

## DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL SCRUTINY PANEL

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate  
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Thursday, 10 December  
2009

Time: 3.30 p.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 and Communications.
4. Declarations of Interest.
5. Questions from members of the public and the press.

#### **For Monitoring:-**

6. Streetpride Update - Richard Jackson, Streetpride Area Manager, to report. Minute No. 41 of the meeting of this Scrutiny Panel held on 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2009.
7. Partners & Communities Together Meetings (PACT) (report herewith) (Pages 1 - 18)
8. Area Assemblies Area Plans – Progress Report (herewith) (Pages 19 - 23)
9. Parish Review/Community Governance Review (report herewith) (Pages 24 - 42)
10. Presentation by Councillor Mahroof Hussain, M.B.E., Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement (additional report herewith) (Pages 43 - 47)

#### **Minutes - For Information:-**

11. Minutes of the meeting of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel held on 29th October, 2009 (herewith). (Pages 48 - 53)

12. Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement held on 2nd November, 2009 (herewith) (Pages 54 - 56)
13. Minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 23rd October, 6th and 20th November, 2009 (herewith) (Pages 57 - 75)
14. Minutes of a meeting of the New Arrivals Working Party held on 24th November, 2009 (herewith) (Pages 76 - 77)

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

**Membership:-**

Chairman – Councillor Austen  
Vice-Chairman – Councillor J. Hamilton  
Councillors:- Currie, Cutts, Dodson, Johnston, Littleboy, Mannion, Nightingale,  
Parker, Pickering, Sims and Tweed

**Co-opted Members**

Joanna Jones (GROW)  
Taiba Yasseen (REMA)  
Councillor A. Buckley (Parish Council Representative)  
Councillor E. Shaw (Parish Council Representative)

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:-</b>	<b>Democratic &amp; Renewal Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:-</b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup> December, 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:-</b>	<b>Partners &amp; Communities Together Meetings (PACT)</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:-</b>	<b>NAS</b>

## **5. Summary**

Rotherham is one of 60 areas across the country that was selected by the Home Office to become a Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Pioneer Area, based on a variety of data including, deprivation, population size, crime information and its determination to work with local communities to address local concerns about crime, anti-social behaviour and justice.

The Casey Review (Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime) examined how to better engage communities in the fight against crime and raise public confidence in the Criminal Justice System.

Following on from Flanagan review (The Review of Policing – Final Report, Sir Ronnie Flanagan) and its recommendation on the integration of neighbourhood management and neighbourhood policing, the Home Office is building upon the momentum by setting out priorities for work in Pioneer Areas, one of which is '*One dialogue with the public on crime*', the main driver being the introduction of Partners & Communities Together (PACT) meetings in every Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) Area.

In February 2009, the Area Assembly Chairs supported the proposal for PACT meetings in Rotherham to be accommodated within our existing Area Assembly meetings and the PACT process is currently well established within that overall structure across the seven Area Assembly/SNT areas.

This report and supporting presentation is in response to an earlier requirement for the Democratic Renewal and Scrutiny Panel to give it a better understanding of the role of the PACT, its priorities and examples of progress to date.

## **6. Recommendations**

- **That the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel notes the current position in relation to the PACT process in Rotherham and progress made to date.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

### One Dialogue with the public on crime

The Casey Review highlighted that the public want one response from public services on crime issues, focussed on what is wrong, what needs to be fixed and how that will occur, followed by feedback on what has happened. The public do not want to be 'engaged with' by lots of different bodies on what, to them, are the same issues. The public want to attend a meeting that should deal with a range of problems from lighting, rubbish collection, potholes, lack of youth facilities, to reporting anti-social behaviour and crime problems.

Both the Casey and Flanagan Reviews highlighted the need to build on good practice by marrying together Neighbourhood Policing and Neighbourhood Management to deliver a better service to the public. In signing up as a Pioneer Area we agreed to help deliver this by:

- Nominating appropriate existing local authority officers as designated liaison points for each Safer neighbourhood Team for all joint action and tasking needed; and
- Ensuring that at every neighbourhood policing public meeting there is a local authority presence

The Casey Review recommends that the public understanding of what a PACT meeting is ideally should be broadly the same irrespective of where in the country that person lives.

To develop our current model, the Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Manager held a series of meetings with South Yorkshire Police (SYP), who had unilaterally already agreed upon a corporate approach to PACT meetings across the county. Their corporate approach did meet the 'one meeting' requirement of the Casey Review, in our case, one meeting for each Area Assembly/SNT area.

In February 2009, the Area Assembly Chairs supported the proposal for PACT meetings in Rotherham to be accommodated within our existing Area Assembly structure. This structure was already embedded into daily business in Rotherham and is well supported administratively with a marketing programme in place, including Rotherham News and other media outlets, Area Assembly websites, targeting by newsletter and posters, local key individual networks and utilising Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) and Wardens.

The amalgamation of the PACT meeting into the Area Assembly meeting ensured that appropriate local authority and police representatives are present to meet the requirements of the Casey review, that being, to deal with a wide range of issues raised by the public through one meeting. The amalgamation of the PACT meeting into our Area Assembly process is seen as 'best practice' by the Home Office.

It was acknowledged that across the borough Area Assemblies do not always meet every month. When this is the case a 'stand alone' PACT meeting is in place.

The South Yorkshire Police corporate model for PACT meetings is built around the following structure/format and meets the requirements of the Casey review and includes:

- The PACT part of the meeting (when part of an Area Assembly meeting) should be chaired by the SNT Inspector/Sergeant or other appropriate SNT police officer.
- The Local Authority should be represented by an appropriate officer(s).
- The purpose and format of the meeting should be explained to the attendees by the chair.
- All attendees should be offered the opportunity to have a say – the chair should ensure that a minority of attendees do not dominate the session
- The chair is to be aware of the requirements of the Data Protection Act.
- The meeting must respect the confidentiality of what is discussed
- Priorities identified by the PACT should be presented to the attendees for their views and comment.
- Feedback will be given on activities taken and progress in tackling existing priorities (delivered in the '*We Asked, You Said, We Did*' format).
- The preferred measure of success against the priorities should be defined by the attendees.
- 'Sign-off' should be offered to the attendees once the success measure has been achieved (attendees to decide final 'sign-off' of a priority).
- The chair should provide monthly updates on local crime and policing issues
- The chair should provide a brief on specific crimes/incidents and what happened to those brought to justice.
- The chair should deliver corporate/partner reassurance messages and local good news stories.
- The chair will deal with complaints and dissatisfaction by utilising existing recording procedures.

### **Current Position**

PACT meetings have integrated well into the Area Assembly structure and are firmly established across all seven SNT areas. Rotherham and the three other local authorities is involved with South Yorkshire Police in a county wide evaluation of the PACT process and initial findings indicate that in Rotherham they are influencing local priorities and driving activity as outlined in the examples given in the supporting presentation and offering the opportunity of wider community engagement on issues that effect local communities. A particular strength of the PACT is that it provides residents with the opportunity to receive information on crime and safety, influence local priorities, receive regular feedback and hold the police and other agencies to account on performance against standards set within the 'Policing Pledge' (Appendix 1).

The examples of PACT priorities and partner responses in the supporting presentation are taken from just one area, but they are replicated across the borough with some excellent successes and positive feedback from communities.

## Conclusion

- Rotherham easily integrated the PACT meeting into existing, well established structures
- Rotherham is well advanced in terms of partnership working and boundaries that are coterminous e.g. SNTs, Area Assemblies, Streetpride, Localities etc
- In some areas, this has increased attendances and given added focus to forums
- The importance of the PACT process engaging with 'hard to reach' groups within the borough has been identified with interventions being put in place. An example of this is a sub-group of the PACT in Eastwood to specifically address issues within the Asian and Eastern European communities and local PACT meetings in Neighbourhood Action Group 'hotspots' (Eastwood Village and East Dene).

## 8. Finance

Central Government funding is available up to March 2010 to support the function of the Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Manager in working towards delivering on the recommendations within the Casey Review. The indication from the Home Office is that funding will remain available through to March 2011.

## 9. Risks and Uncertainties

As a Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Pioneer area we have agreed to help deliver the recommendations within the Casey Review – *'Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime'*. Our success in delivering these recommendations with our partners will attract future additional funding from the Home Office, in addition to that already allocated for the Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Manager post. The opposite could be the case, should we not deliver on the recommendations.

## 10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

## 11. Background Papers and Consultation

'Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime' – Casey Review  
'From the Neighbourhood to the National' – Policing Green Paper  
'The Review of Policing, Final Report' – Sir Ronnie Flanagan

**Contact Name:-** Steve Parry – Neighbourhood Crime & Justice Manager  
Tel 01709 (33)4565  
[Steve.parry@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.parry@rotherham.gov.uk)



## Policing pledge

### Providing information

- As part of our new policing pledge, we want to tell everyone about their dedicated safer neighbourhood team, where they are based, how to contact them and how to work with them.
- We will also provide monthly updates on our progress, and on local crime and policing issues, so that you can hold us to account.
- We will agree with victims of crime how often they would like to be informed of progress in their case, and for how long.

### Listening and taking action

- We will hold regular public meetings where you can meet your local safer neighbourhood team and agree priorities with other members of the community.
- If you leave a non-urgent message for your safer neighbourhood team, they will respond within 24 hours.
- We will ensure our police patrols are visible in areas at times when they will be most effective and, crucially, when you tell us you need them most.
- We will spend 80% of our time visibly working in your neighbourhood, tackling the issues that matter most to you.

### Responding to your needs

- If you dial 999, we aim to answer the call within 10 seconds, sending officers to emergencies immediately and giving you an estimated time of arrival. We aim to attend an emergency incident within 15 minutes.
- When your call is not an emergency we will answer it promptly and give you an estimated time of arrival.
- If you tell us you are dissatisfied with the service you have received, we will acknowledge this within 24 hours. We will discuss with you how it will be handled, giving you the opportunity to talk to someone in person about your concerns and agree what will be done and how quickly.

# Partners & Communities Together 'P.A.C.T' Meetings

**Steve Parry**

**Neighbourhood Crime & Justice Manager**

**Safer Neighbourhoods**

**Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2009**



## **The Casey Review**

### ***‘Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime’***

- Casey Review, ‘Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime’, examined how to better engage communities in the fight against crime
- Rotherham one of 60 areas across country selected by Home Office to become a Neighbourhood Crime and Justice Pioneer Area
- Following on from Flanagan review and his recommendation re integration of neighbourhood management and neighbourhood policing, Home Office priority includes ‘One dialogue with the public on crime’
- The main driver of this is the introduction of PACT meetings in every Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT)



**Louise Casey**

“The public want one response from public services on ‘*crime*’ issues, focussed on what is wrong, what needs to be fixed and how that will occur, followed up by feedback on what has happened.

They do not want to be ‘*engaged with*’ by lots of different bodies on what, to them, are the same issues”

“In practice this means that if the public give up their time to attend local meetings, those meetings should be able to deal with a range of problems and offer solutions – from lighting, rubbish collection, potholes, lack of youth clubs, to reporting ASB and crime problems”

*Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime – June 2008*

## What is a 'P.A.C.T'

- A public meeting
- All the 'right' agencies represented at an appropriate level
- Take action on variety of issues raised by the public
- Provides monthly, common and comparable local information
- Feedback on action taken on crime and neighbourhood priorities and problems
- What has happened to any criminals convicted for local crimes, including Community Payback

## What is a 'P.A.C.T'

- provide communities with clear information about how they can get in touch with their local services
- provide a way in which the Police, local authority and Partners can be tasked by the communities they serve

*'Where this occurs, it is neighbourhood Policing in action –local government providing the 'neighbourhood' and the police providing the 'policing'*

*Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime – June 2008*

# The PACT Will Not

- Replace or undermine the extensive and productive local community meeting structures that already exist in Rotherham



## Amalgamation of Area Assembly Meetings and the PACT's

- In February 2009, Area Assembly Chairs supported the proposal for PACT meetings in Rotherham to be accommodated within our existing Area Assembly meetings
- Area Assemblies ensure delivery of '*One dialogue with the public . . .*' because all the key partners are present

# Amalgamation of Area Assembly Meetings and the PACT's

- Area Assembly structure already part of daily business
- Officer / Administrative Support
- Marketing Programme in place
- Local Authority present
- One meeting – wide range of issues
- Meets requirements of Casey Review

# Current Position

- All 7 Area Assemblies incorporated PACT element into meetings and processes
- Gives public opportunity to receive information on crime and safety, influence local PACT priorities and receive regular feedback through these forums
- Rotherham easily integrated PACT element into existing structures
- Rotherham well advanced in terms of partnership working and boundaries that are co-terminous e.g. SNTs, Area Assemblies, Streetpride, Localities etc
- In some areas, this has increased attendances and given added focus to forums – Positive exit interviews



## EXAMPLES OF PACT PRIORITIES & RESPONSE

### Herringthorpe Playing Fields

- High visibility patrols on/around playing fields
- 'Operation Staysafe' with Youth Offending Team, targeted at East Dene, Herringthorpe and Clifton Park
- 40 young people identified
- Large quantities of alcohol seized from under age drinkers
- Fixed Penalty Notices issued to adults purchasing alcohol for young people
- Joint Police/Trading Standards test purchase operations – 3 premises failed
- Facilities Management and Green Spaces to remove trees and erect new fencing before the end of this calendar year

## EXAMPLES OF PACT PRIORITIES & RESPONSE

### Parking on Queensway

- Warning Notices were initially issued
- 16 Fixed Penalty Notices have now been issued for obstruction
- RMBC & Area Assembly working with hospital to look at alternative parking and possibility of a Residents Only Parking Scheme

## EXAMPLES OF PACT PRIORITIES & RESPONSE

### Maynard Road Playing Area

- SNT/ASB teams conducted a joint operation which identified the youths responsible
- 16 youths subject of stop/check
- 7 youths issued with warning letters
- Another 7 being issues with Acceptable Behaviour Contracts
- Some are attending the PS3 project
- Green Spaces and Area Assembly working with Taylor Wimpey's to tidy up the area and repair equipment

Thank You

Questions

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>10th December, 2009</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Area Assemblies Area Plans – Progress Report</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

## **5. Summary**

The purpose of this report is to update the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel on the progress made by Area Assemblies in delivering the Area Plans for 2009/10.

The report will mainly identify how targets and actions in the plans are addressing the top 3 community priorities and how this links to the Rotherham Partnerships Community Strategy and the Local Area Agreement, particularly linking in to the Safe and Proud themes.

**Why Community Priorities Matter** - The Local Government Act 2000 identifies the need for “community leadership, neighbourhood representation and effective communication between citizens and councils about local needs and priorities”.

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

One method of providing communication between local citizens and the Council is through developing local Area Plans.

## **6. Recommendations**

### **That Members**

- i. Note the progress made**

## 7. Proposals and Details

The Area Plan - The Area Plans provide an overview of the key priorities for each Area Assembly for the current year and details of area achievements from the previous year. The plans are available in easy to read format and as a detailed action plan both on line and in hard copy.

Joined up Working - All targets/actions in the plans meet with Rotherham Partnerships Community Strategy, the Local Area Agreement (LAA) particularly linking to Safe and Proud themes. Projects delivered by the Area Assembly (AA) and partners will contribute to the Corporate Area Assessment (CAA). 'Local public service providers and their partners understand the key role they play in making people safer, making them feel safer and that they understand the needs of their communities. AA input is incorporated into the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) planning cycle - the top three priorities emerging at a local level via Area Plans feed into the LSP and Theme Boards (Safe and Proud).

Links to 2008 Place Survey – The Area Plan Consultation Survey questions were aligned with the 2008 Place Survey Questions. Actions in the Area Plans will influence

- NI4 % of people who feel they can influence decisions
- NI 17 % of Rotherham people who think that Antisocial Behaviour is a problem in their local area

Partnership Plans – Parish and partners plans link, what people tell us in the Area Plans (which cover all wards in an Area Assembly), to what people tell the Parish Councils on a more local targeted level – this ensures that people are listened to and priorities are acted on.

### Community Priorities

The top 3 priorities across all Area Assemblies are;

- Reduce antisocial behaviour (ASB) crime and the fear of crime
- Increase facilities and activities for children and young people
- Roads/pavement maintenance - parks/open spaces and cleaner streets

### Links to Community Strategy Themes:

#### Safe Theme

- Reducing the fear and perception of crime
- Tackling and reducing the incidence of anti-social behaviour

SRP Objective - the top priority expressed by the Safer Rotherham Partnership (SRP) is to make a significant difference in changing the perceptions that local people have regarding crime and antisocial behaviour in their area

Place Survey - NI 17 % of people who think that ASB is a problem in their local area is average for South Yorkshire, however reducing ASB and fear of crime is the top Community Priority in 4 areas.

- The Area Assemblies including partners and the local community are delivering a range of actions through the Area Plan including the Neighbourhood Action Group and the Area Assembly Devolved Budget to address actual and perceived issues on Crime and Safety. This will contribute to delivering SRP and Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) objectives to reduce by 5%, the number of residents reporting ASB as a problem
- We are working with partners to develop and strengthen multi-agency responses to crime and community safety through Safer Neighbourhood Team briefings and Neighbourhood Action Group action plans to tackle hot spots in partnership with communities
- We are increasing the level of awareness in the community of the work of the SNT and the Neighbourhood Action Group and supporting monthly Partners and Community Together Meetings (PACT)

### **Themes: Safe, Proud, Alive, Achieving, Learning**

Increasing facilities and activities for children and young people is the top community priority in 2 areas – second priority in 3 areas and third priority in 2 areas.

Feedback from area plan consultation is that;

- Lack of youth provision is linked with antisocial behaviour
- People would like more publicity about existing provision - lack of information on what is already available for young people was the biggest concern that came through in the consultation both with adults and young people.
- Provision should be more geographically and financially accessible

Projects funded this year also address some of the negative stereotypes of the many young people who aren't involved in antisocial behaviour as well as improving community cohesion and leading to a reduction in the number of young people committing ASB and becoming involved in crime/drugs and alcohol consumption

In order to address these issues we are also

- Establishing joint working arrangements with Children and Young People's Services to develop a multi-agency approach to developing services and access to information for young people and their families through the devolved budget and other actions
- Working closely with Parish Councils and other partners to coordinate and support diversionary activities for Children and Young People (youth shelters;

detached youth work; mobile youth club, multi use games areas, play pathfinder

- Using detached youth work to consult with young people in hot spot areas to identify any gaps in provision and to encourage young people to become involved in active citizenship and local democracy

**Proud Theme:**

The Area Assemblies and Area Plan offer a means by which the communities of Rotherham are empowered to make a difference to their lives and their area and for the voluntary and community sector to influence decision making.

The Area Assembly Devolved Budget process has contributed to the capacity building of local communities by developing and delivering over 230 projects from statutory partners such as NHS Rotherham; South Yorkshire Police; South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue and the local voluntary and community sector.

This should also have a positive impact on the Local Area Agreement Indicator NI4 % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality.

A key element of this, delivered through the Area Plans is to work with partners and individuals to improve the way local communities look and to improve the local environmental quality of our Neighbourhoods( Safe Theme).

**Roads/Pavements maintenance – Clean Streets and Parks and Open spaces were in the top 4 priorities across all areas.**

Through the Area Plan the Area Assemblies are co-ordinating the delivery of:

- Improving access to information on reporting mechanisms so that people know how they can get their issues addressed
- Working with partners and the community to develop a co-ordinated response to the issues communities raise and monitoring the service standards of Streetpride, particularly around roads and pavement repairs
- Supporting Streetpride small scale projects to improve local environments and the “Grot Spot of the month” including offering opportunities for community members to request multi-agency walkabouts in their area to assist identifying and addressing local problems

**8. Finance**

**Devolved Budgets**

A decision was made in 2008 to devolve 1.8 million to Area Assemblies so that local communities could be consulted on how projects which would tackle community priorities identified in the Area Plan and linked to the Community Strategy could be delivered.



The Area Assemblies Devolved Budget Process has

- Strengthened the Community Leadership role of Elected Members by providing opportunities to work with partners and the community in a very practical way, encouraging groups to apply, supporting them in the process and working with the community to get their views on projects
- Funded through partnership working and listening to communities 61 projects in 08/09 – Over 200 were submitted for approval 09/10

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

Early in 2006 Rotherham Borough Council made a decision to change the role and function of area assemblies “away from being simple consultation and information sharing and towards area based coordination and delivery of service improvements and regeneration activities”. The Area Assemblies Devolved Budget has had a significant impact on RMBC and the Area Assemblies coordinating and delivering improvements.

There is a risk that when LAGBI and HMR funding ceases in 2010 and 2011 that this will impact on the Area Assemblies and RMBC sustained delivery of this coordination and delivery, resulting in a lack of confidence from the community and partners.

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

The development of devolved budgets for Area Assemblies has clear linkages with the key Corporate Strategic Themes.

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

The Community Empowerment White Paper: Communities in Control: Real People, Real Power: July 08  
Local Government White Paper: Strong and Prosperous Communities 2006  
Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

**Contact Name:** Jan Leyland, Neighbourhood Partnership Manager Ext 3103

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

<b>1. Meeting:</b>	<b>Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>2. Date:</b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup> December, 2009</b>
<b>3. Title:</b>	<b>Parish Review/Community Governance Review</b>
<b>4. Directorate:</b>	<b>Chief Executive's</b>

**5. Summary**

The report informs the Panel of the latest position as regards the Review and sets out the process for issuing the draft recommendations for public consultation and concluding the review through recommendations to Council and the Electoral Commission.

**6. Recommendations**

**That the report be received.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

### (a) Background to the review

The review is of the whole borough which comprises both parished and unparished areas. There are 29 parishes with 26 parish councils.

The Council has a duty to keep under review the arrangements of its parishes. The last review was undertaken over 20 years ago and since then there has been significant new development and population movement across the borough which may mean that local identities have changed.

Also as part of the periodic electoral review concluded in 2004 there were changes made to parish wards where parts of the parish were included in more than one of the Borough wards. This has created anomalies in parish boundaries and a review was necessary to address these.

The main aim of the review was to ensure that parish boundaries continue to reflect the identities and interests of the communities they serve, are meaningful, and facilitate the delivery of effective and convenient services. The review covers more fundamental issues such as whether parishes should be created in parts of the borough which do not presently have them, whether current parish boundaries should be altered other than merely to address anomalies, whether existing parishes might be amalgamated, whether new parishes might be created from within existing parishes and whether parishes should be warded.

### (b) Legal position and decision making powers

The Parish review began under the provisions of section 9 of the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 (the 1997 Act). Since the review started in September 2007 the 1997 Act has been repealed by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act). The 2007 Act contains a revised set of provisions for what are known as "Community Governance Reviews". These will replace the current provisions in the 1997 Act for carrying out Parish Reviews. Transitional provisions are contained in regulations.

The 2007 Act devolves the Secretary of State's and the Electoral Commission's decision-making powers to principal councils for community governance (parish) review and petition cases which were previously made under the 1997 Act. This means that the power to make changes to parish boundaries is now vested in

the Council. The Council will no longer be required submit proposals to the Secretary of State; instead the Council would be able to make an order bringing the proposals into force, although the Electoral Commission would still have to be consulted about changes to electoral arrangements.

The Council can recommend the creation of new parish councils under the 2007 Act. Government guidance suggests that a parish should reflect a distinctive and recognisable community of interest with its own sense of identity. Any proposals must also have regard to the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and to secure effective and convenient local government.

It should be noted that the following parish councils have protected electoral arrangements which were put in place by SI 2004 No. 123 "Local Government, England. The Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2004". Any changes may not be made without the approval of the Electoral Commission for a period of 5 years from 15 October 2006. Any recommendations which affect these councils must first receive approval from the Electoral Commission.

- Aston-cum-Aughton
- Bramley
- Dalton
- Maltby
- Thrybergh
- Thurcroft
- Wickersley

If the review determines that a consequential change to any borough ward boundary should be recommended, a case would have to be made to the Electoral Commission who would consider whether or not to make the change but would require reasoned arguments and evidence of the need for change.

(c) Summary of phases one and two

Preliminary consultation began in October 2007 and phase one was effectively concluded prior to the May 2008 Council elections.

A significant number of responses were received comprising emails, phone calls, letters, petitions, surveys, and minutes of public and parish meetings. Responses have included proposals to create parishes in parts of the borough which are presently unparished (e.g. in Thorpe Hesley and Scholes), and also to remove areas from existing parishes, either so as to become unparished (e.g. Hooper extracted from Brampton Brierlow

Parish), or to create a wholly new parish (e.g. New Laughton Common splitting from Thurcroft Parish and Hellaby from Bramley Parish).

At phase two of the review, a Member and Officer Working Group sought clarification of the initial proposals. They met on a number of occasions to consider various proposals and in some cases met with those who submitted them. Where proposals were unclear, separate meetings between officers and community representatives also took place to clarify matters. In addition, where necessary, Area Partnership Managers brought parties together with a view to determining boundary changes through agreement and consensus.

Following this, on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009, a report was submitted to Cabinet advising them of the outcome of phase two of the review and submitting as an appendix draft recommendations proposed by the Officer and Member Working Group. These were approved by Cabinet and recommended to Council which adopted them at the Council meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009. A copy of the appendix containing the draft recommendations is attached to this report.

(d) Current situation

In approving the draft recommendations, Cabinet and Council agreed that they be issued for public consultation and specific consultation with all those affected by the draft recommendations. The intention was that the final review recommendations be considered by Cabinet in October, prior to submission to Council and, where necessary, to the Electoral Commission.

Unfortunately, slippage occurred in commencing consultation upon the draft recommendations. However, letters have now been sent to all Parish Councils enclosing a copy of the appendix to this report containing the draft recommendations and maps showing the revised boundaries that would result. Letters have also been sent to all the residents in the areas that would be affected. These include Hellaby and Laughton Common where there are draft recommendations to create new parishes out of existing parished areas, and Thorpe Hesley, where a new parish council may be created out of an area which at present is unparished. Letters have also been sent to residents in areas where there is a draft recommendation to transfer properties from one parish to another. The draft recommendations and maps are on deposit at the Council Offices at Doncaster Gate, and are also available on the Council's website. Public notice of this has been given in Rotherham News. Representations on the draft may be made in

writing, by e-mail or on the website. At Thorpe Hesley, where a new parish council may be created, it is also proposed to arrange public meetings or drop-in sessions.

It is necessary to allow a reasonable period for consultation on the draft recommendations and persons affected have been given until 18<sup>th</sup> December, to respond. Following this, the responses received need to be considered and evaluated prior to a report to Cabinet and then Council to determine the final recommendations. It may be possible for a report to go to Council meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> February, but this is dependent upon the number of responses to consultation upon the draft recommendations and the extent to which the responses raise new issues that require further consideration or call into question the draft recommendations upon which consultation is taking place.

Once the final recommendations are approved by the Council, they will be publicised and the Council will make an order to bring them about. It now seems almost certain that if new parishes are created as a result of the review, then elections to these could not take place until May 2011. There are various reasons for this. As regards Council Tax, staff need time to prepare Council Tax registers and allow for the inclusion for the precepts where properties are moving from one parish to another or where new parishes are being created. There are over 3,000 properties potentially affected by the draft recommendations, and ideally staff need six months notice of the changes. In addition, Electoral Services need to prepare new electoral registers which likewise take account of all the changes that result from the review. A general election must be held within the next six months and the preparation for this must be the main priority of Electoral Services. It would be difficult to accommodate changes to parish boundaries at the same time.

Moreover, the consent of the Electoral Commission would be needed before the Council could make an order implementing some of the present draft recommendations. This is because, as stated above, certain of the parishes have protected electoral arrangements for a number of years following the last review of Borough Council ward boundaries. Even if the view of the Electoral Commission were to be sought on the basis of the draft recommendations, clearly final consent would have to await conclusion of the review and any changes that might be made as a result of the public consultation.

There would be advantages in holding elections for any new parish councils in 2011 rather than next year. This would put new parish councils on the same electoral cycle as those already existing and avoid any overlap where Councillors on

existing parish councils have been elected for areas which would transfer to new parishes. It would also mean that new parish councils would only have to hold elections once, whereas if they are held next year, they would be required also to hold them in 2011. Parish Councils are responsible for bearing the cost of their elections, although some of the costs can be shared with the Borough Council if parish elections are held on the same day as Borough elections.

Another consideration is that the order made by the Council to bring the final recommendations into effect should contain details of transitional provisions and consequential matters such as how properties and assets are dealt with in areas where new parishes are being created or areas are being transferred from one parish to another.

Even if election cannot be held until May 2011, it should be possible for the Council to complete the process fairly early in the New Year, allowing for all of the above issues. The determination of the final recommendations and the making of the order will provide certainty as to the outcome, even if the changes do not take effect until the following year and there will be ample time to prepare the necessary registers and deal with other transitional arrangements.

## **8. Finance**

No specific financial implications arise from this report. There are costs associated with the consultation exercise which is presently taking place.

If new parishes are created, consideration will be needed to be given to setting initial precepts. These are likely to be set by the Borough Council, until such time as any new parish councils are elected.

Financial issues may arise as between parishes where new parishes are created out of the areas of existing parishes or the boundaries of parishes change. Provisions as to these will be made in the order.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

There is opposition to some of the draft recommendations, either from existing parish councils or from some of the residents in the areas affected. Careful consideration will need to be given to all representations made as part of the consultation upon the draft recommendations before the Council makes its final recommendations.

There is always a risk that any newly created parish may not be sustainable or be able to attract local people to serve as Councillors. To mitigate and manage these risks, support and guidance is available from Yorkshire Local Councils Association, the Council and the Local Parish Network.

## 10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Parish councils play an important part in engaging with local people and providing local leadership. The Local Government White Paper includes proposals aimed at extending and deepening parish governance, including a presumption in favour of creating parishes where communities requested them.

At a local level, supporting and enhancing the role and function of parish councils is a high priority for the Borough Council, as reflected in key plans and strategies such as the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan and the RMBC/Parish Charter.

An equality impact assessment will be completed as part of the finalisation of any recommendations arising from the review.

## 11. Background Papers and Consultation

Review of Parish Boundaries, Report to CMT – 30 June 2008

Parish Boundary/Community Governance Review Phase Two –

- Recommendations, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009.
- Parish Warding, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009.
- Guidance on Community Governance Reviews, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009
- Report to Cabinet, 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009

The Local Government and Rating Act 1997.

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

DCLG guidance and circulars available at [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

### Contact Name/s:

Tim Mumford, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services),  
RMBC, ext 3500, [tim.mumford@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:tim.mumford@rotherham.gov.uk)

Zafar Saleem, Community Engagement & Cohesion Manager, RMBC, ext.  
2757 and email, [zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk)



**Appendix 1****All Parish Councils - Recommendations by the Member and Officer Working Party****1. Anston Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Anston Parish Council have been received except that at the request of the working group, Electoral Services reported on Parish Council warding arrangements in a report dated 4 March 2009 and this resulted in a recommendation for the warding of Anston Parish Council.

Anston Parish Council's current arrangement:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters Per Member</b>
Anston	AA, AB, AC, AD, AE	7376	15	491

Proposal:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters Per Member</b>
Anston North	AA, AB, AC	5400	11	490
Anston South	AD, AE	1976	4	494

**2. Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council**

The Parish Council submitted a proposal that no changes be made to their boundaries or electoral arrangements. A proposal from Orgreave Parish Council which is supported in this report makes a slight amendment to the western boundary but affects no residential properties. Aston-cum-Aughton PC has not responded to requests for comments on the Orgreave proposal.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

It is recommended that the western boundary be redrawn in line with the Orgreave proposal at

**3. Bramley Parish Council**

It is recommended that the boundary of Bramley Parish is enlarged through the transfer of properties from the area known as The Lings (off Flash lane) together with all of the adjoining roads, i.e. Sexton Drive, Temple Crescent, Wood Lane etc.

Wadsworth Road would also be included in the transfer to avoid the few voters at these properties making a lengthy and inconvenient trip to the polling station.

As a result in the polling district Wickersley (EA) the following properties would be transferred to polling district Bramley (EB): 46 – 52 Holmes Road; Sexton Drive; 15 – 35 Temple Crescent; 20 – 38 Temple Crescent; 113 – 119; Wadsworth Road; 90 – 96 Wadsworth Road; 85 – 105 Wood Lane; and 76 – 106 Wood Lane.

It is further recommended that as a result of the recommendation at to create a Hellaby Parish Council, the representation level of the South Ward be reduced by two seats.

Other proposals made by Bramley Parish Council are not supported because they would require changes by the Electoral Commission to Borough Ward boundaries and no evidence supporting the need for change has been submitted.

#### **4. Brampton Bierlow Parish Council**

Conflicting proposals were submitted but effective consultation has not been demonstrated. Some consultation on a suggestion to remove Hooper polling district from the Parish Council was carried out but did not appear to address the question of whether the area should become part of Wentworth Parish Council or become unparished.

Government guidance on Community Governance reviews states that a trend in creation rather than abolition of parish councils is expected and the working group is not able to support a proposal that would leave residents without a parish council if they had previously been represented by one.

Consequently, it is recommended that current boundaries be maintained unless in response to a specific, targeted consultation exercise; overwhelming support is demonstrated for an alternative recommendation i.e. to re-draw the Brampton Bierlow southern boundary along the northern boundary of Hooper (GB) polling district so that the whole of that polling district becomes part of Wentworth Parish Council.

It is further recommended that such targeted and specific consultation be undertaken by RMBC to include Wentworth Parish Council, Brampton Bierlow Parish Council and all households in Hooper polling district.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change as a result of either recommendation.

## **5. Brinsworth Parish Council**

It is recommended that current boundaries are maintained. Brinsworth Parish Council submitted proposals for change which cannot be supported. Proposals involve transferring a currently unparished area into Brinsworth Parish but with no evidence of public support or of the need for the change and taking properties currently within Sheffield City Council boundary over which Rotherham MBC has no jurisdiction.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

## **6. Catcliffe Parish Council**

It is recommended that current boundaries are maintained.

Catcliffe Parish Council submitted proposals for change which cannot be supported because they would require Electoral Commission changes to Borough Ward boundaries with no apparent reason, involve Sheffield City Council's boundaries and conflict with Brinsworth Parish Council and the two Parish Councils have been unable to reach agreement.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements at present.

However, it is noted that the Waverley Development is proposed in this area and significant change will take place over the mid to long term.

It is further recommended that the area be kept under review as the scheme develops and that a local governance review for this area be conducted after a period of five years.

## **7. Dalton Parish Council**

It is recommended that the following changes are made to the boundary of Dalton Parish.

- Polling District QA (Whinney Hill) – the transfer of properties at: 1 – 47 Chesterhill Avenue; 2 – 22 Chesterhill Avenue; and 132 – 146 Oldgate Lane from Thrybergh Parish to Dalton Parish.

Comments received from Thrybergh Parish Council do not support this proposal but the working group considers that the proposal accords with the desired outcomes of the review.

- Polling Districts TA (Marcliffe) and TB (Flanderwell) – this would involve transferring areas of Dalton Parish to Wickersley Parish. Polling districts TA and TB would be transferred into Polling District TE (Northfield) which

forms the North Ward of the Wickersley Parish. All properties in Polling District TA would be transferred together with Aireton Close; 2 – 76 Fleming Way; 77 – 103 Green Lane; 82 – 104 Green Lane; 2 – 14 Markfield Drive; 119 – 137 Northfield Lane; 106 – 128 Northfield Lane; and Riding Close.

Comments received from Wickersley Parish Council indicate that this proposal is supported by them.

Dalton Parish Council also proposed a change which involves taking in a previously unparished area of East Herringthorpe. The council has since submitted the result of a consultation exercise but without details of what information was provided to householders and with apparently only one question being asked of residents.

The working group does not consider the response rate of 6.2% of which 61% appear to be in support to be sufficient evidence to recommend this change.

#### **8. Dinnington St. John's Town Council**

The council has not submitted any proposals for change but supported proposals at Woodsetts and Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Councils will result in minimal changes to its boundaries. The town council has supported these.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

#### **9. Firbeck Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Firbeck Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

#### **10. Harthill with Woodall Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Harthill-with-Woodall Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

### **11. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Hellaby**

It is recommended that a new parish for the area of Hellaby is created through disaggregation of the existing polling district EC (Hellaby) from Bramley Parish Council. The boundary would be the existing polling district EC with one modification to enable the properties at Sandy Lane Farm and Brandon in polling district EB (Flash Lane) to remain in Bramley Parish as this is more convenient for the voters.

Evidence of popular support for a new parish council for Hellaby has been demonstrated and no response to requests for comment has been received from Bramley Parish Council.

The new parish council would take approximately 700 electors from Bramley Parish Council (South Ward). There are currently 6 members of the South Ward representing the current electorate of 1900; a representation level of 1 member for 316 electors.

It is further recommended that membership of Bramley South Ward is reduced to 4 and that the new Hellaby Parish Council has the legal minimum membership level of 5 seats.

### **12. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Laughton Common**

Evidence of popular support for a new parish council for Laughton Common has been demonstrated and appears to outweigh the subsequent support for the opposite view.

It is recommended that a new parish for Laughton Common is created through the disaggregation of South Ward from Thurcroft Parish. The boundary would encompass the whole of the South Ward. The South Ward of Thurcroft Parish Council currently has 3 seats and approximately 1000 electors and the North Ward has 3900 electors and 15 seats.

It is further recommended that Thurcroft Parish Council becomes an unwarded Parish Council with 15 members and that the new Laughton Common Parish Council has the minimum legal membership level of 5 seats.

### **13. Laughton-en-le- Morthen Parish Council**

It is recommended that the following change, which was suggested by Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Council and agreed by Dinnington St John's Town Council, is made to the parish boundaries:

In polling district DD (Lordens) the following properties Sunnyside Cottage, The Annexe Sunnyside Cottage, The Barn and St John's Cottage on St. John's Road be transferred from Dinnington Parish to Laughton en le Morthen Parish.

The Parish Council also submitted two proposals which cannot be supported because they would require Electoral Commission changes to Borough Ward Boundaries and no evidence of need or of support for change was included.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for changes to electoral arrangements.

#### 14. Letwell Parish Council

No proposals affecting Letwell Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

#### 15. Maltby Town Council

No proposals were received affecting Maltby Town Council during Phase 1 and 2 but Electoral Services recommended changes to warding arrangements in the report dated 4 March 2009.

The following changes to warding arrangements are recommended:

Maltby Town Council's current arrangement:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters per Member</b>
Maltby East	IA, IB, IC, ID, IE, IF, IG	8989	13	691
Maltby West	ED	3726	5	745

Proposal:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters per Member</b>
Maltby North	IA, IC	3167	5	633
Maltby East	IE, IF, IG	3993	5	798
Maltby South	IB, ID	1829	3	609
Maltby West	ED	3726	5	745

It should be noted, however, that a document signed by 30 electors of the Town Council and dated 1 June 2009 has been submitted to Tim Mumford, Head of Legal & Democratic Services. The document commits to provision of the "necessary petition within the next month so that RMBC can promptly

organise a Community Governance Review”. The aim of the correspondents appears to be the eventual dissolution of the Town Council.

### **16. Orgreave Parish Council**

It is recommended that the boundary between Orgreave Parish and Treeton Parish is realigned along the Orgreave side of the River Rother so that the river forms the natural boundary between the two parishes; no residential properties are affected and it is wholly contained within the Rother Vale Borough Ward.

The proposal was submitted by Orgreave and is supported by Treeton Parish Council. It would also affect a boundary of Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council and no response has been received to a request for Aston-cum-Aughton to comment.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

### **17. Ravenfield Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Ravenfield Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

### **18. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Thorpe Hesley**

It is recommended that detailed and targeted consultation be carried out with the residents of Thorpe Hesley as to the level of support for a parish council since there appears to be anecdotal evidence of support following public meetings but no documented evidence.

Subject to the outcome of this consultation, it is recommended that a new parish for Thorpe Hesley is created with proposed boundary comprising polling district HA (Thorpe Hesley) and part polling district HF (Keppel).

Proposed electoral arrangements for a newly created (unwarded) parish:

	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Voters per member</b>
Polling District HA (Thorpe Hesley)	2795	11	329
Part of Polling District HF (Keppel)	832		
<b>Total</b>	<b>3627</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>329</b>

### **19. Thorpe Salvin Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Thorpe Salvin Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

### **20. Thrybergh Parish Council**

It is recommended that the following changes as suggested by Dalton Parish Council (see 7 above) be made

- Polling District QA (Whinney Hill) – the transfer of properties at: 1 – 47 Chesterhill Avenue; 2 – 22 Chesterhill Avenue; and 132 – 146 Oldgate Lane from Thrybergh Parish to Dalton Parish.

Comments received from Thrybergh Parish Council do not support this proposal but the working group considers that it does accord with the desired outcomes of the review.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

### **21. Thurcroft Parish Council**

Thurcroft Parish Council did not submit any proposals for change but opposed the suggestion of a new Laughton Common Parish Council.

Recommendations are as at 12 above.

### **22. Todwick Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Todwick Parish Council have been received although an early telephone call from the Parish Clerk indicated that proposals would follow. These were never received and no comment has since been made.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

### **23. Treeton Parish Council**

It is recommended to make a series of minor changes to the Treeton/Orgreave Parish boundary to give more defined lines around the



village and which do not affect any residential properties. The proposed boundary of the parish to follow the River Rother more naturally rather than cross it forwards and backwards which is the case currently.

Other proposals submitted by Treeton Parish Council cannot be supported because they would require changes to Borough Ward Boundaries by the Electoral Commission and no evidence of need or support for the changes has been submitted.

In June 2006 Treeton Parish Council requested an increase of membership from 9 to 10. The request was submitted to Cabinet on 7 June 2006 with a recommendation that it be considered as part of the general review of parishes.

The request has been considered by the group but is not supported since Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels which accord with guidance issued by the National Association of Local Councils. The request was submitted in 2006 but not reiterated as part of the Council's proposals for change submitted to this review.

#### 24. Ulley Parish Council

No proposals affecting Ulley Parish Council have been received.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

#### 25. Wales Parish Council

No proposals for change affecting Wales Parish Council have been received but as a result of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 the following warding arrangements are recommended:

Wales Parish Council's current arrangement:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters per member</b>
Wales	RD, RE, RF	5286	15	352

Proposal:

	<b>Polling Districts</b>	<b>Number of Electors</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Voters Per Member</b>
Wales (Kiveton) Park	RE	2304	7	329
Wales (Wales)	RD, RF	2982	8	372

It should be noted that a poll was demanded and held on 18 June 2009 on the question: "Should the Wales Parish Council be dissolved".

The result of the poll was 205 votes for "Yes" and 296 votes for "No". The motion was not carried. Turnout was 9.53%

#### **26. Wentworth Parish Council**

Wentworth Parish Council did not submit any proposals for change but one of the alternatives suggested for change to Brampton Bierlow Parish Council at 4 above would see Hooper polling district transferred into Wentworth Parish Council.

See recommendation at 4 above with regard to specific and targeted consultation with Wentworth Parish Council on this issue.

#### **27. Whiston Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Whiston Parish Council have been received.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

#### **28. Wickersley Parish Council**

It is recommended that all the following changes are made to the Wickersley parish boundary.

A. The polling district TA (Marcliff) being transferred from Dalton Parish into Wickersley PC; the area is within the Wickersley borough ward and the properties would be transferred to the North ward of Wickersley Parish which is also within the Wickersley borough ward.

B. A number of properties are transferred from Dalton Parish to Wickersley Parish by extending the boundary to encompass Green Lane and Aireton Close then south along Northfield Lane, east along Fleming Way and south along Markfield Drive to join the present boundary with Polling District TE (Northfield). The area is already within the Wickersley borough ward and it would transfer into the North ward of Wickersley PC.

C. The boundary is realigned from a point at number 27 Sycamore Avenue south along Sycamore Avenue, easterly along Blackthorn Avenue, south along Acacia Avenue and east along Pear Tree Avenue to a point adjacent to number 47 Pear Tree Avenue. The proposal would see properties transferred between Wickersley and Bramley Parishes as described below.

- Wickersley (TE) to Bramley Central Ward (TD): properties at 2 – 12 Acacia Avenue; 1 – 11 Blackthorn Avenue; 19 – 31 Linden Avenue; 14 – 28 Linden Avenue; 29 – 47 Pear Tree Avenue; and 86 – 104 Sycamore Avenue.
- Bramley (TD) to Wickersley North Ward (TE): properties at 21 – 35 Acacia Avenue; 38 – 62 Blackthorn Avenue; 1 – 27 Greenwood Crescent; 1 – 7 Rowan Drive; and 2 – 8 Rowan Drive.

D. The boundary is realigned between Wickersley and Bramley parish councils south of Bawtry Road. It is proposed that the boundary from Bawtry Road be continued in a straight line to the rear of properties on Wadsworth Road and then east for a short distance to connect with the present boundary. The boundary would then be drawn to the rear of properties 46 to 52 Holmes Road and then following the western perimeter of properties on Sexton Drive, Temple Crescent and Wood Lane such that these properties would be transferred to Bramley Parish and Polling District (Flash Lane). The changes are wholly within the Hellaby borough ward. Not included in the proposal are properties at the top of Wadsworth Road numbered 90 to 96 and 113 to 119. These properties should also be transferred into Bramley Parish to avoid those electors making a lengthy journey to the polling station in Wickersley. The proposal would see properties transferred between Wickersley and Bramley Parishes as described below.

- Wickersley (EA) to Bramley (EB): properties at: 46 – 52 Holmes Road; Sexton Drive; 15 – 35 Temple Crescent; 20 – 38 Temple Crescent; 113–119 Wadsworth Road; 90 – 96 Wadsworth Road; 85 – 105 Wood Lane; and 76 – 106 Wood Lane.

These suggestions were submitted by Wickersley Parish Council and are supported by Bramley Parish Council.

An additional proposal from Wickersley Parish Council to transfer the Brecks area from Dalton Parish Council to Wickersley Parish Council is not supported as there is no evidence of any consultation or support or need for a change and Dalton Parish Council are opposed to the proposal.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding report dated 4 March 2009 indicates no need for change in membership levels even in the light of the above amendments.

## **29. Woodsetts Parish Council**

It is recommended that the hamlet of California in polling district Dinnington (DE) be transferred to Woodsetts Parish polling district AF which would involve 3 properties on part of Gildingwells Road.

Although this would require an amendment to Borough Ward Boundaries (Anston & Woodsetts and Dinnington) unlike other proposals which would require such amendments, this is likely to meet with Electoral Commission

approval. Comments submitted with the proposal demonstrate good reasons for the change and when viewed on a map, it is evident that the hamlet should form part of the community of Woodsetts and has no apparent connection with the community of Dinnington.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding report dated 4 March 2009 indicates no need for change in membership levels even in the light of the above amendments.

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

<b>1</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup> December, 2009</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>CONTEST 2 and Prevent Strategy Progress</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b>

## **5. Summary**

This paper provides a summary of the report contained in the agenda for the previous Democratic Renewal Panel on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

The previous report provided information about the Government's national CONTEST counter-terrorism strategy and Prevent strategy. It also reports on progress made in Rotherham to respond to this agenda.

## **6. Recommendations**

**That Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel:**

- 1. Notes the progress made against the Prevent agenda**

## 7. Proposals and Details

### 7.1 Background to CONTEST

Since 2003, the Government has had a comprehensive strategy in place to counter the threat from international terrorism. The strategy is known as CONTEST. The aim of the strategy is 'to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from international terrorism, so that people can go about their lives freely and with confidence'. The Contest Strategy was revised in March 2009 to take account of the evolution of the threat and of the understanding of the factors which are driving it.

There are four main workstreams of the strategy – known as *Pursue*, *Prevent*, *Protect* and *Prepare*. Local partners are responsible for delivering the Prevent workstream, the aim of which is to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism.

### 7.2 The Threat

According to the Government the most significant current terrorist threat is assessed as coming from Al Qa'ida and like minded groups. It is this threat that is the focus of *Prevent*. The threat is in various forms, such as:

- The Al Qa'ida leadership and their affiliates.
- Groups affiliated to Al Qa'ida abroad.
- Self starting networks or lone individuals with a similar ideology but no connection to Al Qa'ida.
- Terrorist groups with a similar ideology to Al Qa'ida but their own agenda.

The development of CONTEST has been based upon the effect and impact of four deeper and longer term strategic factors:

- Unresolved regional disputes.
- The violent extremist ideology associated with Al Qa'ida.
- Use of technology.
- The radicalisation process.

Assumptions underpinning this are:

- The structure of Al Qa'ida is likely to fragment and diversify into smaller groups.
- Technology will be a facilitator.
- The Al Qa'ida ideology will probably outlive the structure.
- Our ability to reach out to vulnerable people will determine the shape of the threat.
- British Muslims and others will continue to challenge Al Qa'ida's ideology

### 7.3 Scale of the threat

Nationally, between 2001 and 31 March 2008, over 1,450 terrorism-related arrests took place, of which one third led to a charge. Three-quarters of these were for terrorism-related offences, and just over half of these resulted in a conviction

### 7.4 The Prevent Strategy

In June 2008 the Government published a booklet entitled *The Prevent Strategy: A Guide for Local Partners in England*. Recent guidance issued in August 2009, entitled *Delivering the Prevent Strategy: An Updated Guide for Local Partners*, reaffirms and updates the earlier document, taking into account lessons learned and emerging best practice.

## 7.5 The Prevent Framework

The *Prevent* strategy needs to be delivered through a wide ranging local partnership and should be informed by an understanding of the local context. Local *Prevent* partnerships should make connections between *Prevent* and other associated agendas.

Local partnerships are responsible for ensuring that their *Prevent* programme of action includes clear objectives, measurable impacts and comprehensive arrangements for monitoring and evaluation.

## 7.6 Rotherham Partnership response

### a) Leadership and Coordination

Partnership groups have been established to lead and coordinate Rotherham's response to the Government's Prevent Strategy. These are the Guardian (strategic), Silver (tactical) and Delivery (Bronze) groups. The groups were formally established from October 2008 and have met regularly since then. Representation at Guardian Group includes, from RMBC: the Chief Executive, Assistant Chief Executive, Children and Young People's Services, Engagement and Cohesion, and Safer Neighbourhoods. Partners represented include SY Police (Rotherham Command); FE Colleges; Voluntary Action Rotherham; and SY Fire and Rescue Service. At Silver group, Probation Service, Headteachers, the Chamber of Commerce and REMA are also represented. The GOYH Prevent Adviser provides advice and support.

### b) Rotherham Prevent Action Plan

Rotherham Prevent Action Plan was developed and agreed by all partners. It sets out actions to respond to the five objectives (plus 2 cross-cutting enablers) contained within the national Prevent Strategy. It 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 action plan has been recognised as good practice by GOYH and OSCT, and as a result, Guardian Group representatives have been asked to share this work at several regional, national and European forums.

The action plan is supported by a series of projects to deliver work in partnership with partners and communities. These activities, along with community cohesion activities, are labelled under the "Rotherham One Town One Community" initiative, which is inspired and led by Cllr Mahroof Hussain, Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement.

## 7.7 Next Steps

The guidance (*Delivering the Prevent Strategy: An Updated Guide for Local Partners*) incorporates new learning based on experience and comments from local authorities and Muslim communities. The new guidance acknowledges that the effectiveness of the programme can be reduced if the labelling of local activities or their restriction solely to Muslim communities discourages some groups from becoming involved.

The new guidance includes the need to:

- Strengthen Partnership working and involvement of partners, such as health partners.
- Broaden and deepen engagement with communities.

- Ensure best practice around the *Prevent* objectives is reflected in the design of local *Prevent* programmes.
- Programmes need to focus on individuals, communities and places.
- Recognise that communications, and in particular, the internet and digital media are vital to *Prevent*.
- Ensure that the *Prevent* programme of action includes clear objectives, measurable impacts and comprehensive arrangements for monitoring and evaluation.
- Ensure interventions draw in many different communities, working alongside one another.
- Embed *Prevent* in mainstream delivery and make links with related work such as community safety and cohesion.
- Support vulnerable individuals through effective interventions.

The new guidance also makes reference to the need to respond to other forms of violent extremism such as far right extremism. It makes clear that alongside the *Prevent* strategy, the Government and the police are engaged in a range of work in response to these concerns.

Rotherham has been accepted for the IDeA *Prevent* Peer Review Programme. Commissioned by CLG, this programme provides support from IDeA Improvement Managers and specialist associates who will work with us to improve our *Prevent* programme and ensure it responds to the latest guidance and learning.

## **8. Finance**

Area based grant funding for *Prevent* has been allocated by central Government to support this work. Rotherham's ABG *Prevent* budget for 2008 to 2012 is £339,750. Additional funding has also been allocated via South Yorkshire Police, for example, funding for young people's leadership training and capacity building for Mosques, along with staff resources.

In August 2009, the Communities Secretary John Denham announced that Local Authorities will receive an additional £7.5 million to broaden their counter-terrorism activities. The new funding is intended to allow greater flexibility to support a broader range of activities to improve the effectiveness of the *Prevent* agenda. Further details of this and any Rotherham allocation is awaited.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

This is a sensitive agenda and a strong partnership and community approach is vital to ensure that all sections of the community are engaged and supported in working to prevent violent extremism and promote shared values.

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

Progress towards the *Prevent* Strategy is measured and reported through NI35. It is also part of CAA and inspection frameworks. It is linked to the Community Cohesion agenda which is a priority within Rotherham Community Strategy and LAA.

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

*The Prevent Strategy: A Guide for Local Partners in England (June 2008)*

<http://security.homeoffice.gov.uk/newspublications/publication-search/Preventstrategy/>



*Delivering the Prevent Strategy: An Updated Guide for Local Partners (August 2009)*  
<http://security.homeoffice.gov.uk/news-publications/publication-search/general/updated-guide-for-local-partners>

IDeA support for local delivery of Prevent 2009/10:  
<http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelId=13510589>

## **12. Contact Name**

Zafar Saleem, Community Engagement and Cohesion Manager, CXD  
Tel: 01709 822757  
Email: [zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk)

Carol Adamson, Equality and Diversity Officer, CXD  
Tel: 01709 822772  
Email: [carol.adamson@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:carol.adamson@rotherham.gov.uk)

**DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**Thursday, 29th October, 2009**

Present:- Councillor Austen (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Cutts, Littleboy, Mannion, Parker and Pickering.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Hamilton and Johnston.

Also in attendance:- Parish Councillor Alan Buckley and Joanna Jones (Community Representative)

**37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

**38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**39. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REVENUE OUTTURN REPORT 2008/09, 2009/10 BUDGET**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Tim Mumford, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services), which provided information to Members in respect of the 2008/09 outturn position plus the latest monitoring against the 2009/10 revenue budget as part of the first stage of the budget setting process for 2010/11.

The report set out in detail the 2008/09 Revenue Outturn Position and the main variations relating to:-

- Chief Executive's Office (£36k underspend).
- Communications, Policy & Performance (£15k overspend).
- Scrutiny and Member Services (£588 underspend).
- Members Training & Development (£9k underspend).
- Human Resources (£4k overspend).
- Legal and Democratic Services (£468 underspend).

Attention was also drawn to Revenue Budget Monitoring 2009/10 and the summary forecast net revenue budget outturn position (as at 31st August, 2009) for Chief Executive's Directorate which highlighted:-

- There were several vacancies and staff secondments across the Directorate which were offsetting other minor overspends and was, therefore, helping it achieve a break-even position.
- The Rotherham newspaper was partially funded by contributions from the Human Resources Recruitment Management System

package, but due to the current economic climate the number of advertisements being placed had reduced, leading to a probable year end pressure. This was being quantified and would be included in the next Budget Monitoring Report.

- Transport fleet – the drivers currently undertook non-contractual, unbudgeted overtime. Working schedules were under review which should enable this budget to breakeven at year end.

It was noted that the Council currently had an estimated funding gap of £11.5 million to set a balanced budget for 2010/11. Within the Directorate a number of potential savings were identified within the service areas with work currently underway to identify additional savings to contribute to closing this funding gap. These would be brought forward for Member consideration during the budget process.

Discussion ensued and questions were raised and answered.

It was agreed that a breakdown of costs of the light transport fleet and “Rotherham News” would be circulated to Members.

Resolved:- That the outturn position as at 31st March, 2009 and the Revenue Budget Monitoring Report for the period 1st April, 2009 to 31st August, 2009 be noted.

#### **40. UPDATE ON THE IMPACT OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDERS**

PC Perry Mangles from Rotherham’s Anti-Social Behaviour Unit gave a short presentation on Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, what they were, how they could be obtained, examples of anti-social behaviour, how many had been sought in Rotherham and examples of who had been served with them.

Discussion ensued and questions were raised and answered.

Resolved:- (1) That PC Perry Mangles be thanked for his informative discussion.

(2) That a further report on the impact, effectiveness and trends of operating ASBO’s and ABC’s be submitted to a future meeting of this Scrutiny Panel.

#### **41. NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL TRANSITIONAL FUNDING UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report introduced by Deborah Fellowes, Policy, External and Regional Affairs Manager, and Ian Squires, Regeneration Funding Manager, which provided a detailed update of the Neighbourhood Renewal Transitional Funding (NRF T/F) Programme 2008-11 including the current projects with and without approval within each Theme. It also gave details regarding the project exit strategies and

explained the position on this nature of funding both currently and for the future.

The NRF Transitional Funding Commissioning Plan was written to assist with the distribution of the Funds. This plan outlined a commissioning process drawn from the framework and guided specifically by the checklist contained within it.

It also drew on learning from previous commissioning processes; NRF 2006-08 and Children's Fund. It also took into account the findings from the evaluation and scrutiny review of the NRF Programme 2006-08. Finally it had been developed in consultation with the relevant funding bodies, in this case Yorkshire Forward and GOYH.

This approach has created a streamlined light touch process, transparency, development of projects, identification for delivery and evaluation of the impact.

The report also set out the current themes, current position of the programme and exit strategies and other funding sources.

Discussion ensued and questions were raised and answered.

Members questioned the fairness of using the length of highway as part of the determination of Area Assembly devolved budgets.

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

(2) That Streetpride be contacted for them to explain their method of apportioning funds and that this explanation be fed back to the Panel verbally.

#### **42. COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP FUND**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Paul Griffiths, Community Liaison Officer, which provided a summary of spending activity around the Elected Members Community Leadership Fund for the financial year 2008-9 and options for the future administration of the fund.

The fund was considered to be of high value through its ability to enhance the role of Councillors within local communities.

Further information was, therefore, provided on the expenditure for 2008/09 and 2009/10.

Members welcomed this funding becoming part of the core budget, together with the operation of the scheme and the wide range of projects being supported.

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

(2) That the performance against the Community Leadership Fund for 2008-09 be noted.

(3) That further options be considered to ensure maximum value for money was achieved from the fund and that a further report be submitted to this Panel outlining these in more detail, together with details of comparisons with other Local Authorities.

#### **43. EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Ben Knight, Scrutiny Support Officer, which detailed how Participatory Budgeting (PB) was a mechanism that allowed the citizens of an area (neighbourhood, regeneration or local authority area) to participate in the allocation of part of the local Council's available financial resources.

It also aimed to increase transparency, accountability, understanding and social inclusion in local government affairs and applied to a varying amount of the local Council's budget with the actual process developed to suit local circumstances.

In practice, participatory budgeting provided citizens with information that enabled them to be engaged in prioritising the needs of their neighbourhoods, propose and debate new services and projects and set budgets in a democratic and transparent way.

There was no universal way of applying participatory budgeting. Methodologies varied from city to city, but typically it involved allocating between two to three percent of the annual revenue budgets and sometimes the allocation of new investments. The process involved citizens taking into account both the demand and supply of services and public infrastructure.

Participatory budgeting small grants schemes have been set up using money allocated from a variety of sources including neighbourhood renewal funds, community council precepts, local strategic partnerships, neighbourhood management funds, new deal for communities funds and housing funds.

Participatory budgeting could be applied to some local authority main stream budgets. Part of these budgets could be "top-sliced" and allocated to wards or neighbourhoods to be spent according to residents' priorities. In this way residents would influence the Council's departmental priorities.

Most local authorities carried out a yearly budget consultation with the public, but this was often limited to paper correspondence and had a limited time scale. If the consultation process started at the beginning of the budget year, instead of the end, there would be scope to apply a participatory budgeting process.

The report set out in more detail the other possible options for using a participatory budgeting approach, how the participatory budgeting process benefited Local Government, benefits to citizens and the private sector and how the process was managed abroad. A number of examples of how the participatory budgeting process had been successful in the U.K. were also provided.

This report was welcomed as a pre-cursor to the Scrutiny Review of Participatory Budgeting to be commenced shortly. It was suggested that the South Yorkshire Police Authority scheme of participatory budgeting be looked at as part of this review.

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

#### **44. CONTEST 2 AND PREVENT STRATEGY PROGRESS**

Further to Minute No. 80 of the meeting of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2009, consideration was given to 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 the 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.

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

(2) That a presentation be made to this Scrutiny Panel on this initiative, possibly by Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement.

**45. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON 17TH SEPTEMBER, 2009**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel held on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2009 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**46. MINUTES OF A MEETINGS OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENGAGEMENT HELD ON 14TH SEPTEMBER AND 12TH OCTOBER, 2009**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement held on 14<sup>th</sup> September and 12<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

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

**47. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE HELD ON 9TH OCTOBER, 2009**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> October, 2009.

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

**48. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE MEMBERS' TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL HELD ON 17TH SEPTEMBER, 2009**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Members' Training and Development Panel held on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2009.

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

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENGAGEMENT  
2nd November, 2009**

Present:- Councillor Hussain (in the Chair) and Councillor Burton.

**E30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

**E31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12TH OCTOBER, 2009**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2009 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**E32. MATTER ARISING**

Parish Council Review

A meeting was arranged, to include all key Officers and Elected Members, to discuss the latest information with regard to the Parish Council Review. This would take place on Friday, 13<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 at 11.30 a.m.

**E33. CONNECTING COMMUNITIES**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Asim Munir, Principal Community Involvement Officer, which set out the details of the Connecting Communities initiative (formerly named Intensive Local Engagement).

Department for Communities and Local Government and GOYH (Government Offices Yorkshire and Humberside) were working with local authorities, including Rotherham, and their Local Strategic Partnership partners, to bring qualitative and quantitative intelligence to bear on the selection of places within the community, that would face the greatest challenges in terms of worklessness and deterioration of community relations and community confidence as a consequence of the effects of the recession and from low levels of civic engagement.

The Government launch of the Connecting Communities took place on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2009.

Rotherham MBC was to become involved in the Second Phase of the initiative from November, 2009 to March, 2010.

The focus would be on neighbourhoods which were likely to suffer particularly sharply from the recession and where residents felt that no one spoke for them or was responding to their needs.



The report set out the details of a number of proposals to address the need to build cohesive communities in identified priority areas. The areas that had been identified as priority areas in Rotherham for interventions were:

- Maltby
- Dinnington

The Chief Executive's Directorate had been working closely with the Area Partnership Managers from Wentworth Valley and Rother Valley to identify interventions and what support was needed from GOYH to ensure local needs were being met.

This had meant coordinating activities for the N14 Target Support Fund. The proposal included support for greater community involvement in decision making structures and meaningful communications.

A proposal had been submitted to GOYH and the Council was currently awaiting approval.

The "Dimensions of Engagement" section of the report was an evolving process which would be updated and amended as the project developed between now and March, 2010.

It was pointed out that work was still at the development stage, and that it was hoped shortly to put forward a thorough detailed proposal to Local Government Council.

A lengthy debate took place and the following issues were highlighted:-

- One Town One Community initiative and its impact on the Connecting Communities initiative
- NI1 and NI4 Indicators
- Role of Community Development Workers
- Need for long-term investment and sustainability
- NI4 Target Support Fund
- Need for transparency and consistency of approach

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made to date on the Connecting Communities initiative be noted.

(2) That regular progress reports be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement.

(3) That, following confirmation from the Department for Communities and Local Government to ensure corporate and political buy in to the scheme, a report be submitted to the Corporate Management Team and to the Cabinet.

(4) That, in the meantime, further detailed work with Partners take place

to address key concerns, as discussed, and an Officer meeting to discuss the outcome of this work take place on Monday, 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2009. This further detail to include a clear timetable of work.

**E34. FORWARD PLAN/WORK PROGRAMME FOR COMMUNITIES AND INVOLVEMENT**

Zafar Saleem, Community Engagement and Cohesion Manager, referred to the content of the current Forward Plan/Work Programme for Communities and Involvement and put forward the following items for inclusion:-

- Connecting Communities - Update
- Community Cohesion "hate" crime - Update
- NI4 Target Support Fund
- Equality Framework feedback

Resolved:- That the current position, as now reported, with regard to work within the Forward Plan/Work Programme be noted.

**E35. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Cabinet Member for Community Development and Engagement take place on Monday, 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 at 11.30 a.m.

**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 7<sup>th</sup> October, 2009.



**14D PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 23/10/09**

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 9<sup>th</sup> 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, 28<sup>th</sup> 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).

Councillor R. S. Russell (Cabinet Member for Streetpride) attended the Political Speed Dating session.

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

**16D PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 06/11/09**

- 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

**18D PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 06/11/09**

- 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.

**PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**20th November, 2009**

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Boyes, Gilding, J. Hamilton and License.

The Chairman and Councillor P. A. Russell referred to the Macmillan Coffee Morning fundraising event taking place in the Town Hall and it was agreed by members and officers that each would make a contribution to the fundraising event for the drink served during the meeting.

**94. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**95. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**96. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER**

Colin Earl, Director of Internal Audit and Governance, presented the submitted report which showed the Council's most significant risks and a summary of how they were being managed.

The reporting format had two key features:-

- An 'at a glance' picture showing the pattern of risk assessments for corporate priorities or projects both before and after risk management actions
- A more detailed summary of the risk register that reflected the current risk assessments for each corporate priority or project as at 30th September, 2009.

Changes to the previous style of presenting information and the significant changes to the register since the previous report were outlined.

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

- level of attention given to risks
- requests for information from scrutiny panels
- safeguarding children



- comparisons with previous reports
- level of information contained in the reports

Resolved:- (1) That the updated corporate risk register be noted.

(2) That reports on specific risks be submitted to respective scrutiny panels, as appropriate.

## 97. THE POST OFFICE DEBATE

Ben Knight, Scrutiny Adviser, presented the submitted report on feedback from the North of England 'Post Office Debate', a meeting organised by the National Federation of Sub-Postmasters (NFSP) in Leeds on 5th November, 2009.

The meeting addressed how local and central government and other stakeholders across the north could work better with local post offices for mutual benefit and help ensure that the post office network had a sustainable and vibrant future to continue to provide local access to vital banking, Government, mail/retail services, individuals and small businesses in urban and rural areas alike.

The report covered the Panel membership and a précis of contributions from Panel members.

Also submitted was the NFSP document "Six Steps to a Sustainable Post Office Network".

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

- concern at reports of post offices being required to issue fifty pound notes in benefit/pension payments, particularly with regard to the more vulnerable adults
- proposed range of Council payments and services which citizens could undertake at their local post offices and feasibility of such
- justification for ongoing post office closures
- Free Enterprise Zones in town centres
- services taken away from post offices

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

(2) That a further report be submitted on the feasibility of post offices being able to provide the proposed Council Services /payment facilities as

**22D PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 20/11/09**

now reported. Such report to include services taken away from post offices.

(3) That clarification be sought regarding the alleged practice of post offices being required to issue fifty pound notes as part of benefit/pension payments, with a view to appropriate representations being made to M.Ps.

**98. THE FUTURE OF SCRUTINY - TACKLING THE BIG ISSUES**

Ben Knight, Scrutiny Adviser, presented the submitted report on feedback from the Local Government Association/Centre for Public Scrutiny conference entitled "The Future of Scrutiny - Tackling the Big Issues" held in London on 30th October, 2009.

Councillor Les Lawrence (Chair, LGA Safer Communities Board) introduced the conference and the following presentations were given:-

- "Councils Leading Communities : Tackling the Big Issues Locally" by Dr. Phyllis Starkey, M.P. (Chair of the Communities and Local Government Select Committee)
- "The Role of Councils in Tackling Crime and Disorder" by Clare Checksfield (Deputy Director of Home and Foreign Affairs, Prime Minister's Delivery Unit)
- "Councils Tackling Local Health Problems" by Mike Grady (Senior Research Associate, Marmot Review Team, University College, London)
- "CAA Success – the Role of Scrutiny" by Tim Young (Associate, Centre for Public Scrutiny)

Issues covered included:-

- Rebalancing
- Recession and Economic Climate
- Future of Scrutiny
- Policy Goals
- Challenges for Overview and Scrutiny
- Cross Cutting Challenges on Health Inequalities
- Opportunities to develop the Overview and Scrutiny Role
- Local Government Association Key Messages
- New Agenda for Scrutiny

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

**99. YORKSHIRE SOUTH TOURISM**

Further to Minute No. 63(e) of the meeting of this Committee held on 25th

September, 2009, Bronwen Moss, Scrutiny Adviser, presented the submitted report updating Members of the second meeting of the Yorkshire South Tourism Joint Scrutiny Panel held in Barnsley on 23rd September, 2009. The minutes of the meeting were submitted.

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

- funding arrangements
- linkage of the Joint Scrutiny Panel to the Council's Tourism Panel and Tourism Forum
- value for money and monitoring of Yorkshire South Tourism
- reporting of future minutes of the Joint Scrutiny Panel

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

(2) That the minutes of the Joint Scrutiny Panel be received.

(3) That future minutes of the Joint Scrutiny Panel be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation.

#### **100. MINUTES**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 6th November, 2009 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That a letter of thanks be sent to the Youth Cabinet for their contribution to another rewarding and successful 11 Million Takeover Day event.

#### **101. WORK IN PROGRESS**

Members of the Committee report as follows:-

(a) Councillor Whelbourn reported congratulations on the Council's achievement of excellent level in the equality framework for local government. The first in the country.

(b) Councillor McNeely reported that the next meeting of the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel was expecting to consider:

- Cabinet response to the Choice Based Lettings and Voids scrutiny review
- allocations policy and empty properties

- interest for participation in the review of neighbourhood management

(c) Councillor Austen reported :

- there had been the first scoping meeting regarding the Devolved Budgets review
- protocols for the Crime Reduction Partnership had been developed

(d) Councillor Jack reported that the latest meeting of the Adult Services and Health Scrutiny Panel had considered:-

- a presentation on the Personalisation Agenda
- a presentation on the Rotherham Community Health Service
- a presentation on the Annual Report of the Joint Learning Disability Service
- progress of performance clinics into Joint Disability Scheme

(e) on behalf of Councillor Boyes it was reported that the latest meeting of the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel had considered:-

- a presentation on the Chesterfield Canal Trust with a view to inclusion in the Rotherham Local Development Framework
- proposals for changes to Streetpride's target response times for a range of work

It was also reported that, following the above meeting, Councillor Boyes had attended a special meeting of the Yorkshire South Tourism Board in Sheffield regarding plans and governance for the future development of tourism in the region and sub-region.

(f) on behalf of Councillor G. A. Russell it was reported that the next meeting of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel would consider:-

- sexual health
- teenage pregnancy strategy
- update on support for English as additional language learners
- Children and Young People's Services Improvement Plan

It was also reported that the Personal, Social, Health Economic Education

curriculum review was going well.

**102. CALL-IN ISSUES**

There were no formal call in requests.

**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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 31<sup>st</sup> 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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, 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2009, commencing at 9.30 a.m.