

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY COHESION

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

Date: Monday, 24 October 2005

Time: 10.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for Absence.
4. Declarations of Interest.
5. Minutes of the meeting held on 26th September, 2005 (herewith). (Pages 1 - 8)
6. Neighbourhood Management (Presentation by Andrew Balchin)
7. Parish Councils Update (report herewith) (Pages 9 - 12)
8. Advice Services Review (report herewith) (Pages 13 - 16)
9. Asian Earthquake - Verbal Update on Council Action by Zafar Saleem and Lee Adams
10. Local Area Agreements Progress Report (herewith) (Pages 17 - 40)
11. Study of Deprivation in Rotherham (report herewith) (Pages 41 - 44)
12. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Consultation Position Statement (report herewith) (Pages 45 - 55)
13. Rotherham Reachout: Results of the 12th Survey (report herewith) (Pages 56 - 65)

14. Exclusion of the Press and Public
The following item is likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relates to the financial affairs of someone other than the Council)
15. Request for Cash Advance for West Central Community Partnership (report attached) (Pages 66 - 68)
16. Date and Time of Next Meeting - Monday, 21st November, 2005 at 10.00 a.m.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY COHESION
Monday, 26th September, 2005

Present:- Councillor Robinson (in the Chair); Councillors Ali and Sangster.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ali declared personal interests in Minute No. 27 (Updated on Named Voluntary and Community Sector Projects), Minute No. 29 (BME Strategy Group) and Minute No. 32 (External Funded Projects) on the grounds of being involved in projects named.

23. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25TH JULY, 2005

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion held on 25th July, 2005 be approved as a correct record.

Reference was made to Minute No. 14 (Neighbourhood Management) where all Members were invited to attend a meeting of the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel to look at all aspects of Neighbourhood Management.

It was suggested that an abridged version of the presentations be provided for the next meeting of the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion to be held on Monday, 24th October, 2005 at 10.00 a.m.

24. LGA CONFERENCE DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES TO BE HELD AT THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CENTRE, BIRMINGHAM ON 13TH-15TH FEBRUARY, 2006.

Resolved:- That consideration of this conference be deferred and submitted to the Leader's Meeting for decision.

25. TRANSFER FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE TO NEIGHBOURHOODS

Colin Bulger, Head of Policy and Partnerships, presented the submitted report, which detailed the transfer of existing members of staff from the Chief Executive's Office to Neighbourhoods and the creation of a new unit to accommodate them.

After careful consideration it was decided that Neighbourhoods would be the best programme area of the Council to employ these workers as it would facilitate improved linkages with the local community, management of resources at a neighbourhood level, linkages to area plans/strategies and direct neighbourhood management

It was pointed out that as all of the members of staff were currently employed by the Council using external funding, there would be no financial implications attached to the transferring of staff.

Resolved:- That the transfer of staff from the Chief Executive's Officer to Neighbourhoods Programme Area be noted.

26. ROTHERHAM COMPACT

Zafar Saleem, Manager of the Equalities and Diversity Unit, presented the submitted report, which outlined the consultation process that was required on the Rotherham Compact Codes of Practice.

The Rotherham Compact was a statement of partnership between the Voluntary, Community, Statutory and Private sector partners represented in the Rotherham Partnership and showed a commitment to working together more closely and to respect each other's rights and responsibilities.

The Rotherham Compact offered a new approach to partnership and a framework to develop more detailed agreements in future work. There five Codes of Practice which needed to go through the impact assessment stage within the Council were:-

- Black and Minority Ethnic Voluntary and Community Organisations
- Community Groups
- Community Involvement/Consultation and Policy Appraisal
- Funding and Procurement
- Volunteering

The Funding and Procurement Code was still be developed and would be the subject of a Procurement Panel meeting, scheduled to take place on the 17th October, 2005 looking specifically at the Procurement Strategy and the processes behind it.

All five Codes of Practice were to be signed off by the 1st April, 2006, but an update report would be submitted to this meeting in November, 2005 prior to agreement by the Corporate Management Team and then ratified by Cabinet or Council.

There was strong commitment to working with and engaging the voluntary and community sector in the Council and amongst its partners without losing sight of the capacity to engage through Area Assemblies, an avenue which should explored and utilised further.

Resolved:- (1) That the agreed time table for action be noted.

(2) That each Programme Area will nominate an officer who will co-ordinate the Codes of Practice in their Programme Area and review the commitments within the Codes and identify which their Programme Area

could or could not adhere to.

27. UPDATE ON NAMED VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR PROJECTS (MAARI AND RREC) AND COMMUNITY COHESION

Zafar Saleem, Manager of the Equalities and Diversity Unit, presented the submitted report, which provided an overview of the latest developments on community cohesion and two named voluntary/community sector projects – M.A.A.R.I. and R.R.E.C.

Rotherham R.E.C.

The Rotherham R.E.C. ceased operating on the 31st June, 2005 and was now operating its own bank account and financial management with Finance Officers from the Council being formally released from the Accountancy and Treasury Management of the R.R.E.C. monies and resources. Bank mandate transfer forms have been signed off by Council officers.

Monies were still owed to the Council and contact had been made with the R.R.E.C. Executive Officers to arrange for the repayment of monies due from their reserves. Discussions were ongoing and hopefully the situation would be resolved shortly.

Sheffield Race Equality Council had made an approach to ascertain if they could provide any services in Rotherham.

M.A.A.R.I.

The long term funding of M.A.A.R.I. was discussed at the meeting of the Safer Rotherham Partnership Funding Group on 19th September, 2005 where a report setting out potential funding options was tabled for initial discussion. The Funding Group were seeking more information and Zafar Saleem was to liaise with Tim Hawkins, Community Safety Team, to address any issues.

It was pointed out that M.A.A.R.I. was to be included as part of the budget deliberations by Members.

Community Cohesion

There have been no further reported disturbances or tensions as a result of the London bombing and the situation remained calm.

An issue had arisen regarding potential community tensions from the use of migrant workers to pick fruit and this was being investigated further.

The recent announcement by NASS Yorkshire and Humberside to introduce new arrangements to voluntarily assist or forcibly remove Iraqi Asylum Seekers may give rise to tensions in areas where Iraqi Asylum

Seekers were housed, including Rotherham. The Council together with its partners was monitoring the situation and the relevant officers have been made aware of the new arrangements.

The Council continued to contribute to the delivery of the L.S.P. Community Cohesion Strategy through the conducting of a mapping exercise identifying best practice and gaps in current service and in the completion of the Council's Community Cohesion Action Plan, which set out a series of commitments that needed to be finalised by November, 2005.

Resolved:- That the contents of the report be noted.

28. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CORPORATE EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY STRATEGY GROUP

Zafar Saleem, Manager of the Equalities and Diversity Unit, presented the report submitted, which set out the Council's performance on equality and diversity issues since the establishment of the Corporate Equalities and Diversity Unit and the Corporate Equalities and Strategy Group.

The Corporate Equalities and Diversity Unit was established in January, 2004 with the achievement of Level Two of the Equality Standard for Local Government with Level 3 being achieved hopefully by the end of this year.

Following the introduction of strategic leadership and direction to the diversity agenda the Council had made significant progress in improving its performance on equality and diversity issues. These improvements were set out in further detail in the "Draft Corporate Equality and Diversity Strategy Group Progress Report 2004 - 2005" appended to the report.

The Council was now at the stage where it was reaching top quartile performance across the range of equality Performance Indicators mainly due to the introduction on new policies and robust performance management systems

The ongoing challenge was to turn these new and excellent policies into practice, so that both our workforce and the recipients of our services feel valued and respected regardless of their own particular circumstances.

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

29. B.M.E. STRATEGY GROUP

Zafar Saleem, Manager of the Equalities and Diversity Unit, presented the report submitted, which detailed the setting up of a B.M.E. Strategy Group to ensure the needs of the B.M.E. community were identified, acknowledged and addressed through the development and implementation of a B.M.E. Strategy for the borough.

The B.M.E. Strategy Group was chaired by the Deputy Leader of the Council, as this was an R.M.B.C. group, with the Vice-Chair being Jahangir Akhtar (Chair of the Unity Centre),

Membership comprised the key B.M.E. organisations in the borough as well as representatives from the Primary Care Trust, Voluntary Action Rotherham, South Yorkshire Police and the Local Strategic Partnership.

The formal reporting structure for this group was through the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion. The draft Terms of reference for this group as well as the minutes of a meeting held on 11th July 2005 were appended to the report submitted.

Currently the work on the Strategy was picked up within existing resources, but consideration would be given to funding in the future once the needs and issues of the group were known.

Reference was made to a member of the B.M.E. Strategy Group sitting on the L.S.P. Board in order to cover B.M.E. community issues. After some discussion V.A.R. would give consideration to this request.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the B.M.E. Strategy Group and the its draft Terms of Reference be received.

30. DRAFT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POSITION STATEMENT

Andrew Towleron, Policy and Research Manager, presented the submitted report, which detailed the Council's draft Sustainable Development Position Statement.

This Position Statement acknowledged that all Programme Areas were involved in and committed to ensuring sustainable development and that good progress had been made. It also made a number of recommendations on how these actions and interventions could be developed further to support the Council's sustainable developments aims and objectives as set out in the Community Strategy, Corporate Plan and Year Ahead Statement and meet new legislative and other national requirements such as C.P.A. 2005.

Work was still to be done on a number of issues and this work should be highlighted to ensure sustainable development was progressed and evidenced.

The Members' Sustainable Development Advisory Group, to be chaired by the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, would consider the above issues. The next meeting was scheduled for Friday, 28th October, 2005 at 11.00 a.m.

Resolved:- (1) That the Sustainable Development Position Statement,

including the recommendations as outlined in section 7 of this report, be noted.

(2) That the findings of the Position Statement be embedded into policy and service delivery processes and performance management arrangements.

(3) That support be given to each Programme Area to nominate an officer to join the proposed Officer Sustainable Development Steering Group and be its representative on it.

(4) That the report be referred to Members Sustainable Development Group, Cabinet and the relevant Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

(5) That the final Position Statement be forward to the Rotherham Partnership for their consideration.

(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING TWO ITEMS IN ORDER TO PROCESS THE MATTERS REFERRED TO.)

31. R.M.B.C./V.A.R. LIAISON GROUP

Consideration was given to a report, which was circulated and presented by Waheed Akhtar, Partnership Officer.

The report set out the draft membership of the R.M.B.C./V.A.R. Liaison Group, which would be led by Elected Members and attended by the Chair and Chief Executive of V.A.R.

It was suggested that the Liaison Group be arranged as part of the delegated powers meeting for the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Advisers, with the first meeting being on the 21st November, 2005 at 11.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

A subsequent meeting of the Liaison Group should meet in February, 2006.

Resolved:- (1) That the membership of the R.M.B.C./V.A.R. Liaison Group consist of the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and three Advisers, Chairman of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel, the Council's Representative and Substitute on the V.A.R. Board and the designated Liaison Officers, in addition to the Chairman and Chief Executive of V.A.R.

(2) That the first meeting of the Liaison Group take place on Monday, 21st November, 2005 at 11.00 a.m. at the Town Hall in the Council Chamber to facilitate disabled access.

32. CITIZENS' ADVICE BUREAU

Lee Adams, Assistant Chief Executive, confirmed that all Members of the Council had received a letter from a voluntary organisation highlighting funding issues and how the funding stream from the Council would end in March, 2006.

It was suggested that an external review and analysis into funding streams, the effectiveness and levels of delivery of the advice sector be considered with the possibility of some guaranteed funding beyond March, 2006.

The review also needed to take account of geographical coverage of the borough, demographics, the basic advice and specialisms and links to the one stop shop.

Resolved:- (1) That an external review take place on the advice sector.

(2) That the external review be put out to tender with an anticipated start date in November, 2005.

(3) That a report on the review findings be submitted to this meeting in February, 2006.

33. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 5 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (financial assistance provided by the Authority).

34. EXTERNALLY FUNDED PROJECTS - SUCCESSION PLANNING

Waheed Akhtar, Partnership Officer, presented the report submitted, which gave an update on the succession planning process, with focus only on projects with funding expiring or reducing during 2005/06.

Particular attention was drawn to the projects identified as requiring corporate funding, projects identified as requiring funding within existing Programme Area budgets and total mainstream requests.

Due consideration needed to be to the financial implications of Council activity that was funded through external funding sources. Although Programme Areas endeavoured to ensure that they had effective exit strategies for externally funded activity, projects (and staff) were sometimes identified as being at risk very late in the project management cycle, with a subsequent reliance on external funding to maintain projects year on year. This was not desirable in terms of financial planning and, as the external funding environment changes over the next 1- 3 years, it

would become increasingly difficult to find alternative funding sources each year.

Information on potential funding demands needed to be taken into account for the planning of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Resolved:- That the approach taken and the progress made on succession planning issues be noted.

35. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING - MONDAY, 24TH OCTOBER, 2005 AT 10.00 A.M.

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion take place on Monday, 24th October, 2005 commencing at 10.00 a.m.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS/CMT

1. Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion
2. Date:	24th October 2005
3. Title:	Progress on the Joint Charter between Parish Councils and Town Councils and RMBC.
4. Programme Area:	Neighbourhoods

5. Summary

This report presents the first phase of the development of a joint working charter between Rotherham's Parish and Town Councils and RMBC. The Charter will set out how the two tiers of local government aim to work closer together for the well being of local people and to promote engagement with the democratic process.

6. Recommendations

THAT THE REPORT AND PROGRESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A JOINT CHARTER BETWEEN RMBC AND PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS BE NOTED.

7. Proposals and Details

The Rural White Paper of 2000 identified the potential for Town and Parish councils to take on a stronger role as part of the Modernising Local Government agenda. The paper introduced the concept of Quality Parish and Town councils and highlighted their potential to give town and rural communities a better deal on services and a stronger voice in decisions affecting their daily lives. The White paper clearly indicated that the Government envisages local councils providing strong local leadership and working in partnership with principal authorities to improve the quality and range of services available.

Parish and Town Councils are the first tier of democratic government in England. Rotherham currently has 29 Parish and Town Councils of which three are classed as Parish Meetings. In August 2004 the Democratic and Resources Scrutiny Panel reviewed the current situation with regard to:-

- The current relationship between the principal Council and Parish and Town Councils in Rotherham
- The possible impact of Quality Parish Council legislation
- Good practice from other authorities

This review was considered by Cabinet in September 2004 and the following recommendations of the report supported:

- Begin the process of negotiating a joint working Charter.
- Improve communications - consultation to be formalised
- Provide a link officer in each programme area to provide liaison when required
- Training and development opportunities to be opened up to parish clerks and councillors
- Other forms of support e.g legal services to be available to parish councils (at an agreed cost)
- Guidance on funding opportunities to be provided

Following this a Seminar was held in January 2005 between RMBC and all Parish and Town Councils to look at how to improve joint working between the two tiers. It was agreed that the Yorkshire Local Councils Association would be asked to arrange a representative working group from the Parish Councils to work with the Council on the detail of the Charter. Following the seminar twenty four local councils confirmed their commitment to developing a joint charter.

During April 2005 an officers working group met with representation from Neighbourhoods, Education Culture and Leisure, Chief Executive, Economic and Development Services, Resources and Rotherham 2010. This task of this group is to ensure that the Charter is viewed as a high profile issue within their service area and that a link is established for Parish Councils when relevant issues arise.

Next Steps

The Yorkshire Local Councils Association arranged a postal ballot for nominations to be made for the working group during July and August 2005. The nominations were discussed at the South Yorkshire Local Councils branch meeting of the 5th of October

2005 and it was decided that the issue would be finalised by candidates being placed in a further postal ballot to be sent to all Rotherham's Parish and Town Councils.

The YLCA will again arrange this process and have provided a timetable to ensure that ballot papers are returned to them by the middle of December 2005. As soon as the ballot has been processed and the results known the first meeting of the working group will be arranged to be joined by Councils officers and the Cabinet member for Community Cohesion to negotiate the detail of the Charter.

The Charter

It is proposed that the Charter will use the good practice framework provided by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as a starting point. The Charter will set out:-

- A basic statement of mutual rights and responsibilities
- Promote and embed joined up working between the two tiers which will underpin public confidence in local democracy.
- Provide a framework for service devolution and financial arrangements
- Support more councils to obtain Quality status
- A performance and review structure which remains flexible for change and amendment as things develop.

The development of the Charter represents an important element of the move by the Council and partner agencies towards a Neighbourhood Management approach to the delivery of services. Members are currently considering the revised governance arrangements for Area Assemblies and a Neighbourhood Management Coordination Group, working through the Local Strategic Partnership, is taking forward a range of activity aimed at improving the local coordination and integration of services.

The Charter will provide a strong framework for future decisions regarding the role of Parish and Town Councils in the delivery of local services and in strengthening the accountability of service providers to local communities.

8. Finance

Some re-alignment may be required in future if Parish and Town Councils request consideration to devolve some services to a neighbourhood level. The government is currently looking at a national neighbourhood framework to address the issue of inequality in the ability to raise resources between different neighbourhoods.

Parish Councillors will need financial support to obtain training and development if they are to develop a wider community leadership role and make the most of new opportunities.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The Parish Councils are not currently clearly linked to the Area Assembly process. Coordinating structures still need to be developed and these will be addressed in the current review of Area Assemblies. Many Parish councils are small and if they are to make a significant contribution to community engagement and promoting the democratic process clear routes need to be provided for 'grass root' structures to influence strategic decisions.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The issues set out in this report link to key elements of the Government's vision for neighbourhood development, promoting local democracy and delivering community leadership.

Community Strategy

Developing closer ties with Parish and Town Councils links with the PROUD theme and the key priorities: "Develop local democracy at a neighbourhood level, devolving powers and resources and increasing opportunities for engagement."

Corporate Plan

Support Parish and Town Councils in achieving quality status: Develop a parish councils accord and strengthen joint working.

Year Ahead Statement:

Contributes to action point 36: The Community and voluntary sectors, Parish and Town Councils.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Cabinet/CMT Report 29 March 2005
- Charters for Town and Parish Councils and Principal Local Authorities: A Good Practice Guide April 2005
- Rural White Paper 2000
- Citizen Engagement and Public Services: Why Neighbourhoods Matter ODPM 2005
- Scrutiny Review August 2004
- Vibrant Local Leadership ODPM 2005
- Together We Can: Civic Renewal Unit 2005

Contact Names : Paul Griffiths, Community Leadership Manager - Neighbourhoods, Ext 6965 Paul.griffiths@rotherham .gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member (Community Cohesion) Delegated Powers Meeting
2.	Date:	24th October 2005
3.	Title:	Advice Services Review (All Wards)
4.	Programme Area:	Chief Executive's Department

5. Summary

The report provides an update on the current funding situation for advice and information services funded through the Infrastructure and Corporate Initiatives Budget held within the Chief executives Department.

6. Recommendations

Delegated Powers meeting is recommended to:

- (i) Note and comment on the report**

7. Proposals and Details

Background

The Infrastructure and Corporate Initiatives Budget is held within the Chief Executive's Department and is made up of carry forward money from the community element of the Community Economic Regeneration Budget, Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and funding from the Council's mainstream budget. The budget has been reducing over a number of years - the CERB community element no longer exists and NRF support will end in March 06. The focus of the fund has been tightened, particularly over the last year, with a move to working through key infrastructure agencies such as Voluntary Action Rotherham.

The Council has had a funding relationship with a number of voluntary sector advice providers over several years and currently funding is approved to five organisations until 31st March 06. It is felt that a simple move towards infrastructure organisations within this sector may not be the best option as the currently funded agencies are providing front-line services and the Council's money is supporting their core organisational costs. However, there is a need to gain clarity on the level and type of advice needed in Rotherham, map existing provision (including gaps and duplication), identify appropriate delivery models (including direct public sector provision such as the council's own Welfare Rights Service) and prioritise funding accordingly.

A report was prepared earlier this year by the Rotherham Advice and Information Network, but this was limited in its remit and there was a lack of 'buy-in' from a range of stakeholders. It is therefore proposed that an independent review be carried out, with the following aims:

- Identify the current level of need for legal advice within the Borough
- Identify the specific legal advice requirements for both geographical communities and communities of interest
- Identify the current range and level of legal advice services provided by voluntary and community projects, the Council's in-house services, any other statutory providers, and the private sector (solicitors)
- Identify any gaps in legal advice service provision
- Identify models of good practice for legal advice provision
- Make recommendations for the future provision of legal advice services for Rotherham

It is envisaged that this review may take at least until February 2006 to complete and time would then be needed to implement the recommendations.

It should be noted that the Rotherham Community Resource Programme (previously called the Rotherham Crime Reduction Programme) has £52,650 funding approved in 2005/06. The organisation has been clearly informed (in writing and verbally) that there will be no further funding from the Chief Executive's Department after 31st March 06 but it is likely that the organisation will be lobbying for continued financial support.

8. Finance

2005/06

£627,683 is committed within a total budget of £700,097, leaving £72,414 currently unallocated.

2006/07

Following the loss of NRF funding (£150k) and other readjustments (£47,656 CERB fund carry over underspend) the available budget is £501,330. The proposed approvals and current commitments amount to £538,336, leaving an overspend of £37,006.

If the £72,414 from 2005/06 is carried forward, this shortfall would not occur and there would still be £35,408 within the budget after all commitments have been met. This additional funding could be used for other projects or carried forward to 2007/08 depending on the outcome of the review.

A report recommending approval for the carry over of the £72,414 from 2005/06 is being presented to Cabinet on 26 October 2005.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There will always be some risk associated with contracting with external organisations. This is being managed through stronger commissioning, service level agreements and monitoring systems within the financial regulations of the Authority.

If the advice agencies are not funded for a further year there is a risk that the organisations may become unstable, with a resultant loss of services. However, organisations need to be advised that funding will not continue at the same levels, if at all, beyond March 07 and that they will need to make alternative funding arrangements.

There will be further clarity on the potential way forward in funding advice projects once the review has been completed. The funding would be focussed on identified advice needs of clients in Rotherham, rather than the needs of individual organisations.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The advice sector provides services to individuals at risk of social exclusion and in a range of difficult benefit or other rights issues. The review will enable an overview and identification of the best way forward.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

A number of reports have been presented to the delegated powers meeting of the Cabinet Member (Community Cohesion) over the last year.

12. Contact Names :

- Lee Adams, Assistant Chief Executive, ext 2788, lee.adams@rotherham.gov.uk
- Zafar Saleem, Manager Equalities, Community Cohesion, & Inclusion, ext 2757, zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk

Rotherham MBC - Chief Executive's Department Infrastructure and Corporate Initiatives Budget

Appendix A - Funding proposals for 2006/07

<u>THEME</u>	<u>Amount 2006/07</u>	<u>Notes</u>
ADVICE / INFORMATION / COUNSELLING		
Ferham Advice Centre Enterprise	£37,040	New recommendation - approval for one year to complete advice services review
Kiveton Park Independent Advice Centre	£29,000	
Citizen's Advice Bureau	£120,845	
Diversity Forum- Additional Costs for Immigration Project	£8,585	
Community Legal Service Partnership	£25,000	
Sub-totals - Advice / Information / Counselling	£220,470	
COMMUNITY SAFETY		
Rotherham Community Resource Programme	£0	Funding ends in March 06.
Sub-totals - Community Safety	£0	
CREDIT UNIONS		
Rotherham Credit Union Development Agency	£39,164	Year 2 of 3 year agreement
Sub-totals - Credit Unions	£39,164	
EQUALITIES		
Ringfenced BME work	£20,338	Previously funded REC. Ringfenced for 3 years
Giving Real Opportunities to Women (GROW)	£10,283	Year 2 of 3 year agreement
Sub-totals - Equalities	£30,621	
INFRASTRUCTURE		
South Yorkshire Funding Advice Bureau	£48,081	Year 2 of 3 year agreement
VAR	£200,000	Year 2 of 3 year agreement
Sub-totals - Infrastructure	£248,081	
Total	£538,336	

ICIB Budget 2006/07

£501,330

Total Commitments

£538,336

Balance 1**£37,006**

This would be the overspend in 2006/07 if NO carry forward was permitted from the 2005/06 ICIB budget.

ICIB Budget carry forward from 2005/06

£72,414**Balance 2****-£35,408**

This would be the underspend in 2006/07 budget if carry forward IS permitted from the 2005/06 ICIB budget.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion
2.	Date:	24 th October, 2005.
3.	Title:	LAA Progress Report
4.	Programme Area:	Chief Executives Department

5. Summary

The paper outlines progress on development of the LAA, and provides an early draft of the first submission for discussion

6. Recommendations

To note progress made and comment on the areas proposed for the LAA.

7. Proposals and Details

Following a successful launch event in August a working group has been established to develop the LAA reporting to CEOs of the LSP, Terms of Reference are attached along with membership.

Block groups have been established to work up the detail of the LAA, membership is attached.

The first submission document is attached for discussion; it has been generated by the working group.

There has been good community engagement so far, VAR has organised a range of events for the VCS and feedback suggests much support and valuing of our intention for involvement. Presentations are underway for each Area assembly and a members seminar was held on the 6th September. Further seminars for members are underway on the detail of the blocks

8. Finance

There is no direct funding for LAAs , but a reward grant will be integrated into the LAA linked to stretch targets. We will be expected to rationalise funding streams and use mainstream and external funding to further our objectives

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The LAA process will be complex especially negotiation of stretch targets and freedoms

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The proposal would assist us with improvement work for CPA and to implement the Corporate Plan and Community Strategy, It will assist in member and officer development

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Expression of Interest for the LAA May 2005
All partners will be involved in the process of the LAA

Contact Name:

Lee Adams Assistant Chief Executive ex 2775,lee.adams@rotherham.gov.uk

FREEDOMS AND FLEXIBILITIES REQUESTED BY THE LAA PILOT LOCAL AUTHORITIES

SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES FUND

Agreed

- **Finance**
 - Flexibility of carrying over resources from one financial year to another (Barnsley)
 - No requirement to produce separate annual reports on the use of the constituent pots of finance (Barnsley)
 - No long term 'ring fencing' of allocated funding for prescribed areas of activity (Barnsley)
 - The use of one financial and performance monitoring framework (Barnsley)
 - Extend city-wide the Local Partnership Teams that South Yorkshire Police and the Council have developed in north Sheffield to develop a 'Sheffield Community Support Service'. By drawing on pooled funding streams (Neighbourhoods Fund NRF, Liveability, SCP and Neighbourhoods Wardens) this will be brought about in 2005/6, earlier than had been anticipated (Sheffield)
 - Home Office ASB funding to be used flexibly to solve ASB issues (Devon)
 - Utilise DAAT Partnership Support Grant with BSCF/BCU to support (Knowsley)
 - BCU Funding has always been spent as part of a Partnership single pot; we would like this to continue (Wigan)
 - The inclusion of the BCU Fund in the pooled budget arrangements, in line with SSCF aspirations (Barnsley)
 - Divert NDC and NRF monies to use for a series of improvements to parks, open spaces and play areas in those areas of the city that qualify for the NRF/NDC monies (Brighton)

- **Non-finance**
 - Removal of requirement to provide annual CDRP Report (Devon)
 - Where no data is currently available, targets to be set following establishment of baseline in Year 1 (Knowsley)

Requiring Further Negotiation

- **Finance**
 - Carry over community safety grants to the following financial year (Doncaster)
 - Freedom to use the revenue gained from Fixed Penalty Tickets for Disorder for other Community Safety initiatives (Kent)
 - Flexibility to use the DAAT adult pooled treatment budget to support the development of services around alcohol and drugs misuse for both adults and young people (Knowsley)

- Building Stronger Communities Grant and BCU fund guaranteed for period of LAA (3 years) (Knowsley)
- Replace criteria relating to Single Community Programme quarterly spend requirements and loss of grant with quarterly Partnership monitoring against LSP priorities (Knowsley)
- It is essential that mainstream historical funds for drug and alcohol treatment are aligned with the LAA principles in order that re-patterning of resources can occur to achieve true best value in terms of treatment provision. We request this is included in LAA pot by way of Section 31 to allow re-profiling towards need (Wigan)
- Use funding currently specifically allocated for drugs issues for treatment of alcohol misuse and related crime issues (Coventry)
- Use funding for Street Crime Wardens more flexibly, to ensure that the scheme is working as closely as possible with the developing Corporate Warden Service in the city and ensure a smooth transition to mainstream funding in 2006 (Coventry)
- Housing Market Renewal - Concessions on changing capital into revenue where fiscal rules do not permit (Sheffield)
- Use some of the housing capital allocation to make improvements to homes and communities by providing residents with a range of improvements that contribute to quality of life and feelings of safety e.g. alleygating and community engagement. By working with the ALMO and housing strategy to achieve the decent homes standard we will also reduce crime and fear of crime. We require relaxation of the ring fence on HCA in order to reprofile funding. (Wigan)
- Seeking a removal of all monitoring requirements and grant restrictions with regard to Supporting People so that SP can be linked with probation resources to assist people to obtain accommodation and get re-settled when leaving prison thus reducing the re-offending rates (SSCF, Brighton)
- Flexibility to investigate opportunities for pooled drugs treatment budgets (Dorset)
- **Non-finance**
 - As the LAA will be at the cutting edge of change and innovation we would like Kent Police to be able to bid for inclusion in any change of working practices that require legislative changes (Kent)
 - Light touch' monitoring arrangements from Government Offices e.g. DIP and Pooled Treatment Budgets (Barnsley)
 - Crime reduction target thought to be unrealistic due to the impact of changes in National Crime Recording Standards, therefore it is intended to develop a series of local performance measures such as local surveys, including the Citizens Panel survey, use of data from other sources, for example, Accident & Emergency, the Ambulance & Fire & Rescue Service, to measure & validate what is believed to be the true local picture of performance (Brighton)
 - Extend the Positive Activities for Young People programme to term time, outside of school hours, in crime hot spots (Coventry)
 - Make some changes to the mandatory indicators specified for the Safer & Stronger Communities block where we feel this will improve

our ability to measure progress. These involve proposed replacements for the mandatory indicators *"to reduce people's perception of antisocial behaviour"*; *"to reduce the perception of local drug use or drug dealing"*; *the % of people surveyed who are (i) involved in decision-making and (ii) feel they can influence decisions in their area"*; and *"the % of people who have worked in a voluntary capacity over the past 12 months"*. These are still under discussion and baseline data will need to be compiled for these measures if accepted (Coventry)

- Freedom to concentrate on hot spot areas of crime and disorder ensuring account is also taken of the needs existing within low crime areas. This to also involve development of expertise in specific areas of community safety by individual CDRPs acting as pilots or in a co-ordinating role on behalf of all CDRPs (Devon)
- Requirement to identify specific number of offenders per CDRP is removed (Devon)
- Remove responsibility for quota requirement from each CDRP overseeing a PPS scheme (Devon)
- Exclude offences that take place in prisons from crime statistics (Dorset)
- We would like to use P2W and other JCP initiatives to target the hardest to help of our unemployed residents, whilst removing barriers to accessing ETE activity such as ongoing premium entitlement. We request the ability to negotiate with JCP locally without detriment to JCP targets (Wigan)

Refused

- **Finance**
 - Removal of the capital/revenue split within Safer Communities funding stream (Devon, Derby)
 - Use of Victims Fund to assist survivors of Domestic Violence recover from their victimisation (Devon)
 - The transfer of financial accountable body status to BMBC rather than South Yorkshire Police, with one financial accountable body (Barnsley)
 - No capital/revenue split for the resources allocated, especially in relation to the Building Safer Communities Fund monies (Barnsley)
 - Support from GOYH in negotiations with Treasury to increase without penalties to the Council, the amount of capitalised revenue costs. (Bradford)
 - *Housing Benefit subsidy*: Freedom & flexibility is sought to claim highest level of subsidy for people in private sector leased accommodation without being penalised for high acceptance levels. Currently we have to accept a statutory duty to maximise HB subsidy in leased accommodation but we want to keep our acceptance levels as low as possible and seek to prevent homelessness. (Brighton)
 - *All notices of potential funding bidding rounds routed through DCP*. All funded activity needs to contribute to the achievement of the

Community Strategy. The practice of inviting individual competitive bids from partners is not effective in maximising the impact of funds in Derby (Derby)

- Continuity of funding beyond 2005/6, i.e. for anti-social behaviour and domestic violence. (Dorset)
 - Lighten the financial sanctions imposed for not achieving the recruitment targets for Police Officers and extend the crime fighting fund to other members of the police family (Kent)
 - In order to optimise the reduction in bureaucracy, we are proposing that the whole of the Safer, Stronger and Sustainable Communities block funding should be subject to a single annual grant claim and audit process, which will enable us to redirect effort from claiming grants and servicing many separate audit processes into achieving the proposed outcomes. We would seek this grant up-front (Suffolk)
 - Relaxation of the capital and revenue split, which will allow full discretion at a local level of the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund. The relaxation of the capital revenue split will also allow funds to be more effectively directed towards the ever changing requirements faced by CDRPs, recognising that criteria changes from one activity to another (Suffolk)
- **Non-finance**
 - Programme outputs and outcomes are reported on a six monthly basis (Derby)

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Agreed

- **Finance**
 - Align budgets from 2005/06 in relation to relevant Local Authority and LSC funding streams e.g. 14-16 flexibility money, as well as to more fully take into account post-16 provision (Brighton)
 - Align budgets from 2006/07 subject to negotiation with local partners in relation to relevant Local Authority and higher Education funding streams (Brighton)
 - Move capital funding between NDS Modernisation, New Pupil Places, and Schools Access Initiatives Funding to include both approved and new schemes (Brighton)
 - Optimise unspent capital from the Sure Start local programmes to the Council to spend on children and young people's priorities (Brighton)
 - Sure Start: the ability to not to have target funding on specific areas or age ranges whilst maintaining delivery of previously agreed specified outcomes for Sure start (Knowsley)
 - Remove the requirement to allocate funding based upon particular geographic or age restrictions (Knowsley)
 - Freedom to extend the Children's Centre capital completion deadline for specific children's centres up to a maximum of 3% for retention fees (Brighton)
 - Children's Fund: the ability to not to have target funding on specific areas or age ranges (Knowsley)
 - Connexions to be paid monthly (Wigan)
 - Merge the transforming Youth Work Development Fund with the Special Education Needs and Disability Act Funding as a step towards an integrated youth services programme (Brighton)

- **Non-finance**
 - Children in Need – national Sure Start has a very loose definition of reach. A definition of reach in SSLP/Children's Centre areas that encourages programmes to give most support to the children and families most in need is proposed (Brighton)
 - Reduce the reporting requirements on Children's Fund from quarterly to half yearly (Knowsley)
 - Use the performance management of the LAA to monitor progress on grant fund implementation and performance (Wigan)
 - Flexibility regarding Sure Start Children's Centres monitoring arrangements (Barnsley)
 - Extension of Sure Start programme boundaries so that services could potentially be offered to a wider group of children and families (Doncaster)
 - Freedom for local Sure Start programmes to pilot the delivery of Sure Start services through developing Children's Centres in other parts of the city (Wolverhampton)
 - Flexible models of delivery of children's centres to reflect the rural context of Dorset

- Healthy Schools – freedom and flexibility for 2005/06 within current Sport England Guidance so that Sports Programme activities included in Healthy Schools targets (Brighton)
- Teenage Pregnancy – freedom and flexibility in 2005/06 to initiate a holistic approach, in anticipation of ring-fence being removed in 2006, to deliver a broad sexual health strategy which includes teenage pregnancy (Brighton)
- Access to sporting and leisure activities – freedom and flexibility from 2005/06 to unify/simplify reporting processes (Brighton)

Requiring further negotiation

- **Finance**

- Private Sector Grants – flexibility to align budgets in 2005/06 and to create a single local funding stream to undertake works on adaptations, private sector repairs, heating and safety improvements (to include disabled children) (Brighton)
- Use the first year of the LAA to negotiate mainstream and grant funding to be aligned and ultimately pooled by year 3 to meet our LAA outcomes (Wigan)
- Challenge the way current benefits hinder volunteering within the community (Barnsley)
- Challenge the current funding for youth provision to cover younger age groups (Barnsley)
- Freedoms and flexibilities in relation to alignment or potential to pool Connexions funding streams from 2005/6 through the local Children's Trust Pilot initiative (Brighton)
- Removal of Supporting People restriction on not funding outreach and children's support services (Devon)
- Anticipated that the creation of the Children's services department will result in the alignment of funding that mirrors the integration of Children's services within the LAA – would also like to see the health element aligned with the Children's Services outcomes (Wigan)
- Awareness raised of the need to understand and deploy Spearhead and any White Paper funding for the Children and Young peoples healthy lifestyle element of the LAA (Wigan)
- Anomaly of current flexibilities between schools and the LEA in the use of the Standards Fund (Barnsley)
- Devolve the Schools' Standards Fund and Standards Grant to School Clusters (Kent)
- Education Maintenance Allowance - remove means testing during the period in which a client is participating on an approved work based training placement for which they might receive a further allowance (Doncaster)
- **Supporting People -flexibility is required to align budgets in 2005/6 and:**
 - Remove penalties for single homeless acceptance levels in order not to negate opportunities for other support services through SP grant.

- Link funds provided for those under LA care to contribute to support under 16's (on the understanding that funding is not diverted from Supporting People Priorities).
- Create less onerous monitoring requirements with greater emphasis on outcomes
- Extend the range of support services that SP can fund (on the understanding that funding is not diverted from Supporting People Priorities) (Brighton)
- More flexible approach to financial management with carry-forward of National Grants such as IRT permitted to enable spend profiles that take account of project lead in times in 3-tier areas (Dorset)
- Increased freedom for individual schools to take part, of their own free will, and using their own budget, in projects and service improvements carried out under aegis of the LAA, for the purposes and educational benefit of the school, either as a funding partner in commissioning services or as a purchaser of commissioned services (Dorset)
- **Disabled Facilities Grant -flexibility required to align budgets in 2005/6 and:**
 - Expedite processes to provide immediate access to grants and focus spending on meeting needs of vulnerable individuals and their families rather than grant eligibility; by
 - Introducing one local and streamlined means testing process which is subject only to local audit requirements
 - Housing Corporation Guidelines – flexibility on the definition of key workers to better match local workforce needs in line with the Draft Regional Housing Strategy from 2005/6 (Brighton)
- **Support to vulnerable adults with children, and vulnerable young people – freedoms and flexibilities to align or pool funding from 2006/7 and through local negotiation with partners in respect of:**
 - DAAT funding for vulnerable adults – see Safer, Stronger Communities Outcome 1
 - DAAT funding for children and young people
 - Working Age Mental Health Services Grant
 - Carers grant
 - Youth Inclusion Programme
 - Eb4u Restorative Justice and Victim Support (Brighton)
- **Non-finance**
 - Challenge the monitoring and accountability arrangements associated with projects in receipt of funding from various funding bodies (Barnsley)
 - Clarification of the impact that LAA targets and priorities will have within the context of Joint Area Review arrangements (Derbyshire)
 - Freedom to operate the range of services which make up a Children's Centre from more than one physical location where that makes sense

- in a particular geographical context and will improve services to local people (Coventry)
- The current PAF indicator for stability of placements does not usefully reflect the outcomes for children returning to their family or being successfully adopted. We wish to pilot new indicators in the field of Children's Services e.g. in relation to the outcomes for Looked After Children which would give local managers and national Departments better information about outcomes (Coventry)
 - Central Government place a "duty" on schools to work in partnership with other agencies for the provision of integrated local services for Children and Young People and that this be included in their inspection framework (Doncaster)
 - A rationalisation of the data collected by central Government for Sure Start and the Children's Fund (Doncaster)
 - Where an early education and/or child care provider on a school premises is threatened with closure because of poor quality provision, and where there is agreement by the school, the Early Years and Child Care Unit, the Pre-School Learning Alliance and the provider itself, then we seek a permissive freedom that the governors of that school, under their community powers, could take over the provision without the requirement formal closure and re-opening (Kent)
 - Early education and childcare provision - Freedom from having to proactively develop new places in selected localities where there is evidence of a significant or permanent negative impact on existing providers in the locality (Kent)
 - Develop Children's Centres in such a way that local needs are reflected and sustainability enhanced (Kent)
 - DFES shall assist and support creation of Cluster League tables as proposed by the Innovation Forum (Kent)
 - Removal of current requirement that a pupil always must have a Statement of SEN to be taken on the roll of a special school and/or specialist provision. The Education Authority shall have flexibility to meet the needs of pupils who may be at Statutory Action under the SEN Code of Practice without first requiring a formal SEN Statement in every case (Kent)
 - Removal of requirement of School Nurses and Health Visitors to comply with information requirements of Korner Health Service Information System (Barnsley)
 - Homeless Families and Young People – flexibility is required to align budgets in 2005/6 and in relation to penalties for high acceptance levels, and to address Housing Benefit and LA subsidy for families and young people accepted as homeless e.g.
 - To maximise benefit without accepting statutory duty thus enabling families to remain in accommodation
 - To maximise benefits for under 25's, creates opportunities to prevent homelessness & avoid use of temporary accommodation (Brighton)
 - Freedoms and flexibilities re: accommodation and care packages to support young asylum seekers transition to adult services (Brighton)

- Improve the integration and effectiveness of vocational and work related learning provision and funding streams to meet the agreed priorities in the agreed 14-19 post-inspection implementation plan (Brighton)
- During the first year to rationalise and develop a more appropriate Performance Management System that reflects local priorities, demonstrates the effectiveness of local interventions, produces consistency in indicators through the removal of the various layers associated with the various performance systems (Barnsley)
- Experiential learning to count toward accreditation (Barnsley)
- Dorset to be invited / involved in all opportunities (training, conferences) available to those authorities in 'first wave' of Common Assessment Framework programme (Dorset)

Refused

- **Finance**
 - Abolition or reduction of business rates for 'incubator units' on educational sites (Kent)
 - Greater flexibility for Suffolk Youth Service to work with 8-13 year olds. This flexibility would allow funding to be directed at primary school children supporting their transition from to secondary school, at time at which attendance and performance can reduce for particular pupils. (Suffolk)
- **Non-finance**
 - Freedom from Community Safety CPA assessment for life of LAA (Wigan)
 - With over 65% of our target PDU population in treatment in any year and over two thirds of all presentation being repeats, it is essential that we develop the same social treatment focussed model for our drug using offenders. Our access mechanisms for finding and encouraging drug-using offenders into treatment are well established. We would like new resources around DIP to be included in the LAA to ensure that there is cohesion between all elements of the drug service system (Wigan)

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE

Agreed

- **Finance**
 - Increased flexibility in use of funds within the health and social care systems in the NHS towards preventative care for older people (agreed in principle) (Dorset)
 - Jointly brand the intended local integrated financial assessments and benefits visiting service with the Pension Service (but need protocols to take into account the Data Protection Act) (Doncaster)
 - Flexibility in arrangements to reimburse fares/costs to older people to enable travel for treatment in community as well as hospital settings (Barnsley)
 - To work toward the creation of a 'pot' of money to undertake works adaptations, private sector repairs, heating improvements etc. to prevent hospital admissions (Brighton)

- **Non-finance**
 - Practice based commissioning to be utilised across the health and social care community (Barnsley)
 - Respond to individual care needs by extending the not charge period for care services by two weeks (Doncaster)
 - Allow local priorities to determine allocation of resources to enhance provision of morbidity prevention activity (subject to PCT and SHA meeting national priorities) (Brighton)

Requiring further negotiation

- **Finance**
 - Freedom for people to purchase services from the council using Direct Payments (Kent)
 - Use the first year of the LAA to negotiate which mainstream and grant funding will be aligned and ultimately pooled by year 3 to meet our LAA outcomes (Wigan)
 - Freedom to use the Local \enhanced Service scheme to pay workers other than GPs to deliver services in primary care, e.g. health visitors or lay workers to deliver smoking cessation (Barnsley) Link PFI, NHS LIFT and other capital funding streams across DfES and DCMS and to seek flexibility in government departments' timescales to bring potential government funding together (Coventry)
 - The creation of the Adult Services department will result in the alignment of funding – also want to see the health element aligned (Wigan)
 - Allow for fines for community hospital delayed discharge funds to be applied to work with health colleagues on prevention and to reduce the bureaucratic nature of existing relationships with hospital trusts (Dorset)

- Freedom to carry forward PCT underspends to put to best use in order to fulfil the health block outcomes (Dorset)
 - Easier access to rent/rates relief for new start businesses operating as social enterprises (incapacity benefit claimants) (Barnsley)
 - Reward the LSP for reducing the number of people receiving Incapacity Benefits (IB) beyond core business expectations, to the equivalent of the IB savings made that year, for further reinvestment in LAA's partners IB reduction activities (Barnsley)
 - Relaxation of IB eligibility criteria so people can go straight onto employment schemes from day one (Barnsley)
 - Ability to provide additional support to people with for example transport to work costs that do not have an adverse effect on their incapacity benefits (Barnsley)
 - Incapacity benefit claimants to be able to return to benefits within 52 weeks of signing off without having needed to have been on benefits for 28 weeks previously (Barnsley)
 - Relaxation of the current restrictions on weekly earnings for incapacity benefit claimants to bring flexibility on earnings in line with the current flexibility on hours e.g. where a regular work pattern exists over a number of weeks, the hours can be averaged. Consider extension of housing benefit for a longer period (Barnsley)
 - Flexibility to carry over Community Empowerment Fund from one quarter to the next – the removal of quarterly budgeting and clawback. Also seek to remove the need to seek agreement to realign funding in the delivery plan (Wigan)
 - Use Supporting People grant to provide support to carers of older people, people with learning disabilities and people with physical disabilities to enable (Brighton)
- **Non-finance**
 - The Kent Public Service Board shall be given the ability by DWP to pilot mandatory work-focused interviews for those people on long-term incapacity benefits (Kent)
 - Streamline and simplify the inspection programme, monitoring activity and reporting arrangements associated with numerous funding streams (Barnsley)
 - Request approval and support from central Government for the Pensions Service to enter into discussion with the local authority and other relevant partners regarding the sharing of client data with a view to removing any policy or protocol barriers that currently exist (Doncaster)
 - Supporting People - We seek freedom to provide ODPM with the information it desires in a form that is consistent with Kent's local data requirements. This will be resolved on a case-by-case basis (Kent)
 - Flexibility in monitoring requirements for Supporting People – monitoring to be less onerous and outcome driven (Brighton)
 - Freedom to translate National Health Service targets into appropriate local ones and still be fully accountable (Barnsley)
 - Smoking cessation – re-orientate the focus around smoking to enable greater efforts to go into tobacco control. The flexibility sought here is

to reduce the bureaucracy around data collection which will enable all genuine 'quitters' to be counted and increase motivation among primary care staff. This will be in the context of more effective interventions that will reduce the exposure to second hand smoke and therefore the overall prevalence of smoking in Barnsley (Barnsley)

- Ability to define '*helped*' more broadly than the current Department of Health PAF indicator (C32) (helped to live at home). This would enable more informal, early preventative work to be included, in addition to defined social care interventions involving wider project partners (Devon)
- Exclude movement within care settings in the measurement of admissions to institutional care (i.e. currently if a person moves from residential care to nursing care or vice versa, this is counted as an admission, although both are institutional care) (Devon)
- Permitting the sharing of information between agencies involved in providing personal care (often restricted by local interpretation of data confidentiality) (Devon)
- Freedom to use NHS number as unique identifier in health and social care information systems for those older people receiving either health or social care support packages (Devon)
- The support of central Government departments to develop a competency / skills based approach for some posts in direct response to integrated ways of working between health and social care (Doncaster)
- A commitment for central Government to enter discussion with relevant senior personnel within the Commission for Care Standards Inspection regarding flexibilities concerning the National Care Standards (Doncaster)
- Approval, and instruction where necessary from central Government to the CSCI and the Healthcare Commission to share information concerning specific care issues in a much fuller way (Doncaster)
- Participation in physical activity will be measured nationally by a three-yearly survey. Freedom existing citizens panel to undertake a local survey in Dorset in an annual basis to provide measurements within the lifetime of the LAA required to use (Dorset)
- Freedom to include voluntary sector and health sector services in definition of intensive home care used as basis to measure PAF C28 indicator Households receiving intensive home care per 1,000 population aged 65 or over (Dorset)
- Request that the 'physical activity' component (adults/older adults) of the LAA proposal is given the flexibility to set target numbers as the headline target. In order to set subsidiary adherence targets at a later point, we will require the permission from the Department of Health for access to the data collected through the Wigan LEAP programme prior to the final evaluation date (March 2006) (Wigan)
- Access to more local data on economically inactive people to help us better understand local need (Wigan)

Refused

• **Finance**

- Ability to negotiate Health Service capital, revenue splits and 3 year planning and funding (Barnsley)
- Direct Payments: We request the flexibility of giving Direct Payment users the option of purchasing council services. Currently this choice is not available to them under Government (Department of Health) policy. We would like to facilitate local people having as much control and flexibility. Individuals are currently able to access a mixed package of direct payments. To purchase council services would have no benefit for the user and would add to transaction costs. (Doncaster)
- For Kent LAs to retain council tax raised from long term empty homes to be re-invested in the regeneration of local communities (Kent)
- Restriction on Housing Benefit payments to landlords of unfit properties or landlords that are not part of a registration scheme (Kent)
- To give an older person a tax incentive to move home, into smaller and more suitable accommodation, where they wish to (Kent)

• **Non-finance**

- Statement of Special Needs: We request amendment to the statutory requirements relating to SEN Statutory Assessments and Statements of Needs. We will need to discuss this further with Doncaster to precisely identify the flexibilities that is sought. It will not be possible to amend the statutory requirement for Doncaster (Doncaster)
- Ability to define 'helped' more broadly than the current Department of Health PAF indicator (C32). This would enable more informal, early preventative work to be included, in addition to defined social care interventions involving wider project partners. We want to use the LAA proposal as our justification for additional funding. (Wigan)

GENERAL / CROSSCUTTING

Agreed

- **Finance**
 - Ability to carry forward any underspent grants at end of financial year (Devon)
 - Use of any efficiency savings from streamlined management of grant programmes to reinvest locally (Devon)
 - Freedom to vire or combine mainstream funding between organisations to meet shared LAA outcomes (Devon)
 - When the LAA achieves cross-sector savings between LAA partners, these savings shall be retained within the LAA and reinvested accordingly (Kent)
 - To develop an explorer partnership with DWP to develop and trial radical ideas on reducing benefit expenditure in Kent, building on SIP work
 - DTI funds – local responsibility for managing and monitoring in line with DCP systems and practices as approved and agreed by emda in the annual action and delivery plans, in particular in relation to emda and sub-regional strategic partnership – DDEP – funding. This has been agreed in principle subject to further detail being finalised (Derby)

- **Non-finance**
 - Support of a capacity-building project including secondment of an Audit Commission or other inspectorate performance expert to develop with Dorset a partnership performance management framework and feed into future inspection practices (Dorset)
 - Reduce common thresholds across Dorset for developer contributions towards affordable housing (Dorset)
 - To increase the flexibilities of use of transport budgets (reduced ring-fencing) and explore the benefits of putting some LTP funds through the LAA (Dorset)

Requiring further negotiation

- **Finance**
 - Where the actions and investment of a LAA partner delivers a saving to a non LAA partner, incentives shall be devised such that a portion of the saving can be retained by the LAA partner which made the original investment (will be discussed on a case by case basis) (Kent)
 - Freedom to strike a local balance between capital and expense budget allocations, and assurance of timely operational funding (Kent)
 - Access to deprivation related funding, using the Super Output Area option (Kent)
 - To explore on the basis of detailed research (building on and extending the current joint Treasury - DWP - KCC research project

- conducted by Oxford University (*Evaluation of the Kent Supporting Independence Programme*), how the incentive for reducing benefit claims can be reduced (Kent)
- Freedom to submit a strategic, city-wide bid for Big Lottery resources from 2006 to 2009 that will deliver the themes and outcomes of the Big Lottery and support the priorities within the LAA. This request will be subject to detailed discussions with the Big Lottery Fund following publication of their funding programme framework and the decisions of their Board (Coventry)
 - Devolved management and coordination of key funding at a Kent-wide level to focus resources on priority outcomes and to avoid duplication and greater role for the LPSB in the determination of Lottery and other funding distribution through a unique sub-regional pilot in Kent (Kent)
 - European Funds: Local responsibility for and freedom from UK imposed rules for both European programmes, in particular responsibility for the URBAN II Programme Monitoring Committee (Derby)
 - Increasing the flexible use of transport budgets by reducing ring-fencing and receiving RDA rural transport budget for Dorset as a direct allocation (Dorset)
- **Non-finance**
 - To form a strategic partnership with DWP, overseen at Minister - Leader level. We wish to trial radical ideas (going beyond pilot status) on reducing benefit expenditure in Kent, building on our Supporting Independence Programme and using the savings made in Kent benefit expenditure to reinvest in Kent services (Kent)
 - Access to Lottery funding, reduced and/or simplified reporting and monitoring arrangements for the VCS where multiple funding streams, each with different requirements create unnecessary additional work(eg Lottery, ESF funds, Learning and Skills Council etc) (Devon)
 - Performance management of NRF integrated into the LAA processes and timescales, so that the LSP performance management framework evaluates the effectiveness of the partnership in the context of the LAA and does not include an evaluation of action plans and outcomes separate from that for the LAA (Derby)
 - Neighbourhood renewal funding – local responsibility for planning, reporting and monitoring and removal of the LSP Performance Management Framework reporting framework in recognition of incorporation within the LAA. If it is not possible to remove this, then it should be simplified and not extended to include LAA outcomes not supported by NRF funding (Derby)
 - **Intervention in struggling service providers:**
 - LAA partners should be given the responsibility to recommend the most appropriate and acceptable way to deploy the expertise of any excellent public service provider to assist the recovery of an under performing LAA partner

- Assistance of any under performing local authority partner to improve services by arranging support from a high-performing council from within the LAA or support from another Excellent council from elsewhere in the country through the brokerage of the Inter-Authority Partnership Unit
- This will require the LAA partners to have access to the funding that Government Departments and Agencies would have spent on alternative intervention and improvement strategies (Kent)
- To be exempted from the licensing scheme for houses in multiple occupation and allowed to demonstrate the other ways in which we can achieve the government's objective (Coventry)
- Seeking new ways of tackling affordable housing for Dorset's key workers to enable care workers or other jobs that are key to delivering services in Dorset better access (Dorset)
- Increasing the definitions of a 'rural' settlement to a population of 11,000 residents to enable greater flexibility in affordable housing opportunities (Dorset)
- Ability to apply exception site policies to market and coastal towns (settlements of fewer than 11,000) (Dorset)
- To explore new flexibilities to enable shared user transport between social care, education health and other public sector, charitable and business organisations (Dorset)
- Obtain flexibility in planning regime, particularly through amendments to PPG and imaginative use of LDFs (Devon)
- Establish a pilot project to examine how it can integrate the planning frameworks for individual partners, into a signal conversation on public service priorities for an area (Doncaster)
- A pilot is established to examine the nature and structure of a single area based performance management and inspection framework (Doncaster)
- Freedom to negotiate exemptions or variations from national targets when it is evidenced that they do not reflect local needs or priorities. In particular, when new targets emerge which threaten to disrupt the delivery plans of the LAA, or to reduce its necessary focus, it would be helpful to be able to negotiate opt-out for a defined period (would be considered on a case by case basis) (Kent)
- Freedom from tight inspection processes in favour of a lighter touch (Kent)
- Use of the LAA process in place of the Community Empowerment Network [statutory] delivery plan (to be adopted during the pilot year when robust alternatives in place) (Knowsley)

Refused

- **Finance**
 - Guaranteed three year funding to promote long-term investment (Devon)
 - Changes to the SCE(R) calculation in FSS so that we receive full funding for SCE(R) and a change over to more 100% specific grant

funding for capital schemes. The Council is concerned that under the present system delivery of the LTP may not be affordable.

(Government cannot agree this as an LAA freedom but GOSE will work with ODPM and Treasury to examine Brighton's concerns in more depth.) (Brighton)

- That provision of transport for home to school journeys, and access to out of school activities, is improved by freedom and flexibility in 2005/6 for the local authority, in consultation with Head Teachers, to allow local priorities to determine the split between capital and revenue funding (Government can not agree) (Brighton)
- Conversion of Capital to revenue: We request the flexibility to enable the conversion of capital to revenue grants. This request has been denied in line with national policy on this matter (Doncaster)
- Pending the outcome of the Lyons review and relevant changes in national taxation policy, we seek the freedom to receive a proportion of the additional tax yield, gained from increased rateable values and land values, that arises from investing using public funds and rights. We would want to develop this first for a 'Coastal Towns Pilot Scheme', focussed on the areas of Kent with the most depressed real estate values, greatest opportunity for growth, and great potential for regenerative development (Kent)
- Kent LAs wish to explore new approaches outside the constraints of the national PFI scheme, building on the Government's Credit Guarantee Finance Initiative. A new mechanism unique to Kent would give flexibility to make a local PFI arrangement, enabling Kent to gain maximum advantage from Kent's excellent (CPA rated) treasury management (Kent)
- Remove all restrictions within all of the funding streams such as remove all ring fencing, age limits, geographic specificity, and other targeting criteria (Kent)
- We must have freedom to vire funding between the three LAA blocks (Kent)
- Roll forward under-expenditure in any funding streams associated with the LAA (Kent)
- Allow pooling of funds in order to pursue shared LAA outcomes (Kent)
- Extend the VAT exempt status of local authorities, allowing VAT exempt status to be used more flexibly (Kent)

SUGGESTED MEMBERSHIP FOR LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT BLOCK GROUPS

Children and Young People (CYP)

Lead: Helen Longland, RMBC

Councillor: Shaun Wright, deputy Georgina Boyes

Kay Bacon – West Central Community Partnership

Martin Happ - Rotherham Partnership

Jackie Frost – Young Enterprise

Jed McNulty – Children’s Fund

Margaret Murphy – RPCT

Rod Norton – RMBC

Mrs Mahmoona Quayam – Al-Muneera

Helen Rhodes – Rotherham Crime Reduction Programme

Zafar Saleem - RMBC

Graham Sinclair – RMBC

George Trow – FE Colleges

Joanna Walker – RMBC

Sue Walker - RMBC

Julie Westwood – RMBC

Finance Officer Peter Hudson – RMBC

Healthier Communities & Older People (HCOP)

Lead: Dr John Radford – PCT

Councillor: Maurice Kirk, deputy Alan Gosling

Peter Blanksby – Wales Parish Council

Emma Bridge - RMBC

Simon Bunker – RMBC

David Hamilton – RMBC

Steve Hawkins – PCT

Mrs Khalida Luqman – Tassibee Group

Margaret Pyckett – VCS

Pauline Riley – PCT

Phil Rogers – RMBC

Andrew Towleron - RMBC

Finance Officer – Mark Scarratt RMBC

Economic Development & Enterprise (EDE)

Lead: Richard Poundford – RMBC

Councillor: Gerald Smith, deputy Richard Russell

Peter Butters – Phoenix Enterprises

Deborah Fellowes – RMBC

Dave Gibson -

Steve Hawkins – PCT

Mahroof Hussain - REMA

John Lewis - Chamber of Commerce

Dave Gibson – LSC

Stephen Moralee – RMBC

Mrs Parveen Qureshi – United Multi-Cultural Centre

Julie Readman – Business Link South Yorkshire

Steve Ruffle – Waverley Community Connects Project

Trevor Stones – Job Centre Plus

Nigel Tipple - Renaissance SY

Joanna Walker - RMBC

Jeff Wharfe – Rotherham Partnership

Finance Officer – Jeanette Lane RMBC

Safer and Stronger Communities (SSC)

Lead: Paul Varley – South Yorkshire Police

Councillor: Sue Ellis, deputy tbc

Colin Blain – Together for Regeneration

Dominic Blaydon – Rotherham Partnership

Emma Bridge - RMBC

Ness Bryan – Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder

Anne Charlesworth – PCT

Philip Gill – RMBC

Tim Gollins – Supporting People

Tim Hawkins – Rotherham Partnership/RMBC

Debbie Heath – VAR

Tom Knight – RMBC

Steve Lismore – Groundwork Dearne Valley

Kate Plant – Rotherham Partnership

Dave Roddis – RMBC

Finance Officer - Andy Kidder RMBC

Rotherham Local Area Agreement First Stage Submission

RMBC and all Partners in the LSP are excited by the opportunity to develop a LAA, are committed to developing our joint work, and have established a structure and process to develop our LAA.

1. Priorities

The LAA will flow from our recently agreed new Community Strategy which has well developed SMART targets and was constructed with maximum partner and community involvement. Indeed, the LAA process so far has included a range of voluntary and community sector events as well as a partnership launch event, and we will continue to ensure involvement as we proceed. Block developments will ally closely with our new LSP Theme Groups so that the LAA captures the most important local and national priorities. Key areas we are considering for inclusion in our LAA are outlined below. In stage 2 we will focus these further to identify key actions and targets for each objective.

Economic Development and Enterprise Block

- To increase the range, number and mix of businesses by increasing the number of new start up and sustainable businesses
- To assist those who are economically inactive, specifically on incapacity benefits into work
- To improve economic vibrancy by stimulating an enterprise culture and supporting entrepreneurship by enhancing work through the educational, community and social sector and business
- To further grow economic activity by connecting local people and businesses to opportunities created by new investment especially in areas of deprivation
- Strengthen the culture, retail and leisure markets to provide sustainable and quality employment opportunities by creating appropriate intervention to support the start and growth of businesses primarily targeted around the town centre
- Improve business competitiveness by enhancing skills through workforce development.

Inward investment will not be included as a priority in the block because a partnership already exists within South Yorkshire to deliver the Inward Investment Strategy. Similarly transport is not included at this stage nor the rural economy as action is underway on this with good progress. Potential flexibilities to be requested are realignment of funds tied to geography/specific groups and procurement by PCT/RMBC to maximise benefit to local providers.

Safer and Stronger Communities Block

- To achieve local and national targets in reducing crime and anti-social behavior, particularly in areas of most deprivation, reducing the harm caused by illegal drugs and alcohol, reassuring the public and reducing the fear of crime
- To improve housing conditions within the most disadvantaged areas and achieve key milestones on decent Housing
- To improve the quality of the local environment, creating cleaner, greener, safer and better used public spaces (including the Town Centre), reducing the gap in aspects of livability between the worst neighborhoods and the district as a whole
- To increase community and service-user engagement and involvement, supporting the development of volunteering, thus enabling greater local influence in decision making and service delivery.

Priorities that are not included are waste and recycling, and arson reduction as these are making good progress and are pursued as part of the RMBC mainstream plan.

A potential freedom request is to be able to use drugs funding, if drugs targets are achieved, for work to address our alcohol programme. We are aware this is already being considered by Government.

Healthier Communities and Older People Block

- Reduce health inequalities and promote positive health by; a) accurately targeting services to communities and areas of greatest need, b) Reducing obesity and promoting healthy eating, particularly amongst young adults, c) Promoting regular physical activity amongst all age groups, d) Reducing harm by implementing the

smoke free strategy and encouraging sensible drinking in line with national policy, e) Promoting sexual health and preventing disease

- Improve access to health and social care by promoting choice, developing the workforce and joint teams, and ensuring service users' involvement in the development and improvement of services
- Reduce the number of economically inactive within Rotherham by;
a) Maximising income and tackling debt, b) Ensuring health and social care organisations are good employers, maximising the skills and experience of local community, c) Increasing access to occupational health for local employers
- Promote independent living by; a) Increasing access to rehabilitation programmes and assisted technology, b) Provision and adaptation of housing to meet individual needs, c) Supporting self-management of long term conditions and improve quality and access to support services for the most vulnerable, d) further improving our Supporting People programme.

Priorities that will not form part of the LAA include Coronary Heart Disease and dental health/fluoridation as these are already being adequately addressed following national policy.

Children and Young People Block

All partners in Children and Young People's Services in Rotherham are committed to meeting the needs of every young person, from 0 to 25 years, across the Every Child Matters outcomes; through the provision of high quality universal services and targeted services for those who experience barriers to opportunities in their lives through:

- Improving the life chances of all children and young people, by developing integrated services which deliver preventative approaches, safeguards and interventions
- Raising the levels of attainment for all children and young people in Rotherham with a particular focus on reducing the gap for groups such as Looked After Children, children from Black and Minority Ethnic Groups, children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, those at risk of exclusion
- Maximising enterprise and economic opportunities for all young people by providing access to high quality information, advice and guidance, enterprise initiatives, skills and training
- Raising the aspirations and achievement levels of all children and young people by increasing access to information, support and learning opportunities for families and communities.

Priorities that have not been included are the physical improvement of buildings such as schools as we are making good progress through the Schools PFI scheme. Freedoms and flexibilities would include the ease of and ability to combine budgets from the different partner agencies, including both capital and revenue.

Crosscutting objectives-

- To tackle and further reduce inequalities and continue to tackle our equalities and cohesion objectives
- To increase community involvement enable greater local influence in decision making and service delivery
- To increase satisfaction by local people with public services, and the Borough as a place to live.
- To improve the quality of life for people in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods and groups and ensure service providers are more responsive to needs and improve delivery.

We have further work to do to determine which freedoms and flexibilities we wish to negotiate. In addition once we have agreed our direction of travel with GOYH we will discuss possible areas of collaboration across South Yorkshire, but likely areas include community cohesion, transport and economic development.

2. Partnership

The Chief Executive Officers of partner bodies will oversee the LAA, reporting to their respective organisations and the LSP Board. A LAA working group is developing the LAA, and multi agency block groups are working on the detailed objectives and targets. Each agreed objective will have a senior officer lead. A specific remit of the working group will be to ensure that outcomes, issues and targets form a coherent programme. Block groups are multi agency and include RMBC Cabinet leads and BME and Vol/Com representatives.

3. Performance Management and Monitoring

The LSP has a well developed and effective performance management system in place. The framework is recognised as successful by GOYH and is being reviewed to ensure to provide comprehensive coverage of any new requirements that the LAA places upon partners. We welcome the underlying driver of the LAA to simplify funding streams and targets with consequent focus of performance reporting regimes. Reporting to the LSP board will be twice annually, with additional reports on specific issues as necessary. Reporting is based upon Red Amber Green principles according to judgement of performance and risk; is by exception i.e. key strategic indicators against which achievement is high or low and potentially failing

Rotherham partners in the LSP look forward to receiving feedback on this initial submission for our LAA

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

1. Meeting:	Cabinet Member, Community Cohesion, & Advisors Meeting
2. Date:	24 th October 2005
3. Title:	Study of Deprivation in Rotherham
4. Programme Area:	Chief Executive's Department

5. Summary

This report invites Cabinet Member, Community Cohesion, & Advisors Meeting to consider the main findings from a major study commissioned by Rotherham MBC to examine how local people are affected by deprivation and actions needed to address the problems. The findings will have significant implications for policy and service delivery.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member, Community Cohesion, & Advisors Meeting is asked to note the findings from the Study, as outlined in section 7 of this report, for information.

7. Proposals and Details

Background

Although significant progress has been made in Rotherham to measure deprivation levels, identify target areas and develop the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, some remaining challenges were identified. A Study of Deprivation was commissioned from the Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion to address these challenges, with the following aims:

- Provide independent validation of Rotherham's Local Index of Multiple Deprivation.
- Increase understanding of deprivation affecting Rotherham and recommend actions for specific areas, themes and groups.
- Recommend targeted programmes relevant to the areas, themes and communities identified.
- Recommend indicators and targets to measure progress towards meeting Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy targets.

Key outcomes

The development of the deprivation study has been led by officers in the Chief Executive's Office. The study commenced in June 2005, with an interim presentation and discussion with key officers on 19th July. A draft final report and an Atlas of Deprivation were produced in late August, and a final presentation was given on 13th September.

Main Findings

Local Index of Multiple Deprivation & Target Areas

- Local Index of Multiple Deprivation validated as effective & accurate.
- Neighbourhood Renewal Target Areas endorsed as identifying the most deprived areas.

Multiple deprivation

- Key factors are employment, education and health.
- Target areas are well placed to focus programmes on areas of high deprivation.
- There has been some progress on reducing deprivation, relative to statistical neighbours.
- No sign that the most deprived 20% are closing the gap with the rest of the Borough.

Employment

- Employment rates have increased significantly, closing the gap with national position overall.
- For some groups the employment rate gap is widening – unqualified people, older people, lone parents and BME women.
- Over 15,000 people are long term sick, which is driving high levels of worklessness. This is especially a problem in the most deprived areas which have rising numbers on Incapacity Benefit.

Education

- People in the most deprived areas have very poor education levels.
- Key Stage 2 shows the gap narrowing between Rotherham and England but floor targets may not be met.
- No evidence that the most deprived areas are closing the gap
- Good progress in reducing young people not in employment, education or training.
- Adult skill levels are low and BME residents aged 35-49 are poorly qualified compared to their White counterparts.

Health

- Life expectancy is improving but is 6 years lower in the most deprived areas compared to the least deprived.
- Cancer mortality shows an upward trend.
- Teenage conceptions are very high in deprived areas but have fallen in recent years. However, they seem unlikely to meet the NR target.
- Over 17,000 people are on Disability Living Allowance or 7% of the population, almost twice the national average. The numbers on disability benefits have been rising.

Housing, Crime & Liveability

- Relative to the national average, housing conditions are generally good.
- There is a high proportion of non-decent social housing and the 2010 target may not be met.
- Crime levels are not high relative to national & regional rates, and falling, although anti-social behaviour remains a concern.
- Crime is highest in the most deprived urban areas.
- Outdoor living environment is poor, probably due to pollution and poor air quality.
- There is good progress on most environmental indicators.

Programme Recommendations

- NRS focus on three core elements is appropriate to tackle deprivation:
 - Improving the life chances of young people
 - Enabling everyone to achieve functional life skills
 - Improving the position of economically disadvantaged people
- Suggested areas to focus programmes:
 - Pre-school and school age children
 - School to work transition for young people
 - Family environment, including parenting
 - Worklessness, notably long term sickness, including mental health

Performance Management

- General approach of the Partnership is supported.
- Development of small area indicators suggested to monitor progress.

8. Finance

There are no direct and significant financial implications with this report. The study itself was funded through a £15,000 grant from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The main risk is that the key findings of the study are not fully embedded into policy and service delivery processes and performance management arrangements. A series of steps have been taken to ensure this.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Addressing deprivation is a clear and consistent priority of the Council and its partners, and is at the heart of the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan. Deprivation is also pivotal to a wider network of plans, strategies and initiatives such as the emerging Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, Local Area Agreement, Community Plans and LA 21. It is envisaged that the study will play a key role in shaping and informing future policy and service delivery across the Borough and by all partners.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The study has been developed following detailed consultation, discussion and analysis with partners and Council Programme Areas.

CMT has considered a similar report on this subject and agreed to further dissemination of the study and its findings. A series of events are to be held to promote discussion and increase awareness of the study and its implications. A good example is a successful multi-agency workshop held in September which over 50 people attended. The Chief Executive's Office has received requests to present the findings at a number of internal meetings and forums.

Background Documents:

Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2004 - 2010

Study of Deprivation in Rotherham 2005 – Full Report and Atlas of Deprivation

Contact Names:

Lee Adams, Assistant Chief Executive, Chief Executives Office
lee.adams@rotherham.gov.uk, tel: 82(2788)

Miles Crompton, Research Co-ordinator, Chief Executives Office
miles.crompton@rotherham.gov.uk, tel: 82(2763)

Andrew Towleron, Policy and Research Manager, Chief Executives Office
andrew.towleron@rotherham.gov.uk, tel: 82(2785)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

1.	Meeting:	Community Cohesion Delegated Powers
2.	Date:	24 th October, 2005
3.	Title:	Rotherham MBC's Consultation Position Statement
4.	Programme Area:	Chief Executive's Office

5. Summary

This report asks CCDP to consider and agreed Rotherham MBC's draft Consultation Position Statement. This report and attached paper examines the Council's key areas of consultation activity, main consultation challenges facing the Council and makes recommendations for improvement. The Corporate Plan and Year Ahead Statement commits the Council to deliver significant improvements in Involvement and Consultation across the Council.

6. Recommendations

CCDP is asked to:

- 1. Considers and agree the Position Statement and the recommendations it puts forward.**
- 2. Agrees that it should be a key input into the emerging Consultation and Community Involvement Strategy and wider consultation policy and delivery.**
- 3. Agree to receive a further report outlining progress, and presenting a draft Consultation and Community Involvement Strategy.**

7. Proposals and Details

Attached is the Council's draft Consultation Position Statement. Its aim is to improve and strengthen Consultation by the Council both internally and externally, and is intended to be a key input into the Council's emerging Consultation and Community Involvement Position Statement and wider consultation policy and delivery. The Council's Corporate Plan 2005 – 2010 and Year Ahead Statement for 2005-06 commits to a strengthening of Consultation and Community Involvement.

The Position Statement provides an outline of the national and regional agenda on consultation and how the Council is responding locally. It highlights that consultation is an essential and integral aspect of the Council's activities, and that all Programme Areas undertake many varied types of consultation. It also puts forward a small number of recommendations that will strengthen co-ordination and continue to ensure that consultation is integral to service and policy delivery. These are:

- Strengthen mechanisms so that people who are participating & wider public can see the results of their contribution is having an influence on decisions, policy and service development and by strengthen structures and procedures to share the results of consultation across Programme Areas and with Members and partners
- Improve and make more transparent the planning and timing of consultation
- Strengthen the links between consultation and decision making, ensuring that consultation exercises relate to a decision that the Council is intending to make and that can be influenced by the results of that consultation, so as to inform policy and service delivery.
- Improve structures to ensure that those taking part in consultation are representative and inclusive of the Boroughs communities
- Enhance the evaluation and performance management of consultation, ensuring that consultation is being used appropriately, meeting its objectives and what service and policy developments are being achieved as a result
- Develop a joined up approach to consultation with partners across the Borough.

8. Finance

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. It is envisaged that one of the outcomes of the Position Statement will improve the coordination and integration of consultation enabling the Council to make more effective use of resources.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The main risk is that the key findings from the Position Statement are not integrated in to service planning and policy development.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Consultation is integral to the Borough's agreed Vision and Priority Themes, particularly Rotherham Proud and Fairness. It is also an essential component of all major strategies and initiatives. The Council already has in place a Consultation Strategy and has agreed corporate standards for its delivery.

There is a legal duty on the Council to consult on certain aspects of its work. For example, there remains a statutory requirement to consult the business community on budget planning. There is a statutory process of consultation on the Local Development Framework and on certain traffic management issues.

The Government has issued a series of guidance and papers that emphasise the need for councils to consult. CPA also examines how consultation is being conducted and how feedback will inform the service planning process and continuous review and improvement. This Key Line of Enquiry will be strengthened under CPA 2005.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

This Position Statement has been developed with the active support and involvement of all Programme Areas, primarily through the Council's Consultation Co-ordination Group.

This Report has recently been presented at CMT and Cabinet.

Appendix 1: Consultation Position Statement

Contact Names:

- Dawn Price, Corporate Consultation Office, Chief Executive's Office, extension 2783 dawn.price@rotherham.gov.uk
- Andrew Towlerton, Policy and Research Manager, Chief Executive's Office, extension 2785 andrew.towlerton@rotherham.gov.uk

Rotherham MBC Consultation Position Statement

1. Introduction

This Position Statement examines the Council's consultation structures and approaches, and makes recommendations on how these can be refined and enhanced. It is based on a thorough examination of national and local policies and trends; statistical and performance data; findings from surveys and inspections and 'best practice' from other local authorities and agencies notably the Audit Commission.

2. What do we mean by consultation?

There is no nationally agreed or commonly used definition of consultation.

Rotherham MBC, in its Consultation Strategy, defines consultation as a "two way process where views are actively sought and considered before decisions or plans are made". This is similar to the Audit Commission's definition of consultation which is "a process of dialogue that leads to a decision".

In general terms, consultation can be used to describe many forms of public or stakeholder involvement. The process should be a continuous exchange of views and information, and building on existing consultations where possible. The consultation process should ensure that service users, residents and businesses are consulted in the most effective and efficient manner so as to ensure that service improvements directly reflect (where possible) the consultation findings. It is closely intertwined with Community Involvement (for further information see Community Involvement Position Statement [www.](#))

Consultation has become an integral part of local and national government policy making process. There is a clear relationship between good consultation and effective delivery and high satisfaction with services. This is because analysis by key agencies such as the Audit Commission shows that effective consultation means that:

- Can result in better targeted services, improving satisfaction and reducing costs
- Better decisions about policies priorities and strategies
- Local people, partners and employees becoming involved in decision making
- Strengthened community leadership role
- Higher satisfaction levels with a council – there is relationship between between the extent resident feel they can influence local decision making and satisfaction rates

- Improved communication and awareness of services and priorities
- There are also knock-on benefits of consultation, such as improved turn out at elections – analysis shows a relationship between the extent resident feel they can influence local decision making and their likelihood to vote.
- More influence and community involvement has been shown to improve social cohesion and wellbeing in the population.

3. Policy Context

Improving the level of involvement of local people is a major part of the Government's agenda to delivering improved services and policies and greater user satisfaction, nationally and locally.

It has given local authorities a raft of enhanced powers and duties to help achieve this. These powers and duties can be divided into three main categories.

Legal requirements such as to consult the business community when setting the budget, or the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that has a requirement to consult on and submit a "statement of community involvement" as part of preparing a Local Development Framework. Involving service users is also a statutory requirement under equal opportunities legislation, for example the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000.

General requirements such as the Local Government Act 1999 that introduced best value reviews and requires consultation to secure continuous improvements in the way in which Local Authority functions are exercised, and the Local Government Act 2003 which enables local authorities to hold local polls to assess opinion on local services and expenditure.

Specific requirements relating to a particular activity or to involve a particular group, example include the Local Government Act 2000 that requires consultation on the preparation of a Community Strategy.

The Government has made it clear that it continues to see consultation as a top priority, and local authority's powers and duties continue to be strengthened. This is illustrated by the revised Guidance for Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) which continues to emphasise the need for clear and effective co-ordination and 'joined up' approach as a key line of enquiry, and through the councils functions.

"As part of CPA we want to see that councils engage effectively with their service users and wider communities. We also want to see that such engagement makes a difference in practice", and will be "strengthening corporate assessments by considering the quality and robustness of councils own customer surveys, citizens panels and other consultation methods".

4. Rotherham's approach

Consultation has become an integral part of the Council's policy making process.

Every year it undertakes hundreds of consultation exercises, both internally and externally aimed at service users, non service users, residents, partners and other stakeholders.

It is at the heart of Rotherham's new Community Strategy and the Council's Corporate Plan. A good example is the shared Priority Theme Rotherham Proud. This commits the Council and all local partners to "there will be many opportunities for people to be involved in civic life and local decision-making. The means to do this will be clear, well-know and accessible." Strengthening consultation and community involvement mechanisms is also a Year Ahead Commitment.

These are supported by more detailed policies and guidance such as the Good Practice Guide to Consultation which encompasses all elements of good practice, and the production of an Annual Review which enables focus to be placed on the outcomes from conducting consultation undertaken.

Analysis shows that all Programme Area's are engaged in consultation, and use a range of consultation techniques such as consultation documents, public meetings and focus groups.

This consultation can be grouped under three main headings:

- Statutory consultation – e.g. Local Development Framework and Crime and Disorder Strategy
- Consultation where the Authority has chosen to ask questions – e.g. through community planning, to inform funding programmes, the Employee Opinion Survey, Reachout - the Borough's Citizen's Panel and the Council's Staff Opinion Survey.
- Ongoing consultation as an integrated part of service delivery – e.g. assessment and care management in Social Services and Joint Commissioning.

The Council also uses a range of approaches to consult. Focus groups, postal surveys and citizen panels are just a few good examples. Some involve many thousands of people, others just a few, depending on the consultation. These are sometimes combined such as in relation to the development of the Council's new Corporate Plan which included questionnaires, public meetings and focus groups.

The Council has also improved the integration of its consultation activities. These include more established groups, strategic bodies such the Members Advisory Consultation Group and more operational ones such as the cross Programme Area Consultation Co-ordination Group. The production of an Annual Plan for consultation which details the main consultation exercises to take place during a financial year. The appointment of a Consultation Co-ordinator who has the responsibility for ensuring that consultation is co-ordinated, consistent and carried out to a high standard. The Council has also sought to integrate its Consultation and Community Involvement activities by the development of a single Consultation and Community Involvement Strategy.

The Council has developed special measures and approaches to ensure that consultation reaches all sectors of the community, for example a specific community planning event aimed at Disabled people; focus groups held with older persons and Black and Minority Ethnic groups as part of the development of the Community Strategy Vision, the recent Young People's Visioning Consultation and the Disabled and Women Worker Representative Groups.

The Council has also grasped the opportunities new technology presents to enable greater involvement with additional focus being developed in terms of E-Government Agenda and consultation methods and mechanisms, such as text messaging, on-line questionnaires and interactive consultations in terms of video booths. This includes using e-mail and intranet based questionnaires as part of Employee Opinion Survey and Reach-In, the Council's employee Panel.

The Council has also sought to strengthen its internal consultation mechanisms with its own staff such as the bi annual Employee Opinion Survey and Reach-In, the Council's staff panel.

Increasingly the Council is undertaking consultation in partnership. This is illustrated by Rotherham Reachout, the Borough's Citizens Panel developed and implemented jointly with Rotherham Primary Care Trust.

Rotherham MBC is committed to strengthening further its consultation mechanisms and structures. Improving Consultation and Communications is a Year Ahead Commitment (No. 7) which commits the Council this year to "refresh of the Council's approaches to consultation, including its Citizens Panel – Rotherham Reachout, and will encourage all services of the Council to adopt a more pro-active approach to involvement and consultation".

5. How well is Rotherham MBC doing

Analysis shows that Rotherham MBC has made great progress in improving its consultation and mechanisms and structures, and that this is delivering generally improved services and satisfaction with for satisfaction with parks and open spaces improving from 62% in 2000/01 to 70% in 2003/04. It also points to some areas where further strengthening and refinement is required.

The main evidence has come from external inspections and reviews.

In the 2002 Corporate Comprehensive Performance Assessment, the Audit Commission whilst generally supportive of the Council's approach to consultation highlighted that there was little evidence of consultation changing priorities, and the need to determine a role for area assemblies and ensure they provide appropriate community leadership.

Other more recent Audit Commission inspection reports have said:

- "There are encouraging examples of success in delivering improved well-being to residents...through involvement in planning and delivering activities expected to

regenerate their neighbourhoods - the cross-over between economic and social regeneration." (*Regeneration Inspection, 2004*)

- "The council recognises that there is a need to improve the range of groups it actively engages with. Community planning has been identified as one mechanism to improve consultation techniques. This should improve the ways that the council obtains a more representative view on services and develops strategies with the community." (*Indicative ALMO inspection, 2004*)
- "Tenants have been involved through various forums in reviewing services, policies, procedures, producing relevant information leaflets and in identifying service improvements. As a result, the services being delivered are much more customer focused." (*Indicative ALMO Inspection, 2004*)
- "Social services should ask service users and other agencies if services had improved and involve them in the development of services." (*Children's Services Follow-Up Inspection, 2004*)
- "The service has good consultation mechanisms and dialogue with local communities to respond to their needs". (*Waste Management Inspection, 2004*)
- A youth cabinet is in place - drawn from the local secondary schools which each send a representative and hold the majority of their meetings at the town hall. This helps the council engage and consult with young people, as members attend the youth cabinet but also gives the young people a voice." (*Supporting People Inspection, 2005*)
- "The council has supported a multi-agency group which has been effective in raising awareness of services and activities available to people with disabilities and providing networking opportunities for organisations and individuals.... Based on the success of this event, a further event is planned to promote better coordination of information provision and to promote social inclusion for local disabled people." (*Access to Services Inspection, 2005*)
- "There are good examples across service areas of initiatives to engage with Rotherham's diverse communities and to provide opportunities for them to participate in the life of the Borough". (*Access to Services Inspection, 2005*)

In addition, a recent Reachout survey when asked to what extent they thought the Council took notice of the views of members of the public 8% thought 'fully' with the majority (49%) thinking this was partially true. However, 32% thought that the Council only rarely or never took notice of the views of the public. The coordination across the authority should therefore reflect joined up consultations and also methods for ensuring feedback to those involved and to the wider community.

The Council can also point to some areas where its activities are amongst the best. Its Library Services gained Charter Mark Status for their involvement of BME communities in the shaping and delivery of their library services to meet their needs. The Streetpride Scheme also gained a major national award, the Local Government Chronicle Environment Award, for the work it does with the community to maintain

and improve the street scene to a high standard. Economic Development Services also achieved the prestigious ISO 9001 Quality Management System Award, which has at its heart consultation related processes, including specific elements relating to customer focus and involvement of people.

This overall position is also supported by wider evidence such as relatively high response rate to Rotherham Reachout, the Borough's Citizen's Panels, and generally improving user satisfaction with the Council and its services.

6. The Way Forward

The overall position is one of good progress in integrating and delivering consultation into the Council's policies and services, and that this is delivering improved services and user satisfaction. There is a strong and shared commitment across the Council to consultation.

These provide a sound basis to strengthen the Council's consultation mechanisms and structures. However, the development of this Position Statement has highlighted a small number of key strategic areas of potential improvement if the Council is to achieve the ambitious aims it has set itself as set out in key documents such as the Community Strategy and Council's Corporate Plan and the challenges presented by CPA 2005. There:

- A lack of consistency: the quality and quantity of consultation and feedback varies enormously, as does the recording of consultation activity in RMBC.
- Is a need to develop a more transparent and proactive approach to planning of consultation; this will ensure that it is used effectively to support and drive corporate developments, and avoid "consultation fatigue" with major consultation exercises running parallel or consecutively.
- Are gaps in reaching some sectors of the community; such as Gypsy and Traveller communities. Disabled People and Black and Minority Ethnic groups are currently under-represented on Rotherham Reachout, for example.
- Is scope to strengthen opportunities to share the outcomes of consultation across the Council, with partners and Members
- Is a need to ensure that findings are acted upon, and their application evidenced in strategies and plans
- The need to inform consultees and wider groups such as Council staff and Members as to the outcome of their comments; It is important that their contribution has a genuine influence and this is seen to be the case.
- Is scope for greater evaluation and performance management of consultation; putting mechanisms in place to measure consultation and its impact
- examples of inappropriate use of consultation findings such as the use of Reachout for performance indicator measurement

7. Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Council:

- Strengthen mechanisms so that people who are participating & wider public can see the results of their contribution is having an influence on decisions, policy and service development and by strengthen structures and procedures to share the results of consultation across Programme Areas and with Members and partners
- Improve and make more transparent the planning and timing of consultation
- Strengthen the links between consultation and decision making, ensuring that consultation exercises relate to a decision that the Council is intending to make and that can be influenced by the results of that consultation, so as to inform policy and service delivery.
- The consultation techniques used will be appropriate to the people to be consulted
- Improve structures to ensure that those taking part in consultation are representative and inclusive of the Boroughs communities
- Enhance the evaluation and performance management of consultation, ensuring that consultation is being used appropriately, meeting its objectives and what service and policy developments are being achieved as a result
- Develop a joined up approach to consultation with partners across the Borough

Appendix 1: Principles of successful consultation:

The Audit Commission in its report 'Connecting with Users and Citizens, Audit Commission' identified the following underlying principles of effective consultation and involvement:

- **Commitment and cooperation** from everyone taking part and at all levels from front line staff to senior management, and from the full range of agencies involved.
- **Support and structure** – supported by cross organisational structures – specific budget for consultation; approaches should be planned and co-ordinated across the whole organisation to make best use of expertise and resources; training – staff at all levels should receive information and support
- **Diversity and representation** – need to ensure participants in consultation are representational and inclusive.
- **Handing over control** – willingness to hand over control to the service users or communities involved. Lessons learnt are incorporated into new approaches and shared.
- **Real Results** – people participating in consultations is that they can see the results of their contributions having an influence on decisions, policy and service development; communication results and outcomes
- **Learning from experience** – able to grow and develop according to changing needs, and not remain static.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

1.	Meeting:	Community Cohesion Delegated Powers
2.	Date:	24 th October, 2005
3.	Title:	Rotherham Reachout: Results of the 12 th Survey
4.	Programme Area:	Chief Executive's Office

5. Summary

This report considers the findings from the 12th Rotherham Reachout survey, and outlines the key policy implications for the Council.

The 12th Reachout survey was conducted in May 2005. The questionnaire allowed for a detailed and wide-ranging survey, covering topics including: healthy eating, crime, the Rotherham Show, hospital appointments, fixed penalty fines and community cohesion and Reachout survey related questions.

Attached is the executive summary of the full report.

(A copy of the main report is available on the Council's Intranet and Internet and from Dawn Price, Corporate Consultation Officer, Chief Executive's Office).

6. Recommendations

Community Cohesion Delegated Powers Group are asked to:

- 1. Note the findings from the Twelfth survey of Rotherham Reachout and the policy and practical implications identified within this report.**
- 2. Consider its implications for service delivery and policy development.**
- 3. Agree to assess the findings in relation to Community Cohesion and to ensure and agree that an action plan is developed.**

7. Proposals and Details

The results provide interesting and useful information for the Council and its partners. The themes and key findings from the 12th Survey were:

Healthy Eating

Panel Members were asked to give their awareness of the 5 A-Day programme, in terms of their awareness and how frequently they ate 5 vegetables and fruit a day. The questions in Reachout 12 are a direct repeat of those asked in Reachout 9 (March 2004) to enable progress of this programme to be tracked.

- Awareness of the 5 A-Day programme has risen from 72% in Reachout 9 to 78% in Reachout 12.
- Sources of awareness of the programme are largely unchanged (primarily television, newspaper and doctors surgery), although awareness generated by supermarket and poster campaigns has grown since 2005.
- Just under of Panel Members are most likely to eat 3-4 portions per day (48%), with a third eating *five* portions or more.. This is a 4 percentage points increase on the 29% who were eating 5+ per day in the results form Reachout 9.
- More than half of those who have seen publicity for the 5 A DAY campaign say that they have increased the amount of fruit and vegetables they eat in a day as a result of their increased awareness.

Crime

The Panel Members were asked to state overall, how concerned they are about being a victim of crime in Rotherham (fear of crime);

- Panel members who are 'very / fairly concerned' regarding the fear of being a victim of crime has *increased* to 77% of respondents from 69% in Reachout 9
- Concern is highest with regards burglary, and then anti social behaviour and theft of / from a vehicle.
- Men are most concerned about vehicle related theft, with Women more likely to cite concern with being a victim of personal attack.
- The three types of crime that Panel Members are most concerned about being a victim of remain the three they are most likely to have personal of

familial experience of, namely anti social behaviour, burglary, and theft of / from a vehicle.

Rotherham Show

Panel Members were asked to give their opinions on their experience of attending the Rotherham Show in terms of favourite attractions and attractions they would like to see included.

- Results show that in the region of two-thirds of Panel Members have been to the Rotherham Show.
- More than three-quarters of those who have attended say it was good, or very good,
- Respondents enjoyed the trade stands (72%), horticultural show (62%) and vintage vehicle rally (53%) the most.
- When asked what they would like to see more of at the Rotherham Show (regardless of whether they have ever been) one of the most popular aspects is 'music' and the vintage rally.

Hospital Outpatient Appointments

The questions asked of Panel Members focused on the Choose and Book Programme being developed by the PCT. Panel Members were informed that the programme will allow GP Surgeries to book hospital appointments on behalf of patients at the time of their doctor's appointment. Panel Members were asked their opinions on this service.

- Nine out of ten Panel Members responding to these questions say that they would like the choice of where to have their hospital appointment.
- 78% would be most influenced by distance from home 77% said by the quality of care and 75% by waiting times.
- 71% of responding Panel Members would prefer to initially make the appointment via their doctor with 47% through the practice Staff.
- 33% said they would prefer to make any changes to their appointment directly with the hospital, with 33% with their GP.
- 94% of Panel Members say that they have never needed to cancel an appointment and neglected to let anyone know.

Fixed Penalty Fines

We were keen to hear their views on the use of fixed penalty notices as alternatives to prosecution for dog fouling, littering, fly tipping, fly posting and graffiti offences.

- Two-thirds of Panel respondents felt that payment of a fixed penalty notice should be offered as an alternative to prosecution.
- However, opinions ranged about which of the offences fixed penalty notices should be offered as an alternative to prosecution – ranging from 63% for fly tipping, to 88% for littering.
- Four out of ten Panel Members felt that people caught committing offences should *not* be given the opportunity to pay fixed penalty notices in instalments.
- 37% of Panel Members who *do* think instalment payments are appropriate feel that 4 weeks is an appropriate timeframe ..
- Two-thirds of respondents agree that Young People (aged 11-16) should be given fixed penalty notices.
- 83% (4 out of five Panel Members responding) approve of a ‘zero tolerance’ approach to those who commit environmental offences.

Community Cohesion

The Home Office has developed a series of questions to be asked of residents, one of which was replicated in Reachout 12. Respondents were provided with a list of four locations (their neighbourhood, Rotherham, Yorkshire and Great Britain) and asked how strongly they felt a sense of belonging to each.

- 64% of Panel Respondents are most likely to feel a sense of belonging within Yorkshire and 63% said the same for Britain.
- Whilst 55% feel that they belong to their neighbourhood / local area, this is significantly below the national average at 71%.
- Just over four in ten (43%) have a sense of belonging within Rotherham. This figure however varies considerable across the Borough. It is at its highest in and around the Town Centre and its lowest in the north (50%) and south (27%) of the Borough.
- Panel Members were provided with a list of directly person-related crimes, and asked which they would feel able and willing to report if they witnessed them; at least two-thirds would feel able to report *any crime*. 86% of Panel

respondents feel that abuse to individuals with a disability would most likely be reported by themselves, with 65% likely to report homophobic crime.

Reachout Feedback

The Panel were asked how they would like to be fed back the results from future questionnaires, with a request to specify a minimum of two responses.

- The most popular option was a Reachout Newsletter (70%), followed by the Council Matters News (41%).

The response rate for Reachout 12 was 66%, 2% higher than the Reachout 11 survey (64%) is considered a very satisfactory response particularly in relation to the response rates experienced for many other Panels elsewhere in the country. It is important, however, that we monitor the response rates carefully and, where necessary, seek to ensure maximum response for future surveys.

** Please note that all percentages given relate to the percentage of the total respondents to that particular question, based on a total sample of 1600 Panel Members.*

8. Finance

Reachout is funded jointly by the Council and Rotherham Primary Care Trust. Bostock Marketing Group provided consultancy services to support the management of the 12th Reachout survey. The budget for Reachout is held by the Policy and Partnerships Service within the Chief Executive's Department.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The success of Reachout will largely depend on effective dissemination, feedback and ensuring that the results are used to inform policy development, priorities and service improvement.

The CCDP has a key role to play, and has agreed to consider Reachout findings on a regular basis and ensure that the outcomes are used in an appropriate way to inform service planning and policy development. The success of Rotherham Reachout will largely depend on ensuring that the outcomes of such surveys are considered and are used to inform priorities and service improvement.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

As a key element of the Council's approach to consultation, Reachout surveys are an important element of the delivery of Rotherham Proud as part of the Council (and LSP's new vision). Rotherham Proud emphasises the importance of effective community involvement in civic life and decision making, and Reachout is one way in which local residents can influence decisions made by the Council.

Effective use of Reachout will also be key to the theme of Excellent Council, with improvements in consultation and involvement helping to secure improvements in

service delivery. How councils consult and the use the results of consultation is a key line of enquiry in Comprehensive Performance Assessment.

Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS): Reachout enables the Council and its partners to gather the views of residents across Rotherham as to what services they feel are working well, what they would like to improve and which new services they would like developed. This will enable the Council and its partners to improve and develop services to meet the needs of its residents and in doing so contribute to the delivery of the NRS.

Sustainability: Reachout is a cornerstone of the Council's approach to consultation, and provides a key mechanism for consulting with local residents. Effective consultation and involvement are essential for a sustainable Rotherham

Equalities Issues: Reachout respondents are broken down into different socio – economic groups including gender, age, working status, ethnicity and disability.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Reference materials: Rotherham Reachout: Findings from the 12th Survey of Panel Members. Report by Bostock Marketing Group: Executive Summary and Full Report.

A copy of the full report has been placed in the Members Room, Town Hall and will also be available on the Internet and Intranet.

The findings have been distributed to the officers within the Council including those involved in the drafting of the questions for the survey.

Individual summaries relevant to the Area Assemblies have also been prepared, and these have been forwarded to the Area Assembly Chairs and Officers for their consideration.

The questions were submitted through the Reachout Sub Group members from each Programme Area, these were then prepared and coordinated by the Consultation Co-ordinator, Dawn Price. All questions were considered by the Group for effectiveness and readability, prior to full agreement with BMG for Reachout 12.

This Report has recently been presented at CMT and Cabinet.

Contact Names:

Dawn Price, Corporate Consultation Coordinator, Chief Executive's Office, ext. 2783, dawn.price@rotherham.gov.uk

Andrew Towlerton, Policy and Research Manager, Department of the Chief Executive, ext. 2785, Andrew.towlerton@rotherham.gov.uk

ReachOut 12

Executive Summary

In January 2001, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council recruited a Citizens' Panel of local residents, broadly representative at Area Assembly level. The drive for creation of a Panel came from the Council and Partners need to consult with the people of Rotherham, allowing them to monitor satisfaction with services, and indeed, to survey local people on any arising matters of local interest. The Rotherham Citizens' Panel, *Reachout*, currently has some 1,436 members, and remains broadly representative of the Borough.

The present report describes the findings of the *twelfth* Panel postal survey; Reachout Twelve. A further seven Area Assembly reports are also available, comparing the opinions of residents at Area level with those of the wider borough, and indeed, other Assemblies where appropriate.

Reachout Twelve was sent to all 1,436 Panel members, and following a reminder mailing part-way through the survey, a very satisfactory response of 66% was achieved (some 952 questionnaires). The questionnaire allowed for a detailed and wide-ranging survey, covering topics including: healthy eating, crime, the Rotherham Show, hospital appointments, fixed penalty fines and community cohesion. Key findings of the survey are detailed below, reflecting the precise structure of the questionnaire.

Healthy Eating

This section of the questionnaire opened with an explanation of the 5 A DAY programme, and acknowledgement that questions are a direct repeat of those asked in March 2004, in Reachout Nine, in order to allow an element of tracking.

Positively, awareness of the 5 A DAY programme has risen from 72% in 2004 (Reachout Nine) to 78% in 2005 (present survey). Residents were asked where they heard about the 5 A DAY programme, ticking all that apply from a list. Sources of awareness of the programme are largely unchanged (primarily television, newspaper and doctors surgery), although awareness generated by supermarket and poster campaigns has grown since 2005.

Respondents were asked to state how many portions of fruit and vegetables they eat in an average day; they are most likely to eat 3-4 portions per day (48%), with a third eating *five* portions or more (33%). This is an increase on the 29% who were eating 5+ per day in 2004. More than half of those who have seen publicity for the 5 A DAY campaign say that they have increased the amount of fruit and vegetables they eat in a day as a result.

Crime

Similarly, this section of the questionnaire opened with an overview of the Safer Rotherham Partnership, and an explanation that questions are repeated to allow tracking of opinion over the last 12 months.

Respondents were asked to state *overall*, how concerned they are about being a victim of crime in Rotherham; the proportion of residents who very / fairly concerned has *increased* since Reachout Nine (77% presently, compared to 69% in 2004). As in 2004, concern is highest with regards burglary, anti social behaviour and theft of / from a vehicle. Also as in the previous survey, males are more concerned about vehicle related theft, with females more likely to cite concern with being victim of personal attack.

When asked, just 51% of respondents say that neither they, nor a family member, have been a victim of specified crime in the last 12 months; meaning that 49% have a personal or close experience of one of the listed crimes, an increase on 41% in 2004. The three types of crime that people of Rotherham are most concerned about being a victim of remain the three they are most likely to have personal or familial experience of, namely anti social behaviour, burglary, and theft of / from a vehicle.

Rotherham Show

Residents were informed that the Rotherham Show is the largest free show of its kind in the North East of England, and survey results show that in the region of two-thirds of respondents have been to the Show. More than three-quarters of those who have attended say it was good, or indeed, *very good*, with respondents tending to enjoy the trade stands, horticultural show and vintage vehicle rally the most. Males particularly enjoyed the vehicle rally, with females more likely to recall the professional family entertainment being the highlight of their visit. Residents aged over 44 are particularly likely to remember enjoying the horticultural show.

When asked what they would like to see more of at the Rotherham Show (regardless of whether they have ever been) one of the most popular aspects is 'music'. Given that this is *not* one of the aspects most enjoyed by people who have already been to the show, it appears that this could be a good way to improve what is on offer at The Rotherham Show, by both existing show-goers, and those who have never been before.

Hospital Outpatient Appointments

This section of the survey focussed on the *Choose and Book Programme*. Residents were informed that the programme will allow GP Surgeries to book hospital appointments on behalf of patients at the time of the doctor's appointment. Approaching nine in ten respondents say that they would like the choice of where to have their hospital appointment, and this decision would be most influenced by distance from home (78%), quality of care

(77%), and waiting times (75%). Women and older people are more likely than average to be influenced by *how they would get to* their chosen hospital.

In order to make their choice of hospital, residents would like to be able to talk to someone in person, or have access to written information. On the whole respondents would prefer to initially make the appointment via their doctor (71%) or practice staff (47%). If they then needed to change this appointment however, they would prefer to liaise directly with the hospital (71%) as opposed to their GP (33%). It appears that respondents would go to this effort; when asked, 94% say that they have never needed to cancel an appointment and neglected to let anyone know.

Fixed Penalty Fines

This section of the survey opened by informing residents that the Reachout Partners were keen to hear their views on the use of fixed penalty notices as alternatives to prosecution for dog fouling, littering, fly tipping, fly posting and graffiti offences.

At least two-thirds of respondents feel that payment of a fixed penalty notice should be offered as an alternative to prosecution for a number of environmental crimes, with strength of feeling ranging from 63% who feel this way about fly tipping, to 88% who support this for littering.

Whilst four in ten feel that people caught committing offences should *not* be given the opportunity to pay fixed penalty notices in instalments, half of those who *do* think instalment payments are appropriate (37%; 31% of the *total* sample) feel that 4 weeks is an appropriate timeframe.

Approximately two-thirds of respondents agree that young people (aged 11-16) should be given fixed penalty notices, this view ranges by Area of residence (ranging from 76% of those living in Wentworth North to 62% of Rother Valley West residents).

More than half of respondents in each case feel that fines of £100 should be payable by those caught fly tipping or involved in graffiti; twice the £50 already in place. Respondents are equally likely to agree that £50 is appropriate for those responsible for their dog fouling, as to think a penalty of £100 is appropriate (32%; 34% respectively).

Four in five respondents (83%) approve of a 'zero tolerance' approach to those who commit environmental offences.

Community Cohesion

The Home Office describes a cohesive community as one where: there is a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities; the diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and positively valued; those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and, strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods. The Home Office has developed a series of questions to be asked of residents, one of which was replicated in Reachout Twelve.

Respondents were provided with a list of four locations (their neighbourhood, Rotherham, Yorkshire and Great Britain) and asked who strongly they feel a sense of belonging to each. Respondents are most likely to say they feel a sense of belonging within Yorkshire (64%) or Britain (63%).

Whilst more than half feel that they belong to their neighbourhood / local area (55%), approximately four in ten have a sense of belonging within Rotherham (43%). This ranges vastly from 27% of respondents in Rother Valley South to 50% of Panellists who reside in Rotherham North.

Whilst differences in how questions were phrased mean that care must be taken in comparing findings to the Home Office Citizenship Survey, we see that 71% of those nationwide feel that they belong within their neighbourhood, significantly more than respondents in Rotherham (55%).

Moving on, residents were provided with a list of directly person-related crimes, and asked which they would feel able and willing to report if they witnessed them. Positively, at least two-thirds would feel able to report *any*. It appears that abuse to individuals with a disability is most likely to be reported (86%) with homophobic crime least likely to be (65%).

Reachout Feedback

When asked how they would like the Reachout Partnership to feed back the results of future questionnaires, specifying a maximum of two from a list, respondents choose Reachout Newsletter (70%) and Council Matters Newsletter (41%).

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted