

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION

Date and Time :- Tuesday 29 June 2021 at 1.30 p.m.

Venue:- Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham.

Membership:- Councillors Atkin, Barley, Burnett, Cowen, Ellis, Havard, Keenan, Khan, Jones, McNeely, Mills, Miro, Pitchley, Reynolds, Sansome, Tinsley, Whomersley, Wyatt (Chair).

Co-opted Members:- Mrs. K. Bacon, Mrs. M. Jacques.

This meeting will be webcast live and will be available to view [via the Council's website](#). The items which will be discussed are described on the agenda below and there are reports attached which give more details.

Rotherham Council advocates openness and transparency as part of its democratic processes. Anyone wishing to record (film or audio) the public parts of the meeting should inform the Chair or Governance Advisor of their intentions prior to the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 March 2021 (Pages 3 - 7)

To consider and approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 March 2021, as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of interest from Members in respect of items listed on the agenda.

4. Questions from members of the public and the press

To receive questions relating to items of business on the agenda from members of the public or press who are present at the meeting.

5. Exclusion of the Press and Public

To consider whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any part of the agenda.

6. Aids and Adaptations - Tenant Scrutiny Review (Pages 8 – 37)

To receive a report in respect of a scrutiny review and action plan progress.

7. Initial Work Programme (Pages 38 - 43)

To receive and discuss a draft schedule of scrutiny priorities for the 2021/22 municipal year.

8. Appointment of Representative to Health, Welfare and Safety Panel

To appoint a representative to the Health, Welfare, and Safety Panel for the 2021/22 municipal year.

9. Urgent Business

To consider any item which the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

10. Date and time of the next meeting

The next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission will take place on 20 July 2021, commencing at 1.30 pm in Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
Tuesday 16 March 2021

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Brookes, Buckley, Elliot, Jepson, Jones, Khan, McNeely, Reeder, Rushforth, Sansome, Sheppard, Taylor, Tweed and Wyatt.

Apologies were received from Councillor B. Cutts, Ms. Bacon and Ms. Jacques.

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

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

130. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 2 FEBRUARY 2021

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 02 February 2021 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

131. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

132. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The Chair confirmed that no questions had been submitted.

133. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

134. TRANSPORTATION - ACTIVE TRAVEL AND TRANSFORMING CITIES UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report providing an overview and update on progress of the Council's Transforming Cities Active Travel Programme 2020-23. The report included an update on the current position with the programme within the 3-year delivery timeframe, issues which could impact on the current profile, and mitigation approaches in use.

In discussion, Members requested additional details around project scheduling in the Parkgate area. Assurances were provided that the intended works were two years hence, which affords time to plan around key risks. It is customary to work to timing windows, and there can be project delivery conversations ahead of time to minimise congestion at peak times.

Further details were requested around resurfacing at a specific site. This was to be delivered by the Highways resurfacing programme, and the teams would be working closely to coordinate the end results.

Assurances were requested that a list of shovel-ready projects could be compiled and prepared in case of additional funding sources coming through in addition to those already discussed. The response noted that funding was sparse for shovel ready projects, the cost of developing a scheme or project often had to be taken in view of a designated funding stream or bid. IF there were encouragement to believe there would be funding from the TCF, the team would begin to undertake scheme design. Engineering level design and development before funding is available would be an achievement that, whilst desirable and advantageous, is not currently in practice.

Members also requested additional information regarding a specific scheme beyond those mentioned in the report. The response noted a scheme in the area in question which is currently under discussion and how this current discussion corresponds with a historic scheme discussion. Following an explanation of the prioritisation process, it was noted that future updates would include a clear account of prioritisation of projects.

Further details were requested regarding schemes under development for the South of the Borough. The response from officers affirmed that the priority follows where the greatest increase in cycling is anticipated or happening. A recent physical observational survey of the cycle network has informed the development of the cycling strategy. The rationale included in this strategy begins to build a case for development of cycleways where there currently may be fewer or none.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted and the next update be brought in 12 months' time.
2. That a list of projects be prepared to ensure projects can proceed upon receipt of funding.

135. CULTURE, SPORT AND TOURISM UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update on the delivery of the Culture, Sport and Tourism Service throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The report included details on a selection of the projects that the service has delivered over the past year and set out key projects over the coming twelve months.

In discussion, Members requested additional details regarding the logging and tracking of volunteer hours. The response from officers indicated that the variety of volunteer opportunities and the number of volunteers were

currently tracked. Volunteer hours were tracked through the service, but those hours mediated through community organisations were not currently tracked.

Members also requested more details regarding benchmarking in respect of engagement. The response from officers noted that the statistics were taken from the Cultural Strategy which referenced the Active Lives Survey from 2017. More benchmarking statistics would be included in the next update.

Members expressed interest in hearing more about engagement with schools and libraries, and successful engagement opportunities such as pop-up libraries that could be continued and enhanced further. The response from officers provided assurances that engagement with schools had been undertaken and was planned to grow more in the foreseeable future.

Members asked for more information around the “order and collect” library service, and whether this service would continue to be offered even after library buildings are open again. The response from officers affirmed the value of the service and the intention therefore to continue the service.

Members requested further information around the memorial activities in response to bereaved communities following the pandemic. The response from officers explained in detail how the memorial activities would work and the discussions that were currently in progress regarding the potential arts memorials in communities.

Members expressed appreciation and requested that the success of efforts in respect of the Brinsworth Library move be noted.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted and the next update be brought in 12 months' time.
2. That benchmarking be undertaken with libraries in neighbouring authorities and provided as part of the next update.
3. That a procedure be developed whereby volunteer time which is not mediated through the service directly may be logged and tracked, with a view to demonstrating fully volunteer engagement in Rotherham.

136. OUTCOMES FROM WORKING GROUP - WARD HOUSING HUBS

Consideration was given to a report on the findings and recommendations of the 25 February meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission sub-group which examined the redevelopment of Ward Housing Hubs.

Resolved:-

1. That the briefing be noted and the following recommendations be submitted to Cabinet for approval:-
 - a) That training and guidance be provided as part of Member Induction to ensure that new Members have a working knowledge of how Ward Housing Hubs link with Neighbourhoods.
 - b) That provision be made to enable more joint-ward funding and collaboration across ward boundaries where there is mutual agreement and benefit.
 - c) That Members be provided with clear, reader-friendly criteria for HRA funding and guidance around other sources of funding if HRA funds do not apply; and that the guidance include an explanation of the 'roll over' facility for unallocated spend, from one year to the next, within the four year cycle.
 - d) That projects be procured and delivered through an appropriate and timely procurement process with a view to demonstrating value for money.
 - e) That provision be made for approval of projects earlier in the municipal year to maximise the time available to deliver approved projects.
 - f) That processes be developed to enable decision-making where there are only two Ward Members, for example, in the event of a dispute or quorum issue.
 - g) That a range of methods be adopted to promote Ward Housing Hubs and to enable residents to engage actively in a way which suits their needs and preferences.
 - h) That the Council's Employment Solutions Team liaise with RotherFed to promote the Pathways Employment Scheme across all the wards.
2. That the next update be presented to Improving Places Select Commission in 12 months' time.

137. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Consideration was given to a briefing presented by the Governance Advisor in respect of the Commission's updated work programme, with especial mention of a change of schedule for the upcoming Aids and Adaptations Tenant Scrutiny Review, which had been deferred for scrutiny at the next meeting, in June, to incorporate a related and larger piece of review work currently in progress by the Council's Business Unit. It was requested that Members begin contributing to the formation of the work programme for 2021-2022.

Resolved:-

1. That the updated work programme be noted.

138. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there were no urgent items of business requiring a decision at this meeting.

139. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The Chair announced that the next virtual meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission will take place on 29 June 2021, commencing at 1.30 pm.

Public Report
Improving Places Select Commission

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Improving Places Select Commission – 29 June 2021

Report Title

Tenant Scrutiny Panel Review – Aids and Adaptations Service

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No, but it has been included on the Forward Plan

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Anne Marie Lubanski, Strategic Director of Adult Care, Housing and Public Health

Report Author(s)

Jordan Hatswell, Adaptations, Furnished Homes & Temporary Accommodation Manager

jordan.hatswell@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Borough-Wide

Report Summary

The Tenant Scrutiny Panel selected the Aids and Adaptations Service as an area of service for review, as part of a continuous programme of service reviews which are undertaken by the Panel. The work of the Panel is facilitated and supported by Rotherfed, the Council's Tenant Federation provider. The aim of the Panel was to investigate the customer journey for those using the Aids and Adaptations service in terms of accessibility, clarity and fairness.

The Tenant Scrutiny Panel has completed its review and has submitted a report detailing the Panel's findings, together with recommendations for service improvement. The report is attached as Appendix 1. The scrutiny review recommendations are summarised within the service action plan at Appendix 2.

Recommendations

- 1.1 Note the Tenant Scrutiny Panel Report and recommendations.
- 1.2 Note the progress made to date within the Action Plan.
- 1.3 Agree to receive a further report in 12 months' time

List of Appendices Included

- Appendix 1 Tenant Scrutiny Panel Report A&A Scrutiny Action Plan RAG
Appendix 2 Tenant Scrutiny Panel recommendations and service action plan
Appendix 3 The Climate Impact Assessment

Background Papers

None

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

None

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Tenant Scrutiny Panel Review – Aids and Adaptations Service

1. Background

- 1.1 In April 2019 the Aids and Adaptations Service was selected by the Tenant Scrutiny Panel for review, following consideration of the Council's housing service performance outturn for 2018/19.
- 1.2 The performance data relating to the Aids and Adaptations Service showed that service performance for adaptation works completed on time had improved on the previous year, at 96.16%, compared to 94.29% 2017/18. However, the target for 2018/19 of 98% had not been achieved. In considering this area of service for review, the Panel also reflected upon their own experiences of the service and anecdotal evidence they had received from conversations with other tenants.
- 1.3 The Panel set out several objectives for the review, which are summarised below:
 - Review and consider the adaptations customer journey, including accessing the service, time taken, and the number of different services involved.
 - Ascertain whether the publicity around the service is available to all tenants, including hard to reach groups.
 - Use mystery shopping and other methods to explore service access routes.
 - Consider the current service policy in terms of accessibility for tenants.
 - Benchmark against other housing providers to identify any learning and good practice from their systems and policies.
 - Examine the charging policy and how clear it is.
 - Explore links between adaptations and different services e.g. NHS, Occupational Therapists and Assistive Technology
 - Ascertain how service requests are prioritised.
- 1.4 In taking forward the review, Tenant Scrutiny Panel members interviewed representatives of the relevant services. This included senior managers from the Council's Housing Options Service, which administers the aids and adaptations service; staff within the adaptations service and within the Community Occupational Therapy Service (NHS Foundation Trust). The Panel also collected relevant data, using several methods, to inform the review and final report. These methods included a mystery shopping exercise via a telephone survey of 22 tenants, who had recent experience of the major adaptations process or were currently journeying through the process.

- 1.5 Panel members also contacted the Council via various customer access routes, to enquire about adaptations for a friend or family member, via email, telephone and face to face contact.
- 1.6 Finally, a benchmarking exercise was completed by comparing the Council's Aids and Adaptations Service against other similar housing providers and through the Northern Adaptations Group.
- 1.7 The report submitted by the Panel summarised the findings of the review, including the evidence base used to inform the Panel's recommendations to improve the service. Aspects of the service reflected upon included how tenants are informed of their choices regarding adaptations; customer expectations when utilising the service and the communication customers receive whilst works are on-going to the point of completion. A further consideration was the collection of customer satisfaction data and how it is utilised to inform service development and improvement.
- 1.8 The Council received the report at the Housing Service Senior Management Team meeting on 3rd March 2021. The report was very much welcomed, and the recommendations considered and agreed. An action plan was developed by the service in response to the recommendations and implemented.

2 Key Issues

- 2.1 The action plan and progress to date is detailed at Appendix 2. The updated action plan shows that all the submitted recommendations are being implemented, with several actions already completed. This includes improvements to budget monitoring and control, as well as resource management for time critical works for customers in urgent need.
- 2.2 The good progress already being made demonstrates the value the Council places upon the Tenant Scrutiny Review framework and ensuring that the customers voice is clearly heard in how we shape, deliver and continually improve services.
- 2.3 This scrutiny review also contributes towards the following priorities:

The Council Plan:

- Every child making the best start in life
- Every adult secure, responsible, and empowered
- A strong community in a clean, safe environment
- Extending opportunity, prosperity and planning for the future.

The Housing Strategy:

- Strengthening Places
- Improving Health
- Working Together

3 Options considered and recommended proposal

- 3.1 The recommendations arising from the Tenant Scrutiny Review are detailed within the action plan at Appendix 2.

4 Consultation on proposal

- 4.1 The Tenant Scrutiny Review report and recommendations were presented to the Rotherfed Tenant Scrutiny Meeting on 8th February 2021 for discussion and finalisation, prior to submission to the Council. The Report was received, discussed and the findings and recommendations accepted at the Housing Senior Management Team meeting on 3rd March 2021.

5 Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 6.1 Delivery against the recommendations in the action plan is being monitored by the Tenant Scrutiny Panel in liaison with the Council's Aids and Adaptations Service Management Team. The projected completion dates for actions within the plan are reflective of current resources within the service and recognises that the service is on a continuing journey of improvement.
- 6.2 The overall accountable officer is Tom Bell, Assistant Director for Housing.

6 Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications (to be written by the relevant Head of Finance and the Head of Procurement on behalf of s151 Officer)

- 6.1 None arising from progress report

7 Legal Advice and Implications (to be written by Legal Officer on behalf of Assistant Director Legal Services)

- 7.1 None arising from progress report

8 Human Resources Advice and Implications

- 8.1 At DLT on 11 May 2021 four full time additional posts for the service were approved for 12 months on a temporary basis. One project manager, two application officers and one technical officer.
- 8.2 The cost of these posts will be a pressure on HRA (£78K) and General Fund (£64K) budgets. This additional cost is to be funded by the additional fees generated by the completion of carried forward works which has been allocated an appropriate budget. There is a risk that if not enough additional works are completed then that will result in a budget pressure on both HRA and General Fund.
- 8.3 There are no other financial implications resulting from the report.

9 Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

9.1 None arising from progress report

10 Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

10.1 Ensuring that the customer voice is heard is instrumental in how the Council develops and delivers its services and is of paramount importance. The review supports the continued journey of improvement for the aids and adaptations service. The service aims to offer a high quality and accessible service to all customers, ensuring that our residents can live with dignity and independence.

11 Implications for CO₂ Emissions and Climate Change

11.1 The service improvement actions being implemented will contribute to the Council's ambition to become carbon neutral by 2030. The improvements proposed to customer access and self-service opportunities will reduce the potential number of physical visits Council officers will make to complete all paperwork and assessments, by offering a digital solution. The creation of this digital service will reduce paper and printing requirements of the service as well as reducing multiple visits to customers where possible, reducing the services carbon emissions through reduced car usage.

11.2 The Contractor Partners operate to the minimum Standards Charter to:

- Eliminate unnecessary waste by adopting the “reduce, reuse, recycle” philosophy.
- Be a good neighbour, minimise negative local impacts (noise, air quality etc.), improve green areas (e.g. biodiversity, visual attractiveness etc.).
- Reduce carbon footprint – be aware of main impacts on carbon emissions including the indirect carbon used in manufacturing processes and the direct impact of operations and logistics

11.2 Temporary ramps and straight stairlifts are recycled following removal and all new shower installations are energy efficient.

11.3 Please see the Emissions Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 3

12 Implications for Partners

12.1 The Housing Options Service Senior Management Team will continue to work with RotherFed and the Tenant Scrutiny Panel towards delivering the recommendations in the action plan. Delivery of these recommendations will involve collaboration across relevant council services and with key delivery partners.

13 Risks and Mitigation

- 13.1 The key risk is the failure to engage with the tenant scrutiny board in Rotherfed and inability to deliver against the recommendations in the action plan. This will be mitigated by ongoing monitoring, scrutiny and evaluation of the recommendations by the Improving Places Select Commission and the Adaptations / Housing Options Management Team.

14 Accountable Officer(s)

Approvals obtained on behalf of:-

	Named Officer	Date
Chief Executive		Click here to enter a date.
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Mark Scarrott	10/06/21
Assistant Director of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Elizabeth Anderton	10/06/21
Assistant Director of Human Resources (if appropriate)		09/06/21
Head of Human Resources (if appropriate)	Trish Law	09/06/21

Report Author: Jordan Hatswell, Adaptations, Furnished Homes & Temporary Accommodation Manager. jordan.hatswell@rotherham.gov.uk

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).

ROTHERHAM FEDERATION TENANT SCRUTINY



**Rotherham
Tenant Scrutiny**

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT:



**For presentation to Rotherham Metropolitan
Borough Council
November 2020**

This is a summary of the fourth report of the Rotherham Federation Tenant Scrutiny panel resulting from an investigation into the Aids and Adaptations service provided by Rotherham MBC for Council tenants. 'Aids and Adaptations' was chosen by the tenant scrutiny panel following consideration of the Rotherham Council housing performance information for 2018/19 quarter four. The data showed that despite better performance than the previous year for adaptation works completed on time (96.16%), the annual target of 98% was not being met. Panel members were also keen to investigate this topic due to their own experiences and other evidence from their conversations with their neighbours and friends.

The summary includes the findings of the investigation, the recommendations made by the panel, and the evidence leading to these conclusions being drawn.

Terms of reference

Aim: To investigate the customer journey for tenants using the 'Adaptations and Aids' service in terms of accessibility, clarity and fairness

Objectives, to:

- Consider Adaptations customer journeys including accessing the service, time taken and the number of different services involved
- Ascertain whether the publicity around adaptations and aids services is available to all tenants, including hard to reach groups
- Use mystery shopping and other methods to explore access routes for the Adaptations service
- Consider the current policy in terms of accessibility for tenants
- Benchmark against other housing providers to check for any learning from their systems and policies
- Examine the charging policy and how clear it is
- Explore links between Adaptations and different services e.g. NHS, Occupational Therapists and Assistive Technology
- Ascertain how cases are prioritised

Scope

It was agreed that the panel would *not* fully investigate:

- ✗ The quality of aids and adaptations made
- ✗ The financial elements of the service as regards removal of adaptations from voids etc.

Methodology:

The investigation included:

- The panel interviewed representatives of the services including senior managers from Housing options (Rotherham Council) and Community Occupational Therapy (NHS Foundation Trust) and officers based in the Housing adaptations team
- A mystery shopping exercise – a telephone survey of 22 tenants who had experienced the major adaptations process recently or were currently in the system
- Panel members contacting the Council via various routes to ask about adaptations for a friend or family member via email, telephone and face to face
- Benchmarking Rotherham Council's Aids and Adaptations service against other similar housing providers and through the Northern Adaptations group

PLEASE NOTE THAT UNDER THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES AS REGARDS COVID-19, THE PANEL ARE EXPECTING AN ACTION PLAN WITH EXTENDED TIMESCALES FOR RESPONDING TO THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS. TIMESCALES SHOULD ALLOW FOR THE RELEVANT TEAMS TO BE OPERATING AT FULL CAPACITY AGAIN.

KEY FINDINGS

The panel has prioritised its recommendations in order of importance. The supporting evidence for each recommendation is listed:

Recommendation A: Team resources to meet demand

Ensure that the Adaptations team resources are up to full complement to meet the needs of the work demand received.

The Evidence:

- There has been a vacancy for a technical officer in the Aids and Adaptations team for over two years. Consideration is being given to replacing this post with a surveyor role due to the increasing number of assessments for extensions. This proposal was supported by the Tenant Scrutiny panel.
- The primary reason for the investigation of this topic was that the annual target of completing 98% of aids and adaptations on time was not being met (18/19 performance) and this was confirmed by panel members who had numerous examples of how speed of service varied vastly for different tenants.
- Half of the works from the mystery shopping exercise exceeded the 40 working days target for major adaptations, some by several months, and 50% of the respondents said that the service could be improve with shorter waiting times.
- One of the respondents from the major adaptations survey in 18/19 said: *'I was told it would be three weeks and it was in fact ten'*
- When interviewed, officers assessed the service as good but agreed that it had performed better in previous years i.e. The average time for assessment to works commenced was only five weeks between April and July 2019 but had previously been as short as three weeks in 2015/16.
- Although only a few complaints were received each year about the Aids and Adaptations service, the largest percentage referred to delays in service, which could be potentially be reduced if the team was up to full capacity.
- The demand for aids and adaptations rose by 16.5% between 18/19 and 19/20, putting additional pressure on the reduced team. The Rotherham COT team has capacity to handle 3,500 referrals per year; 4,300 referrals were received in 2018/19.
- The national shortage of Occupational Therapists had led to delays in the assessment of adaptations applications; however, it was anticipated that the COT team would reach full capacity in early 2020.

- During July 2019, the backlog for referral to approval had extended to nine weeks exceeding the eight-week target for Rotherham Council. By January 2020 this had further increased to 13 weeks.

Full report pages 19-22

Recommendation B1: Re-draft the policy

Redraft the policy document as soon as possible. This should include drafting a summary version for the general public, working with tenant representatives. The policy should include clear guidance on the re-housing of tenants to previously adapted homes.

The Evidence:

- The current policy and procedures used by Rotherham Council for Aids and Adaptations were written in December 2015. There is no review date mentioned in the documents but all officers agreed that they were overdue for review and refresh.
- The policy is accessible only to officers, which was confirmed by the *Learning from Customers forum* who found it to 'include out of date information' and 'too many abbreviations/ too much information'.
- The Tenant Scrutiny panel found the policy misleading concerning financial assessments for Council tenants and the re-housing of tenants to previously adapted accommodation.
- Panel members could see both the benefits and disadvantages of moving people from their own home into a previously adapted property. It would usually be best for the tenant to stay in their own neighbourhood and for the Council to save on removal costs; however, this was offset by the feasibility of adapting their own home, the cost of adaptations and the cost of potential removal in the future.
- It was disappointing that officers did not have time to review the policy with the Tenant Scrutiny panel's input during the investigation as originally intended, but the panel hoped that the contents of the report and their views could be included in the next draft of the policy.

Full report pages 10 and 11

Recommendation B2: Five-year rule

Consider reviewing the policy to state that tenants must stay in their home for five years following adaptations unless there are unforeseen circumstances, in line with the policy for private households.

The Evidence:

- There is no requirement for a Council tenant to stay in their adapted property for five years, unlike private customers receiving the Disabled Facilities Grant. If the tenant does move on, the property is advertised as an adapted home. If the home is still on the housing stock list after a few months, the adaptations will be removed at a significant cost to the Council.
- There was a strong feeling from the panel that the cost of both the installation and removal of adaptations (if required) should make it imperative that tenants commit to stay five years in an adapted home, except in extenuating circumstances.

Full report page 11

Recommendation C: Improve publicity of the service

Develop a strategy for targeted publicity of the service which is accessible for hard to reach and vulnerable people, including those people without access to the internet.

The Evidence:

- The only publicity for the adaptations service is via word of mouth or from the Rotherham Council website. There are no leaflets advertising the service for people to decide if it is appropriate for them.
- Panel members were happy to see that numerous people taking part in the mystery shopping exercise had heard about the service from other Council officers or Occupational Therapists (65% of people responding to the mystery shopping exercise heard about the service through OTs and Social Care). However, this relied on the person first approaching other services and wouldn't cater for someone who was struggling to access any help.
- The panel were concerned about how people, particularly hard to reach groups, hear about the service, unless they have access to the internet or have a family or GP to help with the referral.
- The COT survey found that the majority of referrals received by the team were from family/ friend / carer and by self-referral, accounting for 45% of the total. Very few referrals were received from the housing department (3-7%), secondary health (hospitals) (3-4%) or voluntary organisations (2-3%).

- It was disappointing that only 3-7% of referrals are from housing teams when the current housing verification visits include questions relating to the need for adaptations; *'How are you managing within your home (identify slips, trips, falls, floods or mental health impact)'* and *'Would you like any further information or support in relation to your health and wellbeing? (includes falls and frailty)'*. The panel wondered if this was because these visits only take place every four years.
- One panel member said *'When I came out of hospital, I didn't receive any information on the adaptations that may be available to me to be able to use my home safely or to be able to go out'*. This was supported by only 3-4% of referrals being received from hospitals.
- Voluntary Action Rotherham do work with some GPs as link workers and may signpost the adaptations service if appropriate. However, the panel thought that there is clearly an opportunity for further targeted publicity through voluntary organisations (including Rotherham Federation) as only 2-3% of referrals were received that way.
- It was noted that Hull City Council produce a leaflet for service users that details how to access the service, the Council's policy and the timescales for the service. The leaflet was found to be really helpful, in particular if used with health professionals and voluntary groups to promote the service to those most in need.
- Panel members agreed with senior officers that any leaflet should focus on people having access to an assessment process rather than making promises about the provision of aids and adaptations. This approach may well make sure that those most appropriate for the service receive it and that inappropriate demand is reduced.
- The Customer Service Centre on two occasions just gave out a phone number to ring when enquiring about aids and adaptations. It was felt that some people would prefer to receive a leaflet to decide whether it was appropriate for them to self-refer, particularly if face to face discussion was not an option and if they didn't have access to the internet.

Full report pages 12-14 and 17

Recommendation D: Publicise service expectations

Develop a leaflet to hand to tenants when using the adaptations service that provides a summary of what they can expect from the service. This should also include the expectations on the tenant in receipt of the service.

The Evidence:

- There is no written communication with customers that lets them know the timescales and expectations of the service.
- It was noted by the panel that some delays are caused by customers not being available when the assessments/works are due to take place. It would helpful if these people are

notified of the service expectations and that the lack of access to their homes will cause delays to the works.

- Officers agreed that publicity could be used to manage the expectations of people who may be considering the service i.e. that an assessment may not always lead to adaptations being approved; the anticipated timescales for completion of assessment processes.

Full report pages 18 and 28

Recommendation E: Written communication on the process

Ensure that written communication on the process is sent out once a referral has been made.

The Evidence:

- It was reassuring that people are being told roughly how long the adaptations will take; but there did seem to be large differences in the times promised (range of two weeks to 12 months for similar works when mystery shopping exercise was carried out). However, this information is given verbally.
- A previous pathway and quality standards document were available in 2011 on the Connect2Support website, which was useful to confirm timelines for customers to refer to for the adaptations service: However, customers are no longer referred to these web pages.
- The COT survey in 2018/19 quarter four received some negative comments about the time taken for referral – one person stating that three months was too long to wait for independence and another stating that it had taken eight weeks for an assessment after leaving hospital.
- The perception of time taken from referral to assessment differed considerably for most people, with some people thinking it had taken up to 32 weeks longer than it had.
- There was some disappointment that there is no written confirmation of when the referral was made and how long before an assessment visit/works would take place. It was thought that written communication soon after referral may well overcome issues with people thinking that the process was taking longer than it should.

Full report pages 18, 20 and 26-27

Recommendation F: Regular contact intervals

Agree, implement and monitor regular contact intervals to keep customers up to date with progress and works scheduling. A key contact approach would help with this.

The Evidence:

- The panel felt that one of the biggest issues for disappointment with the adaptations service was not being kept informed of progress and timescales. This could be overcome by the introduction of a key worker arrangement.
- Comments received from the Adaptations team survey 2018/19 included: *'They were unable to tell me when a decision would be made and how long it would take overall'; 'We didn't know when the builders would turn up to do the work'; 'Too long to wait in getting installed and had to get in touch by telephone'*

Full report pages 22 - 24

Recommendation G: Budget for urgent work

Make sure that some of the budget each year is kept aside for urgent work.

The Evidence:

- The adaptations budget does not include a contingency budget for urgent work, meaning that other routine works are delayed once an urgent case is referred to the adaptations team.
- The tenant Scrutiny panel found it unfair that works already ordered and in the adaptations' system were being delayed each time an urgent referral was received.
- By November 2019, the full year's allowance for Council owned homes adaptations in 2019/20 had been spent. No alternative funding could be found and this led to a long waiting list of work to be carried forward to the following year (13-14 weeks waiting list had already accumulated by January 2020). The panel were particularly concerned that the funding for adaptations had been spent five months earlier than planned, leading to a long list of adaptations waiting for the new financial year. The list could potentially include urgent works.

Full report pages 29-30

Recommendation H: Balance spending on minor and major adaptations

Assess the spending each year between minor and major adaptations to allow for separate budgetary monitoring for each.

The Evidence:

- The adaptations budget is not divided between types of work; major and minor adaptations are funded from the same budget; this could mean that excessive numbers of minor adaptations could lead to fewer major works being carried out and vice versa.
- The panel was worried about the increasing number of referrals and the lack of capacity to handle these. This supported the need for improved prioritisation to ensure that those most in need were receiving services first.

Full report pages 29-30

Recommendation I: Minor adaptations survey

Design, use and monitor a simple customer satisfaction survey for minor adaptations.

The Evidence:

- During the investigation the panel were able to view customer survey results for the COT team survey and also for the Adaptations team survey for major adaptations. However, it was confirmed that a customer satisfaction survey is not issued for minor adaptations.
- The panel felt that it would be useful to receive periodic feedback from people who had received minor adaptations in their homes.

Full report pages 31-33

The full report includes further detail of each recommendation and the related evidence, incorporating 'Panel Views' sections for ease of reading.

Suggested improvements

The following suggestions were considered to be outside the scope of this investigation but to be important improvements that could be made to RMBC services:

1.	Performance Monitoring - Consider splitting the ROKI indicator between minor aids/ minor adaptations and major adaptations?
2.	Assess savings - Test out how much money is saved across adult services by the adaptations service and request an increase in the current budget for this service.

Report produced by:



rebecca.morrisonps@gmail.com

07931 471131

On behalf of:



Rotherham Federation

Springwell Gardens Community Centre, Eastwood View, Rotherham, S65 1NG
info@rotherfed.org Tel: 01709 368515

--

RAG rating: Each action should be given a RAG (Red, Amber, Green) rating according to the following definitions.

Progress/indicator RAG status	
	Work is significantly behind schedule and no progress has been made, and/or Progress has been made but the timescale has not been achieved
	Progress is being made, progress is good and the action is likely to be achieved within timescale. Or the action has been completed but evidence is required to demonstrate achievement
	The action has been completed and there is a record of evidence to support its completion.

Recommendation (in priority order)	Lead Officers	Update	Target Date	RAG status	Outcomes
Recommendation A: Team resources to meet demand Ensure that the Adaptations team resources are up to full complement to meet the needs of the work demand received.	Daniel Peck Jordan Hatswell	<p>The Adaptation Service is continuously monitoring the work in progress (WIP) and forecasting for financial year ahead to ensure adequate resource is in place.</p> <p>An Adaptation Technical Officer was recruited in Nov 2020</p> <p>A separate internal service review is also being undertaken. As an interim solutions until the full-service review is completed the following additional posts have been agreed on a temporary basis for 12 months by DLT on 11 May 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager X1 FTE • Application Officer x 2 FTE • Technical Officer X 1 FTE 	March 2022		

Recommendation (in priority order)	Lead Officers	Update	Target Date	RAG status	Outcomes
Recommendation B1: Re-draft the policy Redraft the policy document as soon as possible. This should include drafting a summary version for the general public, working with tenant representatives. The policy should include clear guidance on the re-housing of tenants to previously adapted homes.	Jordan Hatswell Daniel Peck Sandra Tolley	This will be started following the finalisation of the service review and introduction of new staffing posts. There are wider policy implications that need to be considered in relation to the RRO for 'housing assistance' and a specific review of this policy in conjunction with the Adaptations policy, all of which must work in conjunction with each other. This is now a significant piece of work following some significant findings from the review and associated benchmarking with other authorities.	June 2022		
Recommendation B2: Five-year rule Consider reviewing the policy to state that tenants must stay in their home for five years following adaptations unless there are unforeseen circumstances, in line with the policy for private households.	Jordan Hatswell	This recommendation will not be pursued further following discussions at Housing SMT. This is due to need for the Authority to be flexible as landlord and the complex variety of needs we are to cater for. If an adaptation is completed, it then is reusable as the housing stock is re-let.	N/A		No further action
Recommendation C: Improve publicity of the service Develop a strategy for targeted publicity of the service which is accessible for hard to	Jordan Hatswell	Specific advertisement of service will not be pursued following presentation at Housing SMT. The Service will ensure all professionals on the pathway to access the service are up to date on all procedures.	N/A		Key contacts set up within hospital and first contact to ensure all staff have route to discuss adaptations. Leaflet mentioned below to

Recommendation (in priority order)	Lead Officers	Update	Target Date	RAG status	Outcomes
reach and vulnerable people, including those people without access to the internet.		A service leaflet will be produced as per section E and a review of the website content will be undertaken following the benchmarking done against other local authorities.			be circulated.
Recommendation D: Publicise service expectations Develop a leaflet to hand to tenants when using the adaptations service that provides a summary of what they can expect from the service. This should also include the expectations on the tenant in receipt of the service.	Daniel Peck	Service is currently under full review by Housing Business Development Team and all areas are being looked at and improvements to be suggested included the services wider communications such as it will incorporate this into recommendations about publicity and advertising of service. Customer Portal also to be developed. The Adaptation Coordinator will be working on developing all of its information that is circulated to colleagues and customers, and information that is available digitally. This will include the development of a leaflet for circulation by the professionals on the pathway for adaptations, as well as area housing teams etc.	November 2021		
Recommendation E: Written communication on the process Ensure that written communication on the process is sent out once a referral has been made.	Jordan Hatswell Daniel Peck	Developing customer management system either within Digital Services or via procuring of new system all together which will offer automated customer contact. The service is beginning to look at the procurement of a new system for the delivery of its adaptations program, and	March 2022		

Recommendation (in priority order)	Lead Officers	Update	Target Date	RAG status	Outcomes
		<p>the intention is to include a specific module that will send out automated electronic communications.</p> <p>However, in the interim period until this is done, the approvals for more staffing resources, which includes 2 dedicated Application Officers will improve the customers journey through the process. This will include ensuring communication is sent out to all applicants advising them of the process.</p>			
<p>Recommendation F: Regular contact intervals</p> <p>Agree, implement and monitor regular contact intervals to keep customers up to date with progress and works scheduling. A key contact approach would help with this.</p>	Daniel Peck Jordan Hatswell	<p>The service is looking to procure a new system in which the service will be delivered to increase its efficiency to free up resources to focus more on regular customer contact.</p> <p>The service has received approval for more staffing resources, which I include 2 dedicated Application Officers to improve the customers journey through the process, improving the customer care capabilities within service via a key contact approach. This will ensure regular contact is made. Once this is in place further focus will be given to the contact intervals within the service.</p>	March 2022		Implementation of key contact approach via recruitment of Application Officers will allow for the introduction of more regular contact intervals for customers.
<p>Recommendation G: Budget for urgent work</p>	Jordan Hatswell	Budgets are monitored across all workstreams and moved accordingly to cover any shortfall. However, service	Completed		Budgets monitored monthly and working with commercial

Recommendation (in priority order)	Lead Officers	Update	Target Date	RAG status	Outcomes
Make sure that some of the budget each year is kept aside for urgent work.		<p>has a high demand and faces budgetary pressures. Weekly meetings with partners. Urgent jobs are discussed and prioritised accordingly.</p> <p>Urgent Jobs towards the end of the year / when budgets are low replace other jobs that are currently in the contractors works in progress, as there needs to be an effort to achieve budget by the end of each year.</p>			team in CIC team to maximise budget capabilities.
Recommendation H: Balance spending on minor and major adaptations Assess the spending each year between minor and major adaptations to allow for separate budgetary monitoring for each.	Jordan Hatswell	This is now in place as part of new process for new R&M contract, each element is monitored and reported on individually. Work in line with separate targets for Minor and Major adaptations.	Complete		Budgets monitored monthly and working with commercial team in CIC team to maximise budget capabilities.
Recommendation I: Minor adaptations survey Design, use and monitor a simple customer satisfaction survey for minor adaptations.	Daniel Peck	<p>This survey will be developed when the new staff are in post and operational.</p> <p>Discussions have been had with Colleagues within the CIC team who Deliver the Repairs & Maintenance contract and a survey is being considered along with a Quality Assurance process.</p>	March 2022		Survey to be developed to monitor provision and satisfaction of Minor Adaptations

User guidance:

- The first section of this form guides users through considering major areas where emissions are likely to occur. If emissions are impacted in a way not covered by these categories, please identify this at the bottom of the section
- The first section should be filled as such:
 - **Impact:** identify, in relation to each area, whether the decision of the proposal does the following *reduces emissions*, *increases emissions*, or has *no impact on emissions*. If it is uncertain this section can be labelled *impact unknown*
 - If **no impact on emissions** is identified: no further detail is needed for this area but can be added if relevant (e.g. if efforts have been made to mitigate emissions in this area.)
 - **Describe impacts or potential impacts on emissions:** two sections deal respectively with emissions from the Council (including those of contractors), and emissions across Rotherham as a whole. In both sections please explain any factors that are likely to reduce or increase emissions. If **impact unknown** has been selected, then identify the area of uncertainty and outline known variables that may affect impacts.
 - In most cases there is no need to quantify the emission impact of an area after outlining the factors that may reduce or increase emissions. In some cases, however, this may be desirable if factors can be reduced to a small number of known variables (e.g. if an emission impact is attached to a known or estimated quantity of fuel consumed).
 - **Describe any measures to mitigate emission impact:** regardless of the emission impact, in many cases steps should be taken in order to reduce mitigate all emissions associated with each area as far as possible; these steps can be outlined here (For example: if a proposal is likely to increase emissions but practices or materials have been adopted in order to reduce this overall impact, this would be described here).
 - **Outline any monitoring of emission impacts that will be carried out:** in this section outline any steps taken to monitor emission levels, or steps taken to monitor the factors that are expected to increase or reduce emission levels (for example, if waste or transport levels are being monitored this would be described here)
- A **summary paragraph** outlining the likely overall impacts of the proposal/decision on emissions should then be completed - this is not required if the proposal/decision has no impact across all areas.
- The supporting information section should be filled as followed:
 - Author/completing officer
 - **Research, data, or information** may refer to datasets, background documents, literature, consultations, or other data-gathering exercise. These should also be added to the **supporting documents** section of the cabinet report

-
- Carbon Impact Assessments are to be appended to the associated cabinet reports
 - Prior to publishing reports, Carbon Impact Assessments should be sent to climate@rotherham.gov.uk for feedback
 - Report authors may also use the above email address to direct any further queries or to access further support regarding completing the assessment

Will the decision/proposal impact...	Impact	If an impact or potential impacts are identified			
		Describe impacts or potential impacts on emissions from the Council and its contractors.	Describe impact or potential impacts on emissions across Rotherham as a whole.	Describe any measures to mitigate emission impacts	Outline any monitoring of emission impacts that will be carried out
Emissions from non-domestic buildings?	No Impact	The points in the action plan will have no impact on emissions from non-domestic buildings.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Emissions from transport?	Reduces emissions	By increasing the digital options for self-serve and marketing for customer access, the service will reduce the number of visits required to complete paperwork with applicants, thus reducing emissions from travelling, as well as reducing printing requirements.	Impact will be to reduce emission, but the visits will not have a significant impact upon emissions across Rotherham as a whole.		Monitoring of total mileage from service to ascertain if this is reduced, and in turn emissions have been reduced
Emissions from waste, or the quantity of waste itself?	Reduces waste	<p>The Contractor Partners operate to the minimum Standards Charter to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate unnecessary waste by adopting the “reduce, reuse, recycle” philosophy. <p>Temporary ramps and straight stairlifts are recycled following removal</p>	Impact will be to reduce emissions	N/A	N/A

Emissions from housing and domestic buildings?	Reduces emissions	<p>The Contractor Partners operate to the minimum Standards Charter to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise negative local impacts (noise, air quality etc.) <p>All new shower installations are energy efficient.</p>	Impact will reduce emissions	N/A	N/A
Emissions from construction and/or development?	Reduces emissions	<p>The Contractor Partners operate to the minimum Standards Charter to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate unnecessary waste by adopting the “reduce, reuse, recycle” philosophy. Be a good neighbour, minimise negative local impacts (noise, air quality etc.), improve green areas (e.g. biodiversity, visual attractiveness etc.). 	Impact will reduce emissions	N/A	N/A

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce carbon footprint – be aware of main impacts on carbon emissions including the indirect carbon used in manufacturing processes and the direct impact of operations and logistics 			
Carbon capture (e.g. through trees)?	No Impact	The points in the action plan will have no impact on emissions from non-domestic buildings.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Identify any emission impacts associated with this decision that have not been covered by the above fields:					

Please provide a summary of all impacts and mitigation/monitoring measures:

In order to ascertain the level of which these actions will reduce emissions, the service will monitor its mileage once the required changes are implemented. This will allow us to fully understand the impact these developments will have on emissions, and to what extent they will be reduced.

Supporting information:

Completed by: (Name, title, and service area/directorate).	Jordan Hatswell Adaptations, Furnished Homes & Temporary Accommodation Manager Housing Options Adult care, Housing & public Health
Please outline any research, data, or information used to complete this [form].	
If quantities of emissions are relevant to and have been used in this form, please identify which conversion factors have been used to quantify impacts.	
Tracking [to be completed by Policy Support / Climate Champions]	

Public Report
Improving Places Select Commission

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Improving Places Select Commission – 29 June 2021

Report Title

Initial Work Programme

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Jo Brown, Assistant Chief Executive

Report Author(s)

Katherine Harclerode, Governance Advisor
01709 254532 or katherine.harclerode@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Borough-Wide

Report Summary

To provide an update on the Work Programme of the Improving Places Select Commission.

Recommendations

1. That the Improving Places Select Commission give consideration to an outline work programme using the draft set out in Appendix 1 as a basis for the discussion.
2. That the Chair and Governance Advisor meet with the relevant Cabinet Members and link officer for IPSC to receive feedback on these proposed areas of work.
3. A final report proposing the formal work programme for 2021/22 will be submitted to the meeting in July of 2021 in order for Members to agree a clear set of priorities for this municipal year.

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 Work Programme – Improving Places Select Commission

Background Papers

Agendas of Improving Places Select Commission during the 2020/21 Municipal Year
Minutes of Improving Places Select Commission during 2020/21 Municipal Year

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

Not applicable

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Initial Work Programme

1. Background

- 1.1 The remit of the Improving Places Select Commission (IPSC) is to undertake scrutiny activity in respect of all matters pertaining to the borough of Rotherham as a place. In broad terms, this remit relates to business and economic development, employment, emergency planning, environment, housing, climate change, leisure, culture and tourism, transport and highways, as well as regulatory services such as trading standards and environmental health. The breadth of functions and services that fall within the Commission's remit is significant.
- 1.2 The way in which the Commission discharges its scrutiny activity is a matter for itself, having regard to the provisions of the Constitution and any direction from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The IPSC has chosen to scrutinise a range of issues through a combination of pre-decision scrutiny items, policy development, performance monitoring, information updates and follow up to previous scrutiny work.
- 1.3 The IPSC has eight scheduled meetings over the course of 2021/22, representing a maximum of 20 hours of scrutiny per year – assuming 2.5 hours per meeting. Members therefore must be selective in their choice of items for the work programme. The following key principles of effective scrutiny are considered in determining the work programme:
 - Selection – There is a need to prioritise so that high priority issues are scrutinised given the limited number of scheduled meetings and time available. Members should consider what can realistically and properly be reviewed at each meeting, taking into account the time needed to scrutinise each item and what the session is intended to achieve.
 - Value-added – Items had to have the potential to 'add value' to the work of the council and its partners.
 - Ambition – the Programme does not shy away from scrutinising issues that are of greatest concern, whether or not they are the primary responsibility of the council. The Local Government Act 2000 gave local authorities the power to do anything to promote economic, social and environmental wellbeing of local communities. Subsequent Acts have conferred specific powers to scrutinise health services, crime and disorder issues and to hold partner organisations to account.
 - Flexibility – The Work Programme maintains a degree of flexibility as required to respond to unforeseen issues/items for consideration during the year and to accommodate any further work that falls within the remit of this Commission.
 - Timing – The Programme has been designed to ensure that the scrutiny activity is timely and that, where appropriate, its findings and recommendations inform wider corporate developments or policy development cycles at a time when they can have most impact. The Work Programme also helps safeguard against duplication of work undertaken elsewhere.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 Members are required to review their work programme at each meeting during the 2022/22 municipal year to give focus and structure to scrutiny activity to ensure that it effectively and efficiently supports and challenges the decision-making processes of the Council, and partner organisations, for the benefit of the people of the borough.
- 2.2 A preliminary draft of a work programme for Improving Places Select Commission is appended to this report.

3. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 3.1 Members are recommended to discuss potential areas of scrutiny work to be added to the work programme.

4. Consultation on proposal

- 4.1 The work programme is subject to consultation with the Chair and Members of the IPSC. Regular discussions take place with Cabinet Members and officers in respect of the content and timeliness of items set out on the work programme.

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 5.1 The decision to develop a work programme is a matter reserved to the Commission and will be effective immediately after consideration of this report.
- 5.2 The Statutory Scrutiny Officer (Head of Democratic Services) is accountable for the implementation of any decision in respect of the Commission's work programme. The Governance Advisor supporting the Commission is responsible on a day-to-day basis for the Commission's work programme. Members are recommended to delegate authority to the Governance Advisor to make amendments to the programme between meetings.

6. Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications

- 6.1 There are no direct financial or procurement implications arising from this report.

7. Legal Advice and Implications

- 7.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.
- 7.2 The authority of the Select Commission to determine its work programme is detailed within the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and Responsibility for Functions parts of the Constitution. The proposal to review the work programme is consistent with those provisions.

8. Human Resources Advice and Implications

- 8.1 There are no direct human resources implications arising from this report.

9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 9.1 There are no implications for children and young people or vulnerable adults arising from this report.

10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

- 10.1 Whilst there are no specific equalities implications arising from this report, equalities and diversity are key considerations when developing and reviewing scrutiny work programmes. One of the key principles of scrutiny is to provide a voice for communities, and the work programme for this Commission has been prepared following feedback from Members representing those communities.

11. Implications for CO2 Emissions and Climate Change

- 11.1 There are no implications for CO2 emissions or climate change arising from this report. Members will have regard to the Climate Emergency when selecting potential items for scrutiny.

12. Implications for Partners

- 12.1 The membership of the Commission includes co-opted members from RotherFed who contribute to the development and review of the work programme. Where other matters are being considered for inclusion on the work programme, relevant partners or external organisations are consulted on the proposed activity and its timeliness.

13. Risks and Mitigation

- 13.1 There are no risks arising from this report.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

Craig Tyler, Head of Democratic Services and Statutory Scrutiny Officer

*Report Author: Katherine Harclerode, Governance Advisor
01709 254532 or katherine.harclerode@rotherham.gov.uk*

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).

Appendix 1 - Work Programme

Meeting Date	Agenda Items
29 June 2021	Initial Work Programme 2021-22
	Aids and Adaptations Tenant Scrutiny Review
20 July 2021	Rough Sleeper Strategy Update
	Revised Work Programme 2021-22
August 2021 Working Group	
7 September 2021	Thriving Neighbourhoods Annual Report
	Children's Capital of Culture
2 November 2021	Libraries Improvements Rollout
	Women's Euros Hosting
October 2021 Working Group	
14 December 2021	Allotments Self-Management
	Town Centre Update
January 2022 Working Group	
1 February 2021	Environment Bill – Waste Management
	Planning White Paper
February 2021 Working Group	
22 March 2022	Transportation – Capital Programme Update
	Clean Air Zone
19 April 2022	Review of Redeployable CCTV
	Antisocial Behaviour Policy Update