

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS**

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

**Date: Wednesday, 23rd September,  
2009**

**Time: 9.00 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 (as amended March 2006).
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of meetings held on 13th and 27th July, 2009  
(see Minute Book dated 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2009 pages 17-31J)
4. Energy Performance Certificates Update (Pages 1 - 4)
5. Devolved Budgets for Area Assemblies – Progress Report (Pages 5 - 13)
6. Neighbourhoods General Fund Revenue Budget Monitoring to 31st July 2009  
(Pages 14 - 17)
7. Beeversleigh Petition (Pages 18 - 25)
8. The Lanes Petition (Pages 26 - 32)
9. 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.
10. Acquisition of the Bellows Road Shopping Centre (Pages 33 - 41)  
(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))
11. Neighbourhood Centres Review Final Recommendations (Pages 42 - 78)  
(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))

**(The Chairman authorised consideration of the following two items to enable the matters to be processed.)**

12. Sheltered Housing Modifications 2009/10 (Pages 79 - 84)  
(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))
  
13. Structural Repairs to 92 'Airey' Constructed Non Traditional Properties - Tender (Pages 85 - 93)  
(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>23 September 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Energy Performance Certificates – Update</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

## **5. Summary**

Effective from the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008, Landlords and Property Owners are required to provide Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) for all rented homes; all homes marketed for sale and new build dwellings. In addition, all Public buildings over 1,000m<sup>2</sup> occupied or part-occupied by public authorities (or by institutions or organisations providing public services) must be certified.

This requirement was reported to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods (Minute No. 95), 27th October 2008 and it was advised that a further update report be submitted.

This report is to advise of the local impact of the requirement to provide EPCs to date.

## **6. Recommendations**

### **That the Cabinet Member:**

- Notes the contents of the report.

## 7. Background

Effective from the 1st October 2008, landlords and property owners are required to provide Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) for all rented homes, commercial properties over 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and all remaining homes for sale.

Landlords are required to commission an EPC and ensure a copy of it, including the recommendation report that shows how to improve the dwelling's energy efficiency, are available free of charge, to prospective tenants at the earliest opportunity.

The EPC is designed to help the prospective tenant to make an informed choice in respect of the possible energy consumption costs of the property. As a minimum, this should be provided when prospective tenants are first given written information about a dwelling or are arranging to view it and before any tenancy contract is entered into.

An EPC rates a property on an incremental scale, A-G. Only new-build properties, constructed to Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, that is, very high energy efficiency standards, can achieve an 'A'. The typical score for a three-bed semidetached house would be in the range C-E, depending upon the construction, design and heating installed.

EPCs have a ten year life for rented accommodation from day of production irrespective of change of tenancy. EPCs are strictly recorded on a National Database using bespoke software.

EPC inspection can only be performed by qualified person and there are a number of private individuals offering the service locally.

The Council offered two 'EPC certification' routes for private sector landlords. Initially, Neighbourhood Investment Services offered the service until Rotherham's Quality Landlord Scheme (RQLS) was up and running and formal provision could be made via the RQLS.

The price of an EPC continues to rise with current trends of £70 for up to 5 bedroom dwellings. The RQLS continues to offer the certificate to private sector landlords for a competitive £50.

### 7.2 Progress

The EPC requirement was reported to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods (Minute No. 95), 27th October 2008 and it was advised that a further progress report be submitted.

There are five service areas within the Council affected by EPC legislation:

- **Key Choices Property Management (KCPM)**

As part of the KCPM service (previously known as Rotherham's Quality Landlord Scheme), properties belonging to private sector landlords joining the accredited scheme or benefiting from initiatives such as Rent in Advance (RIA) are required to

have a current EPC in place, prior to the property being occupied. Within KCPM, there is a registered EPC Assessor and to date 20 properties have been assessed.

### • **Trading Standards**

The requirement to provide an EPC is self-regulating to a degree; in that to sell a property on the open market, an EPC is required as part of the Home Buyers pack. Property cannot be marketed by an estate agent without one and as with structural surveys; EPCs are required by lenders to satisfy mortgage purposes.

For rented property the new tenant is entitled to receive an EPC, however what is not yet known is what level of EPC awareness there is amongst households moving within the private rented sector. If they do not know that they should receive an EPC it follows that they will not complain.

To date, Trading Standards have not taken any enforcement action in relation to non-compliance with EPC legislation.

### • **Neighbourhood Investment Service**

A very limited capacity exists within Neighbourhood Investment Services to carry out an EPC assessment. This opportunity was initially made available to private sector landlords registered with the Council's Registered Quality landlord Scheme. To date no EPC inspections have been undertaken.

### • **2010 Rotherham Limited**

EPCs apply to all social housing. 2010 Ltd employs two accredited Agency Surveyors to carry out EPCs on all voids, vacated and Right to buy properties. 2010 Ltd intend to employ in-house operatives to carry out EPCs in due course; further information can be provided by the Stock and Planning Manager at 2010 Ltd (Joanne Crossley) 3,119 EPCs (approximately 40 per week) have been carried out to date, with an average rating of 'C'. EPCs are made available to prospective tenants through the lettings process.

124 public buildings have been surveyed for the Display Energy Certificates (DEC) for the Council and the average rating is E. Comparison benchmarking with other authorities is not yet available.

## **8. Finance**

Neighbourhood Investment Services (NIS) has very limited capacity to carry out EPCs. This service was initially advertised to private sector landlords that are members of the Rotherham Quality Landlord Scheme. KCPM now provide this service at £50 per inspection which compares favourably to typical cost of £70.

To date there has been relatively low take up by private sector landlords at this competitive rate. This may be because there have been no changes of tenancy, because EPCs are not being undertaken or because qualifying private sector landlords are using another EPC service.

If there is a significant uptake in the service over time the situation will be reviewed by Key Choices Property Management Officers.

2010 Rotherham Ltd currently employs two Agency Surveyors at a cost of £10,000 per month including lodgement and mileage allowance. 2010 has explored other delivery options and intends to move to in-house surveyors in due course; reducing the cost to approximately £6,000 per month.

## **9 Risks and Uncertainties**

Properties should not be let without an EPC. 2010 Rotherham Ltd has engaged agency surveyors; the move to in-house surveyors will further safeguard compliance with the legislation.

## **10 Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

In line with the Outcomes Framework, the service provided has a linkage with the fourth key line of assessment theme (KLA4) "Exercise of Choice and Control" as it enables tenants to have an influence on their environment while promoting significant savings that could make a significant difference to a household experiencing fuel poverty.

The service provided also links into the second key line of assessment (KLA2) 'Improved Quality of Life' as the service allows people to have greater control over their income potentially as the report will better inform them of the energy use of the home they choose to buy or rent alleviating fuel poverty.

- Improving health and emotional well being [1]
- Improved quality of life [2]
- Increased choice and control [4]

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

**None**

**Contact Name:**

**Paul Maplethorpe - Senior Home Energy Officer Ext 6568  
paul.maplethorpe@rotherham.gov.uk**

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET MEMBER</b>
---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>23 September 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Devolved Budgets for Area Assemblies – Progress Report</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

### **5. Summary**

The report provides an update on the proposals received from the Wentworth North and Wentworth Valley Area Assembly Coordinating Groups for projects identified to be funded from the Area Assemblies Devolved Budget (Appendix A).

The proposals to be funded from LABGI if approved by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods will be submitted for recommendation to Cabinet on 23rd September 2009.

These proposals will enable the delivery of local initiatives which meet community priorities as identified in the Area Plans of the Area Assemblies.

### **6. Recommendations**

#### **That the Cabinet Member**

- i. Approves the project proposals to be funded from Area Assemblies Devolved Budgets**

## 7. Proposals and Details

Led by Elected Members, the Area Assembly is responsible for delivering the government's challenge to **empower** communities in service delivery and planning and to 'encourage access and participation from local residents in the democratic process'.

Rotherham is already ahead of the game in many aspects, the Government vision is of local authorities working with partners particularly those from Parish Councils and the statutory and vol/com sector, to reshape public services around the citizens and communities that use them.

The Area Assembly Devolved Budget has enabled Area Assemblies to address issues of local importance and priority and help to build capacity and experience in managing resources and projects, paving the way for greater devolution of mainstream budgets to Assemblies from 2010/11 onwards.

Following the approval by Cabinet of LAGBI funding in July 2008 and the commitment of NAS to match fund the proposal, a delivery criteria for the fair and transparent commissioning of projects was developed, ensuring that any local projects funded and delivered are based on priorities identified by communities, partners and agencies and;

- Contribute to Corporate objectives - Through priorities identified in the Annual Area Planning Consultation exercise projects will clearly link to the wider priorities and objectives of the Rotherham Partnerships Community Strategy, the Local Area Agreement and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, particularly linking in to the Safe and Proud themes
- Meet external funding requirements
- Deliver against commitments held with the local area master-plans

The Area Assemblies Devolved Budget Process has

- Strengthened the Community Leadership role of Elected Members by providing opportunities to work with partners and the community in a very practical way, encouraging groups to apply, supporting them in the process and working with the community to get their views on projects
- Funded through partnership working and listening to communities 61 projects in 08/09 - 169 were submitted for approval 09/10
- By October 2009 approx 300 projects will have been submitted

## 8. Finance

Proposed funding sources for the period 2008/11 include

Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) - awarded over two years 2008/09 and 2009/10. Each Area Assembly was allocated £100,000 to be spent approximately £35,000 in 2008/09 and £65,000 in 2009/10.



Neighbourhoods and Adult Services (NAS) The Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate agreed match funding for 35k per area in 2008/09, 65k per area in 2009/10 and 25k per area in 2010/11, primarily from the NAS general fund, Neighbourhood Pathfinder and Regional Housing and Housing Investment programmes to fund a 3-year devolved budget.

### **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

Risks that the ongoing sustainability of funding Area Assemblies devolved budgets will be unstable after LAGBI and HMR funding ceases in 2010. This may result in a lack of confidence from the community and partners.

There are additional risks around the delivery of projects which will need to be managed. Systems for monitoring progress are in place as part of the governance arrangements to mitigate risks of non delivery.

### **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The development of devolved budgets for Area Assemblies has clear linkages with the key Corporate Strategic Themes and contributes towards the aims of Strategic Objective 1 of the NAS Service Plan 2008-11

To **provide integrated local services** so that;

- People can exercise choice, retain their independence, be offered protection and have equality of access.
- Communities are active and shape local services to meet their characteristics and needs.
- Neighborhoods are safe, free from crime and places to be proud of.

The development of devolved budgets for Area Assemblies is a key driver in meeting element three of the Outcomes Framework - **Making a Positive Contribution** by engaging residents and community groups in discussing and identifying community/area/spending priorities and participating in the proposals for the development of projects.

### **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

The Community Empowerment White Paper: Communities in Control: Real People, Real Power: July 08

Local Government White Paper: Strong and Prosperous Communities 2006

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

**Contact Name:** Jan Leyland, Neighbourhood Partnership Team Manager Ext 4509

<b>Wentworth North North NAS HIP Funding 09 - 10 JXC582 WNJJXc582XC582</b>								
<b>Project and Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Match Funding</b>	<b>Strategic Link</b>	<b>Link to Area Plan</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Swinton Recreation Ground Improvements (TO MAXIMISE BUDGET AN EXTRA 47.00 HAS BEEN ALLOCATED TO THIS PROJECT WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN APPROVED)	Swinton	47.05	A406 WN	5200	Proud, Alive Fairness, Every Child Matters, Play Pitch Strategy	Community Priority 2 CHYP 3 crime and community safety 4 regeneration and environment	April 2009 / March 2010	To develop a master plan that sets out how the recreation ground develops as part of the Playing Pitch Strategy and alongside Swinton community School rebuild
<b>NAS HIP Funding BFWD</b>		47.05						
<b>Total NAS HIP Funding Allocated</b>		47.05						
<b>Unallocated</b>		0.00						
<b>Wentworth North NAS Revenue (General) Funding 09 - 10 P22171 7911 WN</b>								
<b>Project and Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Match Funding</b>	<b>Strategic Link</b>	<b>Link to Area Plan</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Stress Control	All	1240.00	P22170.7 911 WN	officer time to deliver sessions			October 2009 - March 2010	
Tot Slots 1 (TO MAXIMISE THIS BUDGET AN EXTRA £90.23 HAS BEEN ADDED TO THEIR ALLOCATION TO HELP COVER VAT COSTS MISSED ON THE APPLICATION BY THE GROUP)	All	90.23	7911 WN	officer time	All	Community Priority 2 ASB	October 2009 - March 2010	To provide new play equipment to support the continuation of the tot slots service
Parish Clean Up	Hoover	1300.00	P22170.7 911 WN	£1,300.00 from Wentworth Parish Council	Safe, Proud, HMR	Community Priority 3 crime and community safety NAG/HMR	October 2009	To provide a Streetpride Community Clean up for the villages of Wentworth and Harley in partnership with the Wentworth Parish Council.

<b>NAS General Funding BFWD</b>		2630.23						
<b>NAS General Funding Allocated</b>		2630.23						
<b>Unallocated</b>		0.00						
<b>Wentworth North NAS HMR/Regional Housing Funding 09 - 10</b>								
<b>Project and Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Match Funding</b>	<b>Strategic Link</b>	<b>Link to Area Plan</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Broadway Environmental Improvement Scheme	Swinton	5450.00	PXE005.A	£4,700.00 secured from Area Housing Panel, has allowed lighting improvements	Safe, Proud		October 2009 - March 2010	To improve the appearance of the shopping area at Broadway along with accessibility whilst reducing the locations appeal as a gathering point by young people and act of ASB and criminal damage.
Serenity CIC	All	1500.00	PXE005.A	None	Learning, Safe, Proud, Achieving, Alive		October 2009 - March 2010	To provide a learning resource room for learners at Serenity CIC in Wath-upon-Dearne.
Kabins Environmental Enhancements	All	3000.00	PXE005.A	None	Safe, Proud, Learning, Achieving, Alive		October 2009 - March 2010	To improve the facilities for young people at the Kabins in Brampton to allow better use of the facility.
Improved Lighting in West Melton	Hooper	20000.00	PXE005.A	None	Safe, Proud, Alive		October 2009 - March 2010	To improve street lighting on Barnsley Road in West Melton
Festive Lights	Swinton and	5930.60	PXE005.A	None	Proud		November 2009 - January 2010	To provide a Christmas tree on the Woodman roundabout at Swinton and to fit and remove the lights in Wath Town Centre.
Improvements to Wood Street Allotments	Swinton	1000.00	PXE005.A	Project previously approved with match	Alive, Sustainable, Proud, HMR		Jan 2009 on	Quotation for storage and accommodation is higher than original estimate

Cortonwood Sports facilities Improvements	Hooper	10000.00	PXE005.A	applications in progress	Alive, Proud, HMR		Jan 2010	To allow the repair or renewal of sports facilities that will allow continuation of community sporting activity and engagement
<b>NAS HMR Funding BFD</b>		25000.00						
<b>NAS HMR Funding Available for 09 - 10</b>		50000.00						
<b>Total NAS HMR Funding Available for 09 - 10</b>		75000.00						
<b>Total NAS HMR Funding Allocated for 09 - 10</b>		72880.60						
<b>Unallocated</b>		1119.40						
<b>Wentworth North LABGI Funding 09 -10 P22171 7819 WN PP22171</b>								
<b>Project and Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Match Funding</b>	<b>Strategic Link</b>	<b>Link to Area Plan</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Broaden Your Horizons	All	7968.90	P22171.7 911 WN	None	Learning, Proud, Achieving, Fairness		October 2009 - March 2010	To enable the provision of free adult training courses to members of the community to build peoples confidence and skills and enhance peoples employability. The training will aim to encourage people to progress onto further education
<b>LABGI Funding BFD</b>		8218.00						
<b>Total LABGI Funding Available</b>		8218.00						
<b>Total LABGI Funding Allocated</b>		7968.90						
<b>Unallocated</b>		249.10						

Wentworth Valley NAS HMR/Regional Housing Funding 09 - 10 NXV025 WV								
Project and Project Sponsor	Ward	Cost	Code	Match Funding	Strategic Link	Link to Area Plan	Timescale	Impact
<b>Maltby Community Development Trust-</b> Energy renewal scheme for the Wesley Centre community building. Cavity wall insulation, replacement of central heating boiler and energy efficiency measures -to allow for applications for photovoltaic panels.	Maltby	6264	A315	Grant applications have been submitted for £100,000 for photovoltaic panels with the BERR-Low Carbon Building programme and Big Lottery - Community Sustainable Energy Programme.	Safe/ Achieving/ Sustainability	Community priority 6- Increase community facilities and activities.	October 2009- March 2010	Reduction in natural gas and electricity consumption to reduce carbon footprint and allow the community centre to keep rental rates affordable/ free in some cases.
<b>Groundwork Dearne Valley-</b> To enhance the appearance of Tickhill Road as you enter Maltby through providing an entrance feature.	Maltby	6000	A315	No. Officer time.	Proud	Community priority 3- Improve parks and open spaces. Community priority 9- improve street cleanliness	October 2009- March 2010	Feature to be decided by local community. Will encourage cleaner streets through enhancing the appearance of the gateway into Maltby along Tickhill Road and improve the open space it is located on.

<b>South Yorkshire Fire &amp; Rescue-</b> provision of 200 gravity fed wheelie bin locks to reduce bin arson.	Maltby	4000	A552	N0 - Officer time	Safe/ Proud	Community priority 1- Reduce Anti-social behaviour. Community priority 2- Improve parks and open spaces. Community priority 9 - Improve street cleanliness.	October 2009- March 2010	Wheelie bin gravity fed locks will be provided on wheelie bins in 'hot spot' bin arson areas. This will reduce local fires in parks and open spaces and reduce litter. It will also reduce the number of replacement wheelie bins and improve local environments from the effects of fires.
<b>South Yorkshire Police -</b> To provide clothing kits for 2 Police Constables to utilise pedal cycles	Maltby	1442.45	A552	No - Officer time	Safe/ Proud.	Community priority 1- Reduce Anti-social behaviour. Community priority 2- Improve parks and open spaces. Community priority 9 - Improve street cleanliness.	October 2009- March 2010	The kits will allow Police Constables to cycle into areas where car access is limited. There will be increased visibility of Police in the area. The police bikes will focus in areas of Anti-social behaviour and environmental crime to improve local environments.
<b>NAS HMR Funding CFWD</b>		22414						
<b>NAS HMR Funding Available for 09 - 10</b>		22414						
<b>TOTAL NAS HMR Funding Available for 09 - 10</b>		22414						

<b>Total NAS HMR Funding Allocated for 09 - 10</b>		17706.5						
<b>Unallocated</b>		4708						

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods General Fund Revenue Budget Monitoring to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Social Services</b>

### **5. Summary**

This report details the income, expenditure and net position for the Neighbourhoods department within the Neighbourhoods & Adult Services Directorate compared to the profiled budgets for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009. It also includes the projected year end outturn position which currently shows a forecast overspend of £492k (11.7%) by the end of March 2010, prior to any management actions which may be implemented following the current review of the Independent Support Service.

### **6. Recommendations**

**THAT THE CABINET MEMBER RECEIVES AND NOTES THE REPORT.**



## 7. Proposals and Details

The table below shows the summary forecast outturn position for the Directorate. Appendix 1 shows more detailed analysis.

<b>SERVICE</b>	<b>Annual Budget (Net)</b>	<b>Projected Outturn to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010</b>	<b>Variance from Budget Deficit/(Surplus)</b>
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
Asylum	0	0	0
Housing Access	447	447	0
Housing Choices	207	207	0
Older People's Housing Services	(136)	356	492
Safer Neighbourhoods	2,621	2,621	0
Business Regulation	579	579	0
Neighbourhood Partnerships	440	440	0
Neighbourhood Investment	53	53	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,211</b>	<b>4,703</b>	<b>492</b>

### Key Pressures

#### 7.1 Independent Support Service (Wardens)

The Independent Support Service (Wardens) or Older People's Housing Service, is currently subject to a full management review, with the potential to integrate this area with Domiciliary Care within Adult Services being explored. Continuation of the Service in its present format, without Management Actions, will result in a projected overspend of £492k in 2009/10.

The position will be closely monitored and any financial implications arising from the review will be included in future budget monitoring reports.

#### 7.2 Safer Neighbourhoods

Current budget pressures within this area relate to estimated Flare system costs (£30k) and Service Quality costs (£10k at 08/09 levels), unbudgeted salary costs relating to a temporary contract that was due to finish in March 2009 and advertising costs for new posts within the Community Protection Service (£22k), essential Health and Safety work at Old Landfill Sites (£35k) and additional staff cost (£9k) and redundancy costs (£29k) within the Anti-Social Behaviour team. The wider Neighbourhoods service is optimising opportunities to save staff costs through tight vacancy management and have implemented a moratorium on non-essential expenditure with the aim of delivering a balanced position by the end of March 2010. This will remain under close scrutiny and progress will be reported in future budget monitoring reports.

### **7.3 Business Regulation**

An estimated pressure of (£25k) relating to the purchase of bespoke computer equipment and additional software costs around the implementation of the worksmart project exists within the Food and Drugs team whilst a shortfall in the income received, maintenance costs relating to disused chapels and the payment of grants to Parochial Church Councils is creating a pressure of (£40k) within Bereavement Services. (This pressure has been included in the MTFS from 10/11 so will cease). Again the wider Neighbourhoods service is optimising opportunities to save staff costs through tight vacancy management and have implemented a moratorium on non-essential expenditure in order to deliver a balanced position by the end of March 2010. This will remain under close scrutiny and progress will be reported in future budget monitoring reports.

### **8. Finance**

The financial implications for each service area have been outlined in section 7 above.

### **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

These forecasts are based on financial performance to the end of July 2009. The forecast outturn is dependent on the planned management actions being achieved and thus effective budget monitoring remains essential. Monthly budget clinics are held with the Service Director to achieve this.

### **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The delivery of the Council's Revenue Budget within the limits determined in March 2009 is vital to achieving the Council's Policy agenda. Financial performance is a key element within the assessment of the Council's overall performance.

### **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

- Cabinet February 2009 – Proposed Revenue Budget & Council Tax 2009/10
- The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2007 – 2010.

The content of this report has been discussed with the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods & Adults) and the Strategic Director of Finance.

**Contact Name:** Mike Shaw, Finance Manager (Neighbourhoods) extn 2031  
Mike.shaw@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1																		
Neighbourhoods	INCOME/EXPENDITURE REPORT As at 31st July 2009									PROJECTED OUT-TURN							Revised Financial RAG Status	* Note
	Expenditure			Income			Net			Net								
	Profilled Budget £000	Actual Spend to date £000	Variance (Over (+) / Under (-) Spend) £000	Profilled Budget £000	Actual Income to date £000	Variance (Over (+) / Under (-) Recovered) £000	Profilled Budget £000	Actual Net Expenditure to date £000	Variance (Over (+) / Under (-) Spend) £000	Annual Budget £000	Proj'd out turn £000	Variance (Over (+) / Under (-) Spend) £000	Current Financial RAG Status	Financial Impact of Management Action £000	Revised Projected Year end Variance Over(+)/Under(-) spend £000			
<b>a) Director of Independent Living</b>																		
Asylum	480	461	(19)	(326)	(253)	73	154	208	54	0	0	0		0	0			
Housing Access	179	146	(33)	(55)	(6)	49	124	140	16	447	447	0		0	0			
Housing Choices	394	424	30	(430)	(595)	(165)	(36)	(171)	(135)	207	186	(21)		21	0			
Older People's Housing Services	452	491	39	(498)	(352)	146	(46)	139	185	(136)	356	492	Amber	0	492	Amber		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,505</b>	<b>1,522</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>(1,309)</b>	<b>(1,206)</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>Amber</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>Amber</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>b) Director of Housing &amp; Neighbourhood Services</b>																		
Safer Neighbourhoods	1,195	1,215	20	(305)	(297)	8	890	918	28	2,621	2,756	135	Amber	(135)	0	Amber		
Business Regulation	500	418	(82)	(284)	(289)	(5)	216	129	(87)	579	644	65	Amber	(65)	0	Amber		
Neighbourhood Partnerships	279	303	24	(135)	(140)	(5)	144	163	19	440	445	5		(5)	0			
Neighbourhood Investment	254	217	(37)	(8)	0	8	246	217	(29)	53	53	0		0	0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,228</b>	<b>2,153</b>	<b>(75)</b>	<b>(732)</b>	<b>(726)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,496</b>	<b>1,427</b>	<b>(69)</b>	<b>3,693</b>	<b>3,898</b>	<b>205</b>		<b>(205)</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>2</b>	
<b>Total for Service</b>	<b>3,733</b>	<b>3,675</b>	<b>(58)</b>	<b>(2,041)</b>	<b>(1,932)</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>1,692</b>	<b>1,743</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4,211</b>	<b>4,887</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>Amber</b>	<b>(184)</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>Amber</b>		

**Reason for Variance(s), Actions Proposed and Intended Impact on Performance**

**NOTES Reasons for Variance(s) and Proposed Actions**

Indicate reasons for variance (e.g. increased costs or client numbers or under performance against income targets) and actions proposed to address the variance which produce the revised RAG status

**Reasons for Variance**

- The ISS Wardens service has an anticipated overspend on salary expenditure and is expected to under recover against income as detailed in proposed actions below.
- Housing and Neighbourhood services as a whole are currently running with a number of vacancies as a result of vacancy management in 08/9 to reduce overspends in that year. A number of pressures have already been identified and management actions, including a moratorium on non-essential expenditure, are in place to reduce the effect of these pressures.

**Proposed Actions to Address Variance**

- The ISS Wardens service is currently subject to a large scale review, supported by the Cabinet Member. This review remains ongoing and is not likely to produce management actions that would reduce the overspend before April 2010. There is an anticipated overspend on fixed expenditure (largely salaries) against the income received for the service. Due to high permanent vacancy rates, as no recruitment is taking place to cover vacant sheltered sites, essential overtime costs are being incurred to cover sickness and enable the service to paying customers to continue to be delivered. Management Actions to contain the use of overtime include making use of "casual" staff paid at normal hourly rates and negotiating staffing resources from the in house domiciliary care service where capacity allows it.
- It is anticipated at this stage that efficiencies throughout the service will offset potential projected overspends.

**Performance**

(List key targets and RAG status- highlight impact of actions intended to address budget variances on Key Performance Indicators)

--

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>23rd September 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Beeversleigh petition</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

**5. Summary**

In July 2008, residents of Beeversleigh submitted a petition to reinstate a full time Caretaker, and when this was reported to Cabinet Member it was requested that 2010 Rotherham Ltd produce an update report setting out action taken in response to the petition. This report was not produced at the time. 2010 Rotherham Ltd produced the report attached as appendix 1, in July 2009. The purpose of this covering report is to summarise 2010's report and draw out key issues for Cabinet Members' consideration.

**6. Recommendations**

**The Cabinet Member is requested to:**

- **NOTE THE CONTENT OF THE REPORT.**
- **APPROVE THE ACTION TAKEN BY 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD AND AGREE THAT THIS MATTER IS NOW CLOSED.**

## 7. Background

43 residents submitted a petition in July 2008 regarding the provision of estate services, and they requested that the Beeversleigh Caretaker be reinstated. 2010 Rotherham Ltd visited the residents in August 2008 to discuss their various concerns, and agreed / implemented a series of actions. A brief summary of the main concerns raised and action taken follows:

- Poor standard of cleanliness of the building (Action: The building is now cleaned once a week, this is managed by Facilities Services and monitored by the neighbourhood office).
- Confusion over how to report estate problems and repairs, and over the role of the Estate Officer (Action: Information was provided to residents via letters and posters to clarify roles and set out contact details. Home visits were also carried out to explain that there is no longer a site-based Caretaker and to clarify the role of Estate Officers).
- Concern over health and safety, specifically lack of fire alarm testing (Action: Fire alarm now tested every week at the same time, residents informed).
- Lack of clarity regarding service charges (Action: Confirmed no service charge is paid by residents other than rent and district heating).
- CCTV not working properly (Action: CCTV is now operating correctly, viewable from within residents' homes, and is monitored by the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Estate Officers are now part of the SNTs and partnership working has been strengthened. Police Community Support Officers attended a community meeting to provide advice on crime prevention).
- Bin chutes and bin rooms not cleaned (Action: Arrangements put in place for cleaning of bin chutes).
- Cracks noted at the bottom of the building (Action: A joint 2010 / RMBC structural survey took place and ascertained that the cracks are not dangerous - currently investigating cause).
- Inadequate recycling facilities (Action: Recycling service will be looked at for flats throughout the borough, discussions currently taking place with RMBC recycling team).

## 7. Financial implications

2010 Rotherham Ltd removed the caretaker service in order to increase value for money, and state in their report that there is no budget to reinstate this service at Beeversleigh. To reinstate a dedicated officer in one area would impact on other communities and estates, and it is therefore important that 2010 Rotherham Ltd takes effective action to improve communication with residents about services provided, strengthen partnership working and improve the quality of delivery.

## **8. Risks and uncertainties**

It is important to ensure that the actions taken by 2010 Rotherham Ltd have brought about a sustainable solution to the problems experienced by the residents of Beeversleigh. 2010 Rotherham Ltd's improvement plan will require that actions taken in response to petitions and complaints are reviewed on an ongoing basis, to ensure continuous improvement of services to tenants and leaseholders.

## **9. Background papers and consultation**

- Appendix 1: 2010 Rotherham Ltd's report

2010 Rotherham Ltd provided the report to RMBC Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Landlord Relations Manager in advance to allow discussion on any issues to take place prior to reporting to DMT and Cabinet Member.

2010 Rotherham Ltd consult the tenants on an ongoing basis via monthly Action Group meetings.

## **10. Policy and performance agenda implications**

Delivery of effective estate management services contributes to the following elements of the Local Area Agreement 'SAFE' theme:

- Improve the local environmental quality of our neighbourhoods.
- A preventative approach will be taken to minimise crime, accidents and hazards; and to further strengthen resilience and thus safeguard all Rotherham citizens.

### **Contact name**

Jane Davies-Haire, Landlord Relations Manager

[Jane.davies-haire@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Jane.davies-haire@rotherham.gov.uk)

Tel: 01709 334970 or 07500 102498

## APPENDIX 1

## Report to 2010 Rotherham Ltd

ITEM NUMBER: ...

<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>27.07.09</b>
<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	Petition from residents of Beeversleigh to reinstate a full time Caretaker
<b>ACTION REQUIRED:</b>	<b>For information</b>
<b>FINAL DECISION TAKING BODY:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION(S):</b>	<b>That the report be noted and that the Cabinet Member supports the actions taken and the matter be closed.</b>
<b>REPORT AUTHOR AND CONTACT DETAILS:</b>	Name: Darren Carr Job Title: Estate Management Champion Tel: 07795475451 or 336976 Email address: darren.carr@2010rotherham.org
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:</b>	<p>This report was drafted by 2010 Officers during 2008 but for some reason did not appear to have ever been reported to Cabinet. The petition and the resultant actions have been resolved many months ago. Therefore the report is for information purposes only.</p> <p>In July 2008 a petition was received from 43 residents from Beeverseigh.</p> <p>The petition highlighted a desire to reinstate the Caretaker (Estate Officer) to full time hours due to the deteriorating standard of service received regarding the general upkeep of the building and the poor standard of cleaning to stairwells, bin chutes and bin rooms.</p> <p>The petition also highlighted the confusion with what the Caretaker (Estate Officer) duties are. The petition highlighted tenants fear of crime, stating there is no visible presence at the flats, health and safety is also a concern regarding testing of the fire alarm. It was stated that there would be no point of contact to report repairs, and it was not clear why tenants pay a service charge. It is also reported that the CCTV</p>

system is not working properly - tenants should be able to view images on screen of their own garage. Concerns were raised that cracks are appearing at the bottom of the building and there is not enough facilities for recycling.

**IMPLICATIONS:**

**CONSULTATION:**

The petition was signed by 43 of the tenants at Beeverleigh and consultation with tenants and other departments will be ongoing. Feedback is provided at the Action Group meetings, conducted every month that the Neighbourhood Champion Paul Mulcrone or Neighbourhood Housing Officer Ellen Pearson attends. Darren Carr Estate Management Champion attends when requested, to address any specific issues relating to the Estate Service.

**ENVIRONMENTAL:**

There are no specific environmental issues in this report.

**EQUALITIES/DIVERSITY:**

There are no specific equality and diversity issues in this report.

**FINANCE AND VFM:**

Budget provision is no longer available for a full time caretaker as the services previously undertaken by this post are now covered by the Estate Officer role. If the caretaker post is reinstated, it would create financial pressures within the business, as there are no surplus resources available to fund an additional post. This would also not represent Value for Money, as there would be a duplication of tasks. In addition, such an approach would lead to differential services provision across the borough, if some areas/schemes have full time caretakers and others rely on the generic estate officer service.

**HEALTH & SAFETY:**

There are no specific health and safety implications.

**LEGAL:**

There are no specific legal implications

**PERSONNEL:**

There are no specific personnel implications as the old Caretaker role is now part of the generic estate officer team working throughout the borough.

**RISK:**

The role of the Caretaker (now Estate Officer) has changed over the years, with the introduction of the Safer Neighbourhood Team. There is a risk that in allocating a dedicated Estate Officer to one specific area this would reduce the impact on other estates and communities.



### **Background Information**

Following receipt of the petition a letter was sent on the 1<sup>st</sup> of August informing tenants that visits will be conducted by 2010 staff on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> August to discuss any concerns or issues they would like to raise. It was also stated that if either of these dates was not convenient to contact the Area Office for an alternative appointment.

The 43 tenants who signed the petition were visited on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of August. 23 tenants were contacted, 2 were unable to be contacted due to ill health. Despite all efforts made 18 of the tenants were unable to be contacted.

- 14 of the tenants raised issues regarding the cleanliness of the building stating that it is of a poor standard.
- 4 tenants raised issues stating that there is confusion with who to report issues to and what is the actual role of the Estate Officer.
- 3 tenants stated that they have concerns regarding if there is a reduction of hours spent by the Estate Officer on site this will make them feel more vulnerable
- 2 tenants raised issues regarding health and safety stating that the fire alarm is no longer tested
- 4 tenants highlighted issues that they would not have a point of contact to report issues regarding repairs etc
- 1 tenant is concerned that it's not clear what the service charge is on the rent card.
- 2 tenants have issue regarding the CCTV not operating properly stating that they should be able to view images of their own garage on their TV screens
- 5 tenants raised concerns the bin chutes and bin rooms are not cleaned
- 1 tenant is concerned regarding the structure of the building stating that cracks are appearing at the bottom of the building.
- 1 tenant highlighted that there is inadequate recycling facilities.

### **Proposals & Rationale**

A course of action was agreed that each relevant department within 2010 and RMBC be contacted and made aware of residents concerns.

All relevant agencies were contacted which resulted in the following action:

General upkeep regarding cleanliness of the building is now maintained by Facilities Services and is cleaned once a week; this is monitored by the Area Neighbourhood Office. Ellen Pearson, Neighbourhood Housing Officer is working closely with Marilyn Schofield from Facilities Services to ensure we work in partnership with RMBC to ensure that all communal areas in flats are swept and mopped weekly.

To answer the confusion with who to report issues to and what is the actual role of the Estate Officer a follow up letter was sent in August 2008 to residents including useful numbers of who to contact. Posters are also on display regarding reporting issues involving Anti-Social Behaviour, Crimestoppers and Safer Neighbourhood Team. A Community Surgery is held every third Wednesday of every month which also allows tenants to raise any issues or concerns.

The Estate Officer role was also fully explained during the home visits conducted. Residents were also informed that the Estate Service no longer has site based Caretakers but have Estate Officers conducting site based duties i.e. assisting with bin collections etc.

The Estate Service now work to area schedules and are part of the Safer Neighbourhood Team combining resources to provide a proactive service to residents throughout the borough. 2010 are encouraging residents to contact the Contact Centres or Safer Neighbourhood Team so reports can be dealt with accordingly.

The Safer Neighbourhood Team operating in the area include South Yorkshire Police, 2010 Rotherham Limited, Streetpride, Environmental Health, and many other agencies all contributing to reducing Anti-Social Behaviour raising awareness regarding crime and the fear of crime contributing to improving the quality of life within the community

A request was sent to South Yorkshire Police requesting that the Police Community Support Officers attend a community meeting held at Beeversleigh to give advice on crime prevention and fear of crime. Tenants were also invited to contact the Area Office to make an appointment to have their belongings property marked. PCSO's attended the Action Group meeting, and the invitation is still open for residents to have their items property marked (upon request).

The health and safety issues highlighted regarding the testing of the fire alarm have now been resolved and the alarm is tested every Monday by the Estate Service at 3pm. Tenants were informed.

Tenants were also advised any repair issues should be reported to Rotherham Connect on 336009 or alternatively visit the website [www.2010rotherham.org](http://www.2010rotherham.org) or [www.rotherham.gov.uk](http://www.rotherham.gov.uk); tenants can also visit the Customer Contact Centre at the Civic Building or phone the Neighbourhood office.

An issue was raised that tenants are being charged a service charge for renting a flat at Beeversleigh. No service charges are levied with tenants being charged only for basic dwelling rent and district heating.

CCTV at the building is now monitored by the Safer Neighbourhood Team and is operating correctly; residents can now view CCTV in their own home. Paul Mulcrone (Neighbourhood Champion) and Ellen Pearson (Neighbourhood Housing Officer) and members of the SNT and view footage of any incidents reported.

Provisions have now been made for an Estate Officer to clean the bin chutes during the time allocated for site duty work which will be between the hours of 08:00 and 10:00 and an inspection sheet is signed by the visiting Estate Officer to ensure this function is continued. Whilst no complaints have been received regarding this change of service, residents have contacted the Contact Centre to report that the bin chute becomes blocked over a Bank Holiday period. Waste Management have been contacted and a request made to check the feasibility for the Waste operatives to rotate the bin to reduce the overspill.

Neighbourhood Champion Paul Mulcrone and Neighbourhood Housing Officer Ellen Pearson have been working closely with the Action Group and RMBC to arrange a structure inspection of Beeverleigh. An inspection took place in November by Trevor Willis (Structural Engineer) of RMBC which found that the cracks are deemed not to be dangerous. A Survey inspection will be conducted shortly to ascertain the cause of the cracks.

The Recycling Team at Bailey House are unable at this stage to make provisions for the collection of paper, cardboard etc. This is an issue that will require further investigation into how recycling provision can be improved at flats throughout the borough.

### **Recommendations**

That the report be noted and that the Cabinet Member supports the actions taken and the matter be closed.

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO CABINET MEMBER**

1.	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>
2.	<b>Date</b>	<b>23 SEPTEMBER 2009</b>
3.	<b>Title</b>	<b>The Lanes Petition</b>
4.	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

**5. Summary**

In April 2008, residents of The Lanes (East Dene) submitted a petition to reinstate a full time Caretaker, and when this was reported to Cabinet Member it was requested that 2010 Rotherham Ltd produce an update report setting out action taken in response to the petition. This report was not produced at the time. 2010 Rotherham Ltd produced the report attached as appendix 1, in July 2009. The purpose of this covering report is to summarise 2010's report and draw out key issues for Cabinet Members' consideration.

**6. Recommendations**

DMT members are asked to:

- **NOTE THE CONTENT OF THE REPORT.**
- **APPROVE THE ACTION TAKEN BY 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD AND AGREE THAT THIS MATTER IS NOW CLOSED.**

## **7. Background**

109 residents submitted a petition in April 2008 regarding concerns over the removal of the dedicated Caretaker at The Lanes, East Dene. The main concerns were that anti-social behaviour would increase, the estate would become unsightly and grounds maintenance would deteriorate. Residents also raised concern over a lack of presence on the estate of other agencies. An initial meeting took place between 2010 Rotherham Ltd's Estate Champion and the main petitioner on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2008, and visits and an action week were held during May 2008.

A range of concerns were discussed, including broken glass, litter, fly-tipping, anti-social behaviour, maintenance of shrubbery, confusion over who to report issues to and the removal of the caretaker. 2010 Rotherham Ltd's report sets out in detail the action taken to deal with each of these concerns. 2010 Rotherham Ltd have received no further complaints regarding this service, and residents have the opportunity to raise any issues through regular contact with local teams, and via monthly 2010 Rotherham Ltd surgeries.

## **8. Financial implications**

2010 Rotherham Ltd removed the caretaker service in order to increase value for money, and the report attached as appendix 1 explains the rationale for the changes to services. In addition to the fact that there is no budget available to reinstate the service, to reinstate a dedicated officer in one area would create an inequality of service provision and would impact on other communities and estates. It is therefore important that 2010 Rotherham Ltd takes effective action to improve communication with residents, strengthen partnership working and improve the quality of delivery.

## **9. Risks and uncertainties**

It is important to ensure that the actions taken by 2010 Rotherham Ltd have brought about a sustainable solution to the problems experienced by the residents of The Lanes. 2010 Rotherham Ltd's improvement plan will require that actions taken in response to petitions and complaints are reviewed on an ongoing basis, to ensure continuous improvement of services.

## **10. Background papers and consultation**

- Appendix 1: 2010 Rotherham Ltd's report

2010 Rotherham Ltd provided the report to RMBC Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Landlord Relations Manager in advance to allow discussion on any issues to take place prior to reporting to DMT and Cabinet Member.

## **11. Policy and performance agenda implications**

Delivery of effective estate management services contributes to the following elements of the Local Area Agreement 'SAFE' theme:

- Improve the local environmental quality of our neighbourhoods.
- A preventative approach will be taken to minimise crime, accidents and hazards; and to further strengthen resilience and thus safeguard all Rotherham citizens.

### **Contact name**

Jane Davies-Haire, Landlord Relations Manager

[Jane.davies-haire@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Jane.davies-haire@rotherham.gov.uk)

Tel: 01709 334970 or 07500 102498

## APPENDIX 1

## Report to 2010 Rotherham Ltd

ITEM NUMBER: ...

<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>27.07.09</b>
<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	Response from the Petition regarding the removal of the Caretaker - The Lanes East Dene.
<b>ACTION REQUIRED:</b>	<b>For information</b>
<b>FINAL DECISION TAKING BODY:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION(S):</b>	<b>That the report be noted and that the Cabinet Member supports the actions taken and the matter be closed.</b>
<b>REPORT AUTHOR AND CONTACT DETAILS:</b>	Name: Darren Carr Job Title: Estate Management Champion Tel: 07795475451 or 336976 Email address: darren.carr@2010rotherham.org
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:</b>	<p>This report was drafted by 2010 Officers during 2008 but for some reason did not appear to have ever been reported to Cabinet. The petition and the resultant actions have been resolved many months ago. Therefore the report is for information purposes only.</p> <p>In April 2008 a petition was received from 109 residents from The Lanes highlighting their concerns regarding the removal of a dedicated Caretaker (Estate Officer). The petition outlined the residents' views that they felt that if the Estate Officers time on The Lanes is reduced, Anti-Social Behaviour will increase and the estate will look unsightly with increased amounts of litter, fly tipping, broken glass and general debris.</p> <p>Grounds maintenance issues were also highlighted regarding the condition of the shrubbed areas and weeds. In addition to this, a lack of presence on the estate by other agencies was also raised.</p>

**IMPLICATIONS:**

<b>CONSULTATION:</b>	The petition had been signed by the majority of residents on The Lanes. The consultation following the receipt of the petition is outlined in the body of the report.
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL:</b>	There are no specific environmental issues in this report.
<b>EQUALITIES/DIVERSITY:</b>	There are no specific equality and diversity issues in this report.
<b>FINANCE AND VFM:</b>	Budget provision is no longer available for a full time caretaker as the services previously undertaken by this post are now covered by the Estate Officer role. If the caretaker post is reinstated, it would create financial pressures within the business, as there are no surplus resources available to fund an additional post. This would also not represent Value for Money, as there would be a duplication of tasks. In addition, such an approach would lead to differential services provision across the borough, if some areas/schemes have full time caretakers and others rely on the generic estate officer service.
<b>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY:</b>	There are no specific health and safety implications.
<b>LEGAL:</b>	There are no specific legal implications
<b>PERSONNEL:</b>	There are no specific personnel implications as the old Caretaker role is now part of the generic estate officer team working throughout the borough.
<b>RISK:</b>	The role of the Caretaker (now Estate Officer) has changed over the years, with the introduction of the Safer Neighbourhood Team. There is a risk that in allocating a dedicated Estate Officer to one specific area this would reduce the impact on other estates and communities.

**Introduction**

In April 2008 a petition was received from 109 residents from The Lanes highlighting their concerns regarding the removal of a dedicated Caretaker (Estate Officer). The petition outlined the residents' views that they felt that if the Estate Officers time on The Lanes is reduced, Anti-Social Behaviour will increase and the estate will look unsightly with increased amounts of litter, fly tipping, broken glass and general debris.

Grounds maintenance issues were also highlighted regarding the condition of the shrubbed areas and weeds. In addition to this, a lack of presence on the estate by other agencies was also raised.

This report is to give details of the action taken at the time of the receipt of the petition and the work that has taken place.

### **Rationale behind the removal of the Caretaker**

There is a multi agency estates safety forum working group that the 2010 Neighbourhood Champion attends, which is conducted following requests from residents. The group discuss any issues regarding the estate and address the functioning of combining resources to improve the quality of life on estates, and ensure that a fair service is delivered to all residents. Many estate based functions (and budgets) are split between RMBC and 2010.

It was not feasible, value for money or the sole responsibility of 2010 to have a site based Caretaker responsible for conducting all of the issues illustrated in the Petition.

The rumour that the caretaker had been removed from the estate was resolved at a meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2008 with the main Petitioners. Residents were also informed during the Action Week on the Lanes and in a meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> December 2008.

Information was also fed back during a briefing session prior to the estate walkabout that Darren Carr, Estate Champion conducted in August 2008. Darren confirmed that the Estate Officer works to an area schedule, covering The Lanes Monday, Wednesday morning, and Friday afternoon totalling approximately twelve hours, again this was agreed with the main Petitioners. In addition to this the Estate Officer conducts a daily inspection.

### **Action taken**

Following receipt of the petition, a meeting was held on the 30<sup>th</sup> April with the main petitioner and Darren Carr from 2010. A letter was sent to all tenants on The Lanes on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> May advising tenants that they will be visited by 2010 staff to give all tenants the opportunity to raise issues regarding the estate and specifically about the points raised in the petition.

In addition an estate action week took place week commencing 19<sup>th</sup> May.

On the 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 32 residents has been contacted with the majority saying that the estate is kept clean and tidy and free from litter. It was stated that this is due to the good work by the Caretaker (Estate Officer).

One person highlighted their concerns regarding broken glass debris, and the same person highlighted issues with Anti-Social Behaviour. Other residents highlighted concerns regarding the following:

- Shrubbery areas
- Litter
- Fly tipping
- Lack of presence on the estate by other agencies



- Removal of the Caretaker (Estate Officer) from the Lanes (except for two hours a week)
- Confusion regarding who to report issues to

Confusion regarding the petition was also discussed and some residents stated that they could not remember signing the petition and thought that the petition was to keep the Independent Living Champion (Care Warden) on site who was the resident who conducted the petition. Clarification was given stating that the petition is actually for concerns regarding the removal of the Estate Officer and the general appearance of the estate regarding litter etc.

A course of action was agreed that each relevant department within 2010 and RMBC be contacted and made aware of residents concerns.

All relevant agencies were contacted which resulted in the following action:

## **Proposals & Rationale**

### **Shrub Areas**

The shrub areas are still maintained by Streetpride, the Estate Officers have recently assisted in the removal of a shrubbed area where ASB issues were occurring. Youths were congregating and drinking alcohol causing annoyance to residents. On one occasion conifers were set alight. The Estate Officers cut back this area and the conifers to make the area safer and less intimidating.

The Estate Officer also conducts small amounts of maintenance work and is conducting weed spraying at the moment

### **Litter**

Litter on the grass verge area to the rear of the post office has now decreased. The Estate Officer litter picks this particular site every Wednesday. Streetpride litter pick the path area fortnightly.

The Rotherham Wardens and Environmental Enforcement section patrol the area, and a Street Litter Enforcement notice was served on a shop keeper who was disposing waste from his bin onto the field area. The notice makes the owner accountable for litter generated from the business premises up to a one hundred meters radius.

An additional recommendation is the Enforcement sections Hot Spot Team target the area. This involves Rotherham Wardens conducting an operation in the area by working in plain clothes and issuing perpetrators with fixed penalty fines.

### **Fly tipping**

Any reports regarding fly tipping on foot paths or grass verge areas will be dealt with by the Estate Service. Streetpride will be remove fly tipping situated near the highway.

The fly capture statistics for Streetpride reporting fly tipping in the area, has not seen an increase in fly tipping since the removal of the caretaking service.

### **Lack of presence on the estate by other agencies**

Safer Neighbourhood Team staff patrol the area on a regular basis. The Estate Officer conducts a daily estate inspection and clears any glass debris or litter. In conjunction with the increased patrols by Enforcement Officers and the regular walkabouts conducted this has contributed to increasing a visible presence on the estate.

The SNT have increased patrols in the area, and regularly conduct patrols. A Community Safety Forum is operating and gives residents the opportunity to raise any issues. A meeting is normally conducted following requests by residents.

Four walkabouts that are led by 2010 have been conducted, involving residents, Safer Neighbourhood staff, RMBC Ward Member, Environmental Health Enforcement Officers, which totalled 37 attendees including 13 were.

61 issues were highlighted during these walkabouts which when broken down covered 1 tenancy breach, 10 littering, 7 graffiti, 14 ASB, 8 repair, 19 other which include removal of moss, leaves and self-set bushes, 1 vehicle and 1 highway related issue.

### **Confusion regarding who to report issues to**

To address the issue of confusion regarding who to report things to, a letter was sent to all residents in May 2008 listing useful numbers of who to contact from each relevant department. A poster is also on display in the Community Centre.

Residents need to be encouraged to follow the appropriate reporting procedure so reports can be dealt with accordingly by the responsible department so that the correct budgets and monitoring can take place.

### **Current position**

No further complaints have been received regarding this service; residents have the opportunity to raise any issues through regular contact with the local teams and within the 2010 Surgeries that are conducted monthly.

One of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's future aspirations is to introduce a borough wide estate grading system, and involve tenants in monitoring services. This will provide a further opportunity for residents to raise any future concerns about the estate.

### **Recommendations**

That the report be noted and that the Cabinet Member supports the actions taken and the matter be closed.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

**Document is Restricted**

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted