

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL

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

Date: Thursday, 10th December 2009

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

FOR DECISION

7. Neighbourhood Management - Expressions of Interest (Pages 1 - 3)

FOR PRESENTATION

8. Choice Based Lettings - Scrutiny Review (Pages 4 - 42)
9. Allocations Policy - 'Fair and Flexible Consultation' (Pages 43 - 70)
10. Void Turnaround Times - Scrutiny Review (Pages 71 - 89)
11. Empty Property Update
(see attached powerpoint presentation)

FOR INFORMATION

12. Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods (Pages 90 - 101)
- minutes of meetings held on 19th October, 2nd and 16th November, 2009

MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13. Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Pages 102 - 113)
- minutes of meeting held on 29th October, 2009
14. Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee (Pages 114 - 126)
- minutes of meetings held on 23rd October and 6th November, 2009
15. New Arrivals Working Party (Pages 127 - 128)
- minutes of meeting held on 24th November, 2009
16. Exclusion of the Press and Public
Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))
17. Non-Traditional Properties (Pages 129 - 149)

**Date of Next Meeting:-
Thursday, 28 January 2010**

Membership:-

Chairman – Councillor McNeely

Vice-Chairman – Councillor P. A. Russell

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

Co-optees:- Alex Armitage (Parish Councils), Bernadette Bartholomew (Parish Councils), Mr. J. Carr
(Environment Protection UK), Derek Corkell (RotherFed) and Andrew Roddison (RotherFed)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. Meeting:	Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel
2. Date:	10 December 2009
3. Title:	Scoping Report for Neighbourhood Management Strategy Review
4. Directorate:	Chief Executive's All Wards

5. Summary

Members are asked if they wish to undertake a scrutiny review of how a neighbourhood management strategy is rolled out in Rotherham.

6. Recommendations

That Members:

- a. determine if they wish to undertake a scrutiny review of Rotherham's neighbourhood management strategy.**
- b. nominate members to be part of a small steering group to scope the review and determine who the panel wish to interview.**

7. Proposals and Details

- 7.1 At its meeting held on 18, June 2009, the panel discussed enforcement activity and how services are being co-ordinated across the borough. Members were concerned about a host of localised problems including the number of void properties; the general street scene; the levels of Anti-Social Behaviour and crime; unkempt gardens and poor public perception. The panel has previously received a presentation on Intensive Neighbourhood Management, piloted in Chesterhill, which has begun to tackle many of these issues.
- 7.2 Rotherham has significant levels of deprivation, manifesting itself in many areas as lower than average family incomes, health inequalities and lower than average levels of educational attainment and skills. A variety of organisations and stakeholders are already working towards “narrowing the gap”, yet many of the issues remain problematic and hard to shift. The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS) and other key documents, underpin the partnership approach to tackling these issues. The NRS runs until 2010. It is timely therefore, to examine how the authority and its partners will develop a coherent strategy for neighbourhood management in Rotherham beyond this point.
- 7.3 There are currently various ways that local areas are managed. The Scrutiny Review could set out to examine how and where partners work effectively together. In particular the review could focus on:
- what is the planned approach to 'narrowing the gap' across the Borough and how this will be resourced
 - how we identify and agree priorities (for example around the crime and grime agenda)
 - how do different agencies work together, and what are their respective roles and how can this be improved
 - how does neighbourhood management relate to Area Assemblies (and the role of members)
 - good practice from other authorities
- 7.4 The panel is asked if it wishes to undertake this review. If so, it is suggested that a small steering group is set up to determine the scope of the review, identify witnesses and undertake background research. Given the potential links with the ‘crime and grime’ agenda, it is suggested that members of Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel are invited to participate in the review.
- 7.5 At the Chair’s request all members of the Scrutiny Panel have been contacted, to ask for expressions of interest in this potential review. To date, three members and a co-optee have responded positively.

8. Finance

- 8.1 The cost attached to the review will be met through existing resources.
- 8.2 The financial implications of any recommendations emerging from the review will require further exploration by the Corporate Management Team on the cost, risks and benefits of their implementation.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1 A failure to proactively tackle the issues which exist in our most challenging neighbourhoods could result in the gap widening and possibility lead to duplication of effort across different agencies.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implication,

Building and supporting responsive and cohesive communities through neighbourhood management arrangements is a key strategic policy outlined in Rotherham's Community Strategy 2005-11. Rolling out Intensive Neighbourhood Management is a 'year ahead' commitment for 2009/10.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- *Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2005-2010*
- CMT Report *Rolling Out Intensive Neighbourhood Management*, 14th September 2009
- *Chesterhill Intensive Neighbourhood Management Pilot: Moving Towards Sustainability*, November 2008
- *The Year Ahead 2009/10: Shaping the Future*
- Barking and Dagenham *Neighbourhood Management Strategy*, March 2007
- Blackburn with Darwen *Resource Mapping Exercise*, January 2004

Contact:

John Evans, Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 01709 (2) 54561

e-mail: john.evans@rotherham.gov.uk

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser

Tel: 01709 (8) 22765

email: caroline.webb@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	10th DECEMBER 2009
3.	Title:	Choice Based Lettings – <i>Improving the Service from a Customer Perspective</i>
4.	Programme Area:	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5.Summary

This report provides commentary and summarises progress made against the recommendations of the Sustainable Scrutiny Review into Choice Based Lettings (CBL) – ***improving the service from a customer perspective***. All the recommendations of the CBL Scrutiny Review have been actioned. The report was endorsed by Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel and Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee at their meetings of 16 July 2009 and 24 July 2009 respectively and Cabinet on 23rd September 2009

6. Recommendations

- THAT SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL NOTES PROGRESS AGAINST THE 24 RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED BY CMT AND CABINET ON 3RD DECEMBER 2009

7. Proposals and details

7.1 Context

7.1 By providing a wider choice where properties are advertised and let in a transparent way through a choice based letting scheme most local authorities have seen a rise in interest which has increased the numbers of households on their housing register. Demand on local housing in Rotherham remains high with over 20,826 households currently on the housing register. It is therefore an ongoing pressure to manage customer expectation against a finite resource of housing stock.

In these circumstances, it is essential that the lettings system is fair and transparent. The purpose of the Scrutiny Review was to find out the customer experience of the Choice Based Lettings (CBL) Service and to identify any gaps in the service and any areas of work for further development. The term “choice based lettings” is used to mean that an authority uses an advertising scheme as part of its allocation policies.

Following the Scrutiny Review and findings the Key Choices team, Assessment team and 2010 Rotherham Ltd's Empty Homes team met and developed an Improvement Plan which is now in place to ensure that areas for development and subsequent gaps in the CBL processes are addressed.

The CBL Scrutiny Review did not comment in any depth on the process for turnaround of void properties as this was addressed in a separate Scrutiny Void's Review which was endorsed by Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel and Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee at their meetings on 16th July 2009 and 24th July 2009 respectively, and Cabinet on 23rd September 2009. However, it has since come to light that there are concerns regarding void properties and this issue is now being looked at separately. RMBC officers are currently undertaking detailed pieces of work that relate to void turnaround times, this includes RMBC's Service Performance Team carrying out a number of 'reality checks' of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's performance on void turnaround times.

7.2 Progress against the recommendations of the scrutiny review

All the recommendations of the CBL Scrutiny Review have been actioned. The report provides commentary on the Scrutiny Review of Choice based letting's recommendations (Appendix A) and details the progress made against the 24 recommendations. (Appendix B).

In summary progress made to date is:

- Further consultation and an analysis of the impact of introducing a Sub-Regional Choice based Letting (CBL) scheme has been undertaken.
- Increased nominations to 100% with 5 RSLs,
- The Allocation Policy now makes reference to the Adult social care assessment through revised Allocation Policy procedures.

- An evaluation of under occupancy in Council tenancies has been completed and we are exploring incentives to encourage tenants to downsize.
- A consultation exercise has been undertaken in respect of the “Fair and Flexible Guidance.” Over one thousand customers completed and returned a survey. The feedback will be reflected in future changes to the Allocation Policy, which is expected to be reviewed late November in conjunction with statutory guidance to be issued by CLG some time this month.
- First progress report for social housing (including the future options for Council Housing) will be presented to Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods in Jan 2010, and then we will provide quarterly reports on progress against 2010 Rotherham Ltd’s improvement plan, and a final report in late 2010 on future delivery of council housing services
- A choice based lettings software package is being procured which will only allow customers to bid for properties that they are eligible for and provide real-time lettings feedback, giving the customer a queue position.
- Key Choices have developed weekly reports to inform of real- time numbers on housing register, bidders and non bidders.
- A five year business plan has been developed, which maps out the strategic direction for The Key Choices Property Management team (KCPM) – formerly known as the Rotherham Quality Landlord (RQL) for the period April 2009 to March 2014.
- An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) had previously been completed.
- Customers are currently being consulted suggest an alternative title to “Direct Homes”
- Work is currently been undertaken to improve the information given to existing and potential applicants
- The Key Choices website is redesigned and the feasibility of ‘virtual tours’ is being explored.
- Quality control systems are put in place to ensure consistency
- A weekly results sheet has been developed which shows the status of previously advertised properties that are awaiting allocation.
- A value for money exercise in respect of advertising properties via local media has been completed.
- A procedure has been implemented by 2010 Rotherham Ltd which will provide information on empty properties at a local level to Elected Members and Key Choices.

8. Financial implications

8.1 A number of the review recommendations have financial implications. These include virtual property tours and the provision of more information. This has required the Key Choices service to carry out further exploration to identify funding streams. For 2009/10 most of the additional costs are to be met by the homelessness prevention grant

8.2 The opportunity for other landlords to promote their properties with the Key Choices letting scheme, incurs additional costs for advertising and staffing resources. Whilst increasing housing options consideration of all resource implications has been taken into account including the set up and annual costs of ICT CBL software solutions. The set up costs of Abritras (£86K) has been funded through the Housing Investment Programme and the annual support costs to manage a Common Housing Register and all aspects of the Choice based lettings functions is funded through the Housing Revenue Account (£20K) However some of the costs will be offset by income generated by recharging other landlords advertising charges for properties other than nominations.

8.3 To be considered a three star “excellent” rating where the Audit Commission has commented positively and identified strengths relating to Allocations and Lettings more innovative good practice should be implemented. However, areas to explore around good practice such as: offering financial incentives to single tenants to downsize from a house to a flat or bungalow, or the establishment of Resettlement Officer or team all incur additional costs.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

9.1 There are risks associated with not utilising local media to market empty properties. The risks include meeting customer expectations, lack of understanding of the processes which affects the reputation of the Council associated with people waiting for a home, increasing the volume of face to face enquiries visiting the Key Choices Property Shop – currently averaging at 600 customers per day and the number of telephone enquiries may increase.

9.2 Availability of affordable, quality housing is a key concern for customers and Elected Members. With high demand for housing, it is important that the process for allocation and letting is transparent otherwise it may damage the public perception of the Council and its partners.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

There are a range of policy and performance implications associated with this report:

Performance implications

- Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA)
- Rotherham’s Local Area Agreement (LAA) Impact on Performance measures such as NI 156 – “reduction in use of temporary accommodation
- 2010 - BVPI 212 targets
- Audit Commission’s Key Lines of Enquiry
- 2010 Improvement Plan,
- 2010 Void Management Processes.

Policy implications

- Building Britain's Future (CLG)
- Community Strategy and Corporate Plan
- Housing Strategy
- Allocation Policy – Fair and Flexible guidance
- Homelessness Prevention Action Plan
- Single Conversation (Homes and Communities Agency)

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Background Papers

Appendices

Appendix A:	Corporate Management Team commentary on recommendations
Appendix B:	Progress against CBL recommendations
Appendix C:	Briefing paper Sub regional Choice based letting scheme

Background papers

- Scrutiny review report for Choice-Based Lettings process and Voids Scrutiny review (reported separately)
- HQN publication “ *What does excellence look like in Allocations and Lettings*”
- HQN publication” *Managing Housing Registers in England*”

Consultation

Officers within RMBC and 2010 Rotherham Ltd have been consulted on the content of this report. A range of information and evidence has been provided and included in the report from:

- The Sustainable Scrutiny Panel
- Customers through a Fair and Flexible survey – 1147 completed surveys
- Development and Solutions Group
- Independent Living (NAS) and 2010 Rotherham Ltd Away day which was focussed developing an improvement plan
- Neighbourhood and Adult Service's Finance Manager

Contact Name:

**Sandra Tolley, Housing Choices Manager, Extension 6561,
sandra.tolley@rotherham.gov.uk**

Corporate Management Team's Commentary on Scrutiny Review of Choice- based lettings - improving the service from a customer perspective

Appendix A

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
Choice Based Lettings review 1) That a Sub-regional Choice based Letting (CBL) scheme is not supported unless it can be demonstrated that its introduction will have a positive impact on the availability of housing in the Borough.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consultation undertaken as part of Fair and Flexible – Customers were asked “should we help people get housing so that they can move between local areas within south Yorkshire” Present information to Sustainable Scrutiny panel in December 09 with details of results of Fair and Flexible consultation, lettings in and out of the Boroughs, and numbers on housing registers in sub region. We are opposed to setting up a Sub regional team 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase available and mobility housing by widening customers housing options to the Sub region Shared infrastructure with a better understanding of need Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased numbers of customers wishing to move into the Rotherham Borough, however this can be closely monitored and changes to the Scheme adopted to keep the balance of mobility to similar 	ICT set up costs £2000 per organisation Shared annual support costs per organisation of £6000	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
				levels across the Boroughs		
Choice Based Lettings review 2) That proposals are put forward to ensure that all housing associations in the Borough release 50% of their empty properties for allocation through Key Choices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with Supporting People accommodation providers to raise awareness of move on accommodation owned by Housing Associations Develop a Common Housing Register to increase from 50% to 100% nominations 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the housing register and better accessibility for customers seeking to move home Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Associations reluctance to offer more than 50% nominations 	ICT set up costs £2000 per organisation Shared annual support costs per organisation of £6000	
Choice Based Lettings review 3) That the Allocations Policy makes explicit reference that the caring responsibilities of non-domicile carers can be taken into consideration when determining the applicant's housing category.	Consideration was given to Carers within the Medical Assessments but an explicit Carers statement has now been included in Housing Allocation Policy	September 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved understanding of Allocation Policy assessment procedures Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information not disseminated to 	Leaflet Publication Print and design cost approximately £2000 (and subsequent reprinting costs)	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
				Carers – need to develop information leaflet.		
Choice Based Lettings review 4) That this Scrutiny Panel receives further reports on how under-occupancy in social housing can be addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce under occupancy through a range of options including increase participation in mutual exchanges and promote priority status and explore incentives to downsize Undertake tenancy checks of all stock to determine occupancy levels 	Feb 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the availability of family accommodation which will reduce the number of families on the housing register Prevent homelessness and reduced the usage of temporary accommodation The household will save on energy costs Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing the increase in voids and associated 	Voids repairs and void rent loss Cost of media to raise awareness and promote downsizing Cost of incentives – Leeds offer £1000 per bedroom. i.e. a tenant would receive £2000 if they moved from a 3 bedroom house	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
				costs		
Choice Based Lettings review 5) That the impact of the Allocations Policy is regularly monitored by this Scrutiny Panel.	Ensure Sustainable Scrutiny Panel receive updates every 6 months to increase understanding, and to ensure that the Allocation Policy reflects the needs, demands and aspirations of local people, whilst also giving priority to those in the greatest housing need.	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rotherham Safe • Housing Strategy • Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: Increase Elected Members understanding of the Allocation Policy so that they can disseminate information and advice to their constituents during surgeries	Can be met through staff time in existing budgets	
Choice Based Lettings review 6) That further reports are presented to the Scrutiny Panel on options for social housing (including the future options for Council Housing)	This is a separate subject matter and should form part of the CBL review. It will be addressed subject to progress with 2010 Rotherham Ltd on an Improvement Plan	December 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rotherham Safe • Housing Strategy 	Benefits: See comments Risks: See comments	Will be considered as part of the first progress report to be reported to Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods in Jan 2010	
Choice Based Lettings review 7) That a system for the introduction of 'real-time' feedback be introduced as a matter of urgency. This feedback should include property specific information, relating to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of ways to advertise lettings results and different methods to provide more information for customers and Elected Members, 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rotherham Safe • Housing Strategy • Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information will enable customers to make informed decisions regarding their 	HRA associated cost of establishing a resettlement team, range from £28K to 56K depending on the number	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
which need group it will be offered to and an indication of the length of time on the housing register needed to be able to qualify for the shortlist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Quality Network has recently published a briefing paper covering Allocations and lettings looking at the attributes of an excellent three star organisation inspected by Audit Commissioning 2007 and 2008. . Areas of good practice are to establish a resettlement team. 			<p>bids, which should reduce the number of customer enquiries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resettlement team of officer will provide support to vulnerable people <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The numbers of households on the housing register fluctuates and turnover of stock is dependent of customers moving out. This can quickly change the waiting times for areas. 	of staff in post. However some of the HRA staffing costs can be met through staff time in existing budgets, or alternatively ceasing other functions.	
Choice Based Lettings review 8) That robust measures are put in place to ensure that the Housing Register is as an up to date,	Effective management of the Housing Register – introduce a package of measures to ensure it is kept up to date, including monthly	May 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the housing register 	Cost of ICT set up of a Housing register Module £20K and annual support costs	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
accurate and effective database of customers. To support this, that a random 'audit' of cases takes place throughout the year to ensure that the database is continuing to be effective.	data cleansing		s Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerable customers removed from the housing register as they have not responded to the review letter 	Cost of review letters and information leaflet	
Choice Based Lettings review 9) That the current appeals procedure against removal and/or re-assessment of registration date be reviewed to ensure that they are adequately meeting the needs of customers, and that this system is clearly outlined to applicants.	To manage the housing register effectively by keeping it up to date and provide information to customers regarding the review process. This recommendation will be incorporated into recommendation 8.	May 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the housing register Risks: <p>Vulnerable customers removed from the housing register as they have not responded to the review letter</p>	Cost of ICT set up of a Housing register Module £20K and annual support costs. Cost publication and postage of the review letters and information leaflet	
Choice Based Lettings review 10) That a review of the effectiveness of the Quality Landlord Scheme is undertaken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Quality Landlord Scheme is now known as the Key Choices Property Management (KCPM) The service has been reviewed, The scheme has developed a 5 years business plan and improvement plan.. The KCPM's core business is to increase the KCPM portfolio of private rented accommodation 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 Private Sector Housing renewal 	Benefits: <p>Improve standards of private sector housing</p> Risks: <p>The portfolio of private rented properties for 2009/10 must retain</p>	The KCPM will be self financing in 2010/11	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
	and improve standards and maintain decency levels in private rented accommodation in Rotherham to assist in the prevention of homelessness and the reduction in usage of temporary accommodation.			the target of 116 properties. The scheme is self financing and is dependent on income generated from management fees		
Choice Based Lettings review 11) That full equality monitoring of successful and unsuccessful bidders is undertaken (not just on the basis of ethnicity) to inform service improvement and that the Equality Impact Assessment is updated on the basis of this information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) already undertaken to ensure that the 7 equalities strands Equality monitoring of housing applications is completed on a monthly basis 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 Equalities and Diversity 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will ensure that services and procedures are not having an adverse impact on a particular group of people due to gender, race or disability. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To plan for costs of negative impacts – where we identify any potential for negative impact, we should consider making changes. E.g. failure to provide information about services in community 	Costs of developing monitoring reports can be met through staff time to develop reporting tools in existing budgets. Cost of translation into Community Languages	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
				languages has a negative impact as people cannot access services they do not know about.		
Choice Based Lettings review 12) Explore whether an alternative title to "Direct Homes" can be developed which is more 'user friendly', descriptive of its purpose and is easily understood by the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct homes information published in advertiser weekly during May to August 09. Consultation exercise planned for November with customers to capture suggestions and understanding of the public's view of Direct Homes 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe - Alive Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 Equalities and Diversity 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in void relet times of Direct homes Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	Costs of undertaking consultation can be met through staff time.	
Choice Based Lettings review 13) That work is undertaken to improve the information given to existing and potential applicants to ensure that there are clear, simple instructions about how and where to bid (so customers bid on properties that they are interested in); and the rationale for prioritisation of bids.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To undertake reality checks: area offices, mystery shopper Allocation policy booklets are supplied to all customers, along with application acknowledgment letters Occupancy level guides included with acknowledgment letters, Frequently asked questions developed 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase customer understanding, resulting in a reduction of enquiries and customers view the scheme as being more transparent. Risks:	Cost of publication and postage of the information leaflets. £5000 Virtual tours £200 each property. Staff time to attend schools to provide	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show visual property standards through virtual tours on 2010 site, with link to Key choices To mainstream information sessions about finding accommodation and leaving home into schools citizenship curriculum. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure vulnerable customers have support to understand the processes 	information about leaving home and finding accommodation	
Choice Based Lettings review 14) That the website is redesigned using best practice from other authorities. As part of this redesign, the feasibility of 'virtual tours' and links with other public services should be explored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesigning the key Choices website in conjunction with a CBL ICT system including links to Google Earth and other public services Virtual tours will be included in the property adverts Photos of localities uploaded Stock Profiles uploaded on website Self service ICT booths in 2010 customer service centres 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers can make more informed decisions regarding making property requests, which may reduce refusal rates Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties are still occupied by the previous tenant when advertised – Risk that virtual tour cannot be completed 	£200 per property for virtual tour x 1000 voids = £200,000 per annum. Costs of developing stock profile reports can be met through staff time	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
Choice Based Lettings review 15) That systems are put in place to 'quality assure' the information published via the web and other avenues to ensure consistency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the Key Choices website by introducing more quality checks Quarterly programme of reality checks to be implemented and conducted by the Customer Inspectors (commencing Nov) 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: Improve satisfaction levels Risks: None	Incorporated into staff time and Customer Inspection group	
Choice Based Lettings review 16) Customer feedback forms should be located in a more prominent position on all web-pages, including those hosted on the 2010 Rotherham Ltd website.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The feedback form has been moved to a more prominent position on the Key Choices Website. 	November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 Customer excellence 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase customer feedback to improve service delivery Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing expectations with the current demand for accommodation 	Incorporated into staff time	
Choice Based Lettings review 17) That consideration is given to giving fuller descriptions of properties, including indication of garden sizes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property adverts have been reviewed and now includes fuller further information regarding the size of the garden is to be requested from the Empty Homes team within 2010 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve understanding of facilities within the property - Potential to 	Publishing costs and staff time	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
	Rotherham Ltd at the next liaison meeting.		Plan 2008-2011	reduce refusal rates Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverts get too much detailed and too large to publish effectively 		
Choice Based Lettings review 18) That the weekly results sheet also reports the status of previously advertised properties that are awaiting allocation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A weekly report is currently being developed which will capture all voids where the property has been advertised. The results will be published weekly on the internet, in the Key Choices Property Shop and in Local neighbourhood Offices. 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved information to customers and reduction in enquires Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	Staff time to produce weekly report	
Choice Based Lettings review 19) That proposals are put forward to improve communications and working processes between Key Choices Team and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. This should include measures to ensure that bids received at outlying offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce fortnightly liaison meetings with operational staff Customers able to view the status of their previous bids on the new ICT CBL system. Mystery Shopping exercises and a Quarterly programme of reality checks to be implemented and conducted by the Customer Inspectors 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver a seamless CBL and Void service Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where issues are identified by the mystery shopping 	Staff time to attend and deliver training	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
and by telephone are recorded and communicated.	(commencing Nov)			exercise – A rolling programme of staff training must be implemented – this may impact on staffing resources to attend and deliver training		
Choice Based Lettings review 20) That information given out at Neighbourhood Offices is comprehensive and consistent. To support this, training should be undertaken with relevant officers in central and Neighbourhood Offices to ensure that they are aware of current developments and processes; this should be updated on a regular basis to address any issues of staff turnover.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement Allocation Policy Training every two month with a rolling programme Reality Checking/mystery shopping, 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood staff to provide a better and consistent advice service for the customer. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff retention 	Staff time to attend and deliver training	
Choice Based Lettings review 21) Ensure relevant and appropriate information about local lettings policies and the housing history of prospective tenants are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved nomination procedures, and capture local letting information 	March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge of prospective tenants which will create 	ICT costs of setting up a Common Housing register – Initial set up costs of Common	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
communicated to RSLs/private landlords.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local lettings Policies reviewed every 6 months Develop a Common Housing register which will enable RSLs to view all details of applicants 		Prevention Action Plan 2008-201	sustainable tenancies Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure data protection is met by provision of a joint information sharing protocol 	Housing Register and CBL ICT module £64K – and annual support costs of £20K - Already included in budget	
Choice Based Lettings review 22) That the process for advertising properties via local media is examined to ensure it is the best use of staff resources and provides value for money.	Undertake a consultation exercise to evaluate usage of current local media Explore other local media outlets to, determine advertising timeframes and costs as comparatives Explore other innovative methods to advertising properties	January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-201 	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective use of resources which offer Value for Money Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure vulnerable customers are not disadvantaged by any media changes 	Rotherham Advertiser £500 per Property Page – weekly distribution to 29,000 households, and meets the weekly advertising cycle. No impact on staffing resources Rotherham News £2000 per page – deliver and printing	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
					<p>timeframe outside the bidding cycle. No impact on staffing resources</p> <p>Weekly Mailing List – cost £1000 per 1000 customers – major impact on staffing resources – not ECO friendly.</p> <p>Alternative – not to use local media and replace with Resettlement team.</p>	
Choice Based Lettings review 23) Review the information sent to all Councillors so that they are well placed to answer any housing queries from their constituents. Drawing on good practice from several wards, Members should be encouraged to work closely with Housing Champions to organise 'housing	<p>Letting results published on Key Choices webpage and emailed direct to Elected Members.</p> <p>Monthly email updates for Elected members broken down by each area assembly?</p> <p>Housing Champions to introduce more Community Surgeries</p>	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-201 	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected Members and applicants are well informed and kept up to date <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of staff time to undertake 	<p>Undertake surgeries within existing staff resources</p>	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication <i>Impact on revenue/capital budget, MTFS</i>	
surgeries' to address specific issues about the application process.				Community outreach		
Choice Based Lettings review 24) That regular Member briefing/ information sessions on housing related matters are held, particularly following any significant changes to policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected Member Briefings embedded into service delivery Continue community surgeries lead by 2010 Rotherham Ltd in Neighbourhood offices 	December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rotherham Safe, Learning Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-201	Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected Members are well informed and kept up to date Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of staff time to undertake Community outreach 	No costs as already included within existing staff resources	

Choice Based Lettings – improving the service from a customer perspective – Appendix B

The Review by the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel.

Progress updated - October 2009

Recommendations and progress:

1) That a Sub-regional Choice based Letting (CBL) scheme is not supported unless it can be demonstrated that its introduction will have a positive impact on the availability of housing in the Borough.

Progress made:

In July 2009 a briefing paper detailing the concept of a Sub regional CBL Scheme (appendix C) was presented to the Scrutiny CBL Review group. It should be noted that the review group were not persuaded that a sub-regional scheme would bring added value to people in Rotherham as the review group felt that its introduction may place greater pressure on the housing register in the borough.

The briefing paper explained that “Homes for All” the Government’s 5-year housing plan, made clear that the Government is keen that CBL’s should operate sub-regionally, recognizing that housing markets do not always follow local boundaries. There are 19 Sub Regional Choice based lettings schemes that are now in operation. A sub regional CBL Scheme will enable greater mobility and breaks down artificial boundaries; it will bring together a larger pool of available housing, giving home- seekers more choice and helping to ease localised problems, of low or high demand.

Further work has been undertaken to demonstrate that a sub regional scheme would have a positive impact of available housing in Rotherham.

- An analysis of the housing register and comparisons to those within the sub region has been undertaken. Below is the latest available benchmarking information which is taken from the 2007/08 Housing Strategy Statistical Appendix (HSSA) returns. This shows that by joining with Barnsley and Doncaster, would increase the supply of available housing for Rotherham people by 40,537 and reduce the pressure on the housing register against the percentage of stock from 98% to 69%.

Local Authority (LA)	LA Stock (Excl RSL's)	Number on the Housing Register	% against stock
Barnsley	19,516	6,097	31%
Doncaster	21,021	15,973	75%
Rotherham	21,289	20,826	98%
Sheffield	42,470	92,515	217%

All the local authorities in the sub region including Rotherham operate an open Allocation Policy; this means that households who live outside their Borough are eligible to apply for housing in the normal way. An analysis of COntinuous REcording (CORE) for year 2008/9 shows that there is consistent mobility within the sub region.

- During 2007-2008 a total of **138 households** moved out of **Rotherham to take up social housing elsewhere**
- During 2007-2008 a total of **52 households** moved into Rotherham and became **RMBC tenants**

Of those 57 households who moved into Rotherham during 2007/8 the table below details where the household lived previously

Previous Address	Number of Households moved into Rotherham
Barnsley	5
Bassetlaw	1
Blackpool	1
Camden	1
Chesterfield	1
Doncaster	17
Durham	1
Kennet	1
Kingston upon Hull	1
North East Derbyshire	2
Sheffield	20
Wigan	1
Total	52

- During 2008-2009 a total of **113 households** moved out of **Rotherham to take up social housing elsewhere**
- During 2008-2009 a total of **57 households** moved into Rotherham and became **RMBC tenants**

Of those 57 households who moved into Rotherham during 2008/9 the table below details where the household lived previously

Previous Address	Number of Households moved into Rotherham
Amber Valley	1
Barnsley	10
Bassetlaw	1
Blyth Valley	1
Chesterfield	1
Doncaster	10
East Riding	1
Kingston upon Hull	1
Newark	1
North East Derbyshire	2
Preston	1
Sheffield	25
West Lindsey	1
York	1
Total	57

- **Consultation** - During a 6 week period - July 09 to August 09 - 1173 customers completed a survey "Fair and Flexible – *"Have your say on proposed changes to the way we provide housing for people of Rotherham."* Customers feel very passionate about the way Council housing is offered; this was evident in the high volume of responses. As part of the consultation questionnaire Customers were asked "***should we help people get housing so that they can move between local areas within south Yorkshire***". In total 888 customers responded to this question (62.5%) 169 strongly agreed and 386 agreed, 199 had no view and 134 disagreed.

2) That proposals are put forward to ensure that all housing associations in the Borough release 50% of their empty properties for allocation through Key Choices.

Progress made:

- 100% nominations with 5 RSLs, including South Yorkshire Housing Association, Archers, Anchor, Sadelok and Great Places.
- 100% nominations with all new build housing association properties
- 100% nominations for move on accommodation and are working with Supporting People accommodation providers to raise awareness of availability.
- In the process of developing a Common Housing Register with RSLs, in conjunction with new CBL software.
- RSL Nomination Performance meetings held every 3 month with all RSL's

3) That the Allocations Policy makes explicit reference that the caring responsibilities of non-domicile carers can be taken into consideration when determining the applicant's housing category.

Progress made:

- The Allocation Policy now makes reference to the Adult social care assessment through revised Allocation Policy procedures. The following statement has been included:

Following assessment in respect of requesting to move to provide support, a priority will be awarded if the following information is received:

- *Assessment identifies that care and support is given to the customer daily*
- *Care given must be personal care e.g. assisting with bathing, dressing, medication etc.*
- *Confirmation of the support given to be obtained by Social Care Assessment (if one undertaken by Adult Services)*
- *Distance to provide care and family commitments will be taken into account*

4) That this Scrutiny Panel receives further reports on how under-occupancy in social housing can be addressed.

Progress made:

- A letter has been posted to all under occupiers currently on the housing register encouraging a move to a smaller home. Since the January 2009 there has been 156 households awarded Priority status for under-occupying.
- An evaluation of under occupancy has been completed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd, the results have identified that there are 5,000 three bedroom and 100 four bedroom Council homes that are occupied by a single person.
- The Housing Options Manager has attended a seminar presented by Communities and Local Government regarding under occupancy. Leeds City Council promoted their under occupancy scheme which offers £1000 per bedroom to under occupiers. This means that someone who moved to a flat or bungalow from a 3 bedroom house would receive £3000.

Further actions are to:

- Utilise the names and address list from the 2010 tenancy checks and write to all under occupiers living in council tenancies - promote downsizing – i.e. energy savings etc
- Promote that priority will be given to tenants downsizing into new build schemes – council houses and RSL stock.
- Explore if the Fond Farewell package can be extended to include further incentives
- Explore whether 2010 Rotherham Ltd, from within its existing framework can create a moving house company. – That can offer free gratis packages such as arranging utility transfers and a moving service for downsizes.
- Promote energy efficiency/wastage for under occupancy – provide case studies that promote how much households spend on energy utilities before and after a move.
- Develop a mutual exchange system that promotes under occupancy through choice based lettings
- Become a member of Home Swapper scheme
- Advertise on digital TV

5) That the impact of the Allocations Policy is regularly monitored by this Scrutiny Panel.

Progress:

As part of the Fair and Flexible consultation more one thousand customers completed and returned a survey/questionnaire providing us with good intelligence about what needs to be done to improve the Allocation Policy. Based on the results of the survey, we have began work to put forward

options to revise the Allocation Policy, to improve understanding of the scheme and to improve its legitimacy with residents. In considering changes we will consider the strategic market assessment, be compatible with the Housing Strategy and be consistent with the local authorities Homelessness Prevention Strategy. The Allocation of Accommodation under Part VI of the Housing Act is one of the main ways in which Rotherham discharges its homelessness duty.

Based on customer feedback from the survey areas within the Allocation Policy that we are considering change are:

- Develop Local Lettings Policies in Rural areas to give priority to local connection
- Develop Local Lettings Policies to help more customers move home to gain employment possibly look to create more mixed communities by setting aside a proportion of vacancies for applicants in employment.
- Revisit the concept of a sub regional choice based letting scheme
- Changing the quota system to give more priority to applicants in the general group with long waiting time. Currently only 10% of properties are offered to the General Group.

In setting our quotas we will take into account the size of the housing register, and composite groups, profile of stock and turnover of property

- As part of the 'Inspection Action Plan' to address the recommendations from the Care Quality Commission Inspection of Adult Social the revised Allocation Policy will ensure that we will increase options for disabled people of all ages.
- A briefing session for Sustainable Scrutiny Panel regarding the impact of the Allocation Policy and proposals for change has been arranged for 10th December 2009 and an All Member Seminar for 12th January 2010.

6) That further reports are presented to the Scrutiny Panel on options for social housing (including the future options for Council Housing)

Progress:

- First progress report to be presented to Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods in Jan 2010, and then provide quarterly reports on progress against 2010 Rotherham Ltd's improvement plan, and a final report in late 2010 on future delivery of council housing services.

7) That a system for the introduction of 'real-time' feedback be introduced as a matter of urgency. This feedback should include property specific information, relating to which need group it will be offered to and an indication of the length of time on the housing register needed to be able to qualify for the shortlist.

Progress:

- The Housing Options team provide weekly feedback on letting results which are published on the internet, the Property Shop and local Neighbourhood 2010 offices. The Housing Options team have benchmarked with other Local Authorities (LA) and RMBC's Legal Service to ensure that data protection is adhered to. The results show that all LA's follow data protection by removing the house number – this process is adopted in Rotherham.
- A clause is included in the Allocation Policy Summary booklet explaining that details of lettings will be published.
- The Housing options team are in the process of procuring a choice based lettings software package which will only allow customers to bid for properties that they are eligible for and provide real-time lettings feedback, giving the customer a queue position. A project group has been established to develop the ICT systems, with an anticipated implementation date of March 2010.

Further actions to explore are:

- Housing Quality Network has recently published a briefing paper covering Allocations and lettings looking at the attributes of an excellent three star organisation inspected by Audit Commissioning 2007 and 2008. . Areas of good practice are:
 - Explore the introduction a resettlement team or Resettlement Officer – Your Homes Newcastle has a “Pathway team” who support customers and care providers. It is designed to help homeless people and hospital patients into settled accommodation. Overall the service is making a major contribution to homeless prevention, tenancy sustainment, hospital discharge and refugee integration.
 - Explore the appointment a Resettlement Officer to oversee the needs of vulnerable applicants, including supporting households to make property requests and support those households who are ineligible for housing due to rent arrears or anti social behaviour.

8) That robust measures are put in place to ensure that the Housing Register is as an up to date, accurate and effective database of customers. To support this, that a random 'audit' of cases takes place throughout the year to ensure that the database is continuing to be effective.

Progress:

- Continue to monitor outcomes of lettings by participating fully in Continuous REcording (CORE), which provides profiled reports about the new tenants of all new lettings. Details include, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, disabilities, income, source of income and economic status, including occupation of head of household. The main reason why

the household has left their last settled home is also recorded. During 2008/09 one of the main reasons that customers moved home was that their property was unsuitable due to ill health or disability.

- Weekly reports have been developed to inform of real- time numbers on housing register, bidders and non bidders
- A bi monthly training programme has been implemented to raise understanding of inputting and updating of housing applications
- The Housing Options team are in the process of procuring a CBL software package that manages the housing register, each application will be reviewed annually.
- Weekly reporting tools have been developed that highlights “inputting errors.” The officer who has made the error is contacted to discuss, if there is a training issue appropriate support/training is implemented.

9) That the current appeals procedure against removal and/or re-assessment of registration date, be reviewed to ensure that they are adequately meeting the needs of customers, and that this system is clearly outlined to applicants.

Progress:

- An analysis of the housing register has been completed and the finding are to be reported to DMT and Cabinet Member (Oct/Nov 09)
- An ICT software package is being procured which will facilitate monthly housing register reviews, this is expected to be implemented March/April 2010

Areas to be developed:

- Embed good practice identified in two recent Housing Quality Network publications, “Managing Housing Registers in England” and “What does excellence look like? – Allocations and Lettings”
- Develop an information leaflet to provide advice regarding the housing register review process.

10) That a review of the effectiveness of the Quality Landlord Scheme is undertaken.

Progress:

- A five year business plan has been developed, which maps out the strategic direction for The Key Choices Property Management team (KCPM) – formerly known as the Rotherham Quality Landlord (RQL) for the period April 2009 to March 2014. The core business is to increase the KCPM portfolio of private rented accommodation as alternative housing options, improve standards and maintain decency levels in private rented accommodation in Rotherham and assist in the prevention of homelessness and the reduction in usage of temporary accommodation.

- In August 2009, a 12 hour Private Landlord Extravaganza was held. This event provided existing and new landlords with advice and information about letting private rented accommodation. It was a very successful event and was well attended by private landlords. Three new landlords joined the accreditation scheme increasing the KCPM portfolio by 20 properties.
- Regular liaison meetings are now held with housing benefits to ensure that systems are in place to support vulnerable customers in paying their rent – this includes a process to make direct payments to Landlords as opposed to the tenant if there is a risk of non payment.
- All front line Key Choices staff has been trained in housing benefit verification. This means that the staff can verify income details on behalf of housing benefits which speeds up the claim process.

11) That full equality monitoring of successful and unsuccessful bidders is undertaken (not just on the basis of ethnicity) to inform service improvement and that the Equality Impact Assessment is updated on the basis of this information.

Progress:

- Equality Monitoring ICT reports are being developed for both bidders and non bidders, this will include age, ethnic origin, sexuality and gender.
- An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed and will be updated in line with the results.
- Customers completed the equalities monitoring questions on the Fair and Flexible questionnaire, 88.9% answered this question, 70% were female, 64% were between the ages of 18 to 54, 14% had a long term disability, 14% were Carers, 92% were White British and 3.4% declared they were lesbian or gay, and 0.9% declared they were bi-sexual.
- A new housing application is being developed in partnership with housing associations; this will include all equality strands. Arbritas the new CBL software will facilitate the new improved housing application form.

12) Explore whether an alternative title to “Direct Homes” can be developed which is more ‘user friendly’, descriptive of its purpose and is easily understood by the public.

Progress

- A weekly article has been published in the Rotherham Advertiser on the Key Choices Property page during May to August 09.
- During November a consultation exercise focussed on Direct Homes is planned for the Property Shop. This will capture customers understanding of Direct Homes and suggested name changes will be captured.

13) That work is undertaken to improve the information given to existing and potential applicants to ensure that there are clear, simple instructions about how and where to bid (so customers bid on

properties that they are interested in); and the rationale for prioritisation of bids

Progress:

- Reality Checks to be undertaken by the Service Quality Team through Customer to Customer questionnaires at Key Choices Property Shop on a monthly basis (commencing end Oct 09).
- A Summary guide which details a step by step guide is displayed at the Key Choices Property Shop and Neighbourhood Offices and is included with the acknowledgement letter sent to new applicants.
- Develop an occupancy level guide which will be posted with a housing application acknowledgement is an agenda item for next Development and Solutions group meeting (Dec 09)
- Development of a stock profile which will be posted with the housing application acknowledgement and displayed in a range of outlets is an agenda item for (Dec 09)
- An explanation to customers of what properties they are entitled to is a design feature of Abritas which is expected to be in operation March 2010
- Developing a frequently asked questions is an agenda item for the Development and Solutions group meeting in Nov 09
- An Assessment Officer, Jan Frost, who is based in the Housing Assessment team, is undertaking awareness sessions for parents and children with learning difficulties. The first information sessions are to be held at Hilltop at Maltby and then Kelford School at Meadow bank. The sessions are called "Life after Hilltop/Kelford" The aim is to roll these sessions into all schools and to be mainstreamed into the schools citizenship curriculum.

Further actions:

- Develop a joint protocol and assessment process with Children and Young People Services aimed at assisting 16/17 year olds who require accommodation and support.
- Establish a project group to develop information about leaving home which will targeted at 16/17 year old. As part of the consultation process other agencies who work with young people such as Rush house, Action Housing and Action for Children will be involved.

14) That the website is redesigned using best practice from other authorities. As part of this redesign, the feasibility of 'virtual tours' and links with other public services should be explored.

Progress:

- The Housing Options team have met with Fluid and an ICT company to organise virtual tours of properties to commence Nov/Dec.
- Still photo shots have been taken of Borough which will be included in Property Adverts in November 09.

- Key Choices website has links to information for the local areas on the individual property adverts; information is retrieved through an Information Viewer and includes local details of; the Name of the Ward, Local Councillors, Primary and Secondary Catchment areas, Area Assembly, details of the local library, the nearest waste and recycling centre, bus and train travel information, aerial photo graphs, Neighbourhood statistics., housing market renewal pathway information, Up my street, Council Tax Band, links to Planning with details of planning applications in the local area.
- Additional telephone line to be installed in the Property Shop
- Housing Choices Officers walk the floor in the Property Shop to assist customers with advice and information and will support customers with operating the Virtual booth

Further actions:

- Further improvements to the website design will be implemented with the introduction of Jada, the Councils website management system and Abritras.
- 2010 Rotherham Ltd to explore options for funding to purchase additional virtual booths in Neighbourhood Offices.

15) That systems are put in place to 'quality assure' the information published via the web and other avenues to ensure consistency.

Progress:

- Systems are in place to ensure all property adverts are quality checked and signed off by the Housing Options Manager before publishing
- Implemented fortnightly meetings with 2010 Empty Homes Manager and Housing Options Manager
- Streamlined the advertising processes to reduce duplication and potential for human errors.

Further actions:

- Quarterly programme of reality checks to be implemented and conducted by the Customer Inspectors (commencing Nov)

16) Customer feedback forms should be located in a more prominent position on all web-pages, including those hosted on the 2010 Rotherham Ltd website.

Progress:

- Completed this has been moved to a more prominent position on the Key Choices Website

17) That consideration be given to giving fuller descriptions of properties, including indication of garden sizes.

Progress:

- The property adverts have been reviewed and now includes the following information; room sizes, type of adaptations, property type and number of bedrooms, if the property is furnished or not, if pets are allowed or not, local lettings policies, utility suppliers, eligibility rules i.e. families and couples are eligible for houses. The garden description includes open or enclosed – to front and rear. Further information regarding the size of the garden is to be requested from the Empty Homes team within 2010 Rotherham Ltd at the next liaison meeting.
- Still photographs and virtual tours are being finalised.

18) That the weekly results sheet also reports the status of previously advertised properties that are awaiting allocation.

- A weekly report is currently being developed which will capture all voids where the property has been advertised. The results will be published weekly on the internet, in the Key Choices Property Shop and in Local neighbourhood Offices.

19) That proposals are put forward to improve communications and working processes between Key Choices Team and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. This should include measures to ensure that bids received at outlying offices and by telephone are recorded and communicated.

- Fortnightly liaison meetings have been established with the Housing Options Manager and Coordinator and 2010 Rotherham Ltd Empty Homes Manager and Voids Controller.
- Customers will be able to view the status of their previous bids on the new ICT CBL system.
- Mystery Shopping exercises and a Quarterly programme of reality checks to be implemented and conducted by the Customer Inspectors (commencing Nov)

20) That information given out at Neighbourhood Offices is comprehensive and consistent. To support this, training should be undertaken with relevant officers in central and Neighbourhood Offices to ensure that they are aware of current developments and processes; this should be updated on a regular basis to address any issues of staff turnover.

Since the implementation of CBL's there has been difficulties in that some 2010 Rotherham Ltd staff has struggled to understand the processes of CBL's and the Allocation Policy. This is attributed to the turnover of staff and new appointments who have limited knowledge of the system including the Local Authority's statutory responsibilities in relation to homelessness. As a

consequence, customers are being redirected to the Property Shop for advice, and often customers have previously been misinformed.

Progress:

- Considerable resources have been committed to train staff on all lettings issues. A bi monthly timetable of free training is offered by Key Choices team to all RMBC and 2010 Rotherham Ltd staff that provides advice to customers regarding rehousing. The training includes the Allocation Policy, Choice based letting processes and ICT training of how to register and update a housing application. The take up of the training has been high.
- Further work has also taken place to streamline systems and procedures with 2010 staff.
- A reporting tool has been developed which highlights errors that individual staff have made when inputting a housing application. The staff member who has made the error is contacted by the Key Choices team and actions taken – i.e. if there is a training need, the team will organize work shadowing or attendance to the training sessions.
- All new 2010 Rotherham Ltd staff whose role is offering customers advice regarding rehousing now attends a full day in the Property Shop as part of their induction.
- Implement monthly mystery shopping activities at Neighbourhood Offices conducted by the Customer Inspection Service team (Dec 09)
- The Service Quality team are undertaking customer journey mapping through Home Truths Diaries. They have recruited 1 Home Truths video diary and are undertaking a weekly recruitment campaign.
- The Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate's Service Quality Team carried out a random telephone survey of 8 customers who have recently taken up tenancies and the findings are as below;
 - ❖ **75%** of customers were satisfied with the service received from 2010 Rotherham Ltd when moving into a home.
 - ❖ **76%** of customers were happy that staff treated them politely, friendly and fairly.
 - ❖ **100%** of customers were happy time taken from making a bid for this property to the time taken for 2010 staff to contact you to verify your application details
 - ❖ **76%** of customers were happy with the time taken from making a bid for this property to moving in to the property.
 - ❖ **None** of the customers received a House proud bucket

21) Ensure relevant and appropriate information about local lettings policies and the housing history of prospective tenants are communicated to RSLs/private landlords.

- A common housing application is being developed in conjunction with Housing Associations. The new housing application will include a joint information sharing protocol which will comply with data protection legislation and will enable each RSL's to view the housing history of prospective tenants.

- Local Lettings Policies are published on the Internet.

22) That the process for advertising properties via local media is examined to ensure it is the best use of staff resources and provides value for money.

In 2005, when Key Choices was first launched, a weekly mailing list was produced and posted out to approximately 1000 vulnerable households. In addition to staff time to produce the mailing list there were additional costs for printing and postage of £1000 per week. Often customers visited the Property Shop to collect a mailing list but had previously advised us that they couldn't access any information point where properties were displayed i.e. the internet, their local neighbourhood office or the Property Shop. A survey was implemented and customers told us that they would like to view the Property Adverts in the Local News paper. This prompted negotiations with the Rotherham Advertiser, whose distribution is over 29,000 purchases per week. This paper actually reaches more people as the paper is often recycled with the household by family members passing onto others to read.

Processes were established to ensure that the properties are advertised within the weekly cycle giving careful consideration to ensure the property is advertised in the termination period ensuring that there is no impact on void relet times.

The Key Choices Property Page is full colour and is published in the "Property Section" along with other housing options with local estate agents.

The cost for the Key Choices Property page is £500 per page per week as opposed to £1000 per week for the mailing list other added benefits are that the Advertiser provides additional copies of the news paper for no extra cost. The additional copies of the Property Pages are used to find alternative accommodation in the private rented sector by the Housing Solutions Officers to assist in prevention of homelessness.

To ensure that the process for advertising properties via the Rotherham Advertiser is still providing value for money an analysis of how many customers purchase the advertiser to specifically view Key Choices Property page is being undertaken.

The results of the value for money exercise so far are:

Profile and volume of customers:

- Older People tend to prefer to use the Advertiser to view adverts
- 1006 customers were asked through an online and face to face survey where they currently look to find accommodation in Rotherham, 27% (279 people) told us that they only used the Advertiser, 46% (464 people) used the Property Shop, 10% (110 people) used their Local Neighbourhood Office, 52% (526 people) the Key Choices website and 9% (91 people) didn't respond.

- All Housing Association new build developments and relets are marketed on Key Choices Property page, and the RSL is recharged by Key Choices. The RSL's along with Private Landlords who are part of Key Choices Property Management view the low cost of advertising in the Key Choices Property Page as an incentive to be part of the Key Choices Scheme.

Further Research:

- A dedicated Key choices telephone request line (335005) is in operation and this is managed by RBT Connect. RBT were approached to request that for a two week period the telephone call centre operator asks applicants (telephone callers) an additional question of where the customer viewed the adverts. Unfortunately RBT advised that there would be an additional charge of over £1000 to undertake this on off survey.
- The Housing Options team utilise Right Move to advertise private rented properties. For a two week period an alternative request line telephone number will be published in the Rotherham Advertiser – this will be a 0845 number that is then redirected to RBT Connect. The number of calls can be logged and this will determine how many customers have used the Rotherham Advertiser. There is no extra call charge for the customer but there is a risk that some customers store the 336005 telephone number into their contact list in their mobile so not all customers will be captured.
- A further face to face and telephone survey will be undertaken to determine more details of how many customers use the Advertiser to view Property adverts

The cost and distribution of the Property Adverts through local media:

	Cost per page £	Distribution	Distribution Frequency
Rotherham Advertiser	£500	29,000 + family recycling	Weekly – every Friday
Rotherham News	2000 with a potential discount of 20% = £1600	Every household in Rotherham	Monthly – distribution cycle 7 to 10 days
Mailing List	£1000	To 1000 vulnerable households	Weekly

- There are alternative options to consider if the final results show that the Rotherham Advertiser is not widely used meaning that it is not value for money. However if this is the case the proposal would be to stop using newspapers as a media outlet as there is no other newspaper that is distributed as widely and is published weekly. Note that Rotherham News is distributed monthly and is not delivered on the same day to every household. This means that even if the publication

was made weekly the distribution is over a period of seven to ten days meaning that adverts would be published and households would miss the weekly advertising cycle to make a request. i.e. if the newspaper was delivered after the Tuesday 4pm request deadline.

An alternative option is:

- To utilise the savings to pay for a resettlement officer, who could offer personal support to vulnerable households. They would provide advice to customers of properties available; explain what the customer is eligible for, including arranging repayment plans for those customers on the register who are in arrears. In addition the Resettlement Officer could advice on a range of housing options, including private rented, housing association and home ownership.

23) Review the information sent to all Councillors so that they are well placed to answer any housing queries from their constituents. Drawing on good practice from several wards, Members should be encouraged to work closely with Housing Champions to organise 'housing surgeries' to address specific issues about the application process.

- A procedure has been implemented by 2010 Rotherham Ltd which will provide information on empty properties at a local level to Elected Members and Key Choices. This has been implemented by linking with Neighbourhood Champions weekly estate management updates.
- Letting results are published on Key Choices web page and emailed direct to Elected Members.
- The letting results will be published in Rotherham Advertiser where space permits.

24) That regular Member briefing/ information sessions on housing related matters are held, particularly following any significant changes to policy.

- The Housing Choices Services are in the process of developing a Media Plan.
- A briefing session for Sustainable Scrutiny Panel regarding the impact of the Allocation Policy and proposals for change has been arranged for 10th December 2009 and an All Member Seminar for 12th January 2010.
- An Elected Member Briefing has been distributed regarding the Fair and Flexible consultation.
- Continue with Community Surgeries which are lead by 2010 Rotherham Ltd in Neighbourhood Offices.

Briefing Paper - Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel - July 2009

Sub Regional Choice Based Lettings (Appendix C)

The Council's Key Choices Service, together with 2010 Rotherham Ltd requested Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel's view on any potential development of a Sub Regional scheme, which would enhance its existing service. **The scheme was not supported unless it can be demonstrated that its introduction will have a positive impact on the availability of housing in the Borough.**

The Background

Choice based lettings (CBL) allow customers to apply for vacancies which are openly advertised. Applicants can see the full range of available properties and apply for a home.

"Homes for All" the Government's 5-year housing plan, set out the Government's strategy for taking forward its CBL's policy. The aim is to have in place, nationwide choice based lettings by 2010. "Homes for All" also made clear that the Government is keen that CBL's should operate sub-regionally, recognizing that housing markets do not always follow local boundaries. There are 19 Sub Regional Choice based lettings schemes that are now in operation.

CLG has provided £4M over the last three years to support the development of regional and sub regional choice based letting schemes (CBL's) in England by the means of a bidding process. The money has been made available over three years (2005-2008.).

There is a final opportunity to apply for funding and CLG have recently approached all LA's in South Yorkshire to determine whether they are intending to submit a final bid. Doncaster, Barnsley and Sheffield have all expressed an interest in a submission.

. The criteria of the sub regional scheme are that:

- At least 2 Local authorities have indicated that they wish to join;
- RSLs operating in the sub region have indicated that they are willing to be included in the scheme;
- Involvement or plans to work with the private rented sector;
- Partners operate or plan to operate a Common Housing Register;
- Properties are advertised openly and transparently;
- Customers are given generic feedback to the letting results;
- A housing options approach is adopted;
- Value for money is demonstrated.

In October 2005, Rotherham submitted a Sub Regional bid which had been developed in partnership with Sheffield, Doncaster, Barnsley. However, no progress was made as both Doncaster and Barnsley withdrew their involvement.

Cabinet Member's view at that time was that this would not now be a true Sub Regional Scheme. The reason that Doncaster withdrew their involvement is that they were in the

process of developing their own Choice Based Lettings scheme, and this was their priority at that time. Barnsley withdrew because they were in the process of reviewing their Allocation Policy.

The aims of a Sub Regional Choice Based Letting Scheme are to:

- Enable greater sub-regional mobility and breaks down artificial boundaries; it will bring together a larger pool of available housing, giving home- seekers more choice and helping to ease localised problems, or low or high demand.
- Improve engagement with Housing Associations operating in Rotherham, the advantages for RSL's is that they cut the costs of being involved in several different schemes. There is also the opportunity to have full membership which would increase nominations rights to 100%
- A letting service within the Sub region that empowers homeseekers to choose a home regardless of the local authority area it falls in,
- One of the features of the scheme will be a joint website, which replicates Rotherham's good practice in full, and will drive the property advertising. All properties for each organisation will be advertised on a weekly basis, with the same open/close day.

The Benefits for the Customers is:

- Better accessibility for customers on all income streams i.e. if you can afford to purchase your home you have the choice of moving across boundaries, whereas if you are on a low income customers are restricted to moving across boundaries and can only access properties in the private rented sector
- A One Stop approach, with a Common Housing Register customers only have to apply once, as opposed to several applications with different Local Authorities and Housing associations
- A better understanding of housing options
- Easy access to information of available homes across the Sub Region

The Benefits for the Partners are:

- One point of contact for Housing Associations. They don't have to have systems in place with different local authorities i.e. Chevin has stock in Sheffield
- Avoids duplication – customers are on several housing registers
- Shared infrastructure with a better understanding of need
- Properties for nomination with automatically be sent for adverting, which means that Housing Associations will have reduced admin requirement so they may be inclined to offer 100% nominations
- The nomination process will be transparent and quicker
- Automatic tracking of results

The risks - by not responding proactively to facilitate mobility could result in the following:

- A rise in homelessness and blockages in temporary accommodation.
- Less effective prevention work.
- Not delivering on Government expectations on delivery of a Sub Region Scheme.
- Poor service to customers who wish to move across boundaries
- Only receiving 50% nomination rights with Housing Associations, whereas Housing Associations may offer 100% if they are part of a Sub regional Scheme
- Increased numbers of customers wishing to move into the Rotherham Borough, however this can be closely monitored and changes to the Scheme adopted to keep the balance of mobility to similar levels across. There are only small numbers of customers moving into the Borough the 2006 report identified that only 16 people moved into Rotherham who had previously lived outside the Borough


Stock levels for 3 of the Local Authorities in the region are similar. Doncaster, Barnsley and Rotherham have approximately 20,000 properties each, and Sheffield's portfolio stands at over 50,000.

Key Challenges- If a Sub regional Choice Based Lettings Scheme was approved and funding attained from CLG, there are various options for the delivery of the scheme, which are:

1. All the members of the Sub region advertise all their vacancies in the Sub Regional scheme, but have their own lettings policies, and have ICT systems in place to monitor how many applicants are being rehoused in and out of their own local authorities boundaries
2. Small step approach and offer up a percentage of vacancies to the Sub Regional scheme, where there would be one common lettings policy for all members. (The downside is that it could be confusion for customers having 2 schemes in operation. I.e existing Key Choices and a Sub Regional Scheme

There would be challenges ahead for both options above and for the scheme to be successful it is suggested that the following are considered:

- To establish an Elected Members Forum who would act as lead
- Consult with customers
- Address any concerns
- To assign a project Officer
- To set up a Project Group with Key decision makers
- Have clear Terms of Reference
- Set out clear criteria
- Develop a partnership agreement with all members of the scheme
- Agree to share project costs – i.e. ICT



- Choice Based lettings review (progress)
- Allocations Policy - including update on 'fair and flexible' consultation





Purpose of the CBL Review

To find out the customer experience of the Choice Based Lettings (CBL) Service and to identify any gaps in the service and any areas of work for further development.

Update - A Selection of the Review's Recommendations

R5. The Allocation Policy

R7. Introduction of 'real-time' feedback

R8. Managing the Housing Register

R12. Alternative title to "Direct Homes"


R13. Improve information

R14. 'virtual tours'

R20. Information at Neighbourhood Offices is comprehensive.

R22. Advertising via local media

R23. Information to Elected Members



“Fair and flexible - Draft statutory guidance on social housing allocations for local authorities in England” (31/7/09)


CLG asked all LA’s a series of questions regarding the proposed changes to the Code of Guidance in Allocations.


- Aim - To offer more choice and mobility to tenants and prospective tenants, and to allow local authorities more freedom to prioritise needs specific to local areas. The importance of tackling ‘myths and misunderstandings’ about allocations was also emphasised,

The Findings

More than one thousand customers completed and returned a survey/questionnaire


- The Scrutiny Review and Fair and Flexible provides good intelligence about what needs to be done to improve the understanding and operation of the Choice Based Letting system and make changes to the Allocation Policy .







Fair and Flexible Key Results

Do you agree or disagree that some housing should be set aside for people who have a connection to a local area or who have been on the housing register for a long time?





**Fair and Flexible
Key Results
(continued):**
How easy or
difficult do you
think it is, to find
information about
the housing
available in
Rotherham?






Learning



Achieving



Alive




Safe



Proud

Fair and Flexible Key Results (continued):
Where do you currently look to find information about housing available in Rotherham?



Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council
Where Everyone Matters




Recommendation 5 - The Housing Allocations Policy

- Offer more choice and mobility to tenants and prospective tenants
- Allow more freedom to prioritise needs specific to local areas
- Demonstrate transparency - Scrutiny Review

We can consider:

- Introducing a rural priority lettings policy
- Set aside a proportion of vacancies for applicants in employment and help people to live closer to their place of work
- Analyse waiting time re the lettings quotas





1 Bedrooms Bungalow In Chawson Valley Ref: 119
CBL Property



Front View

[Show on map >>](#)

[Show local services >>](#)

[Show full details >>](#)

PropertyID [Show full details](#)

Mason Drive, Anyborough, GL55 3FF

Bedrooms: 1 Bedrooms

Property Type: Bungalow

Property

Landlord: Demo

Close Date: 02/07/2009



At present there are 3 people above you for this property. Please note your position for this property can change as other people add or remove their bids

[Apply Now](#)

R7.

Introduction

of

'real-time'

feedback


Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council
Where Everyone Matters



Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

Withdraw bids

Select the bids above that you wish to withdraw



[Click here to search for properties](#)



Historic bids (last 30 days)



CBL Property

Property Ref	Address	Queue Position	Status
131	Green Street, Any Town, RG1 2EG	8	
132	Black Street, Any Town, RG2 1EG	8	

[Click here to view all historic bids](#)


R7.

Introduction

of

‘real-time’


feedback



R8. Managing the Housing Register

- Participating fully in COntinuous REcording (CORE).
- Weekly reports to inform of real - time numbers on housing register, bidders and non bidders.
- A bi monthly training programme to raise understanding of inputting and updating of housing applications.
- Weekly reporting tools that highlight “user errors.”
- Procured a CBL software package that manages the housing register, each application will be reviewed annually.






R8. Managing the Housing Register


Bidders	11495
Non Bidders	10457
Total applicants on Housing Register	21952
Priority Plus group	87
Priority group	2001
General plus	1631
General group	18233
Total all groups	21952





R8. Managing the Housing Register

Priority plus (Elderly)	34
Priority plus (Family)	26
Priority plus (Single)	27
Total Priority plus applicants	87
Priority (Elderly)	820
Priority (Family)	597
Priority (Single)	584
Total Priority applicants	2001
General plus (Elderly)	28
General plus (Family)	1057
General plus (Single)	546
Total General plus applicants	1631
General (Elderly)	2825
General (family)	8584
General (Single)	6824
Total General applicants	18233



R8. Managing the Housing Register


Priority transfers	419
General plus transfers	138
General transfers	2761
Total transfer applicants	3318



R12. Alternative title to “Direct Homes”

	Yes	No
• Do you know what a ‘Direct Home’ is?	61%	39%
• Do you think ‘Direct Homes’ should be advertised until allocated?	90%	10%
• Do you think that information on adverts is clear?	63%	37%
• Do you ever use the Rotherham Advertiser to view and request properties?	60%	40%
• Suggested Alternative Names – More to do		
<i>Beeline Home</i>		
<i>Free Home</i>		
<i>Easy Access Home</i>		





R13. Improve information Profile of RMBC housing stock

RMBC Housing Stock





Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

R13. Improve information Voids advertised but not let

Rotherham South

VAV

373782	1VAV	26 Warwick Street, Wellgate, S60 2PY
400456	1VAV	53 Upper Rye Close, Whiston, S60 4DD
429036	1VAV	87 Coleridge Road, Eastwood, S65 1LW

Total VAV's for Rotherham South - 3

VUN

371928	1MAJ	33 Oxley Grove, Broom Valley, S60 2RZ
396344	1MAJ	64 Hall Close Avenue, Whiston, S60 4AS
401266	1ASB	75 Canklow Road, Canklow, S60 2JF
419732	1MAJ	49 Carlisle Street, Clifton, S65 1HA
459835	1MAJ	166 Fitzwilliam Road, Eastwood, S65 1QA
461125	1MAJ	75 Selborne Street, Eastwood, S65 1RP
461515	1MAJ	56 Shakespeare Road, Eastwood, S65 1QY
461668	1MAJ	178 St Anns Road, Eastwood, S65 1RJ
471352	1MAJ	434 Longfellow Drive, Herringthorpe, S65 2LJ
475542	1ASB	31 Sheridan Drive, Herringthorpe, S65 2HP
478063	1ASB	117 Tennyson Road, Herringthorpe, S65 2LT
483783	1MAJ	33 Dene Crescent, East Dene, S65 2UP
484103	1POL	65 Dene Crescent, East Dene, S65 2UP
491182	1ASB	11 Mowbray Gardens, East Dene, S65 2UH
493881	1MAJ	121 North Road, East Dene, S65 2SB
498974	1ASB	55 The Lanes, East Dene, S65 3RZ
497849	1ASB	144 The Lanes, East Dene, S65 3SB
498788	1MAJ	5 The Yews, East Dene, S65 2BS


Total VUN's for Rotherham South - 18

Total Voids's for Rotherham South - 21

							Weeks Since ASKC	
RS02	LORS	15/11/2009	2	ASKC	22/10/2009		6	
RS08	LOFD	01/11/2009	4	ASKC	08/10/2009		8	
RS01	DEAT	22/11/2009	1	ASKC	12/11/2009		3	
RS02	RERS	01/11/2009	4	ASKC	11/11/2009		3	
RS08	DEAT	27/09/2009	9	ASKC	09/11/2009		3	
RS06	DEAT	22/11/2009	1	ASKC	28/10/2009		5	
RS02	TRMR	13/09/2009	11	ASKC	27/11/2009		0	
RS01	LAIN	01/11/2009	4	ASKC	25/11/2009		1	
RS01	DEAT	16/08/2009	15	ASKC	17/09/2009		11	
RS02	TRMR	25/10/2009	5	ASKC	27/11/2009		0	
RS01	TRMR	13/09/2009	11	ASKC	14/10/2009		7	
RS03	DEAT	04/10/2009	8	ASKC	09/11/2009		3	
RS03	PRIN	01/11/2009	4	ASKC	02/11/2009		4	
RS03	HARB	15/11/2009	2	ASKC	02/11/2009		4	
RS05	DEAT	16/08/2009	15	ASKC	31/07/2009		17	
RS05	TRIN	18/10/2009	6	ASKC	20/10/2009		6	
RS05	TRLP	08/11/2009	3	ASKC	02/11/2009		4	
RS05	TRNP	06/09/2009	12	ASKC	07/09/2009		12	
RS04	PRRS	22/11/2009	1	ASKC	06/11/2009		3	
RS04	LOIN	22/11/2009	1	ASKC	28/10/2009		5	
RS05	LOIN	15/11/2009	2	ASKC	28/10/2009		5	




Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council
Where Everyone Matters



R14. 'virtual tours' of the Area – Entering Maltby





R14. ‘virtual tours’ of the Area –Addison Road, Maltby





Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

R14. 'virtual tours' of the Area –Roche Abbey, Maltby






Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

R14. 'virtual tours' Maltby Town






Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

R14. 'virtual tours' – Coronation Park, Maltby





Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe




Proud

R14. 'virtual tours' Maltby Craggs




Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council
Where Everyone Matters



R20. Information at Neighbourhood Offices is Comprehensive

- A bi monthly timetable of free training, and part of Induction process
- Streamline systems and procedures with 2010 staff.
- Monthly mystery shopping activities at Neighbourhood Offices conducted by the Customer Inspection Service team
- Customer journey mapping through Home Truths Diaries.
- Service Quality Team undertaking random telephone survey






R22. Advertising via local media

Survey 18.9% , further consultation 60% = 14 said yes 9 said no – Phone survey results to follow

	Cost per page £	Distribution	Distribution Frequency
Rotherham Advertiser	£500	29,000 + family recycling	Weekly – every Friday
Rotherham News	2000 with a potential discount of 20% = £1600	Every household in Rotherham	Monthly – distribution cycle 7 to 10 days
Mailing List	£1000	To 1000 vulnerable households	Weekly

STOP - Utilise the savings to pay for a resettlement officer.





R23. Information to Elected Members

- 2010 Rotherham Ltd will provide information on empty properties at a local level to Elected Members and Key Choices.
- Letting results are published on Key Choices web page and emailed direct to Elected Members. [Letting Results](#)
- The letting results will be published in Rotherham Advertiser where space permits.
- Continue with Community Surgeries by 2010 Rotherham Ltd in Neighbourhood Office.






Learning



Achieving



Alive



Safe



Proud

Any Questions?



Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council
Where Everyone Matters

Briefing Paper Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel – Consultation re “Fair and Flexible” Housing Allocation Policy

On 31st July 2009, Communities and Local Government issued a consultation paper regarding the Allocation of Social housing. The consultation paper was called **“Fair and Flexible - Draft statutory guidance on social housing allocations for local authorities in England”** – This paper strengthened councils’ freedom to prioritise specific local needs alongside those households who are in ‘reasonable preference’. In some areas this will mean giving more priority to people who have been on the housing register for a long time or more priority for people with strong local connections to rural areas.

To ensure that we involved local residents in this debate we implemented a survey which captured the views of local communities. Over one thousand customers completed and returned a survey/ questionnaire; the results have been clearly analysed, and are reflected in proposed changes to the Allocation Policy and Local Lettings Policies. The proposed changes will meet the needs, demands and aspirations of local people, whilst also giving priority to those in the greatest housing need.

The proposed changes to the Housing Allocation Policy are to consider:

- Introducing a rural priority lettings policy
- Set aside a proportion of vacancies for applicants in employment and help people to live closer to their place of work
- Analyse waiting time regarding the lettings quotas in the General Band

To ensure we captured as many views as possible RMBC have been working with Rotherfed and the “Learning from Customers” Focus group. Both groups have ensured the consultation questions were “Easy Read”. Customer consultation took place via a briefing note from Cllr Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods to Elected Members, an online survey, face-to-face surveys at the Key Choices Property Shop in mid September and Rotherham Show on 12th / 13th September 2009.

Over 1000 surveys were completed and returned. There were 20 individual comments from customers who thought that applicants in the General group with long waiting time should be given more priority, and 80% agreed that a percentage of rural housing should be set aside for people with a local connection, 64% wanted help to move home in another area to gain employment, 67% of people wanted help to move home within South Yorkshire.

Moreover, in order to dispel myths and misperceptions, Rotherham is looking to improve the provision of information on how housing in Rotherham is being allocated, and are looking at innovative ways such as “virtual property tours” and “real time feedback” to enable customers to make informed choices available to them. The Fair and Flexible consultation told us that 69.50% of people found the Allocation Policy easy to understand, 37.7% of people told us that they looked for information about housing on the Key Choices website,

34.3% at the Property Shop, 21.20% in the Rotherham Advertiser's Key Choices Property page and 6.8% at their Local Neighbourhood office (10.4% of people were not looking to move)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO CABINET MEMBER

1.	Meeting	SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
2.	Date	10 DECEMBER 2009
3.	Title	Scrutiny review of void turnaround times
4.	Directorate	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5. Summary

A scrutiny review was carried out to address concerns over the time taken to re-let empty ('void') Council properties. The report was endorsed by Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel and Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee at their meetings on 16th July 2009 and 24th July 2009 respectively, and Cabinet on 23rd September 2009. This report provides an update on progress against the recommendations of the review. Of the seven recommendations, three have been completed and the other four are on target.

6. Recommendations

THAT MEMBERS:

- **NOTE PROGRESS AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW.**
- **NOTE THAT SEPARATE PIECES OF WORK ARE BEING UNDERTAKEN BY RMBC OFFICERS TO ADDRESS (A) REALITY CHECKS OF PERFORMANCE ON VOID TURNAROUND TIMES AND (B) STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH LONG-TERM EMPTY PROPERTIES.**
- **AGREE TO RECEIVE A FURTHER REPORT IN APRIL 2010, CONFIRMING COMPLETION OF THE OUTSTANDING ACTIONS WITHIN 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD'S EMPTY HOMES REVIEW ACTION PLAN.**

7. Proposals and details

7.1 Context

Scrutiny reviews were carried out of void turnaround times and the Choice-Based Lettings (CBL) process. Reports on both of these were endorsed by Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel and Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee in July 2009, and by Cabinet on 23rd September 2009. A report on progress against the CBL review is being considered concurrently with this report.

The aim of the scrutiny review into void turnaround times was 'to consider the current process for re-letting void properties and make recommendations for improvements in order to minimise the length of time that houses are empty and provide a more effective service for tenants'. The review report, which is attached as appendix 1, made seven recommendations. A summary of progress against each of these recommendations follows under section 7.2. Three of the recommendations are now complete, and the other four are on target for completion.

It should be noted RMBC officers are currently undertaking two separate, detailed pieces of work that relate to void turnaround times. Firstly, RMBC's Service Performance and Service Quality Teams have carried out a number of 'reality checks' of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's performance on void turnaround times. This work was carried out in response to concerns raised by the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel. The reality checks have highlighted concerns over performance and a series of high level meetings will take place to consider action required to rectify this. Secondly, Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel also requested a report on long-term empty properties. This will be presented in December 2009 and will address long-term voids in both the Council's housing stock and the private sector.

7.2 Progress against the recommendations of the scrutiny review

Recommendation 1: That improvements are made to the CBL process in line with the recommendations of the current scrutiny review.

Please refer to separate report on progress against the CBL scrutiny review recommendations.

Recommendation 2: That the verification process is made more efficient by screening out ineligible bids at an earlier stage.

This recommendation was made in order to deal with delays between Key Choices submitting a shortlist to 2010 Rotherham Ltd and applicants being informed that they are to be offered a property, which has sometimes meant that by the time 2010 Rotherham Ltd has contacted the applicant they have already been re-housed or changed their mind. The Anite IT system has now been updated to include a verification module. This is now completed for all applicants who are verified and duplication has been reduced. Also, the Abritrax system for CBL will only allow eligible bids to be placed.

Recommendation 3: That clear criteria are published about the circumstances in which decorating vouchers will be issued to new tenants and that the allowance of £25 per room is reviewed.

2010 Rotherham Ltd is in the process of reviewing the allowance. This review will be completed by the end of November 2009 and recommendations will be reported in early December 2009.

Recommendation 4: *That in line with good practice demonstrated by high-performing ALMOs, consideration is given to a reward scheme to encourage tenants to leave properties in good condition.*

2010 Rotherham Ltd has implemented a 'fond farewell' scheme, which incentivises tenants to leave their home and garden in a good condition by offering a payment of £100. This is being piloted for six months, following which a cost benefit analysis will be completed to evaluate value for money.

Recommendation 5: *That information is provided to Elected Members on a regular basis on the void properties in their ward including reasons why a property is empty and when it is expected to be re-let.*

2010 Rotherham Ltd's Neighbourhood Champions produce a weekly estate management update to Ward Members, and this now includes information about empty properties. Additionally, the Empty Homes Team provides neighbourhood staff with a monthly update for every empty property, stating the estimated completion date and / or reasons for delay.

Recommendation 6: *That more detailed information is provided when reporting on voids to give a clearer picture of why properties are empty and the financial implications.*

In addition to the measures set out under recommendation 5 (above), a joint working group has been established that includes officers from RMBC's Neighbourhood Investment Service, to jointly review properties that have been empty for over 16 weeks. The financial implications are measured by the amount of potential rent lost through properties being left empty.

Recommendation 7: *That action taken towards the recommendations of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's empty homes service review 'every day counts' (April 2009) be monitored and reported back to the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in due course.*

2010 Rotherham Ltd produced an action plan to ensure that recommendations made as part of the 'every day counts' review were followed up. Of the 16 recommendation, 12 are either complete or mostly complete. The following items are outstanding:

- Review 'incentives to stay' in order to reduce the number of tenancy terminations received (due to be completed by April 2010)
- Review decoration allowance – see recommendation 3 above (due to be completed by the end of November 2009)
- Review all new procedures (due to be completed by December 2009).
- Review the process of backdating tenancy commencement dates (due to be completed by October 2010)

This report proposes that a further report be provided to Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in April 2010, to confirm that all of these actions have been completed, with the exception of the review of backdating tenancy commencement dates which is due for later completion.

8. Financial implications

The 'fond farewell' reward scheme pilot is being paid for from within 2010 Rotherham Ltd's existing resources, and a value for money review will be completed to assess whether the scheme is contributing to savings.

There are no direct financial implications associated with implementing the other recommendations of the scrutiny review.

Delays to re-letting properties result in the following financial impacts:

- Rent loss through voids (measured by local performance indicator 69)
- The cost of securing empty properties
- Costs associated with antisocial behaviour and vandalism
- Additional temporary accommodation costs as fewer properties are available to house homeless people on the housing register

The separate report on long-term empty homes, which will be provided to Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in December 2009, will examine in more detail the impact of rent loss, and investment requirements for empty homes.

9. Risks and uncertainties

The risks associated with delays to re-letting empty homes include the following:

- Continuing pressures on the housing register
- Negative perceptions of the neighbourhood
- Effect on RMBC's and 2010 Rotherham Ltd's reputation – we should be making the best possible use of the social housing we already have, as well as building new Council houses
- Increased costs (see section 8 above)
- Failure to achieve performance targets and therefore potential implications for the Council's Comprehensive Area Assessment

The final outcomes of the two related pieces of work that are looking at reality checks of 2010 Rotherham Ltd reported performance, and long-term empty properties respectively, are not known at the time of producing this report.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The void turnaround performance indicator (BV 212) is a critical indicator for the Council and 2010 Rotherham Ltd, as it directly affects our ability to meet the needs of customers on the housing register, has implications for the *use of resources* judgment within the Council's Comprehensive Area Assessment, and empty homes can cause blight in neighbourhoods. There are implications for the 'safe' and 'proud' themes within Rotherham's Local Area Agreement.

Management of void turnaround times is one of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's core services. High performance in this area is crucial to achieving the standards set by the Audit Commission and the Tenant Services Authority.

Rotherham's new emerging housing strategy will emphasise the importance of making the best use of our existing social rented homes, which includes ensuring high performance on void turnaround times.

11. Background papers and consultation

Appendices

Appendix 1: Scrutiny review report

Appendix 2: Corporate Management Team commentary on recommendations

Background papers

Scrutiny review report for Choice-Based Lettings process (reported separately)

Consultation

Officers within RMBC and 2010 Rotherham Ltd have been consulted on the content of this report.

Contact name

Jane Davies-Haire, Landlord Relations Manager

Jane.davies-haire@rotherham.gov.uk

Tel: 01709 334970 or 07500 102498

RMBC Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel

Scrutiny Review into Void Turnaround Times

CONTENTS

1 / INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 Reason for the review	2
1.2 Aim of the review	2
1.3 Scrutiny working group	2
1.4 Methodology	2
1.5 Key Findings	3
1.6 Recommendations	3
2 / THE VOIDS PROCESS	4
2.1 What is classed as a void?	4
2.2 How many voids are there?	4
2.3 Who is involved in the voids process?	5
2.4 Bidding for properties	6
2.5 Repairs	6
2.6 Long-term voids	7
2.7 Budget	7
2.8 Performance	7
3 / FINDINGS	8
3.1 The bidding process	8
3.2 Carrying out repairs	9
3.3 Sheltered and Medical Priority properties	9
3.4 Improving Performance	10
3.5 Customer Satisfaction	10
4 / LOOKING AT GOOD PRACTICE ELSEWHERE	10
5 / WITNESSES AND THANKS	11

1 / INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reason for the review

The time taken to re-let void properties has been identified as a key concern for Elected Members. Whilst performance is improving, it still falls below expected levels and with the high demand for housing, it is important that properties are re-let on a timely basis to maximise housing options for tenants and Council revenue. Failure to address this issue will have a significant impact on the Housing Revenue Account and may also damage public perception of Rotherham 2010 Ltd and the Council.

It was agreed that a scrutiny review would be carried out to consider the issue in more detail.

1.2 Aim of the review

To consider the current process for re-letting void properties and make recommendations for improvements in order to minimise the length of time that houses are empty and provide a more effective service for tenants.

The working group agreed the following terms of reference to define the scope of the review:-

- (a) To gain an understanding of the key issues affecting voids turnaround times including a clarification of how voids are classified;
- (b) To review the effectiveness and impact of procedures and actions which have already been put in place to improve performance;
- (c) To consider the financial impact of long term empty properties in the borough;
- (d) To consider good practice within the borough and from other local authorities in relation to void turnarounds;
- (e) To consider what further measures could be taken to reduce void turnaround times.

1.3 Scrutiny working group

The scrutiny working group for this review was comprised of the following scrutiny members:

- Cllr Rose McNeely (Chair)
- Cllr Jeb Nightingale
- Cllr Fred Wright
- Cllr Paul Lakin
- Cllr Alex Armitage – Parish Councils' representative
- Andy Roddison – tenants' representative

1.4 Methodology

The Scrutiny Panel decided to take a "Select committee approach" to this review meaning that it was completed within a short period of time so that there would be no delay in making the recommendations.

The scrutiny working group met twice to agree the terms of reference for the review, identify witnesses and look at the background information and good practice in other authorities. Meetings were also held with the Chief Executive of 2010 Rotherham Ltd, the Voids Manager and staff at Key Choices Property Shop. Key witnesses were invited to the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel meeting on 16th April to give evidence and answer questions put forward by the Panel members.

1.5 Key Findings

The review highlighted that the involvement of several different teams in the management of void properties leads to confusion about who is responsible for each stage of the process and a duplication of effort in some areas. Elected Members are not routinely kept informed about void properties in their wards and local residents are frustrated when they see empty houses in their neighbourhoods that are not available to rent.

The average time taken to re-let empty homes has reduced significantly over the last 12 months and 2010 Rotherham Ltd appear committed to making further improvements to the service. Their recent Empty Homes Review carried out at the same time as this scrutiny review in April 2009 identifies several areas for improvement which have been incorporated into an action plan.

2010 Rotherham Ltd's "Empty Homes Service Review" aims to map out the whole of the voids management process giving consideration to the deployment of resources, accountability, priorities, and benchmarking against other services. Unfortunately the Review was only made available on 15th April and therefore Members did not have time to digest the information before the scrutiny meeting on the 16th April.

1.6 Recommendations

Having considered the available evidence, the scrutiny review group makes the following recommendations:

- 1. That improvements are made to the Choice Based Lettings process in line with the recommendations of the current Scrutiny Review.**
- 2. That the verification process is made more efficient by screening out ineligible bids at an earlier stage.**
- 3. That clear criteria are published about the circumstances in which decorating vouchers will be issued to new tenants and that the allowance of £25 per room is reviewed.**
- 4. That in line with good practice demonstrated by high-performing ALMOs, consideration is given to a Reward scheme to encourage tenants to leave properties in good condition.**
- 5. That information is provided to Elected Members on a regular basis on the void properties in their ward including reasons why a property is empty and when it is expected to be relet.**

6. That more detailed information is provided when reporting on voids to give a clearer picture of why properties are empty and the financial implications.
7. That action taken towards the recommendations of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's Empty Homes Service Review "Every Day Counts" (April 2009) be monitored and reported back to the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in due course.

2/ THE VOIDS PROCESS

2.1 What is classed as a void?

Voids are empty homes. They can be classed as VAVs "Voids Available" i.e. ready to be let (perhaps after minor repairs) or VUNs "Voids Unavailable" i.e. those that would require major works to bring them up to a lettable standard.

Currently the VUNs, which may include properties which have been empty for a long time because they are going to be demolished, are still classed as voids and count towards the figures for Local Performance Indicator 212 which looks at the average time taken to re-let a property. As soon as a void property ceases to be a void because it is let, the total number of days it was void is added to the figures. This means that if long-term voids are brought back into the housing stock, the figure for average re-let time could increase dramatically.

2.2 How many voids are there?

On 2nd June 2009 there were 379 empty properties in Rotherham. Of these 228 (60%) are 'Vun' properties (ie – requiring major works to bring them up to a lettable standard) and 151 (40%) are classed as 'Vavs' – voids available to let.

However the 151 available properties include 21 which are not to be let because they are pending demolition or a decision (14 on Dawsons Croft; 2 on Calladine Way; 2 on Becknoll Road and 3 ex-warden flats). It also includes 38 properties which are classed as sheltered, or age-restricted, and as a result are hard to let.

The table below shows a breakdown of the 379 empty properties by Area Assembly:

	Vav	Vun	Total
Rother Valley South	8	25	33
Rother Valley West	10	29	39
Rotherham North	15	50	65
Rotherham South	8	28	36
Wentworth North	37	30	67
Wentworth South	64	55	119
Wentworth Valley	9	11	20

There are currently around 19,000 people on the housing register. If more void properties can be brought up to a lettable standard, this would help to reduce the complaints regarding empty homes.

2.3 Who is involved in the voids process?

In 2007, 2010 Rotherham Ltd undertook a review of the voids service and decided that efficiency savings could be made by creating a centralised Voids team. In April 2009 the name of the team was changed to the Empty Homes team.

In addition to the centralised Empty Homes team, there are several other teams involved in the voids process and it appears that the work is not always joined up. Below is an outline indication of the different areas of responsibility:

- **Empty Homes team, 2010 Rotherham Ltd.**

The voids team complete a pre-termination inspection of the property to assess repair work needed. They carry out the necessary repairs. They receive the shortlist from Key Choices and when the property is ready, they contact the applicants to check that they are eligible, arrange viewings and sign them up to the property.

- **Housing Options team, (Property Shop), RMBC**

The Housing Options team, based within Key Choices receive information that a property is to be vacated and during the 4-week notice period they advertise the property and collate a shortlist of bids which they pass on to the Empty Homes team at 2010 Rotherham Ltd, within 24 hours of the close of advertising. They are not responsible for contacting the people who have bid on the property to verify if they are eligible.

They carry out assessments on customers who may be eligible for properties in the General+ category.

- **Assessment Team, Housing Services, RMBC**

The Assessment Team assess applications for sheltered, aged persons and medical priority housing. The team receive an average of around 220 applications for assessments each month and visit customers to identify their needs in respect of rehousing to suitable properties. The number of applications has increased significantly in the past 12 months. They inform the customers about how to bid for a property and what adaptations they need to look out for on the properties that become available.

They also carry out “mini-assessments” over the telephone for customers who bid for “Direct Homes”. These are properties which are difficult to let and which anyone who meets the advert criteria can bid for. They check that the applicant is eligible and has some level of additional health need.

They check the shortlist of people who have bid on properties in the Priority category to confirm that they have been assessed as meeting the necessary criteria. Sometimes due to customers waiting on the housing list for a long time, their needs change and the team carry out a re-assessment.

- **Estate Management, 2010 Rotherham Ltd**

During estate walkabouts, Neighbourhood Champions inspect void properties to ensure that they are not vandalised and the gardens do not become too overgrown or misused. They report any issues to the Estate Officers and any costs relating to clearing gardens of void properties, for example if they have been used to dump

rubbish, comes from the Estate Management budget. Currently about 65% of all rubbish removal is from void properties although to date there has been no breakdown of the budget to analyse how much this is costing. From 2009/10 financial year, the Estate Management costs will be broken down by Area Assembly area and by void/non-void properties.

- **Neighbourhood Investment Service, RMBC**

With regard to void properties, the Neighbourhood Investment Service is responsible for providing 'landlord' advice, support and direction to 2010 Ltd on investment decisions regarding non-traditional housing stock, any void property which exceeds a total investment cost of £20,000 and unsustainable housing stock, and managing demolition and regeneration programmes.

- **Cabinet Member, Economic Development, Planning and Transportation**

If repair work on a void property is estimated to cost more than £20,000, it must be authorised by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation.

2.4 Bidding for properties

Under the Key Choices Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system which has been in place in Rotherham since June 2005, tenants can exercise a right to choose a council property that they wish to live in. In reality, demand outweighs supply of Council owned dwellings and so in order to increase housing options, the Housing Options team advertise Housing Association properties and private rented properties managed by the Council's Key Choices Property Management Service on behalf of the landlord.

In relation to voids, CBL could potentially have a positive impact in highlighting to prospective tenants that if they bid for properties which are less desirable (due to their size or location) they have a much greater chance of success.

A separate scrutiny review is currently underway looking at the Choice Based Lettings process and it is hoped that implementation of its recommendations will help to improve the system and have a positive effect on the voids management process. Emerging issues of the CBL review which impact on voids include a need for more consistency in the information provided on adverts for properties, communication between teams in 2010 Rotherham Ltd and Key Choices and provision of information to Elected Members.

2.5 Repairs

There is an Empty Homes lettable standard and associated cleaning standard, both of which were agreed by the Empty Homes Service Improvement Group. Tenants are currently offered a copy of these when they move into a property as part of their Houseproud bucket which is filled with cleaning products.

Rotherham 2010 Ltd identified delays in the time taken to carry out repairs as the main reason behind the underperformance against LPI 212 (Average Re-let Times). In June 2008 a restructure of the Voids repair team took place so that instead of three pre-let and three post-let repair champions covering three geographical areas

there are now six Repairs Champions covering six geographical areas. The average re-let times have improved significantly since June 2008 and the new team structure means that less time is spent travelling between repair jobs.

The Repairs Champions carry out the termination inspections before a property becomes vacant and where possible carry out repairs during the 28 day notice period whilst the outgoing tenant is still in the property.

In order to address the backlog of empty properties needing repairs in 2008, some properties were passed to the Decent Homes teams who brought them up to the Decent Homes standard. In these cases, the Decent Homes work was paid for from their budget and general empty property repairs were charged to the empty homes budget.

2.6 Long-term voids

There are some properties in the borough that have been empty for a number of years, either because they are undesirable to bidders, in need of significant investment to bring them up to a lettable standard, or awaiting a decision about possible demolition. Long-term voids result in a considerable loss of rent for the Council; it is calculated that £96,733.81 was lost in rent in 2008/9 on properties that are pending a decision regarding investment or change of use.

If repairs needed on a property are estimated to cost more than £20,000, 2010 Rotherham Ltd refer the property to the Neighbourhood Investment Service who will evaluate the options and submit a report to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhood Services who will approve either investment, sale of the property or demolition. This process currently takes around 8 weeks. 2010 Rotherham Ltd have recommended in their recent review of the voids service that when a property is referred to the Neighbourhood Investment Service, a clear target date is agreed for a decision to be made. They have also recommended that consideration be given to increasing the threshold from £20,000 to £25,000 before referral to the Neighbourhood Investment Service is required.

2.7 Budget

The budget for empty homes for 2008/9 was £3.7 million split between £1.5million Capital and £2.2 million Revenue which was to cover all works undertaken to vacant properties.

The budget has increased by £450,000 for 2009/10 with £1.5million Capital and £2.5 million Revenue and an additional £100k for damp proofing and £50k for structural works.

2.8 Performance

The 2008 Audit Commission report into 2010 Rotherham Ltd reported that with regards to void properties,

“....strengths outweigh weaknesses. An integrated voids team manages empty homes effectively. Performance is high on re-letting empty homes quickly. Procedures are customer focused. Too many empty properties have security grilles however, and the repair standard is not clear to new tenants.”

Performance on empty properties is measured by Local Performance Indicator (LPI) 212 which records how long it takes for an empty property to be re-let. The target for 2008/9 was an average turnaround time of 23 days, and this was not met as the actual cumulative average was 39.45 days. However if the figures are broken down, significant progress was made during 2008/9 to reduce the average re-let time from 66.78 days in the first quarter to 24.54 days in the final quarter. The target for this year 2009/10 remains at 23 days. Current performance for re-let times is 26.35 days for April 2009 and 24.01 days for May 2009.

The void turnaround time also impacts on other performance indicators, including:

- Rent loss through voids (LPI 69)
- Percentage of tenancies not lasting 12 months.
- Number of households living in temporary accommodation (NI 156)

3 / FINDINGS

3.1 The Choice Based Lettings process

The review identified that there is a need for a clearer understanding about how the bidding process in Choice Based Letting works. There is anecdotal evidence showing that many people believe they have to be seen to be actively bidding in order to have a greater chance of getting a property. This means that some people are regularly bidding for properties that they do not want, believing that this will improve their chances of success when a property they do want becomes available.

These 'wasted' bids are slowing down the allocations process. In fact, analysis for 2007/8 showed that 28.1% of people who were offered a property refused to move and the four main reasons given for refusal were:

1. No wish to move
2. Not desired location
3. Property too small
4. Refused to view

Prior to the new allocation policy taking effect in December 2008, the assessment team "matched" applicants to properties and this contributed to the higher refusal rates. There are also customers who may have had no intention for moving house in the first place or who would have benefitted from having more information available to them at the bidding stage in order to make a properly informed decision about whether the property was suitable for them.

A discussion took place at the scrutiny meeting on 16th April 2009 about whether people bidding on properties that they did not want ought to be penalised in some way, but it was felt that this would be contrary to the Code of Guidance in allocations and that what is needed is for customers to have a better understanding of how the bidding system works.

It appears that there is currently duplication of effort in the allocations process between the Key Choices team and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. As set out in section 2.4, Key Choices are responsible for collating a list of the top 30 bidders for each property and sending this list through to 2010 Rotherham Ltd who verify the eligibility of customers for that property. On occasions, due to the high percentage of customers with Priority needs and to 'wasted' bids, a large number of applicants will not be eligible and 2010 Rotherham Ltd must work their way down the list of names before finding someone who could take the property. Delays between the shortlists being

drawn up and the applicants being contacted also mean that customers have sometimes already been rehoused or changed their minds. This does not seem to be the most efficient way of allocating properties and there are clear frustrations between the two teams.

On occasions there have been long delays between Key Choices submitting a shortlist to 2010 Rotherham Ltd and applicants being informed that they are to be offered a property.

3.2 Carrying out repairs

If the Repairs Champion considers the standard of decorating in a property to be unsatisfactory, vouchers up to the value of £25 per room will be offered to the new tenants and included in the property advert. The scrutiny working group has questioned whether this amount is sufficient and anecdotal evidence suggests that the vouchers are not always issued immediately. The Audit Commission report (2008) found that there was no clear approach to awarding decorating allowances and the review group recommends that clear criteria are published setting out the conditions under which a decorating allowance will be given to ensure transparency.

During the review, questions were raised about the costs of putting metal screens on empty properties and whether, due to the high costs of hiring screens and rent loss, it would be more economically viable to have the repairs carried out by sub-contractors. This does happen to some extent already, but could probably be looked into in more detail. The Audit Commission report into 2010 Rotherham Ltd in 2008 concluded that screens are being used too frequently giving a negative impression to prospective tenants and affecting the appearance of neighbourhoods. They found that around 40 per cent of short-term voids and most long-term voids have steel shutters. As a direct result of the Audit Commission recommendation, 2010 introduced a new procedure for securing empty properties and re-tendered the grilling contract. Each void is now made secure dependant on the area and known issues and alternatives to metal screens are considered including alarms, net curtains and clear polymer screens.

3.3 Sheltered and Medical Priority properties

The allocation of sheltered, aged persons and adapted properties contributes to the delay in reletting empty properties because these homes are harder to let. This is because customers must be assessed to confirm if they meet the criteria for the property they have bid for. Many applicants do not meet the criteria set out in the Allocations Policy.

Previously only over 55s on the housing register and classified as "priority" due to disabilities or other extra needs could apply for sheltered housing. However on 24th September 2008, 2010 Rotherham Ltd were instructed to a change in policy allowing over 55s without priority needs to be offered "sheltered" properties if no sheltered matches could be found, as long as the tenants were willing to pay the £8/week service charge attached to the sheltered housing (even though they did not require the service). As a result 51 "sheltered" properties with a total of 8344 days void between them were let to over 55s.

3.4 Improving Performance

The *Voids Performance Recovery Plan* produced in July 2008 listed 25 actions to address the issues which were thought to have contributed to the poor performance, including:

- Communication problems and lack of ownership between Voids Team and Neighbourhood Team
- Insufficient staff resources to carry out repairs
- Key Choices process takes 24 days
- No analysis of termination reasons undertaken.

The actions should have all been completed by March 2009, however some of these issues have not been resolved and are still listed as areas for improvement in the recent 2010 review into Empty Homes, "Every Day Counts". Outstanding areas for improvement have been incorporated into the Empty Homes Review Action Plan with target dates and an identified lead person or team. Performance will need to be monitored against the listed actions and Members kept informed of progress.

For 2009-10, 2010 Rotherham Ltd will report more detailed figures on voids, including a breakdown of long-term voids and properties that are with the Neighbourhood Investment Service pending a decision. This will give a much clearer picture of the voids situation and help to identify any reasons for delays in reletting properties.

3.5 Customer Satisfaction

Turnaround figures are only one part of the story and there is a balance to be found between minimising the time that a property is empty and making sure that the property is repaired to a satisfactory standard and is right for the tenant.

Tenants are now given 48 hours after a viewing to consider whether or not they wish to accept the property. Previously they were expected to sign up immediately. Although this adds two days on to the void turnaround time, failed tenancies (those lasting less than 12 months) have fallen from 13% to 5%.

4 / LOOKING AT GOOD PRACTICE ELSEWHERE

It is useful to look at what other ALMOs are doing in comparison to 2010 Rotherham Ltd. Sandwell Homes, Solihull Community Housing and Homes for Islington were all recently rated as excellent by the Audit Commission and below is an outline of the voids service they offer.

Sandwell Homes was inspected by the Audit Commission in November 2008 and was classed as "excellent" with "excellent" prospects for improvement. They have a clear void standard developed with tenants and provide tenants with an empty property standard setting out how the property is to be left. A reward scheme is being piloted which pays tenants £100 if they leave the property clean with no rechargeable repairs and no rent arrears.

Empty homes are repaired quickly and re-let in an average of 27 days. There are clear targets for each stage of the void process and tracking systems in place to

monitor the progress of voids as well as clarity about the inclusion of decent homes improvements in empty properties.

There were however some areas of the voids process which were criticised including: Monitoring customer satisfaction, and arrangements for outgoing tenants not yet being fully implemented.

Solihull Community Housing (ALMO) currently re-lets properties within an average of 24 days (their target is 28 days). They rarely use screens to protect empty properties, instead favouring portable alarm systems where necessary so as to make sure the properties remain attractive to prospective tenants. They rank empty properties as gold, silver or bronze to prioritise repairs, based on the property's likely lettable standard. Their lettable standard is however criticised for being too basic and tenants often have to carry out decorating themselves.

Homes for Islington has an average turnaround time for voids of 22 days (2007/8). They provide a high quality welcome box for new tenants to establish a positive relationship with them. They have an incentive scheme which pays £150 to tenants leaving the property to a specified standard, and estimate that the scheme has saved £10,000 a year after costs. Tenants whose property does not reach this standard can be charged up to £290. Tenants benefit from gas and electricity being connected for them prior to moving in.

5 / WITNESSES AND THANKS

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1. Cllr Akhtar | Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods |
| 2. Kevin Lowry | Chief Executive 2010 Rotherham Ltd |
| 3. Adrian Cheetham | Voids Manager, 2010 Rotherham Ltd |
| 4. Sandra Tolley | Housing Choices Manager, Key Choices, RMBC |
| 5. Sandra Wardle | Housing Options Manager, Key Choices, RMBC |
| 6. Phil Syrat | Housing Options Co-ordinator, Key Choices, RMBC |
| 7. Catherine Dale | Neighbourhood Initiatives Manager, RMBC |
| 8. Diane Green | Assessment Manager, Neighbourhoods, RMBC
(<i>regarding allocation of medical priority housing</i>) |
| 9. Paul Walsh | Programme Manager, Neighbourhood Investment Service, RMBC
(<i>regarding investment in long-term voids</i>) |

Corporate Management Team's Commentary on Scrutiny Review of Void Turnaround Times

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication	
1. That improvements are made to the CBL process in line with the recommendations of the current scrutiny review.	Progress against the CBL scrutiny review recommendations is reported in a separate report	Various	Rotherham Safe Housing Strategy Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011	See response to CBL scrutiny review	See response to CBL scrutiny review	
2. That the verification process is made more efficient by screening out ineligible bids at an earlier stage.	Anite IT system updated to include verification module	Complete	Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011	Benefit: Reduced duplication	Budget identified and upgrade already completed	
3. That clear criteria are published about the circumstances in which decorating vouchers will be issued to new tenants and that the allowance of £25 per room is reviewed.	Clear information about decoration allowance available on 2010 Rotherham Ltd website. 2010 Rotherham Ltd to review decoration allowance.	December 09	2010 Rotherham Ltd's decoration policy	Benefit: Opportunity to ensure consistent approach taken whenever decoration vouchers are to be issued	Financial implications to be assessed as part of the review	
4. That in line with good practice demonstrated by high-performing ALMOs, consideration is given to a reward scheme to encourage tenants to leave properties in good condition.	2010 Rotherham Ltd is piloting a 'fond farewell' scheme, which incentivises tenants to leave their home and garden in a good condition	January 2010	2010 Rotherham Ltd's service standards	Benefit: Properties left in good condition will improve turnaround times	Tenants receive £100 as a reward for leaving the property in a good condition – cost met within 2010's existing resources. Cost	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication	
					/ benefit evaluation to be completed in January 2010.	
5. That information is provided to Elected Members on a regular basis on the void properties in their ward including reasons why a property is empty and when it is expected to be re-let.	<p>2010 Rotherham Ltd's Neighbourhood Champions produce a weekly estate management update to Ward Members, and this now includes information about empty properties.</p> <p>Additionally, the Empty Homes Team provides neighbourhood staff with a monthly update for every empty property, stating the estimated completion date and / or reasons for delay.</p>	Ongoing	Empty Homes Strategy	Benefit: Members are provided with clear information about empty properties in their areas, allowing them to provide accurate information to members of the public and to challenge poor performance.	N/A	
6. That more detailed information is provided when reporting on voids to give a clearer picture of why properties are empty and the financial implications.	<p>As above</p> <p>A joint working group has been established that includes officers from RMBC's Neighbourhood Investment Service, to jointly review properties that have been empty for over 16 weeks. The financial implications are measured by the amount of potential rent lost through properties being left empty.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Empty Homes Strategy</p> <p>Housing Strategy</p>	Benefit: Clearer understanding of reasons why properties are empty, leading to identified actions and improved performance.	N/A	

Scrutiny recommendation	Proposed action/ comment	Target date	Link to Themes/ Strategies	Impact Analysis		CMT recommendation to Cabinet
				Benefit/ Risk	Cost implication	
7. That action taken towards the recommendations of 2010 Rotherham Ltd's empty homes service review 'every day counts' (April 2009) be monitored and reported back to the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in due course.	12 of the 16 recommendations within the action plan are either complete or mostly complete. Outstanding items:		Homelessness Prevention Action Plan 2008-2011	Benefits:	Within existing resources	
	Review 'incentives to stay' in order to reduce the number of tenancy terminations received	April 2010	2010 Rotherham Ltd procedures and service standards	Reduced homelessness		
	Review decoration allowance – see recommendation 3 above	November 2009-11-06		Consistent approach to decoration allowance		
	Review all new procedures	December 2009-11-06		Clear and up-to-date procedures in place		
	Review the process of backdating tenancy commencement dates	October 2010				

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS
19th October, 2009

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Goulty and Kaye (Policy Advisors).

J71. DOG FOULING - DOG CONTROL ORDER

Further to Minute No. 73 of 15th September, 2008, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported on the consultation that had taken place with regard to the proposed introduction of a Dog Control Order.

As required by the Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations 2006, a consultative process had been initiated on 7th August, 2009, requiring a Public Notice to be placed on the Council website and in a local newspaper (Rotherham Advertiser). A copy of the Order had also been placed on public view at Reresby House. Parish Council Clerks, the Access Authority and the Local Access Forum had also been consulted. The process had closed on 4th September, 2009.

All of the responses received had been supportive of the proposals as they currently stood with no amendments having been suggested. One response called for Dog Licensing to be introduced, however, there was currently no legislative framework which allowed this type of dog control. The anticipated outcomes of the proposal were:-

- The issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices for breaching Dog Control Orders would greatly assist in the promotion of responsible dog ownership and a reduction in complaints
- Children would be able to play more openly because of the requirement that dogs were kept under strict control in more areas
- A cleaner and more sustainable environment
- Improved health and wellbeing through access to areas where dogs were kept under strict control
- Reduced likelihood of infection with Toxocara

Once the Order had been made, a further legally required Public Notice of the intention to bring in the Order would be placed in the local newspaper at least 7 days before it came into force together with press releases and other publicity to again raise awareness of the changing Legislation. It was intended that the Order would come into force on 1st December, 2009.

Resolved:- (1) That the outcome of the legally required consultative process as required by the Dog Control Orders (Prescribed Offences and Penalties etc.) Regulations 2006 and Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations 2006, be noted.

(2) That it be noted that the proposed Order, The Fouling of Land by Dogs (Metropolitan Borough of Rotherham) Order, will be made by the

Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services.

(3) That a further report be submitted in February, 2009, following the consultation on Dog Control Orders for additional issues such as access to land and keeping dogs on leads.

(4) That a press release be issued and an article included in the next edition of Rotherham News.

J72. SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services presented a report advising of the changes made to the Scheme of Delegations for Neighbourhoods and Adult Services.

The Scheme allowed for an appropriate level of decision making with the Directorate Management Team (DMT) acting as the framework for ensuring consistent decision making across the Directorate so that all Directors worked towards the same vision and same management directives.

The Service Performance Team had worked with Directors to update the documents and, as a result, had changed the hierarchy of the documentation to achieve greater alignment with the structure of the Directorate and hopefully therefore creating a better understanding of the Scheme.

The Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services functions had been encompassed into 1 document to span the entire Directorate. The statutory role of the DASS was also shown in the new structure, as it was a statutory requirement. The individual delegation of powers to Officers Schedule B sat under the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Function document and reflected the recent changes in the Department's structure.

The Scheme was divided into the following 4 schedules:-

- Schedule A: The 'functions' document which detailed the functions covered by the Directorate and who was responsible for them e.g. Cabinet, Cabinet Member, Strategic Director or Service Director. This document also listed all the legislation covered within the function under the Schedule of Powers Act
- Schedule B: The statutory role of the Director of Adult Social Services which detailed the statutory requirements placed on the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services by the Government

- Schedule C: The 'delegation of powers to officers' document which provided details of the work of each Department within Neighbourhoods and Adult Services together with the individual officer responsible for each area of work.

Resolved:- That the revised Scheme of Delegation be noted.

J73. AREA ASSEMBLIES DEVOLVED BUDGET PROPOSALS

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods Services submitted an update on the process for the redevelopment of project proposals to be funded through either LABGI or identified budgets within Neighbourhood and Adult Services. Such proposals would enable the delivery of local initiatives which met community priorities as identified for example in the Area Plans of the Area Assemblies.

The latest projects submitted for approval were from the Housing Improvement Programme (HIP); Housing Market Renewal Funding (HMR) and NAS General Funding and LABGI and included project proposals from Rother Valley West, Rother Valley South, Rotherham North, Rotherham South and Wentworth South (as set out in Appendix A of the report submitted).

Projects submitted by Wentworth South and Rotherham North were to be funded from LABGI and, if approved, would be submitted to Cabinet for further ratification.

Resolved:- (1) That the projects to be funded from identified Neighbourhood and Adult Services' budgets be approved.

(2) That the LABGI project proposals be submitted to the Cabinet for ratification.

J74. 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD. IMPROVEMENT PLAN

In accordance with Minute No. 41 of 27th July, 2009, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services submitted the latest version of the Improvement Plan which had been approved by 2010 Rotherham Ltd.'s Board on 7th October 2009.

The report also proposed that the current management agreement was extended to 30th June, 2011, three months later than previously recommended.

Meetings had taken place between the Council and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. to establish clear targets which had resulted in the submitted Plan. It was

proposed that quarterly monitoring meetings be held between key managers in RMBC and 2010, following which reports (by exception) would be submitted to the Cabinet Member.-

Tenants' priorities had been identified through the STATUS Survey and test of opinion surveys and feedback from tenants' events. They fell into the following 6 Themes:-

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Theme 1 | Address tenants' and leaseholders' priorities for improvement |
| Theme 2 | Achieve the standards expected of top performing organisations |
| Theme 3 | Make a unique contribution to Rotherham's priorities, particularly
The Safe and Proud themes |
| Theme 4 | Ensure all services are well governed and well managed |
| Theme 5 | Ensure strong financial management processes are in place |
| Theme 6 | Deliver value for money, making excellent use of resources |

The next STATUS Survey was not due to be repeated until October, 2010, so 2010 Rotherham Ltd. had requested that it be carried out earlier.

Tess Butler, Director of Business Development, reported that the organisation would not be subject to inspection by the Audit Commission until 2011 at the earliest and, therefore, impossible to formally verify the organisation's star rating. The actions and measures given in the Plan utilised external awards and benchmarking to assess the standards achieved.

The Council and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. would ensure customers were involved in carrying out reality checks and monitoring progress against the Plan. Progress reports would include an analysis of risks.

It was also proposed that the current management agreement be extended to 30th June, 2011. The three month extension (the previous report recommended an extension to 31st March, 2011) recognised the additional time taken to agree the Plan, and recent changes to the ALMO's senior management team.

Discussion ensued on the externalisation process and associated financial issues.

Resolved:- (1) That the Improvement Plan, attached at appendix 1 of the report submitted, be approved.

(2) That quarterly progress reports be submitted, the first to be submitted in January, 2010.

(3) That the existing Management Agreement be extended to 30th June, 2011.

J75. HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS 1ST QUARTER (APRIL TO JUNE) PERFORMANCE 2009/10

John Mansergh, Performance Management Officer, presented the submitted report which outlined the Key Performance Indicator results and efficiency projections for the first quarter of 2009/10.

At the end of the quarter, 12 (86%) Key Performance Indicators were currently on track to achieve their year end targets, this compared to 75% at the end of last year. There were 2 Indicators that were rated 'off' target, and were shown as a red triangle alert in Appendix A. Of the Indicators solely owned by the Directorate, 100% were on target. For 2010 Rotherham Ltd., 7 (78%) Key Performance Indicators were on track to achieve their year end targets which compared to 50% at the end of last year. The Indicators off target at the end of the 1st quarter were:-

2010 Rotherham Ltd.

- BV211a Programmed/Responsive Repairs
- LPI185 Repairs Appointments Made and Kept

2010 Rotherham was identifying rent lost for 2009/10 as a result of voids at the end of June of £288,000.

Resolved:- That the report and the remedial action in place to improve performance be noted.

J76. 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.

J77. NEIGHBOURHOODS GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report presented by Mike Shaw, Finance Manager, which detailed the income, expenditure and net position for the Neighbourhoods Department within the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate compared to the profiled budgets for the period ending 31st August, 2009. It also included the projected year end outturn position which currently showed a forecasted overspend of £570,000 (13.5%) by the end of March, 2010, prior to any management actions which may be implemented following the current review of the Independent Support Service.

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

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Council)).

J78. HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (HIP) 2009/10

Mike Shaw, Finance Manager, Neighbourhood and Adult Services, submitted a report detailing the progress of the 2009/10 Housing Investment Programme and non-HIP Capital Schemes for the period to 15th September, 2009. The report also set out proposed revisions to the Programme and the supporting resources.

HIP schemes totalling £76,950M were approved on 13th July, 2009 (Minute No. 34 refers) representing a slight over programming of £37,000. As at 14th September, 2009, spending on the HIP totalled £26,859M (34.90%) of the approved Programme.

The approved Programme was split between schemes managed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd. (totalling £63,238M) and those managed by the Council (totalling £13.712M). To date 2010 Ltd. managed schemes had incurred expenditure of £22,235M (33.57%) and Council managed schemes £4.624M (33.72%).

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

(2) That the revised 2009/10 HIP Programme of £78.770M be approved.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act – information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))

J79. INTRODUCTORY TENANCY PANEL

It was noted that an Appeals Panel had been held on 13th October, 2009, comprising Councillors F. Wright (in the Chair), Nightingale and P. Russell, to review a decision to terminate an Introductory Tenancy.

The Panel had confirmed the decision made on 18th September, 2009.

Resolved:- That the Panel's decision be noted.

(Exempt under Paragraph 2 of the Act - information likely to reveal the identity of an individual)

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS
Monday, 2nd November, 2009

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair) and Councillor Goulty (Policy Advisor).

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Kaye.

J80. SELECTIVE LICENSING OF PRIVATE RENTED PROPERTIES

In accordance with Minute No. 109 of 24th November, 2008, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported on the consultation process undertaken in relation to developing Selective Licensing for private rented properties.

Consultation in Eastwood Village had consisted of survey questionnaires sent to every home, business and landlord in the area or having interest in the area. Officers from the Community Protection Unit, Neighbourhood Investment Team and Area Assembly had visited properties to support the consultation, provide information and ensure propriety.

Out of 900, 180 completed questionnaires were returned from tenants and residents, 8 from businesses and 7 from landlords and managing agents. This was a disappointing return given the intensity of staff commitment. The return for tenants and residents was 73.3% owner occupiers, Council and RSL tenants who were exempt from the provisions of Selective Licensing. Consequently, long term residents who expected to remain in the Village in the medium to long term (80%) were over represented. Unfortunately, this sample was unrepresentative of the overall tenure of the Village which had high levels of private rented properties with approximately 15% Council/RSL stock. In general, Selective Licensing was supported by all respondents not directly affected by it and opposed by those who were, especially if cost was anticipated. The make up of the returned sample made it unlikely to be acceptable to the Secretary of State as adequate consultation.

Though many of the issues raised within Eastwood Village were similar to those identified when Selective Licensing was proposed as a potential solution, evidence showed that the extent and severity had changed. The changing issues within the Village required constant re-appraisal of available multi-agency interventions.

The proposed consultation on the Selective Licensing area in Dinnington had been postponed due to the experience gained at Eastwood and uncertainty regarding Neighbourhood Renewal plans for redeveloping.

To date, only 11 areas of Selective Licensing had been authorised with authorities reporting that the process was time consuming and there was a very slow "turnround time" with the Secretary of State. The Government had launched a further period of consultation to address the concerns regarding the process.

Resolved:- (1) That Selective Licensing be not approved as an appropriate intervention for Eastwood Village at this time.

(2) That continued focussed activity of partners in the Eastwood Village area be supported, which had proven to deliver tangible improvements for residents over the last year.

(3) That the possibility of applying for consent to adopt Selective Licensing for specified areas of private rented properties in the Borough be kept under review. Any application would be dependent upon developing sufficient, relevant, multi-agency intelligence to successfully support such an application to the appropriate national authority (Secretary of State).

J81. 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.

J82. DEMOLITION OF THE BONDED WAREHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED PROPERTIES IN THRYBERGH

Further to Minute No. 23(2) of 16th June, 2008, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported on the progress made with the strategic acquisition and demolition of acquired properties on Oldgate Lane, Thrybergh.

Approval was sought to rehouse the occupant of No. 78 Oldgate Lane, the strategic acquisition of the identified remaining property interests in the redevelopment area, approval of the demolition contract tender and the demolition of the properties identified in the report to support resident redevelopment.

Resolved:- (1) That the next stage of the demolition programme, as set out in the report submitted, be approved.

(2) That the tender submitted by TKL Earthworks Ltd., in the sum of £115,480.00, together with associated costs in the region of £22,500.00, to deliver the first phase of demolition be approved.

(3) That rehousing priority be granted to the tenant of No. 78 Oldgate Lane, Thrybergh, to facilitate timely relocation.

(4) That, subject to further negotiation with regard to the value of the premises, the strategic acquisition and demolition of the convenience store premises at Nos. 130/132 Oldgate Lane and the fish and chip shop

at Nos. 134/136 Oldgate Lane, Thrybergh, be approved.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Council))

J83. PETITION - TENANT BEHAVIOUR, TREETON

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported receipt by 2010 Rotherham Ltd. of 2 petitions from residents in Treeton regarding the behaviour of a tenant. The petitioners alleged that the tenant in question displayed anti-social and criminal behaviour and requested that action be taken to remove him from the property.

The Neighbourhood Champion had interviewed all petitioners and the alleged perpetrator where it was found that some of the allegations could not be evidenced. Liaison had also taken place with the Police and the Safer Neighbourhood Team.

A referral had been made to 2010 Rotherham Ltd.'s Tenancy Support Officer who was currently supporting the tenant.

Letters had been sent to the petitioners outlining their complaints, informing them that 2010 had no evidence to support their allegations and that no action, therefore, could be taken. However, steps were now being taken to support the tenant.

Resolved:- That the action taken by 2010 Rotherham Ltd. and other organisations involved be noted.

(Exempt under Paragraph 2 of the Act - information likely to reveal the identity of an individual)

J84. NEW BUILD COUNCIL HOUSING

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services submitted an update on the progress being made on the Wood Street Street/School Street site at Thrybergh which was the successful scheme from a Round 1 bid to build new Council housing.

The report also set out the progress being made to submit a bid to build more new Council housing in Rotherham under Round 2, the final date for submissions for which was 30th October. It was proposed to put forward 10 sites owned by the Council as part of the bid to deliver 127 new homes across the Borough.

Discussion ensued on the report including the priority ranking of sites and the Housing Revenue Account.

It was noted that the Cabinet was to consider the report at its meeting on 4th November, 2009.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made on building new Council housing be noted.

(2) That expenditure on fees and charges be approved, at risk, up to a value of £35,000.

(3) That the selection of the 10 sites to be released for Council housing building at nil value be supported.

(4) That the bid application to the HCA for the 10 sites for grant funding estimated at £8.3M be approved.

(5) That it be noted that the prudential borrowing required by the Council would need to be subsidised by the Housing Revenue Account until year 16.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Council))

J85. STAGE 3 COMPLAINT PANEL

Further to the joint meeting held on 22nd July with the Cabinet Member for Streetpride (Minute No. 39 refers), and the Complaints Panel held on 17th June, 2009, it was noted that the Panel had reconvened to consider the issue of compensation to the complainant.

The Panel had recommended that compensation be awarded to the complainant in the sum of £2,771.00, to be met from the Environment and Development Services and Neighbourhoods and Adult Services' budgets.

Resolved:- That the report be noted and the compensation approved.

(Exempt under Paragraph 2 of the Act - information likely to reveal the identity of an individual)

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS
Monday, 16th November, 2009

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Goult and Kaye (Policy Advisors).

J86. LOCAL AUTHORITY DUTY TO SUPPORT VULNERABLE 16 AND 17 YEAR OLDS

In accordance with Minute No. 69 of the Cabinet Member for children and Young People's Services meeting on 4th November, 2009, Paul Grimwood, Youth Offending Services Manager, presented a report, for information, on the implications of a recent (May, 2009) Law Lords judgement (G vs Southwark), which considered how local authorities support homeless 16 and 17 year olds.

The legal case tested the circumstances in which local authorities should provide accommodation for this age group and the legislation that should apply. The judgement concluded that the duties of local authorities to accommodate children in need could not be circumvented by referring the young person to the housing authority. The case has profound implications for local authority children's services.

The report also referred to the position of unaccompanied asylum seeking young people, including support arrangements, accommodation support, support in relation to their status as looked after children and financial arrangements, as informed by a 2003 High Court judgement, (R v London Borough of Hillingdon and the Secretary of State for Education and Skills. The report and this issue in particular was to be considered at the next meeting of the New Arrivals Working Party.

Discussion took place on the huge financial implications the judgement would have on the Council, particularly the Children and Young People's Service who would be responsible for the young people until the age of 21.

It was noted that work was taking place and hoped that a further report would be submitted to the 2 respective Cabinet Members.

Resolved:- That a further report be submitted as soon as possible.

J87. NEIGHBOURHOODS GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2009

Consideration was given to a report presented by Mike Shaw, Finance Manager, which detailed the income, expenditure and net position for the Neighbourhoods Department within the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate compared to the profiled budgets for the period ending 31st September, 2009. It also included the projected year end

outturn position which currently showed a forecasted overspend of £814,000 (13.5%) by the end of March, 2010, prior to any management actions which may be implemented following the current review of the Independent Support Service.

The following key pressures were highlighted:-

Independent Support Service (Wardens)	£672,000 overspend
Safer Neighbourhoods	£139,000 overspend
Business Regulation	£5,000
underspend	
Neighbourhood Partnerships	£31,000 overspend
Housing Access	£21,000 overspend
Housing Choices	Balanced forecast
Neighbourhood Investments	£1,000
overspend	

It was also noted that to date, Neighbourhoods had spent £20,181 on agency staff.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised;-

- Vacancy management
- Warden Service
- Ringfenced Government funding
- Housing Revenue Account

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

(2) That monthly Housing Revenue Accounts be submitted in future.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL
29th October, 2009

Present:- Councillor McNeely (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Blair, Cutts, Falvey, Lakin, P. A. Russell, Walker and F. Wright. together with Alex Armitage (Parish Councils), Bernadette Bartholomew (Parish Councils), Mr. J. Carr (Environment Protection UK), Derek Corkell (RotherFed) and Andrew Roddison (RotherFed)

Councillor Smith was in attendance for Minute No. 45.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Havenhand, Hodgkiss and Nightingale.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

41. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

42. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair reported that a Christmas lunch for the Panel would be held on 10th December at the rising of the meeting.

43. BUDGET

Mike Shaw, Finance Manager (Neighbourhoods) presented the Revenue Outturn for 2008/09 together with the latest performance and monitoring against the 2009/10 Revenue Budget as part of the first stage of the budget setting process for 2010/11.

The report highlighted:-

- General Fund Revenue Outturn position was an overall overspend of £261,000
- Housing Revenue Account Outturn position was an overall overspend of £287,000
- Value for Money
 - showed that the relationship between cost and performance of homelessness was excellent with Rotherham being the rank bottom spender
 - 100% of Neighbourhoods Key Performance Indicators targets achieved
- As at August, 2009, projected overspend of £538,000 for the Independent Support Service (Wardens)

- A number of budget pressures within Safer Neighbourhoods. The wider Neighbourhoods Service was optimising opportunities to save staff costs through tight vacancy management and had implemented a moratorium on non-essential expenditure with the aim of delivering a balanced position by the end of March, 2010
- Budget pressures of £53,000 within Business Regulation (£5,000 within the Animal Health Team and £49,000 within Bereavement Services)
- Projected overspend of £31,000 in Neighbourhood Partnerships – unable to meet the vacancy factor allowed for in the staffing budgets
- Unachievable vacancy factor within Housing Access but would be offset by a reduction in establishment costs due to maternity leave

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

- Discussions were taking place with the Police with regard to making meetings much more “visible” i.e. holding them in venues that members of the public could attend, publicity etc.
- The need to streamline the number of community meetings to avoid duplication which hopefully would increase attendance
- There were a number of instances in the report where it stated that vacancy management savings would not be achieved. However, it was a Corporate requirement of the Directorate’s budget setting process that an automatic 5% vacancy allowance was built in. In small teams it was very difficult to fulfil that commitment. The Strategic Director undertook to report the Panel’s concerns to the Finance Director and Corporate Management Team
- Independent Support Service
 - Very sensitive issue which needed to be dealt with appropriately as they were highly valued by members of the public
 - Budget used to be contained within Adult Social Care budget which for this year was £68M. The Warden Service had never broken even or been self-financing but the difference between the costs recovered and the cost of the Service had been contained within the massive Adult Services budget.
 - When the budgets were realigned the scale of the difference between the cost of the Service and income recovered became more obvious
 - A review was taking place of the Service which had included consideration given to whether there was scope to integrate

some of the Warden Services with Domiciliary Care Services. The review was still ongoing and far more complicated than envisaged due to the skill set and the geographic community served

- The charges for the Warden Service were very low compared to many neighbouring authorities but any increase would impact on people's quality of life. Options for increasing charges on a scale basis were still being worked up
- The review was also looking at re-organising the working arrangements for the Wardens which would be done in consultation with the Wardens and residents as to their practicality
- Given the scale of the problem nationally, some authorities had arrived at a half-way solution
- The Value For Money document was produced by the Audit Commission. All Directorates had been instructed to present the report to their respective Scrutiny Panel together with the budget monitoring report. In some cases it was a useful tool but in others, such as Housing, it gave misleading information. It should be accompanied by a "health warning"

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

(2) That the proposals for the future of the Warden Service, together with any other proposals for efficiency and savings, be submitted to this Panel for consideration.

(3) That the comments made by the Scrutiny Panel on the Value For Money document be communicated to the Strategic Director for Finance.

44. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

John Mansergh, Performance Management Officer, gave a powerpoint presentation on the Performance Management Framework as follows:-

Performance is reality

- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) should show what we are getting from our money
- Should reflect reality
- KPIs are only a 'can opener' – insight into the quality of service
- Use alongside other tools e.g. budget reports, inspection assessments and customer satisfaction ratings

Target Setting – Why?

- Legal duty to continuously improve
- Helps to prioritise
- Focuses efforts (Service Plan) and resources (Medium Term Financial Strategy) on achieving a target

- Aims for better performance each year and to achieve levels of the very best

Performance Report

- Current Performance
 - Identifies performance within the year against the set target (green is on target – red off target)
 - Good performance is identified as a higher figure is better/or lower
- Baseline
 - Outturn performance figure from the previous year
- Results
 - Identifies the cumulative performance within the year at a given point in time
- This time last year
 - Enables a trend analysis comparing the same reporting periods year on year
- D.o.T. (Direction of Travel)
 - Identifies performance when comparing the same reporting period from the previous year (green is better/red is worse)
- Target
 - We will include quarterly targets as recommended at last Panel
- Outcome Framework
 - Identifies the linkage of the KPI to the Outcomes Framework

Making Performance Management Work

- Strong leadership and commitment
- Clear roles and responsibilities
- Setting clear, challenging but realistic objectives for improvement
- Robust performance information
- Balanced, open and honest reporting
- Taking quick and decisive action
- Integration with financial management
- Ensuring user focus and meeting all needs
- Creating a performance improvement culture

John presented the performance report for the first quarter of 2009/10 which outlined the Key Performance Indicator results and efficiency projections.

At the end of the quarter, 12 (86%) Key Performance Indicators were currently on track to achieve their year end targets, this compared to 75% at the end of last year. There were 2 Indicators that were rated 'off' target, and were shown as a red triangle alert in Appendix A. Of the Indicators solely owned by the Directorate, 100% were on target. For 2010 Rotherham Ltd., 7 (78%) Key Performance Indicators were on track to

achieve their year end targets which compared to 50% at the end of last year. The Indicators off target at the end of the 1st quarter were:-

2010 Rotherham Ltd.

- BV211a Programmed/Responsive Repairs
- LPI185 Repairs Appointments Made and Kept

2010 Rotherham was identifying rent lost for 2009/10 as a result of voids at the end of June of £288,000.

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

- What was 2010 predicting as rent loss for the end of the year?
- Ward Members had drawn attention to some practices of 2010 that officers had not been aware of. A review was currently underway into those practices together with the predicted rent loss as at the end of the financial year. It was expected that that piece of work would be completed shortly
- Once completed, the findings of the review would be presented to Members as well at the 2010 Board
- PSA7 (number of vulnerable households no longer living in decent accommodation in the private sector) was a national Indicator
- Decent Homes did not mean that every property received a new central heating system, kitchen etc. so responsive repairs were still required
- What help was there for those who had bought their property under the Right to Buy and was not subject to Decent Homes? This was an area that required significant investment nationally. Rotherham had made inroads into improving performance in the private sector which had been recognised in the Housing CPA rating but there was more work needed. The Housing Strategy was being revised to take into consideration some of the strategic housing issues
- The funding available for HAL had been committed. Further work was being undertaken with private landlords to address non-decency issues. Future reports were planned on this issue
- The Council was preparing for Single Conversation with the new Homes and Communities Agency which would pull together all the funding streams for housing

Resolved:- (1) That the report and the remedial action in place to improve performance be noted.

(2) That a report on long term empty properties be submitted to the next Panel meeting.

(3) That the Audit Commission document "Is there something I should know" be circulated to Members of the Panel.

45. ROTHERHAM ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY

David Rhodes, Corporate Environmental Manager, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Why Climate Change?

- Sustainable Community Strategy
- Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change
- Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006
- Climate Change Act 2008 – 34% reduction by 2020, 80% reduction by 2050

Impacts of Climate Change

- Warmer, drier summers
- Wetter winters
- More extreme weather events
- Air pollution episodes
- Biodiversity
- Most vulnerable will be the worse affected

Strategy Background

- November, 2007 – RMBC signed the Nottingham Declaration
- Commitment to develop a Climate Change Action Plan
- Council Plan – energy, transport and buildings
- Action Plan for the Borough needed – inclusive of partner and community activity and wider environmental activity
- Rotherham's Sustainability Partnership lead supported by the Council's Sustainable Development Officer Group

Performance Links

- Co-ordinate innovative partnerships to improve sustainable infrastructure, mitigate and adapt to climate change
- Improve the local environmental quality of our neighbourhoods
- LLA target
- National Indicators

Aims

- To reduce Rotherham's contribution to climate change through CO2 reduction

- To prepare Rotherham for a changing climate
- To reduce Rotherham's Ecological Footprint
- To promote sustainable development across the Borough
- To enhance Rotherham's local environment

Next Steps

- Consultation August-October
- Presentations and workshops with partners and stakeholders
- Website
- Sign off
- Ongoing development and monitoring

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues highlighted:-

- NI185 CO₂ Emissions from Council Activities – the Council collected the data which was reported via a spreadsheet produced by DEFRA
- NI186 CO₂ Reductions from within the Borough – the information was collected by a private company on behalf of DEFRA. The Council did not see how the data was collected. Concerns had been raised with regard to this in the past as it did not allow you the ability to see how accurate the data was.
- NI187 and 189 were interlinked but was little mention of them in the report
- An Environmental Statement was produced annually which was externally verified. Auditors had commented previously that the Council did not publicise all its elements of good practice
- A meeting was to be held later day with the Children and Young People's Management Team as part of the consultation process. Carbon Reduction Emissions would be discussed in particular as the Council would have to purchase allowances for schools but they would only be allowed to report energy consumption data and not carry out reductions. That was being looked at with the possibility of changing Financial Regulations so that CO₂ reductions could be enforced in the future
- Recycling facilities in PFI Schools
- How well was the Eco homes performing?
- Role of partners e.g. PCT

Resolved:- (1) That the development of the draft Environment and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan for the Borough be noted.

(2) That David Rhodes raise with Children and Young People's Services the issue of recycling facilities.

(4) That the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation convey to the Partnership Board the need for Partners to be involved in the Strategy.

(5) That a future agenda item be submitted on building stronger links with climate change issues.

(6) That an update on the Strategy be submitted on a quarterly basis.

46. **GARAGE SITE REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME**

Tracie Seals, Sustainable Communities Manager, presented an update and progress report on the Garage Site Review including an overview of the initial recommendations, resident consultation feedback information and the next steps to be undertaken to complete the review.

Consultation had been ongoing with Ward Members, residents and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. to enable recommendations to be finalised.

Of the 440 garage sites within the Borough, the analysis of sites undertaken Borough-wide had recommended that 87% of sites be retained and improved and that 11% of the sites be considered for disposal. The remaining 2% of sites were owned by Environment and Development Services and were being reviewed separately.

The proposed recommendations included:-

Recommendation	Grand Total	% of Sites
Retention and Investment	383	87
Site to support Affordable Housing Programme 2008-2011 Phase One	3	1
Site to support Affordable Housing Programme 2008-2011 Phase Two	21	5
Site to be disposed on the open market	25	5
EDS owned sites under review	8	2
Total	440	100

A report would be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods in November for approval of the Garage Site Review final recommendations.

46 sites had been identified as unsustainable and therefore been recommended for disposal to either support the Affordable Housing Programme, including new Council housing or for potential open market sale, subject to service area consultation processes and Cabinet approval. Consultation had commenced on 30th July with garage tenants and residents that surround sites identified for potential disposal and development.

The majority of sites across the Borough were in high use and demand and, therefore, proposed for retention. These would be programmed for investments if it had not been carried out previously. The Refurbishment Programme would include garage door replacements, resurfacing work, brickwork and painting works.

A number of management issues raised previously still required monitoring with actions being agreed to resolve matters with 2010 Rotherham Ltd. including:-

- Concerns regarding the general condition of garage and garage sites
- Site management protocols
- Dealing with damaged/derelict garages
- Tenancy termination process
- Demand and usage.

The following issues were clarified:-

- Some of the sites proposed for disposal on the open market were constrained and suitable for self-build or small scale development
- Where residents adjacent to sites had created a vehicular or pedestrian access an assessment is undertaken to establish whether a right to access exists. Where access is to be retained the schemes are designed to accommodate such, however, where no such rights exists residents are contacted and arrangements to remove the access discussed
- Planning appraisals had already been carried out and for sites to be disposed of on the open market, details as to acceptable use and site constraints would be included in the marketing literature
- Through the 2010 Liaison Group, management issues had been raised and discussed. The feedback would be contained within the final recommendations
- Sites with high level of voids would more likely have gone forward for development. However, for those sites where there was demand but which still had voids it may have been due to the garage being in a dark area of the site or where awkward manoeuvres were required and those would be addressed by 2010 through their management

processes

Councillor Cutts thanked officers for the exemplary manner in which the consultation had been carried out.

The Chair acknowledged the consistent quality of reports from Paul Walsh, Neighbourhood Investment Service, in relation to the Garage Site Review.

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

(2) That the final recommendations be submitted in the New Year to take into consideration the outcomes of the HCA Round 2 of the Council Housing Building announcements in December, 2009.

(3) That an annual update be submitted to the Panel.

47. 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD. IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Jane Davies-Haire, Landlord Relations Manager, presented the latest version of the Improvement Plan which had been approved by 2010 Rotherham Ltd.'s Board on 7th October 2009.

The report also proposed that the current management agreement was extended to 30th June, 2011, three months later than previously recommended.

Meetings had taken place between the Council and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. to establish clear targets which had resulted in the submitted Plan. It was proposed that quarterly monitoring meetings be held between key managers in RMBC and 2010, following which reports (by exception) would be submitted to the Cabinet Member.-

Tenants' priorities had been identified through the STATUS Survey and test of opinion surveys and feedback from tenants' events. They fell into the following 6 Themes:-

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Theme 1 | Address tenants' and leaseholders' priorities for improvement |
| Theme 2 | Achieve the standards expected of top performing organisations |
| Theme 3 | Make a unique contribution to Rotherham's priorities, particularly
The Safe and Proud themes |

Theme 4	Ensure all services are well governed and well managed
Theme 5	Ensure strong financial management processes are in place
Theme 6	Deliver value for money, making excellent use of resources

The next STATUS Survey was not due to be repeated until October, 2010, so 2010 Rotherham Ltd. had requested that it be carried out earlier.

The Council and 2010 Rotherham Ltd. would ensure customers were involved in carrying out reality checks and monitoring progress against the Plan. Progress reports would include an analysis of risks.

It was also proposed that the current management agreement be extended to 30th June, 2011. The three month extension (the previous report recommended an extension to 31st March, 2011) recognised the additional time taken to agree the Plan, and recent changes to the ALMO's senior management team.

Discussion ensued on the Plan with the following issues raised:-

- Out of the 58 outcomes, 12 were on red, 36 amber and 10 green. How much confidence was there that they would lead to an improved, sustained and efficient organisation?
- The status of the Plan showed a degree of self-awareness. 2010 were confident they would be able to deliver and would be monitored every quarter
- 5.4 stated that financial reports were timely and reliable and clear – the test would be whether they identified at an early stage problems that enabled management action to be taken
- 5.3 stated that 80% of all budget holders receive training – all budget holders should receive training
- Issues around access need to be strengthened
- Very poor publicity for the new “golden” number
- Concern expressed regarding the amount of money spent on consultation by 2010 and the number of red and ambers in the Plan. Was there long enough for them to turn green?
- How close were the ambers to green or ambers to red? What was the direction of travel?

Resolved:- (1) That the Improvement Plan, attached at appendix 1 of the report submitted, be noted.

(2) That 2010 Rotherham Ltd. submit to this Panel information as to how sustainable/achievable the Plan was.

(3) That the Chief Executive of 2010 Rotherham Ltd. and the Board Chair be requested to attend the January meeting of this Panel to discuss the Plan further.

The Panel noted the decisions made under delegated powers by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods held on 9th and 23rd September and 5th October, 2009.

Arising from Minute No. 66 (Approval of Tender for Structural Repairs to 92 'Airey' Constructed Non Traditional Properties) questions were raised with regard to those properties that had been purchased under Right to Buy.

Resolved:- (1) That a report be submitted on the options available to the Council within the resources available.

(2) That a report be submitted on non-traditional properties in general.

49. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th September, 2009, were agreed.

50. PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 11th and 25th September and 9th October, 2009, were noted.

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
23rd October, 2009

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Austen, Barron, Gilding, J. Hamilton, License and Swift.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Boyes, Jack, McNeely, G. A. Russell and P. A. Russell.

(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE APPOINTMENTS PANEL)

75. POSTS OF DIRECTOR OF SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING AND SENIOR DIRECTOR OF SCHOOLS AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Nominations were sought to sit on the membership of the Appointments Panel for the posts of Director of Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting and Senior Director of Schools and Lifelong Learning, scheduled to take place on the following dates:-

Longlisting Meeting (for both roles) Monday, 7th or Thursday, 10th December, 2009

Shortlisting Meeting:-

Director of Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting	Tuesday, 5th or Wednesday, 6th January, 2010
--	---

Senior Director, Schools and Lifelong Learning	Thursday, 21st or Friday, 22nd January, 2010
--	---

Final Stage:-

Director, Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting	Tuesday, 12th or Wednesday, 13th January, 2010
--	---

Senior Director, Schools and Lifelong Learning	Tuesday, 2nd or Wednesday, 3rd February, 2010
--	--

Resolved:- That consideration be given to the nomination of the Chair of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel and a further nomination be sought from the remaining Members of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee not in attendance at today's meeting.

76. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

77. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from the public or the press.

78. ROTHERHAM'S BUDGET 2010/11 AND BEYOND

Andrew Bedford, Strategic Director of Finance, gave a presentation which highlighted Rotherham's budget for 2010/11 and beyond.

The presentation drew specific attention to:-

- Revising Budget Forecasts.
- Where the money was being spent.
- What savings came from.
- Current year pressures.
- Forecast Outturn 2009/10.
- MTFS – Summary Resources and Spend.
- What the future would look like.
- Grant Projections.
- Forecast Funding Gap.
- Audit Commission – Value for Money Profile Report 2008/09.
- Bar Charts depicting:-
 - Children's Services.
 - Individual Schools Budget.
 - School Improvement.
 - Access.
 - Education for Under Fives.
 - Social Care for Children and Families.
 - Environment, Planning and Transportation.
 - Street Cleansing – Environment.
 - Transport – Highways.
 - Transport – Public Parking.
 - Culture – Expenditure Overview.
 - Social Care for Adults.
 - Social Care for Older People.
 - Domiciliary Care Service Volume.
 - Adults with Learning Disability.
 - Adults with Physical Disability.
 - Council Tax Administration, Central Services and Other.
 - Benefits Administration.
- Corporate/Cross-Cutting Savings.
- Next Steps.
- Revenue Budget – Original Gap.
- Revisions to Bridge the Gap.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the

following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Reduction in staff and alternative ways to bridge the deficit.
- Car mileage rate reductions and tax relief alternative schemes.
- Value for money on high spend services.
- Value for money savings and cross cutting exercises.
- Waste collection and the high amount of spend per head.
- Concessionary fares and how they were affecting Rotherham.
- Value for Money Review Process and Arrangements.
- Budget pressures through the use of consultants.
- Bicycle purchase through salary sacrifice schemes.
- Car parking income.

Resolved:- That Andrew Bedford be thanked for his informative presentation and the contents be noted.

79. LOCAL AUTHORITY BUSINESS GROWTH INCENTIVE - AREA ASSEMBLIES DEVOLVED BUDGET PROPOSALS

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update on the proposals from the Area Assembly Co-ordinating Groups for projects identified to be funded through Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) within the 2009/10 financial year.

These proposals were approved on 19th October, 2009 by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods for recommendation to Cabinet on 21st October, 2009.

These proposals supported the corporate objective of devolved decision-making in the Borough through Area Assemblies and the delivery of local projects and actions which met corporate objectives and community priorities as identified in the Area Plans of the Area Assemblies.

Resolved:- (1) That the project proposals to be funded from the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive be supported.

(2) That Cabinet be asked to explore options to support the long term sustainability of devolved budgets to Area Assemblies.

80. CONTEST 2 AND PREVENT STRATEGY PROGRESS

Carol Adamson, Equalities and Diversity Officer, introduced a report which provided information about the Government's national CONTEST Counter-Terrorism Strategy and Prevent Strategy and the progress made in Rotherham to respond to this agenda.

The report set out in more detail the four main workstreams of the Strategy known as Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare. Local partners were responsible for delivering the Prevent workstream, the aim of which was to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism.

CONTEST made it clear that Prevent built on and was linked to the Government's wider work to create strong, cohesive and empowered communities, based on a commitment to common and shared values.

Further information was provided on:-

- The Threat.
- Scale of the Threat.
- The Prevent Strategy.
- The Prevent Framework.
- Rotherham Partnership's Response.
- The Next Steps.

The Rotherham Prevent Action Plan was based on the priorities for Rotherham identified by Guardian Group in accordance with the Prevent Strategy, taking into account the local context. Rotherham's Counter Terrorism Local Profile was also informing the local Prevent agenda, so that activities were in line with, and proportionate to, local circumstances.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Democratic accountability.
- Progress of the action plan and the need for regular monitoring mechanisms.
- Possible funding allocation for Rotherham.
- Involvement and support of local Ward Members.
- Rotherham's perception of extremism.
- Kashmir police links and the benefits to Rotherham.
- Little information about priorities in the action plan.
- Presentation of information to the Area Assembly Neighbourhood Action Groups.
- Support for School Cohesion through BME and School Councils, how the schools were identified and how Schools duty to promote community cohesion fitted into this project.
- Categorisation of the Prevent Groups.
- Work and support at a very local level.
- Little or no publicity around Local Democracy Week.
- Involvement and curriculum development of mono-cultural schools or schools with low numbers of BME students in the cohesion agenda.
- Community cohesion involvement led by School Governing Bodies.

- Area Assembly involvement and discussion at meetings of the Area Assembly Chairs.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made against the Prevent agenda be noted.

(2) That an update be provided to this Committee in six months and be monitored thereafter on a twice yearly basis.

(3) That progress on Area Assembly involvement be included as part of the monitoring report on the Area Assembly Action Plans and that this be reported to the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel in due course.

81. PLACE SURVEY ACTIONS

Consideration was given to the report presented by Miles Crompton, Research Co-ordinator, which set out the key issues and implications for Rotherham arising from the 2008 Place Survey along with measures to disseminate the results and identify actions for the Borough. The Place Survey measured quality of life outcomes and satisfaction with services provided by the Council and partner agencies.

The Place Survey provided eighteen National Indicators and four of Rotherham's LAA indicators. Key findings from the survey were that satisfaction with the local area had risen and concerns about community safety had fallen. However, satisfaction with the Council, Council services and value for money was low and community cohesion was well below average.

The final results of the Place Survey were published on 23rd June, 2009 and needed to be fully disseminated and understood by the relevant officers and partner agencies. In addition, actions which could improve local quality of life or satisfaction with services needed to be identified and prioritised.

Rotherham's overall results reflected a pattern of declining satisfaction evident nationally, although the relative position of the Borough had worsened. There were positive messages about improved quality of life with increased satisfaction about the local area and reduced perception of anti-social behaviour. However, satisfaction with the local authority overall and most Council services has fallen since 2006.

The potential existed for Rotherham to improve perceptions through more effective communications as most people did not feel well informed about what local public services were doing or how they could influence local decisions. Appropriately targeted communications through all forms of media, including internet, were important to reach the widest range of customers. Rotherham News, the community newspaper of the Local

Strategic Partnership, launched in 2008, and its impact had yet to be evaluated formally.

On a positive note, service users were invariably more satisfied than non-users and services needed to gain more credit for services actually delivered and improvements in quality of life. Increasing the use of services such as libraries, leisure centres, museums and theatres would help to increase satisfaction. However, the majority of people were likely to rely on Council or partner publications, local media or word-of-mouth to inform their perceptions of most local services.

The results of the Place Survey were a valuable indicator of what local people thought about living in Rotherham and their perceptions of, and satisfaction with, local services. It was, therefore, important that the findings continued to be disseminated widely and discussed to provide a better understanding of local perceptions and ensure the results of the survey were used to shape local public services. It was important that Place Survey results influenced both service planning and the marketing/communications activity required to support delivery relevant to the indicators surveyed. In the short to medium-term, actions were being undertaken or recommended to assist with the circulation of the final report.

In the longer-term, the results should be used to inform the planning and prioritisation of communication during 2010/2011, so that resources could be targeted in line with the views of local people. These findings should also inform budget setting and service planning.

Discussion ensued on the questions asked as part of this survey and the correlation between the satisfaction on certain areas and the perception indicators and how these linked together.

It was, therefore, suggested that some of these areas be included as part of a Scrutiny Review being undertaken by the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel on perception indicators.

Discussion ensued on the significance of the statistics and the margin for error and how this survey, like others, could only provide a snapshot at a point in time. This survey was based on the views of a 1% sample of Rotherham adults. Results were subject to confidence intervals of around + or – 3% of the actual results so care needed to be taken when interpreting the findings.

Further dialogue took place and questions were raised by the Committee, which were answered, relating to:-

- Weighting of the data and what information was taken into consideration including gender, age, economic climate and household income.
- Possibility of a Members' Seminar to share the results with

- attendance from the Audit Commission and MORI.
- Perception and fear of crime and anti-social behaviour in Rotherham Town Centre.
- Lack of Police presence to alleviate concerns.
- Publication of the survey results and the use of Rotherham News.
- Randomness of samples given that Rotherham was 70% rural and 30% urban.
- Outcome of the Local Strategic Partnership wide dissemination event and workshop on 7th October, 2009.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the final report on the 2008 Place Survey by Ipsos MORI be noted.

(2) That action plans be developed to improve Rotherham's position on LAA Indicators and in response to other key issues as outlined in the report.

(3) That the dissemination plans for the Place Survey results as outlined be supported.

(4) That the results be used to inform budget setting, service planning and the development of the Council's Marketing/Communications Plan for 2010/2011.

(5) That consideration be given to the arrangement of a Members' Seminar on the results and Legal and Democratic Services be notified in due course.

82. MINUTES

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9th October, 2009 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

83. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported as follows:-

(a) Councillor Swift reported on matters relating to the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, particularly the budget process.

(b) Councillor Jack had submitted information on matters relating to the Adult Services and Health Scrutiny Panel, particularly:-

- The start of the budget process,
- Performance targets for 2008/09 and the first quarter.

- Ongoing review of “Help People to Live at Home”. This had been delayed due to the staff leaving the authority, but this was now being progressed.
- Breastfeeding Review was almost complete and was being led by Councillor Burton.
- Ongoing work with flood victims in the Holderness Ward. Co-ordinating information was progressing.
- Reminder of the Fairs Fayre Event at Magna on Wednesday, 28th October, 2009.

84. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
6th November, 2009

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Austen, Barron, Boyes, Jack, License, McNeely, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell and Swift.

Also in attendance for items 91 onwards below were George Bailey, John D'Silva, Myles Doran, George Foster, Charlotte Scothern and Melissa Waterworth (representatives of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet). Tommy Aitchison, Mateen Duresmain and Oliver Newrick (representatives of Rawmarsh Community School Council).

Councillors Fenoughty, St. John (Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport), S. Wright (Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services) and Wyatt (Cabinet Member for Resources).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Doyle, Gilding and Stone.

85. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

86. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

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

87. MINUTES

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd October, 2009 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 78 (Rotherham's Budget 2010/11 and Beyond) and the reference to bicycle purchase through salary sacrifice scheme, the Assistant Chief Executive, Human Resources, be requested to look into other areas that could be processed through salary sacrifice for the benefit of the employees.

88. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported as follows:-

(a) Councillor G. A. Russell referred to the launch on 3rd November, 2009 of the Youth Cabinet manifesto and reported that the latest meeting of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel had considered:

- a presentation on Child Poverty
- Narrowing the Gap (Raising the Bar) project
- Directory of services and activities for children and young people

and families (Young People's Zone)

- H.M. Government response to the Lord Laming report
- Value for Money budget review

(b) Councillor McNeely reported that future meetings of the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel would consider:

- the work of enforcement officers
- 2010 Rotherham Ltd. Improvement Plan with the Chief Executive and Chair of the Board

(c) Councillor Boyes reported:

- the latest position regarding Yorkshire South Tourism
- congratulations to Council staff and South Yorkshire Police for a very well managed bonfire season

(d) Councillor Jack reported that the next meeting of the Adult Services and Health Scrutiny Panel on 12th November, 2009 was to consider the personalisation issue to which all Members of the Council were invited.

(e) Councillor Austen reported that the latest meeting of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel had considered:-

- a presentation an anti social behaviour orders
- a presentation on transitional funding NRF
- report on participatory budgeting
- protocol issues regarding crime and disorder responsibilities
- a presentation on the Community Leadership Fund

89. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call in requests.

90. MEMBERS OF THE YOUTH CABINET TO INTERVIEW ELECTED MEMBERS ABOUT BEING A COUNCILLOR

At this point in proceedings the meeting was adjourned to facilitate a political speed dating session between representatives of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet and members of this Committee and Cabinet.

The meeting reconvened, together with members of the Cabinet and representatives of Rotherham Youth Cabinet and Rawmarsh Community School.

As part of 11 Million Takeover Day, Melissa Waterworth (Youth Cabinet) chaired the remainder of the meeting.

(Melissa Waterworth in the Chair)

Melissa welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

91. INTRODUCTION TO SCHOOL COUNCILS

Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services, gave a brief introduction to school councils stressing their importance particularly in the context of equality of experience and student council opportunities.

Councillor Fenoughty indicated he was an advocate of school councils and referred to his five years at St. Bernards which had provided him with his first experience of democracy. Advantages of school councils included:-

- lobbying governors and heads for resources
- led to the development of the Youth Cabinet and Youth Parliament
- teaching formalities of meetings
- establishing relationships between students and teachers and also students from different year groups
- opportunity to use one's voice and question

Joyce Thacker and Councillor Fenoughty were thanked for their contributions.

Members received a briefing note on the background to school councils.

92. HOW A SCHOOL COUNCIL WORKS

Tommy Aitchison, Oliver Newrick and Mateen Duresmain of Rawmarsh Community School gave a presentation relating to the above which covered:-

- Why are we on the school council

- Transferable skills gained from being on a school council
- The benefits to school from the school council
- What needs to be in place for a school council to work well

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

- detailed level of answers received to bullying survey due to being conducted by students
- outcomes from the bullying survey
- monitoring and feedback of survey results
- obstacles to a successful school council
- elected member input to assist school councils
- some school councils better than others and reasons for such

Tommy, Oliver and Mateen were thanked for their informative and interesting presentation.

93. SCHOOL COUNCIL PRINCIPLES

George Foster and Myles Doran, Rotherham Youth Cabinet, gave a presentation relating to the above which covered:-

- Mission Statement for Rotherham Youth Cabinet
- Principles of Student Councils
- Aim of Secondary Student Councils
- Objectives
- Principles of Good Practice in Secondary Student Councils:-
 - Constitution
 - Structure of Councils
 - Support for the Council
 - Communication
 - Elections
 - Student Roles
 - Equality and Diversity
 - Schedule of Meetings
 - Budget

- Valued
- Content of Meetings
- Training and Support

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

- numbers of school councils allocated a budget
- linkages between school councils and respective communities e.g. Youth Parish Council
- fun/social aspects of school councils
- conflicting demands of teachers and school council duties
- constitutional structures of school councils and need for flexibility
- anonymous elections
- biggest barrier to goals of school councils
- importance of member of staff support to school councils
- priority of principles and greatest challenge
- potential tap in to local elected member leadership fund for assistance
- importance of communication link between school councils and local elected members

Resolved:- That the School Council Principles, as now reported, be endorsed by this Committee and referred to Cabinet.

In closing the meeting, Melissa thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions.

NEW ARRIVALS WORKING PARTY
Tuesday, 24th November, 2009

Present:- Councillor Sharman (in the Chair); Councillors Hussain and Doyle.

6. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 22ND JULY, 2009

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 22nd July, 2009, were agreed as a correct record.

Arising from Minute No. 2 (Refugee Integration and Employment Services), it was noted that a group of voluntary refugees were working to help those refugees that wanted to stay in Rotherham. Andrew Crowley was to meet them shortly to discuss their experiences.

7. REDUCING THE CAP

Andrew Crowley, Asylum Project Team submitted a report setting out the background to the agreement reached by the Strategic Migration Group, following consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders, on the cap of asylum seekers per head of local population.

The report also referred to the Case Resolution Programme announced by the Home Office. The impact of the Programme on the Authority was still not known at the present time.

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

(2) That a further report be submitted to the 31st March, 2010, meeting of this Group.

8. NEW CONTRACT

Andrew Crowley, Asylum Project Team, submitted a report outlining the Home Office's announcement that they wanted to offer new contracts for the support of Asylum Seekers and Refugees.

The scope of the contracts was outlined in "Project Compass" and did offer local authorities the possibility of playing a more central role in the provision of accommodation and services to asylum seekers and refugees.

The current asylum support and refugee integration contracts and grant agreements were due to expire in 2011.

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

(2) That the Asylum Team Manager undertake more research into the proposal and submit a report to a future meeting.

(3) That a report be submitted on the "Gateway" project.

9. LOCAL AUTHORITY DUTY TO SUPPORT VULNERABLE 16 AND 17 YEAR OLDS

Agreed:- That this item be deferred until the January meeting.

10. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF NEWLY ARRIVED CHILDREN (MAY 2009)

Bev Booker, Service Leader for Ethnic Minority Children, presented a report of the recent Scrutiny Review into Newly Arrived Children.

An action plan had been drawn up to address the recommendations arising from the Review which was approved by Cabinet on 15th July, 2009 (Minute No. 54 refers).

It was noted that the level of activity to support newly arrived children was determined by the current level of funding. Additional funding was identified by the schools to support the recruitment of 3 Slovakian speaking young people who supported the Welcome Officer and worked with families. The Scrutiny Review contained recommendations relating to financial resources. Actions to address these recommendations were detailed in the action plan.

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

(2) That a report be submitted on newly arrived children in schools to the next meeting.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to report.

12. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING

Agreed:- That a further meeting of the New Arrivals Working Group be held on Wednesday, 27th January, 2009, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

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

Document is Restricted