.

54. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair reported that there were no items of business requiring urgent consideration by the Board.

55. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Wednesday 12 September 2018 at 11.00 a.m. in Rotherham Town Hall.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
12th September, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Brookes, Cowles, Cusworth, Evans, Keenan, Mallinder, Napper, Sansome, Short, Walsh and Wyatt.

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

56. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 1 AUGUST 2018

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2018 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

58. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

59. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda which would require the exclusion of the press or public from the meeting.

60. REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTIONS SERVICE CHANGES - IMPLEMENTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, ENGAGEMENT APPROACH AND FLATS PROJECT

Consideration was given to a report which was submitted by the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment to provide an update on the implementation of new waste and recycling services across Rotherham, and provide information on the key implementation activities, communications, engagement approach and flats project.

Members queried what progress had been made in respect of the communications strategy supporting the service changes and whether information could be forwarded to all councillors. Officers confirmed that they would share the information outside of the meeting. Furthermore, engagement had already commenced at the Rotherham Show on the previous weekend, where there had been positive feedback. Officers had also attended the Parish Council Liaison Group to discuss the service changes and the process that would be followed. It was also explained that a lot of engagement had taken place online through the Council's website and social media platforms. In addition, every household in the borough would receive a letter notifying residents of the changes.

Focusing on arrangements for apartment blocks, Members queried whether there would be exceptions to the proposed recycling process where everything would go into general waste. In response it was confirmed that the approach was to introduce recycling to all flats and that work was ongoing with colleagues in Housing Services to offer recycling opportunities for all residents.

Clarification was sought as to how low recycling areas had been identified and it was explained that records and experience of delivering the service were used. The service had started to look at how that impacted on anti-social behaviour and working with colleagues in Community Safety and other teams across the Council to engage with local groups. Following on from a question concerning engagement with staff across the authority, assurances were provided that there had been significant cross directorate working with involvement from Customer Services, Communications and Housing Services. The trial projects had included Housing Officers who had helped to select areas for trial. Their understanding of localities and the issues on the ground had proved very helpful in developing the approach to implementation.

Members sought assurances that the letter to be sent to all households would be user friendly. It was explained that the same approach had been used for communicating as had been adopted for the consultation. It was further explained that the communications approach had been tested with an older people's group who had fed back that it needed to be much simpler. This was taken into account and the content changed accordingly.

Clarification was sought as to whether negotiations with BDR Waste Partnership would end on a positive note. In response, it was confirmed that discussions had been positive to date and that a resolution was expected in November 2018.

Members welcomed the update and the progress that had been made to date. Recognising the importance of getting the service changes right and ensuring wider oversight of the changes, the Board

Resolved:–

1. That the update be noted.
2. That a further report be submitted in February 2019 to provide an update on implementation of the first stage of the service change.
3. That further update reports and the final review of the implementation of the service changes after February 2019 be submitted to the Improving Places Select Commission.

61. FORGE ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Consideration was given to a report which provided a progress update on the appointment of a development partner for the Forge Island development site in Rotherham town centre. Members noted that the Forge Island development was the flagship scheme in the Town Centre Masterplan and central to the Council's plans to regenerate the town centre. The Masterplan indicated that Forge Island should be redeveloped with a range of leisure-led uses to strengthen and diversify the town centre. The intended beneficiaries of the development were not restricted to local residents living within close proximity, but also spread to the wider borough and City Region level.

Members sought further information on the type of leisure and business outlets that were anticipated to be part of the development. In response, and being conscious of commercial sensitivities, it was confirmed that the detail on the make up of the offer would be subject to the planning process, but it was anticipated that a cinema operator, a number of food and drink outlets and a quality hotel operator would be interested to the development. In addition, there would an improved range of public realm.

Assurances were sought that there would be guarantees in respect of wage levels for those working on the development. In response, the Board were advised that no contracts had been signed to date, but officers would work with colleagues in Procurement to ensure that it was included in the contract prior to confirmation.

Turning to the risks associated with the development, Members queried what risk there would be to the authority. In response, officers confirmed that Finance and Legal Services were working through the risks and mitigations. Members noted that there would always be a risk with speculative development as it is at the mercy of market forces, however they also reflected on the risk of doing nothing given the potentially reduced town centre offer, which was a national issue for town centres and not bespoke to Rotherham.

Members queried whether the detail of the winning bid could be shared with the Board. It was explained that the information was commercially sensitive and that it would be appropriate to give further consideration as to how that could be shared. Members felt a workshop would be the most appropriate method, but agreed that the Chair would discuss separately with the Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy and officers.

In response to a question on the key milestones for the contract, it was confirmed that the agreement for the lease was expected by the end of 2018. Following that the developer would be able to appoint a development team. A planning application for the development was expected to submitted at the beginning of 2019, with work starting later in the year. Present projections were that the first phase of the development

would be open in 2020, but at these were only indicative dates at this stage.

Resolved:-

1. That the update be noted.
2. That, subject to discussions between the Chair and the Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, a workshop be arranged with scrutiny members.

62. ADULT SOCIAL CARE IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND BUDGET MONITORING

As part of the Board's ongoing oversight of the Adult Social Care Improvement Plan and Budget Monitoring, the Strategic Director of Adult Care, Housing and Public Health submitted an update on progress and the current position. In presenting the report, the Strategic Director reflected on the significant challenges facing adult care in Rotherham and the broader challenges arising from pressures which were common across the country. These challenges had arisen from the need to change approaches to service delivery and government driven austerity through the ongoing reductions to the Revenue Support Grant, which was impacting on all Council services.

Of the 19 key areas of accountability that were contained within the improvement plan, Members noted that:-

- 8 had progressed onto become routine activity
- 9 now formed part of the MTFS project plans either directly or as an enabler to delivery
- 2 had become the focus of additional input
- All actions had been captured within routine activity or form part of the new Medium Term Financial Strategy project plans.

Having received an overview of the current position of the service, Members asked for an outline of the critical milestones to successfully deliver the savings required and how they would be managed. In response, the Strategic Director explained that she chaired a Project Assurance meeting on a fortnightly basis where all programmes were reported to. Furthermore, daily reports on progress were monitored to ensure that there would be no slippage in meeting the required savings.

Members further sought assurances that plans were in place to get the adult social care workforce in a place where they could deal with complexities in service delivery. In response, the Strategic Director confirmed that there had been a number of very positive sessions with frontline staff. Furthermore she reiterated the importance of understanding and applying the law in adult social care, which meant there were multiple areas that social workers had to be mindful of in discharging their

responsibilities. The focus on this, coupled with increasing confidence to manage challenge, would be ongoing in further sessions with managers and social workers. However, it would take time to embed the changes and it was anticipated that it would likely take up to two years.

Members referred to the market shaping role that the Council has through the Care Act and the current mixed approach to service delivery in the borough. The Strategic Director explained that the authority engaged with the private sector in a formal setting already, albeit on a regulatory basis. It was noted that there were a lot of national providers operating in Rotherham who brought a lot of good practice with them. The service was working with national experts and Voluntary Action Rotherham to facilitate an understanding of what is required from market locally and how to start a conversation on shaping the offer to meet the requirement.

Members referred back to the Council's role in providing training and the significant investment that the authority had made and continued to make to develop the wider market. Noting the need to review the provision of that training, Members queried the risk of care homes closing if staff had not received appropriate training. It was explained that the amount of training provided was far too high and was a legacy of decisions in the past, but ultimately responsibility was with the employer to train staff, not the authority. The Strategic Director confirmed that she would be happy to come back to Members on this when a review had been undertaken.

The transition from Children's Social Care to Adult Social Care remained a priority for Members and clarification was sought in respect of when further transitions would be projected to occur. The Strategic Director confirmed that officers were currently working on that.

Reviewing the budget position, Members queried how many interims were in post within the service. The Strategic Director confirmed that there were interims who had been covering fully funded vacancies. Discussions were ongoing to transition those interim staff as permanent employees of the authority. In addition, there were also agency social workers, which had been funded through the Better Care Fund, which was not a guaranteed source of future funding and it would not be prudent to appoint permanently for such roles.

The Chair thanked the Strategic Director for her attendance and the frank responses provided to Members questions.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Principal Social Worker be invited to attend a future meeting where the Improvement Plan is being reviewed.

3. That mitigations against risks associated with the cessation of training for care homes be identified prior to any decision to cease the provision of training.

63. SCRUTINY WORKSHOP: ADULT RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING CARE HOMES

Consideration was given to a report which set out the main findings and recommendations from the scrutiny workshop undertaken by the Health Select Commission to consider residential and nursing care home for adults aged over 65. The purpose of the workshop was to consider progress in bringing about improvements to safety, quality and effectiveness in the sector.

Resolved:-

1. That the report, conclusions and recommendations be noted. 2
2. That the report be forwarded to Cabinet for their consideration of the recommendations and to Council for information.
3. That the response to the recommendations be reported back to the Health Select Commission.

64. ARCHIVES ACCREDITATION - POLICY APPROVAL

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment which was due to be determined at the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on 17 September 2018 concerning the approval of a policy for Archives Accreditation.

Members noted that the authority's application for Archives Accreditation was scheduled to be discussed at the Archive Service Accreditation Panel meeting on 21 November 2018. The National Archives had confirmed the Forward Plan and supporting policies should be approved by 'an appropriate delegated authority', which is why Cabinet approval was sought. Supporting policies included:-

- Heritage Service Forward Plan 2018-22, which set out the core purpose and vision for the Service and includes a detailed action plan
- Collections development policy, which examines the background and history to Rotherham Archives and Local Studies; the profile and scope of the collections identifying current limitations; priorities for future collections development and the Service's approach to appraisal and disposal

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 12/09/18

- Collections information policy, which documents Rotherham Archives and Local Studies' approach to maintaining and providing accurate documentation of collection
- Care and Conservation Policy, which covers the Service's strategic approach to conservation including the principles of collections care; ethics, legislation and standards; premises and storage; conservation assessment and treatment; environmental monitoring and control; housekeeping; access; training; security; emergency planning; and environmental awareness
- Access Policy, which details Rotherham Archives and Local Studies' approach to access (physical and intellectual, onsite, remote and through wider engagement) to the collections under its care

Members broadly welcomed the proposal, the way in which the service was being delivered to a high standard and indicated their full support for the recommendations to be considered by the Cabinet on 17 September 2018.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.

65. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS - SEPTEMBER TO NOVEMBER 2018

Consideration was given the current publication of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions and Members identified items for pre-decision scrutiny:

Resolved:-

That the following items listed on the Forward Plan of Key Decisions be submitted for pre-decision scrutiny:-

- South Yorkshire Regional Adoption Agency
- Early Help Strategy Phase 2 & 3 Implementation
- Sex Establishment Policy
- Modern Day Slavery Transparency Statement
- Community Energy Switching Scheme
- Submission of the Clean Air Zone Outline Business Case to the Joint Air Quality UnitClean Air Zones (by Improving Places Select Commission)
- A new delivery model for Intermediate Care and Council Residential Care Homes (by Health Select Commission)

66. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

It was reported that the Rotherham Youth Cabinet would be holding their Manifesto Launch event on 13 November 2018 and Members would receive an invitation to attend this in due course. It was further reported that the Cabinet was currently considering its response to the recommendations from the Children's Commissioner Takeover Challenge and these would be reported back in due course.

Resolved:-

That the update be noted.

67. WORK IN PROGRESS - SELECT COMMISSIONS

The Chairs of the Select Commissions reported on recent and forthcoming activities:-

Health Select Commission

Councillor Evans reported that the Commission had met on 6 September 2018 where the following reports had been discussed:-

- Update on Health Village and Implementation of Integrated Locality Working
- RDaSH Estate Strategy
- Response to Recommendations from Scrutiny Review- Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Recovery Services
- The Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Priorities 2019-20
- South Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Wakefield Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update

Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor Cusworth reported that the next meeting would be held on 18 September 2018 with the following items listed for consideration:-

- Children Missing Education
- Update on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND)
- Outcomes from the Improving Lives Select Commission Workshop Session - Complex Abuse Investigation
- Feedback from Improving Lives Select Commission Performance Sub-Group

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Mallinder reported back on the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, which had taken place at the end of July. During that meeting, an update had been received on the development of the Cultural Strategy and representatives from Dignity,

the provider of bereavement services, had attended to deliver their annual report to the Council. The next meeting was due to take place on 20 September 2018, where the following agenda items were due to be considered:-

- Rother Valley Caravan Park
- Thriving Neighbourhoods
- Housing Strategy Refresh - 2019-2022

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board reported that he would be meeting the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Finance and officers in due course to discuss the budget setting process and when proposals would be brought forward for scrutiny. He further reported that a working group had been established to review the operation of Rothercard. Furthermore, he reminded Members of the visit to Voluntary Action Rotherham that had been arranged for Chairs of the Select Commissions on 3 October 2018 to discuss how scrutiny works in Rotherham.

Resolved:-

That the update be noted.

68. CALL-IN ISSUES

The Chair reported that there had been no call-in requests received in respect of recent Cabinet decisions.

69. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair reported that there were no items of business requiring urgent consideration by the Board.

70. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Wednesday 3 October 2018 commencing at 11.00 a.m. in Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
3rd October, 2018

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

Councillors Alam, Allen, Lelliott and Read, Cabinet Members, were also in attendance.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Cusworth, Evans and Mallinder.

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

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

72. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

73. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda which would require the exclusion of the press or public from the meeting.

74. JULY 2018/19 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

Consideration was given to the report which set out the financial position as at the end of July 2018 and was based on actual costs and income for the four months April to July, 2018 with forecasts for the remaining eight months of the financial year.

This report was part of a series of financial monitoring reports presented to the Cabinet for 2018/19, setting out the projected year-end revenue budget financial position in light of actual costs and income for the first four months of the financial year and included revenue forecasts, details of capital spending and the projected capital outturn position.

The current revenue position after four months showed a forecast balanced revenue budget after taking account of the £10m budget contingency approved within the 2018/19 budget. Work continued to identify further savings to improve this position further by the financial year end.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 03/10/18

The report set out by Directorate, the summary forecast revenue outturn position after management actions which have already been quantified and implemented and these were highlighted.

However, to achieve this position a number of mitigating savings actions have been required and further spending reductions had to be identified and implemented across all Council services, in order to offset the impact of a range of cost and demand pressures impacting on the Council's budgets.

The overspending against budget in Children's and Young People's Services Directorate was continuing in the current financial year as a result of demand for services outstripping budget capacity. The number of children in care continued to increase this financial year.

The increased number of Looked after Children also placed significant pressure on Legal Services within the Finance and Customer Services Directorate. The current forecasted overspend for Legal Services was £1.230m. The Finance and Customer Services Directorate overall was forecasting to outturn within budget after putting into place a range of mitigating actions to compensate for the Legal Service forecast overspend.

The Adult Care Services Directorate were forecasting an overall overspend of £6.221m. A combination of increased client numbers, the rising cost of care packages, and delays in delivery of savings plans have led to pressure on budgets across all client groups. A recovery plan has been developed to address previously undelivered savings and project plans are currently being finalised with the expectation that further savings will be identified from this activity.

Regeneration and Environment Directorate was forecasting a balanced budget, although it was facing challenges from a combination of declining business from the school meals service and challenges with delivery of budget savings.

Discussion ensued on the ability to balance the budget and maintain statutory services and whether there was any flexibility within the Capital Programme once funds had been allocated. It was pointed out the Council had not reached the stage where it could not fulfil its legal responsibilities and that the Capital Programme was continually monitored for areas of slippage and different financial decision making.

Members also referred to the major pressures facing Regeneration and Environment Services and whether the reviews had been concluded and delivered upon. In addition, whether the pressure on Licensing, as a result of the more robust regime, with the additional legal costs and Counsel fees, could have been mitigated against with permanent staff. Members were advised that recruitment remained ongoing in Legal Services and the locum capacity reviewed regularly. A partnership

arrangement was in place with Sheffield's in-house Legal Services to assist with child care cases.

The position in Legal Services would be closely monitored and cases profiled to identify any early trends which may impact even further on the overspend. Indications were that the demand in Children and Young People's Services was beginning to plateau and balance out.

The situation with regards to traded services for schools was also subject to review as this was linked to potential income.

Since the report had been written a number of savings, particularly in Customer Information and Digital Services were yet to be delivered at the current time, but it was anticipated this would be achieved by the end of the year.

The ability of Legal Services and Children and Young People's Services to achieve a balanced budget was questioned further by Members and whether the forecasted figures were accurate, especially when savings proposals had been approved and additional pressures had then arisen, thus cancelling each other out.

Members were advised that the figures contained within the report were for Quarter 1 only (three months of information) and whilst known cost pressures could be identified, assessments based on performance allowed forecasts to be projected forwards. Services were reasonably confident savings could be delivered, more so with achieved and exceeded income targets from areas such as the theatre, museum and parks etc. and holding vacant posts where this could be done without significantly impacting on service delivery.

Members were mindful of judicial review pressures impacting on the Council and the NHS due to the need for services to change and the risks associated with this.

Reference was also made to the recent application of a parking charge at Rotherham Show and whether there had been any learning as a result. Members were advised that charges had to be priced sensibly. There had been several complaints on social media and comments made by the public all of which had been taken on board. This would feed into the Rotherham Show debrief. Members of the public appreciated the need for such a charge being implemented in order for the show to be delivered and remain free to access by members of the public.

Members sought clarification on alternative strategies should the income targets not be achieved given the pressures on Regeneration and Environment Services.

It was noted that all controllable spend was being strictly monitored across all Directorates. Any strands for additional income, such as building consultancy, were being explored for where this could bring some surplus.

Whilst it was noted that the non-filling of vacant posts may be seen as an easier option with smarter working, this did have an impact and placed more strain on existing staff. Members were advised there was no intention to increase pressure on employees especially where demand was still great like in Corporate Services. A longer term review of efficiencies was to take place in some areas which may result in some being reshaped.

The Workforce Management Board had oversight of all vacant posts being held and whilst there was a need for some priority posts to be filled, by holding posts vacant this enabled some existing staff to develop into other areas.

Members again referred to the implementation of a number of historical savings which had led to cost pressures in Customer Information and Digital Services and the action to resolve some of the savings alongside a review of management and staffing structures.

It was pointed out that the costs pressures in the current year were being reviewed on a month by month basis. The review of the staffing structures was ongoing and discussions with the Trades Unions was imminent.

Clarification was sought on the recruitment to posts for employees who were on maternity leave and Members were advised that each post was considered on a case by case basis.

It was also confirmed to Members that the financial forecasts had an included assumption amount against claims for CSE and this was reviewed annually.

Resolved:- (1) That the forecast General Fund balanced budget position after use of the budget contingency be noted.

(2) That the management actions continue to address areas of overspend, provide enhanced controls over all spend and to identify alternative and additional savings.

(3) That the alternative budget savings proposals for Regeneration and Environment, and Finance and Customer Services as referenced in paragraph 3.4.3 and 3.6.7 as recommended for approval to Cabinet be noted.

(4) That the updated Capital Programme be noted.

(5) That financial monitoring in relation to Children and Young People's Services and Adult Services be submitted to future meetings.

75. COUNCIL PLAN QUARTER 1 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.

The Performance Report and Performance Dashboard/Scorecard (Appendices A and B) provided an analysis of the Council's current performance against fourteen key delivery outcomes and seventy-two 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) twenty-five 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 thirty-two (49.2%) of the indicators measured in this quarter. The Priority area with the highest proportion of targets met was Priority 4 (Extending Opportunity and Prosperity).

Reference was made to areas that were performing well or improving and those that were off target for the five Priorities, but in general the performance was positive and improving in the right direction.

Members sought information on how workforce capacity and skills could be developed and how the workforce could be sustained. It was pointed out that the Skills Strategy had been delayed, but was currently being worked through by the Investment and Skills Sub-Group. This linked into the Sheffield City Region's strategy and policies, but from a Rotherham perspective. Work was also taking place with the new university campus.

Members welcomed the new style format for the report. In noting the detail asked about the number of complaints and performance data collated for the call centre and more specifically if data was collated for call abandonment.

Performance data was collated for the call centre and there had been some complaints about waiting times. However, staff numbers in the call centre were due to increase over the next few weeks. There had been an increase in calls more recently due to the changes in the waste collection service, but as this service became embedded the number of calls should decrease.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 03/10/18

Given the aims of Priority 5 of becoming a modern, efficient Council it was asked if consideration had been given to the early involvement of scrutiny members in the development stages and review of policies which would confirm that Cabinet were taking this priority seriously.

Early engagement with scrutiny members was key and there was a huge amount of scrutiny activity now taking place with scrutiny colleagues.

Online digital services were being rolled out more with the implementation of new software which was working well. This had confirmed that more than 85% of those wanting a green waste service had signed up online. There was more to do over the coming months.

Members had noted that fixed penalty notices being issued had decreased. There had been a gap between the pilot ending and the new contract arrangements, but performance in this area should soon improve and be evidenced in the next quarter. Due to the court system in Sheffield some of the case prosecutions were taking time to be processed.

Further information was sought on whether the enforcement contract extended to more than just Rotherham Town Centre and actually branched out into wards. Members were advised that two weeks into the contract enforcement officers had been across fifteen of the twenty-one wards and provided a visible presence and would be more prevalent once the full staffing resource was achieved.

Members questioned why there had been an apparent increase in complaints for street cleaning and grounds maintenance and were advised huge challenges faced grounds maintenance with the initial snow at the start of the season, torrential rain and then drought conditions with the warmer weather. Performance relating to waste management had improved.

It was also noted that anti-social behaviour incidents and hate crime figures had reduced. The reduction in the percentage of positive outcomes for reported hate crime incidents was lower than last year. South Yorkshire Police had seen an increase, however, in the satisfaction levels for how hate crime was dealt, but a reduction in the number of repeat victims of anti-social behaviour. The Police were to continue delivering a programme of awareness and embed this as part of the CAT meetings and Police resourcing.

Clarification was sought on how the creation of a rich and diverse cultural offer and thriving town centre would be measured (Ref. 3.A6). Members were advised that 38% of the target had already been achieved in Quarter 1 as a result of the increase in visits to the Council's culture and leisure facilities and libraries. This was measured by attendance figures at various organised activities by individuals, groups and schools. Specific examples were provided.

Comparison figures were sought on the Council's performance from last year to this and it was reported that 50% of the actions were on target and 50% were off target. Performance was being closely monitored and actions driven forward for continuous improvement. There was regular liaison between Cabinet Members and Strategic Directors on a weekly basis and reports provided to scrutiny and the Cabinet on a quarterly basis.

The Chairman thanked Members and officers for their attendance and input and welcomed early sight of performance in relation to Children and Young People's Services and Adult Services in due course.

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

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

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

**76. RESPONSE TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS -
USE OF INTERIMS, AGENCY AND CONSULTANCY STAFF**

Further to Minute No. 33 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th September, 2018, consideration was given to the report which detailed the outcome of the review following concerns by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at the increasing and significant forecast of in-year agency and consultancy overspend.

The review sought 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 Cabinet accepted all twelve broad recommendations arising from the scrutiny review. Progress would continue to be closely monitored and would be led by the Assistant Director for Human Resources and Organisational Development.

Resolved:- (1) That the Cabinet's response to the scrutiny review on the Use of Agency, Interim and Consultancy Staff be noted.

(2) That a report be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in January, 2019 for an update on progress.

77. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

There were no issues to report.

78. WORK IN PROGRESS - SELECT COMMISSIONS

The Chairs of the Select Commissions provided the following updates on work undertaken and planned activities:-

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Sansome confirmed all activity/reporting would be monitored through the work programme.

Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor Brookes reported the Performance Sub-Group had discussed a number of issues relating to Safeguarding and Early Help, which Councillor Watson had provided an update on.

Challenges were also made to dips in performance and reassurances were provided.

Health Select Commission

Councillor Short had nothing further to report.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

The Chair confirmed a meeting was to take place with Voluntary Action Rotherham and two additional budget meetings were to be scheduled shortly.

Resolved:- That the update be noted.

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

There were no call-in issues to report.

80. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no matters or urgent business to report.

81. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Wednesday, 17th October, 2018 at 11.00 a.m.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
Monday, 1st October, 2018

Present:- Councillor E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC - in the Chair); Councillor P. R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and Councillor C. McGuiness (Doncaster MBC), together with Mrs. L. Baxter and Mr. T. Smith (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC), Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S. Sansome (Rotherham MBC) and Mrs. G. Gillies (Doncaster MBC).

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 6TH JULY, 2018

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 6th July, 2018.

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

12. BDR JOINT WASTE PROJECT - MANAGER'S REPORT

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

- Contract delivery (including performance and targets);
- Complaints;
- Health and Safety;
- Finance – the Operational Management Budget Out-turn 2017/18;
- Communications;
- Minutes of the meeting of the BDR PFI waste treatment facility community liaison group held on 30th April, 2018;
- Resources;
- Waste Compositional Analysis;
- Renew Contract.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD - MEETING DATE

The Joint Waste Board welcomed Mr. A. Brookes and Mr. S. Lund (Renewi) who reported on the contract performance in respect of the Bolton Road waste treatment facility. Reference was made to the commercial performance of Renewi and the company's commitment to the current contract.

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

(2) That the details now reported in respect of the Renewi contract be noted and Members be provided with copies of the briefing note now discussed.

13. CURRENT ISSUES

Discussion took place on the following items:-

(1) During the spell of hot weather in July and August 2018, there had been an increase in the number of complaints about flies from the Bolton Road site. The number of complaints had reduced as the spell of hot weather had ended.

(2) Possible introduction by Central Government of an Incineration Tax, as part of the proposed new Waste and Resource Strategy.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

14. RISK REGISTER

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI risk status report (risk register) which had been maintained during the various stages of the joint waste project. The report stated that fifteen risks are registered, with one risk added and none deleted since the last Joint Waste Board meeting held on 6th July, 2018. The new risk had been added due to the financial performance of the sub-contractor in the UK municipal market.

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

15. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on either Monday, 26th November, 2018, or Monday, 3rd December, 2018, at a venue in Sheffield and at a starting time to be determined.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD - MEETINGDATE

(2) That the next following meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on a Monday during February or March, 2019 at the Town Hall, Rotherham.