

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL

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

Date: Thursday, 12 June 2008

Time: 9.30 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. Communications
4. Apologies for Absence
5. Declarations of Interest
6. Questions from members of the public and the press

FOR DECISION

7. Appointment of Co-optees for 2008/09 (Pages 1 - 3)
8. Representation on Working Parties/Panels 2008/09 (Page 4)
9. Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies 2008/09 (Pages 5 - 6)
10. Forward Plan/Work Programme for the Scrutiny Panel (Pages 7 - 9)

FOR PRESENTATION

11. Priorities and Work Programme
- presentation by Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods

12. Priorities and Work Programme
- presentation by Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Communities and Involvement

FOR INFORMATION

13. Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods (Pages 10 - 18)
- minutes of the meeting held on 21st April and 19th May, 2008

MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

14. Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Pages 19 - 26)
- Minutes of the meeting held on 24th April, 2008
15. Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee (Pages 27 - 41)
- minutes of the meetings held on 11th and 25th April, 2008

**Date of Next Meeting:-
Thursday, 10 July 2008**

Membership:-

Chairman – Councillor McNeely

Vice-Chairman – Councillor P. A. Russell

Councillors:-Atkin, Blair, Cutts, Falvey, Gamble, Goulty, Havenhand, Lakin, Nightingale, Walker and
F. Wright

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
2.	Date:	12 JUNE 2008
3.	Title:	CO-OPTION ONTO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PANEL
4.	Programme Area:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S

5. Summary

To inform Members of progress made in co-options to this panel.

6. Recommendations:

- a. That Members co-opt Mr Jack Carr as a representative of the Yorkshire division of Environmental Protection UK onto the panel.
- b. That Members agree the nominations to represent tenants and residents associations as proposed by RotherFed.
- c. That Members co-opt Cllr B Bartholomew and Cllr A Armitage (Aston Cum Aughton) to represent Parish Councils on the panel for 2008-10.

7. Proposals and Details

This panel had agreed that its co-opted Members would comprise 2 representatives of tenants and residents organizations; 2 representatives of town and parish councils in Rotherham and a representative from the Yorkshire Division of Environmental Protection UK (formerly the Clean Air Society)

It has been further agreed that all co-opted Members will be co-opted for a period of two years.

Representatives of TARAs

It has been agreed by the Chair that Rotherfed will be asked to conduct elections for these positions. The election results will be reported to this panel, once they are known.

Representatives of Town and Parish Councils

At the close of nominations from Town and Parish Councils, Cllr B Bartholomew and Cllr A Armitage (Aston Cum Aughton) were elected unopposed.

Environmental Protection UK

Mr Jack Carr from the Yorkshire Division of EPUK has been nominated to be their co-opted representative on this panel.

8. Finance

Any additional expenses arising from having co-optees on the Panel (e.g. additional travel or catering costs in connection with a review or off-site meeting) will be met from existing Democratic Services budgets.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

It is impossible to devise a list of co-optee organisations that comprehensively includes all issues that may be covered by the Panel. However, it should be noted that the Panel has the option of co-opting additional specialists for any specific matter that it sees fit, as well as for scrutiny reviews.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Corporate Plan Priority Themes:

Rotherham Proud – “Rotherham people and pride in the borough are at the heart of our vision. Active citizenship and democracy will underpin how Rotherham works. Equalities and diversity will be highly valued.....”

11. Background Papers and Consultation

None

Contact Name: *Sioned-Mair Richards, Scrutiny Adviser 01709 822778*

sioned-mair.richards@rotherham.gov.uk

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
REPRESENTATION ON WORKING PARTIES/PANELS
2008/09

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Health, Welfare and Safety Panel | Councillor P. A. Russell
Sub. Councillor Nightingale |
| 2. | Recycling Group | Councillor Atkin |
| 3. | Looked After Children Scrutiny Sub-Panel | Councillors McNeely and
P. A. Russell |
| 4. | Compact Monitoring Group | Councillor Walker |
| 5. | Members Sustainable Development Action
Group | Councillors Atkin and
McNeely |
| 6. | Members Consultation Advisory Group | Councillor Atkin |
| 7. | Members Training and Development Panel | Councillor McNeely |

Representation of the Council on Other Bodies 2008 – 2009

Title	Description	Council Rep.	Frequency	Councillors Role	RMBC Officer Support	How issues are reported back into the Council
Decent Homes Steering Group	Steering Group and Core Group made up of Neighbourhoods, 2010 Rotherham Ltd and the contractors for the programme. The group look at the progress of the programme to date	2 reps. from the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Councillors McNeely and P.A. Russell)	Monthly	Representative	Michelle Musgrave	Performance management reports to Cabinet Member
Rotherham Rent Bond Guarantee Scheme	Bond Guarantee Scheme, recent re-organisation taken place undertaken in respect of attendance and support by Officers	1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Councillor F. Wright)	Bi-monthly	Representative	Claire Boldy	Quarterly performance reports Annual funding report to Cabinet Member
RUSH House Management Committee	Providing the strategic direction and the overall decision making body for the accommodation and support service for homeless people aged 16 to 23	1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Councillor F. Wright)	Bi-monthly	Co-opt member To read papers, receive minutes and report back.	Sandra Tolley	Elected Member to report to Cabinet Member annually
South Yorkshire Trading Standards Sub-	Sub-Group suspended pending outcome of enquiry	2 reps. from the Sustainable Communities	-	Representative	Serviced by Sheffield City Council	Sub-Group suspended pending outcome of enquiry

Title	Description	Council Rep.	Frequency	Councillors Role	RMBC Officer Support	How issues are reported back into the Council
Group		Scrutiny Panel			Supported by Harry Clarke	
Environmental Protection - Yorkshire and Humberside Division	The work of the Division is carried out voluntarily by members who want to make an impact upon creating sustainable environments for future generations.	4 reps. from the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Councillor Atkin and Mr. Carr)	1 event and 3 meetings per year	Representative and information sharing	Mark Ford	Information shared between Officers
Yorkshire and Humberside Pollution and Advisory Council	To consider all matters relating to environmental pollution and control.	2 reps from the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	Annual Meeting In July	Representative	Mark Ford	Report to Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel
Women's Refuge	Refuge Management Committee, addresses all management, strategy, policy and operational matters of the Women's Refuge	1 Rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Councillor Havenhand)	Monthly	Representative	Sandra Tolley	Monthly management minutes Elected member to report back annually

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. Meeting:	SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
2. Date:	12TH JUNE 2008
3. Title:	WORK PROGRAMME 2008/089
4. Programme Area:	Chief Executive's

5. Summary

The panel is being asked to discuss issues which it might consider as suitable for review during the coming year.

6. Recommendations

That Members draw up a list of possible scrutiny reviews for the year and request the scrutiny adviser to subject them to the scrutiny checklist for suitability.

7. Proposals and Details

The current scrutiny plan has been informed by the corporate priorities agreed by the council, issues raised by elected members on behalf of the communities they serve and with reference to national agendas.

Each of the Council's Scrutiny Panels is required to develop a forward programme of work for the new Municipal Year. It is important that the forward programme decided by the Panel is realistic in terms of the scope and number of issues to be considered and relevant in terms of adding value to the work of the Council or in responding to the community. Scrutiny should be challenging if it is to be effective and a well thought out forward programme of work is important to enable this to happen.

However, it is not possible to be too specific at this stage on the precise nature of some issues for scrutiny and consequently the forward work programme will to some extent evolve during the course of the year.

During the last year Members have not undertaken any reviews through the panel itself but have been involved in:

- Part II: Review of Area Assemblies,
- Corporate Complaints Review,
- Advice Centres Review
- Public use of Community School Buildings Review.

In the Forward Plan for Scrutiny Services the proposals for work include reviews of :

- The Council's Housing Allocation Policy – the consumer perspective
- Touching the Voids – what would be a reasonable turnaround time
- The Housing Needs of EU Migrant workers - how the private sector can meet this challenge.

We will also be looking at:

- working with Rother Fed
- Community planning
- Private sector enforcement
- Farepak – government proposals
- Increasing the provision of council owned housing
- HMR: Four Years on – what progress?

These proposals came from members of this Panel, from the public and from other officers. The Scrutiny Adviser has also written to each member of the Panel to ask for any other proposals for scrutiny reviews. Members are very welcome to make any further proposals either at the meeting on the 12th or beforehand to the Scrutiny Adviser.

Others issues which the panel may wish to discuss at a themed Panel meeting include:

- Relevant Local Area Agreements targets
- Progress of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams
- Implications of the Criminal Justice and Police Bill - CCfA

8. Finance

There are no financial implications arising out of this report. Recommendations arising out of scrutiny reviews may have financial implications and these will need to be evaluated when such recommendations are referred to Cabinet.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The work programme must be realistic in terms of the capacity to properly examine issues that come before it. Issues may be referred to the Panel which are not known about at this stage.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Corporate Plan

Community Strategy

All associated Scrutiny Reviews and progress reports

All associated Inspection's by outside bodies and recommendation outcomes.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Scrutiny Services Annual Report & Forward Plan

Contact Name: *Sioned-Mair Richards, Scrutiny Adviser 01709 822790*

sioned-mair.richards@rotherham.gov.uk

NEIGHBOURHOODS
21st April, 2008

Present:- Councillor Ellis (in the Chair); Councillors N. Hamilton and McNeely.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Kaye.

223. PARENTING PROGRAMME UPDATE

Further to Minutes Nos. 11 and 62 of the meetings held on 18th June and 3rd September, 2007 respectively, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services presented the submitted report which provided an update on the current position with the Parenting Programme and highlighted corporate development of the Parenting Strategy.

The report highlighted progress of the project to date in working with families and children to help change behaviour to enable positive outcomes for the young person and the wider community. In doing so this would break the cycle of disadvantage and social exclusion. Through the Youth Task Force, Rotherham Council had been provided funding along with 76 other areas to employ a Respect Parenting Practitioner.

Since the start of the project the current postholder, based within the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, had actively engaged not only with parents and young people but also with the agencies that referred the families. A series of visits to Safer Neighbourhood Teams, Neighbourhood Action Groups and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. Neighbourhood Staff, Adult Social Services and Young People's Services had taken place in order to give staff advice on how to refer and to put faces to names so that they were well known to staff.

The project had developed its methodology using the nationally recognised evidenced based parenting programme known as "Triple P" (Positive Parenting Programme). This programme aimed to prevent severe behavioural, emotional and developmental problems in children by enhancing the knowledge, skills and confidence of parents. Adopting the "Triple P" approach ensured that the Parenting Officer could provide the programme to a full range of age groups from the very young to teenagers, and parents, rather than the normal range of families with 5 – 7 year olds. This widened the scope and capacity of the Council to change behaviours of individuals through ensuring there were the skills and abilities available to deliver the programme to a range of families in an effective manner.

To enable delivery it had needed the Parenting Officer to participate in a three months intensive training schedule to the end of December, 2007 with the Government's Youth Task Force.

Failure to deliver a successful Parenting Programme would have a negative impact on future funding from the Youth Task Force.

Failure to deliver a successful Parenting Programme would negatively affect the Council's position in supporting the Government's National Agenda for Cutting Crime- A New Partnership 2008-11.

Failure to deliver a successful Parenting Programme would have a negative impact on the Council's commitment to improving the life chances of young people and working towards the goals of Every Child Matters.

Also submitted as an appendix to the report was a summary of the Council's current strategic approach, including an explanation of the "Needs Levels".

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- parenting and family support delivery
- future parenting support
- drop off rate from parenting classes and what happens to the parents
- Family Intervention Project (FIP) : assessment and managing performance
- establishment of schools councils to ensure parents' voices were heard and that they played a real part in developing services which were needed
- need for critical analysis with objective measures

Resolved:- (1) That the Positive Development of the Parenting Programme be welcomed.

(2) That ongoing development of the Parenting Strategy for Rotherham be noted.

(3) That an update on performance of the programme be submitted in six months time, such report to include issues now raised regarding performance management and alignment with the Family Intervention Project and what happens to parents who drop out of the parenting classes.

224. REFRESH OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POLICY

Resolved:- That consideration of this matter be deferred.

225. CHESTERHILL INTENSIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT PILOT

MID TERM REVIEW AND IMPACT

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Neighbourhood Initiatives Manager highlighting Chesterhill Avenue was identified in 2007 as the most vulnerable community in Rotherham and in need of intensive neighbourhood management arrangements. A pre-defined neighbourhood, taking into account the streets and community surrounding Chesterhill Avenue was established covering around 650 households. A twelve month period of intensive management began in September, 2007. The report looked at the mid-term impact and progress made by the Intensive Neighbourhood Management Pilot; the lessons learned so far and highlighted key recommendations.

The report covered:

- initial focus over the first six months
- focus over the next six months
- baseline assessment and resident priorities incorporating key findings from the extensive consultation
- local governance arrangements and communications
- 'quick win' interventions delivered
- additional resources invested in the pilot area
- mid term stakeholder review
- what has worked so far
- the key challenges/barriers
- impact

The structures for 'joined up' working now existed within the pilot area and resident's capacity for involvement and empowerment had grown. Any exit strategy would need to recognise and support the need for these structures to continue to grow and the model embedded, fully supported and monitored through more of a 'lighter touch' approach within existing mainstream structures.

The early success of the pilot demonstrated that services at neighbourhood level could be delivered more cost effectively and efficiently, and consideration should be given for the Council to continue to fund the Intensive Neighbourhood Management approach with contributions from partners.

In the future, the Council needed to consider whether to roll out the

approach into other vulnerable localities or whether to target only one vulnerable locality at any one time. A full evaluation would need to be undertaken in September, 2008 which would identify options for delivery and the resources needed to deliver a Neighbourhood Management Strategy in Rotherham.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- refocus of existing funding
- new funding
- savings as a result of the pilot and need to quantify such
- need to be able to quantify/qualify reduced levels of anti-social behaviour
- need to know what has happened to the tenants that have been moved
- impact of moved tenants on the reduced levels of anti-social behaviour

Resolved:- (1) That the mid-term progress and impact be noted.

(2) That it be noted that a full evaluation and options appraisal was to be carried out in September, 2008 which would consider the development and implementation of an Intensive Neighbourhood Management Strategy for Rotherham.

(3) That the issues now raised be included in the report back to this meeting.

226. HOUSING STRATEGY 2008-11

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Policy and Strategy Officer which detailed the progress of the Housing Strategy 2008-11 following an extensive period of consultation to key stakeholders in the borough and across the region and sub-region.

It also highlighted the key milestones within the strategy development project plan enabling the production of a 'fit for purpose' Strategy document prior to the ALMO inspection by the Audit Commission in June, 2008.

It was noted that work had continued with Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber in relation to the Strategy to minimise the risk of not meeting any future guidance that may be released.

Failure to meet the key milestones set out in the strategy development project plan will mean the Council has no approved Housing Strategy to present to the Audit Commission in time for the ALMO inspection in June and which will undoubtedly not reflect well on the Council.

Resolved:- That the timeline for completion of the 2008-11 Housing Strategy, included in the attached implementation plan, be noted.

227. SHELTERED HOUSING MODIFICATIONS

Consideration was given to a report, presented by Gary Gaunt, Project Manager, Asset Management, which set out the options and recommendations for spending the 2008/09 Regional Housing Board allocation for Sheltered Housing modifications, and provided an update of progress during 2007/08.

The original intention was always to improve access and design of all sheltered housing. The lack of assumed funds had severely limited the potential spend against the original sheltered housing review. Tenants' expectations had been raised, and, although not all proposals were popular, many had expected improvements to their homes to be funded. There was a risk of negative publicity unless an alternative funding source could be identified. Communications with tenants now needed to be very sensitively managed, particularly on schemes where the pilot extensions had taken place.

A decision on the preferred partner contractor for Adaptations had yet to be taken. The current contractors' average costs for the modifications project in 2007/08 (2010 Rotherham Ltd) were required as soon as possible to allow an informed assessment of the number of properties that access could be improved to through the 2008/09 budget. Based on a £1.9 million programme, it was estimated, at present, that costs would average out at £4,000 per property; therefore approximately 400 properties could receive access improvements once fees and contingencies had been taken into consideration.

Ideally, all access design should be delivered up front so that costs (an agreed Target Cost and GMP) could also be agreed up front with the contractor. This would in turn provide us with clarity on the number of properties we could deliver access to and the length of time it would take for the contractor to deliver the work on site. A full programme, with completion dates and key deliverable stages, would be required from both the designer and the contractor once budget spend and prioritisation had been agreed.

An Occupational Therapist resource was required to support the design process. An assessment of cost would need to be funded from the overall budget.

Discussion ensued and focused on the need for more work regarding

finance and the potential for the submission of a capital bid.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made in relation to the Sheltered Housing Modifications project for 2007/08 be noted.

(2) That the options presented for the 2008/09 budget be noted.

(3) That spend be committed to complete access work for properties that had already been surveyed, as identified in Appendix A to the report.

(4) That a programme be drawn up to improve access based on schemes that were the most sustainable, as identified in Appendix B to the report.

(5) That the marketing of the pilot bedroom extensions be deferred pending the submission of a further report in May, 2008.

(6) That a further report be submitted in May, 2008 covering :-

(a) costs and details of a potential access programme

(b) viability/progress of a bid to the Capital Programme

228. DECENT HOMES AFFORDABILITY REPORT

Consideration was given to a report, presented by Mark Whittle, Director of Investment, 2010 Rotherham Ltd, outlining the affordability of the Decent Homes investment programme in Rotherham. The affordability model was based on 91% actual surveys, findings being extrapolated to 100% of the housing stock and taking into account the actual costs achieved through the delivery of the Decent Homes programme.

The report covered:-

- available funds
- affordability of the decent homes programme (2008-2011)
- affordability analysis worst case scenario
- major factors which affected the affordability of the Decent Homes Programme in Rotherham and included in the calculations presented:-
 - change in the quantity of elements identified as needing replacing
 - change in the number of properties to work on
 - change in costs – forecasted costs/tender prices/actual costs

- changes in specification
 - non-traditional properties
 - sheltered schemes
 - environmental improvements
- costs pending : non-traditional properties
 - affordability analysis (5% refusals)

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- funding variance levels
- impact refusals strategy and effective monitoring of such
- discrepancies within the report on the spend levels so far on the Decent Homes Programme
- discrepancies within the report on the right to buy numbers and impact on potential costs
- clarification of the overall programme savings resulting from better than projected elemental prices
- the environmental element of decent homes was £10.98m (5% of the CLG funding) in the approved investment plan. Although the CLG funding was reduced subsequently by approximately £3m, the environmental programme being developed needed to reflect 5% of the revised CLG funding and not the £10m suggested in the report
- clarification needed on the calculation of the 2010 management fee which should include surveys left to be carried out which had been shown as an additional cost in the table provided

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

(2) That clarification be provided in respect of the issues now raised and listed above.

229. DECENT HOMES: RECOMMENDATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF SHOWERS OVER BATHS

Consideration was given to a report, presented by, Mark Whittle, Director of Investment, 2010 Rotherham Ltd, which was an updated version of an original report presented to the Cabinet Member on the 21st January, 2008 containing additional information requested at that meeting.

Further to Minute No. 228 above, and the request for clarification of the financial position, it was felt inappropriate to commit funding on these proposals without full knowledge of the budgetary position.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- clarification required on the affordability model
- need to understand the relative costs of carrying out this work within and outside the Decent Homes Programme
- need for an analysis of future pressures on the HRA including non traditional and shelter housing commitments
- clarification needed of the outturn position
- details of the costs for showers over baths, including future maintenance cost implications

Resolved:- That consideration of this matter be deferred pending submission of a further report, within two months, clarifying the budgetary position and issues highlighted above.

230. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs indicated below of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

231. DISTRICT HEATING SCHEME FITZWILLIAM ESTATE, SWINTON - RESIDENT COMPENSATION

Further to Minute No. 185 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods held on 18th February, 2008, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services presented the submitted report indicating the rationale for compensation for tenants as a result of periods of heating loss at the Swinton Fitzwilliam Estate.

Compensation options and payment options were outlined.

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

(2) That Option 2, as now amended, be supported as the preferred method of compensation payment.

(3) That the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services be authorised to determine the most suitable method of delivering the compensation payment.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act – financial/business affairs)

232. PUBLIC SECTOR APPLICATION EXCEEDING DELEGATED POWERS

Further to Minute No. 151 of the meeting held on 10th December, 2007, the Interim Adaptations Team Leader presented the submitted report on further options in respect of Application No. 21372 (Disabled Facility Adaptation) in the light of further developments.

Resolved:- That the original decision, set out at Minute No. 151 of the meeting held on 10th December, 2007, be affirmed.

(Exempt under Paragraph 2 of the Act – information likely to reveal the identity of applicants)

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
Thursday, 24th April, 2008

Present:- Councillor McNeely (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Falvey, Goult, Lakin, P. A. Russell and F. Wright.

Also in attendance were: Councillor S Ellis (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods), Mr D Barker (Parish Councils), Mr J Carr (Environment Protection UK), Mr K Stringer (Parish Councils), Mr D Willoughby (Housing Tenant Panel)

Apologies were received from Councillors Havenhand, Nightingale, Robinson and Walker.

131. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman announced that the term office for the co-optees would soon be coming to an end and as such this was their last meeting. She thanked them for all the support they had given her.

132. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

133. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from the public and press.

134. TOWN CENTRE DISPERSAL ORDERS

Steve Parry, Safer Rotherham Partnership Co-ordinator presented the submitted report which considered the impact of the Dispersal Order on aspects of crime and anti-social behaviour over the relevant periods and drew comparisons with the same periods during 2006/07 when a Dispersal Order was not in place.

A joint presentation with South Yorkshire Police was also given by Chief Inspector Marissa Cooper to highlight the impact of the Dispersal Order.

The Dispersal Order was agreed by the Council in 2007, to put in place using the boundary of the Rotherham Town Centre Alcohol Exclusion Zone between May 2007 and January 2008.

In line with agreed protocols, the application was supported, taking into account the perceived disruption by offenders to traders and visitors. These included:

- Daytime problems caused by street drinking and youths congregating and behaving in intimidating and abusive ways
- Night time drink related violence

- Anti-Social Behaviour and offences of violence, including associated intimidation felt by residents, workers and town centre visitors
- To aid the management of football matches and other town centre events and activities

During May 2007 and January 2008, the Dispersal Order was used on 43 separate occasions, involving the 'moving on' of 115 individuals, 21 of which subsequently breached their order. Of this number, the figures for its use of power during the hours defined as 'night time economy' was slightly higher at 23 compared with 20 during the day. The months of June, July and October saw the highest number of use of the power and individuals dispersed.

During this period there were a total of 12 individuals who repeatedly breached the order, 10 of which were issued with 2 Dispersal Notices each. A further 2 were issued with Dispersal Notices on a number of occasions.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- Whether it would be possible to extend the dispersal order to other areas in Rotherham. It was felt that this would not be appropriate as there were other tools which could be used to combat the different areas of crime and disorder.
- Why there had been a higher use of the order in June, July and October.
- What happened to repeat offenders
- Whether the anti social behaviour was alcohol related during the night time economy.
- Whether a taxi marshalling scheme would be run every year and if so how would it be funded?
- The introduction of a digital radio scheme and how it was operated.
- The overall lessons learned

RESOLVED – that the Panel note the positive impact that the Town Centre Dispersal Order and other policing and partnership activities, had had on crime and anti-social behaviour compared with the same period during 2006/07.

135. NEIGHBOURHOODS 3RD QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT 2007/08

John Mansergh, Service Performance Manager, presented the submitted report which outlined the 2007/08 key performance indicator 3rd quarter results and efficiency outturns for the Neighbourhoods elements of the Directorate.

At the end of the quarter, 25 (90%) of key performance indicators were on

track to achieve their year end targets. This compared to 79% on target at the end of the last quarter.

The 3 indicators that had been rated as 'off target' were

2010 Rotherham Limited

- xBVPI 72 Urgent repairs completed in time
- BV 212 Average void re-let times

Neighbourhoods

- CPA 31 Business satisfaction with trading standards

The indicators had been affected by the flooding and 2010 Rotherham had reorganised the repair delivery teams to better match capacity and demand. As a result performance had been steadily improving for the last two quarters.

2010 Rotherham reported that the impact on empty property re-let times (BVPI 212) increased during this period by 2 days. 30 properties were held back for 4 weeks as emergency accommodation and lettings staff were also involved in recovery effort which meant that over vacant properties were not let in the initial days following the floods.

The repairs service was the area most affected. Traffic chaos meant that repair work to non-affected properties was not completed on time or to the original appointment made with the customer. A total of 3411 working hours were lost during this time and 2010 Rotherham estimated that the impact on xBVPI 72 was a decrease of 0.5%, which would have otherwise meant that performance would have been on track to improve from last year. An additional £1m would have to be spent by the end of the year to bring decent homes properties back up to standard again.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised:-

- Concerns about the number of void properties increasing. It was felt that it was unacceptable to have such a large number properties left empty for long periods of time.
- Whether these were the same Performance Indicators which were under-performing as the last quarter
- Why Performance Indicator CPA 31 was showing as red, when it was on track to improve. It was felt that in relation to this, a stretching target needed to be set, and although the indicator was set to get back on target of 96%, it was currently falling short at 95%.
- Management of empty properties and whether it was more important to have quality or speed. It was felt that re-letting a house in order to fit the target when it may not be in a suitable state

of repair would be totally inappropriate

- Whether funding for overtime relating to repair and maintenance work would be taken from the £1m which had been held back.
- How successful the take up had been in relation to the free training and coaching sessions which had been offered.

RESOLVED - That the results be noted.

136. NEIGHBOURHOOD INVESTMENT – PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT PLAN 2008-11

Angela Smith, Neighbourhood Strategy Manager, presented the submitted report relating to the Private Sector Investment Plan. The plan proposed to target vulnerable households, private rented sector and pre 1919 housing with a range of interventions that would provide residents with a better quality of life.

Rotherham was currently refreshing its housing strategy to align with sub regional working and included the approved 2007 Rotherham Private Sector Housing Strategy key objectives.

The Rotherham Private Sector Housing Strategy focussed on the following key private sector interventions and outcomes:

- Improving the condition of the private sector housing stock and ensuring progress towards Decent Homes targets and satisfactory Housing and Health and Safety Ratings Assessments, particularly vulnerable people
- Improving access to and choice within the private sector, be it private rented or owner occupied, thereby improving choice for residents
- Improving management of the private sector, be it private rented or owner occupied, thereby improving standards and reducing environmental nuisance
- Supporting vulnerable people to stay in their own homes or maintain their accommodation, be it private rented or owner occupied, thereby improving independence and choice
- Improving the energy efficiency of private sector homes and reducing fuel poverty, thereby improving health, quality of life
- Reducing impact of hazards within the homes that may have an impact of the health and well-being of individuals and households

Since the completion of the strategy two key pieces of work had been carried out, which were the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Private Sector Stock Condition Survey (PSSCS). Both provided evidence and analysis to help shape the investment decisions and supported ongoing work.

The findings of the SHMA and the PSSCS which were undertaken and reported during 2007 estimated that:

- Private sector stock in the borough averages 84,242 dwellings representing approximately 80% of the total housing stock
- There are currently 2,544 vacant private sector homes
- The Borough shows better dwelling conditions than those found nationally.
- 21% of all private sector homes are non decent
- The cause of non decency is predominantly due to poor thermal comfort and category 1 hazards, such as dangerous electrical installations.
- Highest levels of non decency are found in private rented dwellings constructed pre 1919.
- The average income in the borough is £22k compared to the national average of £29k, therefore many households cannot afford to buy a home.
- Nearly 40% of private tenants spend more than 50% of their income on housing with many households in fuel poverty.
- Average income for newly forming households is only £9k, which does not allow them to meet their aspirations of being able to afford to buy

The evidence masked the very local incidence of severe problems in the private sector within some of the most vulnerable localities. Two examples of poor quality private sector houses were highlighted within the report.

The private sector investment plan proposals which showed the indicative budget allocation set against housing themes, strategy objectives and project activity was appended to the report.

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

- Concern as to why there were currently 2544 vacant private sector homes
- Whether there were any more poor quality private sector houses other than those mentioned in the report
- What type of work was carried out by the Work Enforcement Team
- What work was undertaken with private sector tenants and whether they were supported by Rotherham Fed
- What the range of “new tools” were
- Home Assistance Loans and where the funding was being obtained. This was confirmed as being funding from the Regional Housing Board, and not Local Authority money

A request was made for information in relation to non traditional housing.

It was not possible for this information to be made available at the time of the meeting as an intensive piece of work was currently being carried out. However, it was agreed that a report would be presented to a future meeting when information was available.

RESVOLVED:- (1) That the content of the report be noted

(2) That a report be brought to a future meeting in relation to non traditional housing.

137. OPTIONS FOR BUILDING NEW COUNCIL-OWNED HOUSING

Further to Minute 201 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods held on 17 March 2008, consideration was given to the report relating to options for building new council-owned housing. The report developed the options from an earlier report, and provided a critical analysis of the various models available to Rotherham MBC.

The options available were:

- ALMO direct build
- Local Housing Companies
- Councils developing on surplus HRA land
- Council-owned local delivery vehicle
- Limited Liability Partnership

In terms of overall risk, none of the options were untried; all were in development and/or implementation by other Councils; and all were acceptable to the Department Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

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

- What the timescales were for commencement of building work
- Putting together a strategy outlining exactly what members wanted before considering the options
- The need for careful marketing of the council housing schemes
- Whether there was any scope for going into partnership with other authorities to deliver new housing.
- Would the newly built properties be a mix of rent/lease and privately owned or purely rent/lease.

RESOLVED:- That the content of the report be noted.

138. ROTHERHAM MBC SMOKE FREE LEGISLATION UPDATE

Janice Manning, Manager, Food, Health and Safety, presented the submitted report. The report provided an update of action taken by the

Council to raise awareness and encourage boroughwide compliance with smokefree legislation which came into force on 1 July 2007 and additionally, work undertaken to ensure the Council's own compliance.

The legislation required virtually all enclosed public places and work places to be smokefree and enforcement of the controls was the responsibility of the Council's Food, Health and Safety Team.

The approach for securing compliance across Rotherham was developed in partnership with the PCT, South Yorkshire Police, Chamber of Commerce and other key partners, and an Enforcement Protocol was jointly produced and implemented.

The report outlined the work which was undertaken prior to 1 July 2007 which included:

- An Awareness Campaign
- Installation of signs in Council Premises and Vehicles
- Compliance Activity

Between 1 July 2007 and 31 March 2008 a total of 3553 visits were made to premises and returns on this work were made monthly to the Government. Compliance had been high and approached 100%.

During the period 1 July 2007 and 31 January 2008, 46 complaints had been made to the Council, mainly relating to allegations of people smoking in smokefree premises/vehicles, including a post office, public houses, a residential home, taxis and vans. All complaints had been investigated and with satisfactory outcomes on compliance achieved.

To date it had not been necessary to issue Fixed Penalty Notices or institute legal proceedings. However, the legislation had now embedded and a firm position would be taken on non-compliance discovered during the investigation of complaints or spot check inspections in accordance with Council's General Enforcement Policy.

Members raised concern about the future funding as no further grant was available for 2008/09. The Manager, Food, Health and Safety confirmed that there would be some pressure on the budget in relation to this.

A discussion took place around non compliance of the legislation in other areas, and the impact this may have over time in Rotherham. Members were assured that officers were being proactive in this area and monitoring that compliance was being upheld.

The Chair congratulated the officers for the work they had undertaken in relation to compliance with smokefree legislation and looked forward to a further update report in 12 months time.

RESOLVED:- (1) That the progress report be received

(2) That a further progress report be presented in 12 months time.

139. FWD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Consideration was given to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions. Members requested that a report on Parenting Support be submitted when the next Respect update was available. Also a request was made for reports to be included on Sheltered Housing Modifications, Private Sector Licensing Options, Garage Sites Review and Enviro-Crime Strategy refresh.

RESOLVED:- (1) That the Forward Plan of Key Decisions be received

(2) That the next Forward Plan include the following:

- Parenting Support
- Sheltered Housing Modifications
- Private Sector Licensing Options
- Garage Site Reviews
- Enviro-Crime Strategy refresh

140. CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS - MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 3, 17 & 31 MARCH 2008

The Panel noted the decisions made under delegated powers by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods held on 3, 17 and 31 March 2008.

141. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL - MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 MARCH 2008

The minutes of the meeting of the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel held on 13 March 2008 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

142. PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 29 FEBRUARY 2008 & 28 MARCH 2008

The minutes of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 29 February 2008 and 28 March 2008 were noted.

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
11th April, 2008

Present:- Councillor Stonebridge (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Austen, Boyes, Burton, Clarke, Doyle, Jack, McNeely, G. A. Russell and P. A. Russell.

Also in attendance was Councillor Wardle (Chair of the Audit Committee)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Whelbourn.

180. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

181. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

182. CONSULTATION PAPER RESPONSE - CPA THE HARDER TEST FRAMEWORK FOR 2008

Matt Gladstone, Assistant Chief Executive, presented the submitted report indicating that the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) was the existing assessment framework which measured how well councils were delivering services for local people and communities. This would be replaced from 2009 with the Comprehensive Area Agreement (CAA).

The Audit Commission had published a consultation paper in January, 2008 titled "CPA – The harder test framework for 2008" which invited views on the proposed changes to the existing CPA framework for its final year. The deadline for responses was 11th April, 2008.

After considering how the proposals could impact on the Council's current "Excellent" rating, a response to the consultation was prepared. The proposed response was submitted.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:

- Key risks in service blocks
- Concerns in Adult Social Care
- Active People Survey and definitions of activities
- Green spaces and schools
- Activities in schools: children's participation in sports
- Anomalies in schools' data
- Active People Survey within area assemblies
- Need for a plan for 20-25 year olds regarding improving the health of the public
- Concerns regarding lack of advice for pregnant smokers and referrals to smoking cessation clinics

- Potential joint review (Regeneration/Children and Young Peoples Services) regarding the Culture block issues
- Potential impact of the use of community buildings review
- Active space concordat with partners as a potential future initiative
- Publicity to encourage patterns of activity
- Promoting breastfeeding

Resolved: (1) That the response to the consultation be noted

(2) That the potential for a joint review regarding the cultural/schools issues concerns now raised be discussed further at the next meeting of this Committee

(3) That the well-being issues including breastfeeding and pregnant smoking concerns be referred to Rotherham PCT and also to the Alive spoke of the Rotherham Partnership for consideration

(4) That the breastfeeding and pregnant smoking concerns be also referred to the Women's Strategy Group

(5) That consideration be given to the identification of a role model to encourage breastfeeding

(6) That an active space concordat with partners be considered as a future initiative

(7) That area assemblies be requested to carry out active space/active land surveys and highlight opportunities for people to improve their well-being

(8) That scrutiny panels be requested to monitor issues relevant to their area of work.

183. COMMUNITY STRATEGY/CORPORATE PLAN/LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT

Matt Gladstone, Assistant Chief Executive, presented the submitted report which detailed the latest version of the refreshed Rotherham Community Strategy and RMBC Corporate Plan 2005-2011. The Plans had been updated to cover the period 2008-2011 in line with the Local Area agreement timeframe. Incorporated within the Strategy and the Plan were the sixteen mandatory education and early years targets for 2008-09 and the 'up-to-35' indicators and targets that would form the basis of the 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement subject to final negotiations with Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber and partners. As such, attached for consideration and agreement were:-

- A draft of the updated Community Strategy 2008-2011.
- A draft of the Corporate Plan 2008-2011.
- The indicators taken from the National Outcome and Indicator set

that were currently proposed for our second Local Area Agreement 2008-2011.

The cost of the refresh and production of the revised documents was to be met within existing budgets.

Major costs included consultation costs for partnership events £2,000, design and print costs, based on 500 copies of each document estimated to be £ 12,000, though these would be kept to a minimum by ensuring that both documents were downloadable from the Council's and Partnership's Website.

In addition, around £2.1 million of reward grant could be claimed by the Council in 2011 for delivery against the targets contained within the Agreement. At this time, details were still not available as to how the reward grant would be allocated against targets or calculated. Our next steps to publication included:-

- Corporate Plan and Community Strategy to full Council for approval on 4th June, 2008.
- Publication of the final documents to be deferred until June after Local Area Agreement negotiations were complete to enable any amendments to targets to be reflected in final Community Strategy and Corporate Plan.

Successful Partnership ownership of the Agreement was essential for the effective delivery of the Community Strategy and the Agreement. To mitigate against this risk, an extensive process of engagement had taken place ensuring that the Chief Executive Officers Group, Rotherham Partnership and individual target holders had been involved in all stages of the negotiation process.

A key risk was that the indicators chosen to form the basis of the Agreement were neither simple, measurable, attainable, realistic or achievable within the three year time-scale. To reduce this risk, the negotiation process included an initial check list agreed by Cabinet for short-listing potential indicators (from the basket of 198); the delivery of four structured challenge events that included representatives from Government Office, potential target holders and all key partners; a risk assessment against all 198 potential Indicators undertaken by the Council's Performance and Quality Team and regular reviews of progress by the Chief Executive Officer Group, the Council's Corporate Management Team, Cabinet and the Council's Scrutiny Panels.

There was also the potential risk that, due to the extended process of risk assessment, partnership involvement and extensive negotiation, the final agreement lost its connection to Rotherham as a place. Action taken to reduce this included:-

4T PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 11/04/08

- Refreshing the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan at the same time as negotiating the 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement.
- Ensuring that all 'risk assessments' make reference to the Strategic Priorities within the Community Strategy.
- Working with the Council's Scrutiny Boards to ensure that the Indicators were meaningful for local Elected Members.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:

- Textual presentation
- Statistical hub funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government
- Presentation of consultees
- Involvement of elected members and parish councils
- Definition of targets
- Observations from other scrutiny panels

Resolved:- (1) That the list of indicators and targets forming the basis of the 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement (subject to final negotiations and agreement with Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber and partners) be supported

(2) That comments/views now expressed on the documents be considered and any further comments on the draft(s) be submitted to the Assistant Chief Executive.

(3) That further consultation take place with Members on the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan through referral to Scrutiny Panels alongside the Local Area Agreement proposals.

(4) That a further report be submitted to this Committee highlighting the observations made by all the scrutiny panels.

(5) That it be noted that the final versions of the plans and the Local Area Agreement would be submitted to Council for approval on 4th June, 2008.

184. INTEGRATING EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (IEM) - SUMMARY OF PHASE 2 DISCUSSIONS

Cath Saltis, Head of Scrutiny Services, presented the submitted report relating to the above.

The report covered:

- Pitt review
- Critical infrastructure
- Category 2 responders
- Gold Command
- Environment Agency (EA)
- Local Resilience Forums (LRF)
- Information sharing
- Local issues
- Issues requiring further attention

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:

- Information sharing
- Action plans progress internal and partner wise
- Insurance premiums/excess levels
- Need for insurance companies to pursue liability claims with responsible organisations where appropriate
- Need to assess changes as a result of work undertaken

Resolved: (1) That the information be noted.

(2) That this report be sent to partners/agencies seeking their response to the actions proposed.

(3) That the Emergency Planning Team report to the next meeting of this Committee, such report to include:

- progress regarding local action plans
- progress regarding action plans of other agencies
- priorities of action plans

(4) That, initially, a letter be sent to insurers citing examples of the problems caused to claimants with a view to the British Association of Insurers being invited to a future meeting of this Committee.

185. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28TH MARCH, 2008

Resolved: (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 28th March, 2008 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 172 (Co-option onto Scrutiny Panels) it be clarified that organisations being scrutinised be not represented on scrutiny panels as co-optees

(3) That, with regard to Minute No. 177 (Hearing Loop and AV Equipment), investigations continue, to include the viability of individual members utilising portable hearing loop equipment at meetings within and outside the Town Hall.

186. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported as follows:

(a) Councillor Akhtar reported that, with regard to the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel:

- the 2nd April meeting, themed on the town centre renaissance and retail strategy, had gone well.
- Consideration had also been given to progress against the recommendations of the Christmas illuminations scrutiny review.

(b) Councillor Austen reported:

- that the 3rd April meeting of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel, themed on equalities issues, had been well received
- the area assemblies scrutiny review phase two had been considered by Cabinet (The Chairman indicated this had been referred back to the Corporate Management Team for further work).

(c) Councillor G A Russell reported that the Children and Young People's Service Scrutiny Panel had considered:

- Local Area Agreement Targets
- Key Stage 1 and 2 attainment levels
- Imagination Library

(d) Councillor Doyle reported that the Adult Services and Health Scrutiny Panel would be:

- meeting with John Radford, Director of Public Health, with a view to possible health diversity scrutiny work
- considering consultation issues including mental health

(e) Councillor Stonebridge reported an approach to participate in the National Audit Office study "Why doesn't Government Learn". Examples of scrutiny issues were invited.

187. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call in requests.

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
25th April, 2008

Present:- Councillor Stonebridge (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Austen, Burton, Clarke, Doyle, Jack, McNeely, G. A. Russell and Whelbourn.

Also in attendance for Item 195 below were Councillors Billington, Goult, Sharman, Stone and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Boyes and P. A. Russell.

188. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

189. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

190. MINUTES

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 11th April, 2008 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

191. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported as follows:-

(a) Councillor Doyle reported that the Adult Services and Health Scrutiny Panel was focusing on the work programme for the coming year.

(b) Councillor G. A. Russell reported that the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel was looking at the refresh of the Bullying review.

(c) Councillor Stonebridge reported:-

- the complaints review was now in draft form
- the review of the use of consultants was now being pulled together
- a first draft of the Advice Sector review was complete with comments received from contributors

192. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call in requests.

193. COPTION ONTO SCRUTINY PANELS

Further to Minute No. 172 of the meeting of this Committee held on 28th March, 2008, Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser, presented the submitted report updating the Committee on co-option arrangements.

The report covered:-

- thanks to co-optees for their contributions over the last two municipal years
- clarification of co-option arrangements for organisations subject to formal scrutiny
- Parish Council Network agreement to nominate co-optees onto all scrutiny panels
- approaches to organisations for co-optee nominations utilising the previously agreed application form
- dispatch of application forms to individuals who were currently co-optees but not representing specific organisations
- scope to extend invitations to members of the public to participate in reviews either as co-optees or witnesses
- invitations to co-opted groups, who had not attended on a consistent basis, to attend in an advisory capacity for relevant items
- response deadlines
- proposed voluntary code of conduct for non voting co-optees along the lines of the Area Assembly Co-ordinating Group's Code of Conduct (submitted as an appendix to the report)

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- confirmation of appointment of co-optees at the first meeting of respective scrutiny panels in the new municipal year
- textual amendments to the submitted voluntary code of conduct

Resolved:- (1) That the information and progress to date be noted.

(2) That scrutiny panels confirm the appointment of co-optees at their respective first meetings in the new municipal year.

(3) That the principle of a voluntary code of conduct for co-optees, along the lines now submitted and amended, be approved.

(4) That, further to (3) above, discussions take place with a small group of co-optees on the format of the code and a further report be submitted to a future meeting of this Committee.

194. YORKSHIRE SOUTH TOURISM

Cath Saltis, Head of Scrutiny Services, presented the submitted report regarding the latest position in respect of regional scrutiny of Yorkshire South Tourism.

The report indicated that, at a meeting of officers from the four South Yorkshire authorities held on 8th April, 2008 to consider the next stage in the development of scrutiny for tourism across the region, the following issues were discussed:-

- number of meetings to be held per year
- political representation
- remit of the Panel
- Yorkshire South Tourism as a potential limited company
- next steps

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- terms of reference and the drawing up of such
- status of the group
- Doncaster MBC as lead authority for scrutiny arrangements
- potential scrutiny framework
- concerns regarding the delays in progressing arrangements
- discussion with neighbouring South Yorkshire authorities
- governance of Yorkshire South Tourism

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

(2) That the governance implications be referred to the Audit Committee with a view to discussions taking place with the Audit Committee of Doncaster MBC.

(3) That this matter of Yorkshire South Tourism be brought to the attention of Cabinet and the South Yorkshire Leaders to consider the following

issues:-

- (a) need for elected Member representation
 - (b) need to tighten up governance arrangements
 - (c) need for clarification of the intended status of the organisation
 - (d) support for the request that overview and scrutiny arrangements are progressed rapidly either by Doncaster MBC or another authority.
- (4) That Richard Jones and South Yorkshire local authority overview and scrutiny members be invited to a future meeting of this Committee to discuss scrutiny arrangements, including proposed terms of reference.

195. SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and, along with Matt Gladstone, Assistant Chief Executive (who focused on 'Year Ahead' implications), gave a presentation relating to the above which covered:-

- Purpose of the day
- Scrutiny work programme : principles
 - balance of scrutiny roles and types of activity
 - alignment with priorities of the Council – supporting the improvement agenda
 - informed by a range of people and information
 - realistic – with spare capacity to be responsive
- Potential areas of work
 - (a) customer services agenda
 - customer access strategy – delay in publication
 - customer service centres – timescale for delivery slipped
 - customer service standards
 - national customer excellence standard
 - follow up complaints review
 - (b) Council reputation

- website development
- single partnership community newsletter
- communications and marketing activity Council wide
- research methods and mechanisms to obtain better understanding of the borough

(c) Comprehensive Area Assessment

- embedding the new national indicator set across the authority and partners
- greater understanding of local areas (i.e. development of ward based records)
- Local Area Agreement

(d) Children's Trust arrangements

- implementation of locality working
- commissioning strategy
- safeguarding unit
- not in education, employment, training (NEETs)

(e) Adult Services

- value for money
 - modernisation agenda
- Contest : the changing national policy landscape
- Councillor Call for Action
 - overview and scrutiny committees may be empowered to require information from partner organisations
 - scrutiny of external organisations
- Headlines
- refresh and revise internal and external communication
 - develop overview and scrutiny involvement in aspects of Council improvement work

- develop ways of further involving the community
- programme of training and development
- Outcomes sought
 - overview and scrutiny adding value to those areas of greater relevance and having a more strategic focus
 - overview and scrutiny looking at the right things at the right time – more timely recommendations
 - value and impact of overview and scrutiny being recognised by the whole Council, its partners and the public
 - local people being actively involved in shaping and informing decision making and policy development
 - members and officers being confident and effectively supported to undertake their roles
- Ways of Working
 - themed meetings
 - scrutiny adding value as a consultee
 - holding decision makers to account
 - performance and progress monitoring
 - responding to petitions
 - joint work between panels and with other authorities and other governors

Areas for consideration –

for example

- adult access to dentistry
- breastfeeding friendly Rotherham
- supporting people on incapacity benefit back into work
- safeguarding children

- support for newly arrived children
- Yes Project
- child road safety
- allocations housing policy/key choice
- adaptations service
- risks and benefits of partnership working
- flooding/integrated emergency planning
- strategic commissioning
- road repairs strategy

Discussions and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- single partnership community newspaper and editorial arrangements
- NEETs and influencing factors/organisations
- NEETs targets in Local Area Agreement
- effective use of research material
- health agenda/scrutiny arrangements
- buy in of partner organisations at the highest level
- need for clear channels for communicating information
- information sharing

The meeting then divided into two groups to highlight priority issues for overview and scrutiny work.

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

(2) That all Members of the Council be invited to identify any priority issues.

(3) That the scrutiny team write up the comments from the group discussions and report further to a future meeting of this Committee.

(The Chairman authorised consideration of the following item to prevent any unnecessary delay in processing the matter referred to)

196. CENTRE FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY ANNUAL CONFERENCE - LONDON - 10TH JUNE, 2008

Resolved:- (1) That four places be reserved for the above conference.

(2) That Members be provided with the conference details and expressions of interest in attending be invited.