

## **SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL**

**Venue: Bailey House,  
Rawmarsh Road,  
Rotherham S60 1TD**

**Date: Thursday, 15th July, 2010**

**Time: 9.30 a.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for Absence.
4. Declarations of Interest
5. Questions from members of the public and the press
6. Communications

### **FOR DECISION**

7. Co-optees 2010/11
8. Representation on Outside Bodies (Pages 1 - 2)
9. Representation on Working Parties/Panels (Page 3)
10. Work Programme 2010/11 (Pages 4 - 6)

### **FOR MONITORING**

11. Review of Stray Dog Arrangements (Pages 7 - 13)
12. Neighbourhoods General Fund Revenue Outturn 2009/10 (Pages 14 - 19)

13. Housing Investment Programme (HIP) 2009/10 and Other Capital Schemes (Pages 20 - 28)
14. Introductory Tenancy Review Panels (Pages 29 - 52)  
Training Session  
Members of the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel have been invited for this item at approximately 10.30 a.m.
15. Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhood Services (Pages 53 - 56)  
- minutes of meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> June, 2010

### **MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

16. Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel (Pages 57 - 63)  
- minutes of meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2010
17. Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee (Pages 64 - 67)  
- minutes of meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2010

**Date of Next Meeting:-  
Thursday, 16 September 2010**

**Membership:-**

Chairman – Councillor The Mayor (Councillor McNeely)

Vice-Chairman – Councillor P. A. Russell

Councillors:-Atkin, Blair, Cutts, Ellis, Gamble, Havenhand, Hodgkiss, Nightingale and Walker

Co-optees:- Jenny Andrews (Parish Council Network), Mr. J. Carr (Environment Protection UK),  
Derek Corkell (RotherFed), Andrew Roddison (RotherFed), Jenny Andrews (Maltby Town Council)  
and George Skinner (Whiston Parish Council)

## Representation of the Council on Other Bodies 2010 – 2011

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

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

**SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL****REPRESENTATION ON WORKING PARTIES/PANELS  
2010/11**

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Health, Welfare and Safety Panel             | Councillor P. A. Russell<br>Sub. Councillor Nightingale |
| 2. | Recycling Group                              | Councillor Atkin  |
| 3. | Compact Monitoring Group                     | Councillor Walker                                       |
| 4. | Members Sustainable Development Action Group | Councillors Atkin and<br>McNeely                        |

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

<b>1. Meeting:</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>2. Date:</b>	<b>15<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2010</b>
<b>3. Title:</b>	<b>WORK PROGRAMME 2010/11</b>
<b>4. Programme Area:</b>	<b>Chief Executive's</b>

**5. Summary**

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

**6. Recommendations**

**That Members consider the proposed review subjects plus the proposed themed meetings and agree a work programme for the year.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

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

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

However, it is not possible to be too specific at this stage on the precise nature of some issues for scrutiny and consequently the forward work programme will to some extent evolve during the course of the year. As the public sector in general and local government in particular are required to make very large savings in the next three to five years, Members will wish to scrutinise closely any proposals coming from service areas in the next few months.

During the last year Members have undertaken reviews around:

- Turnaround Times for Void Properties
- Government Plans for House Building
- The Councillor Role in combating Climate Change

At the last panel meeting Members discussed possible areas of work for the coming year. These included:

- The Role of Private Sector Housing in Rotherham
- Housing Market Renewal – moving on
- Sheltered Housing Warden and Care Enabler Service

We will also be looking at:

- Developing our work with Rother Fed
- The future of Rotherham 2010
- Adaptations & Improvements
- Neighbourhood services & democracy

These proposals came from members of this panel and from officers. The Scrutiny Adviser has also written to each member of the Panel to ask for any other proposals for scrutiny reviews. Members are very welcome to make any further proposals either at the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> or beforehand to the Scrutiny Adviser.

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

- Better partnership working
- Shared services

**8. Finance**

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

**9. Risks and Uncertainties**

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

**10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

Corporate Plan  
Community Strategy  
All associated Scrutiny Reviews and progress reports  
All associated Inspection's by outside bodies and recommendation outcomes.

**11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Scrutiny Services Annual Report & Forward Plan

**Contact Name:** *Sioned-Mair Richards, Scrutiny Adviser 01709 254453*  
[sioned-mair.richards@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:sioned-mair.richards@rotherham.gov.uk)



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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> July, 2010</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Review of Stray Dog Arrangements</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

**5. Summary**

The report provides a review of the Stray Dog arrangements within Housing and Neighbourhood Services with options for the future based on projected costs of service provision, as well as a benchmark of services within the sub region.

**6. Recommendations**

**That the Scrutiny Panel notes the report.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

Since the introduction of the legislative changes to remove Police responsibilities for stray dogs in July 2008 and, thereafter, place full duties with the Council there has been a significant increase in the reports of stray dogs made to the Council. This is demonstrated in Table 1 below.

Although there was an increase in the number of service requests in 2008/9 on the previous year, the number of stray dogs that the Council has processed did not increase as much as expected. Initially it was estimated that there would be an increase of about 400 dogs per year, however the actual increase was less than 200 dogs in 2008/9.

The Council has a responsibility under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to provide a service which can receive stray dogs handed in by the public. It makes no reference to the hours of operation. However to tackle the public safety and health problems caused by stray dogs as well as the concerns residents have, the Council has provided a patrolling dog warden service as a normal service since before the 1990 Act. As an additional service, the Council provided a 24 hour reception facility after the Police ceased providing these services in 2008.

<b>Actions from July – July</b>	<b>2007/8</b>	<b>2008/9</b>	<b>2009/10 (projected)</b>
Service Requests made to Community Protection	1472	1772	1532
Dogs Seized and processed by RMBC	344	592	528
Dogs Seized and processed by Police	394		
Of these, taken to RMBC out of hours (OOH) kennels and collected by 10pm		173	182
Of the total number of dogs seized, the number left in out of hours cabin after 10pm and before 8am.		5	9
<b><u>Total seized in the Rotherham Area</u></b>	<b><u>738</u></b>	<b><u>592 (20% less)</u></b>	<b><u>528 (11% less)</u></b>

*Table 1: Number of dogs handled 2007-8 and 2008-9*

In the table above, it can also be seen that the projected year end figures for the number of dogs seized by the Council in 2009/10 fell again by 11% as well as a decrease in complaints by 13.5%. With regards to the out of hours provision, there has been an increase of 5% in the projected numbers of dogs received out of hours up to 10pm and taken to our contracted kennels. This demonstrates that there is still a demand for the out of hours provision, however after 10pm there is only a small number of dogs left in the out of hours cabin.

When comparing the service with other neighbouring Councils, Rotherham provides the most comprehensive stray dog out of hours service in South Yorkshire. Doncaster Council only provides a reception facility at its contracted kennels in Doncaster, which are operated privately. Barnsley Council does not provide any out

of hours service. Sheffield City Council owns and operates its own Stray and rehoming kennels as a business which operates outside office hours due to very large demand (which has no spare capacity).

In 2008/09, there was an increase to the Stray Dog budget of £10,000 per year which was funded by a dedicated increase in the Revenue Support Grant to cover the changes in the legislation which removed the Police from the process of dealing with stray dogs.

This funded 7 additional spaces at the main contracted kennels and an out of hours transit kennel arrangement in Rotherham that is linked via Rotherham Connect and Rothercare Direct to an out of hours service to transfer the stray dogs to Doncaster.

With RMBC's approach to all dogs "seized" being received out of hours there has been an increase in customer demand on the owner of the animal sanctuary where the transit kennel facility is sited. Consequently, there has been a need for re-negotiation regarding the arrangements for on-site customer service, including the time spent by the owner on dealing with dogs out of office hours, and basic dog welfare issues. This has resulted in the introduction of part year service fees for 2009/10 and increased annual leasing cost. The costs are shown in Table 2. The use of the Animal Sanctuary staff for the welfare and cleaning work will free up the Dog Wardens to spend more time patrolling and dealing with stray dogs.

The tables below show the costs for 2009/10 which have been incurred to provide a comprehensive out of hours service, and the projected costs for 2010/11 in section 8 of this report assume a 3% increase in the cost of these services;

	<b>2009/10 costs</b>
Additional contracted kennels (Doncaster) (7 no.)	£5,000
Transit Kennel Land Lease (Rotherham)	£1,040
Transit Kennel Customer & Dog Welfare Services (Rotherham) (8 months)	£2,288
OOH stray dog transfer from Transit to Contracted Kennels	£3,460
<b>Total</b>	<b>£12,288</b>

*Table 2: 2009/10 costs*

Due to increasing costs which are not sustainable in the budget as well as decreasing demand for the service, four options have been assessed. These are set out below.

### **Option 1 – Continue with current provision in 2010/11**

This option will retain our current out of hours provision and provide a 24 hour service. It will enable us to respond to local needs and deal with dogs quickly and provide a local drop off point for customers. See Table 3 for financial details.

The continuation of this service however has a number of disadvantages and uncertainties for the future. These are:

- The Portacabin design kennels require ongoing maintenance and some additional safety modifications in addition to the costs for renting the site. These are detailed in the next section; however there will be an increased budget pressure of £4033 in 2010/11 if the service continues in its current form with a projected overspend of £6,321. With the current climate it is not possible to fund any of this overspend from existing revenue budgets, and an increase in the budget would be required.
- The use of its current location is not guaranteed as it is on privately owned premises (which was the only suitable site identified in 2007 and no other sites have since been identified).
- The temporary nature of the site provides further uncertainties regarding the acceptability of the site.

Continuing with the current arrangements is not financially sustainable without prioritising an increase for out of hours kennelling of £6,400 in 2010/11 reducing to an additional £4,800 in 2011/12.

### **Option 2 – Remove all out of hours stray dog services.**

This option would restrict customer access to stray dog services to office hours, Monday to Friday. Customers would be able to arrange for a Dog Warden to collect Stray dogs from premises, or be advised not to apprehend dogs themselves if they cannot keep them until a Dog Warden can attend.

The increased provision of kennels at our contracted Kennels would need to continue to ensure we can meet the increased demand since the Council took sole responsibility for Stray Dogs, and various scripts within Rotherham Connect would need to be amended. Accordingly Table 4 shows an estimated saving of £1,350 (from the £10,000 additional allocation in 2008/09) on the anticipated cost of the full service in 2010/11, which would increase to an estimated saving of £4,695 in 2011/12.

The disadvantages of this option are:

- There would be no weekend provision and nowhere for the public to take dogs themselves
- There would be an increase in the number of complaints about stray dogs as there will not be any provision to store and collect them at weekends.
- There is likely to be increased pressures on the Dog Warden staff to respond to all the complaints and reports of Stray Dogs.
- Partner agencies such as the RSPCA and the Police would not be able to ensure any stray dogs are secured outside normal Council office hours.

**Option 3 – Adjust the service to providing a reception facility at the Councils contracted Kennels.**

This option will enable the Council to make a saving of £6,471 on the projected expenditure for 2010/11 as compared with Option 1, and will enable the service to be delivered within the additional £10,000 budget. This can be seen in Table 5 and these savings will be repeated in 2011/12 to reduce the total cost of the out of hours provision to only £6,568. The service would operate out of office hours from 8am until 10pm, Monday to Sunday, with enquiries being directed through the Councils main telephone numbers, where a reference number would be provided for the customer to contact the Kennels. Alternatively members of the public would be told if they wish they can keep the dog until the Dog Warden is on Duty. The RSPCA and other external partners would still have a drop off point for stray dogs that they happen to deal with. Bearing in mind the low demand for out of hours kennelling after 10pm, and the increasing costs of operating the service to maintain 24 hour provision, this option may be the most appropriate.

The disadvantages of this service are:

- customers would have to take stray dogs directly to our Kennels at Hampole, near Doncaster out of office hours. This is an average round trip of 30 miles. Alternatively they could keep the dog until the next working day when it could be collected by the Warden.
- Some dogs may be released or not held by customers and therefore be allowed to continue to roam the streets.
- After 9.30pm (bearing in mind the travelling time to Hampole), there would be nowhere for a stray dog to be taken by members of the public.

**Option 4 – Stray dog collection service out of hours by a private kennelling company.**

This has the ability for customers to have dogs collected from their own property up to 10pm (no calls responded to after 9pm), however there would be no service provision overnight until 8am. There are no savings associated with this option, as a very competitive quote by our current kennelling provider would result in a total cost of £15,700 in 2010/11 and £12,567 in 2011/12 onwards. The advantage of this service however is the lack of an ongoing asset liability and a simple commercial relationship with one kennelling provider.

**8. Finance**

The cost of the out of hours service for 2009/10 is £12,288. This is set against a provided budget of £10,000 the £2,288 part year pressure being absorbed by the revenue budget in 2009/10, however this not something which is sustainable. Below are the tables detailing the finance issues and projections for the 4 options.

**Table 3 Option 1 – Continue with the current arrangements**

	2010/11	2011/12
Additional contracted kennels (Doncaster) (7 no.)	£5,150	£5,305
Transit Kennel Land Lease (Rotherham)	£1,072	£1,104
Transit Kennel Customer & Dog Welfare Services (Rotherham) (Full 12 months)	£3,535	£3,641
OOH stray dog transfer from Transit to Contracted Kennels	£3,564	£3,671
Annual maintenance costs (repairs/painting) of out of hours cabin (estimated)	£1,000	£1,000
Modifications to the electrical and solar power system for safety reasons	£2,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£16,321</b>	<b>£14,721</b>

**Table 4 Option 2 – No out of hours service**

	2010/11	2011/12
Additional contracted kennels only (Doncaster) (7 no.)	£5,150	£5,305
Est. Administrative changes (RBT charges) within Rotherham Connect in 2010/11 only	£3,000	
Disposal of Cabin	£500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£8,650</b>	<b>£5,305</b>

**Table 5 Option 3 – Stray Dog Drop off at Contracted Kennels**

	2010/11	2011/12
Additional contracted kennels only (Doncaster) (7 no.)	£5,150	£5,305
Stray Drop off point at Hampole Kennels out of hours by the public	£1,200	£1,263
Est. Administrative changes within Rotherham Connect in 2010/11 only	£3,000	
Disposal of Cabin	£500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,850</b>	<b>£6,568</b>

**Table 6 Option 4 – Stray collection by Contracted Kennels**

	2010/11	2011/12
Additional contracted kennels only (Doncaster) (7 no.)	£5,150	£5,305
Pick up service out of Hours by current kennelling provider to customer addresses taking calls up to 9pm through Rotherham Connect (150 dogs per year; £47 call out including mileage)	£7,050	£7,262
Est. Administrative changes within Rotherham Connect in 2010/11 only	£3,000	
Disposal of Cabin	£500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£15,700</b>	<b>£12,567</b>

## 9. Risks and Uncertainties

The current holding kennel facility in Rotherham does not have a guaranteed future as we do not own the site and do not have a long term lease. Some operational difficulties exist but are being accommodated e.g. the use of solar energy for lighting and hot water.

There is a risk to the reputation of Rotherham Council, as the provision currently in place is the most comprehensive in South Yorkshire, and this has been praised by the RSPCA.

Continuing with the current arrangements is not financially sustainable without an increase in the budget for out of hours kennelling by £6,400 in 2010/11 reducing to an additional £4,800 in 2011/12.

There are no National Indicators or local Performance Indicators relating to Stray Dogs, however there is a risk that a reduction in the service provision could impact in the public's perception of how well the Council and partners are dealing Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour under the Place Survey (NI 1).

## 10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act strengthen the tools and powers that are key for safer and cleaner neighbourhoods. In doing so addressing the issues that are often a signal for the well being and perceptions of safety in communities will address the "Safe" priority in both the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan.

The Policy has clear linkages to the seven outcomes of the Outcomes Framework for Social Care, and importantly includes:

- ***Freedom from Discrimination or Harassment***, by supporting those who need social care having equal access to services without hindrance from discrimination or prejudice; people feel safe and are safeguarded from harm

## 11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Enviro-crime Strategy
- Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005
- Environmental Protection Act 1990
- Guidance on Stray Dogs, DEFRA, October 2007

**Contact Name: Matthew Finn, Safer Neighbourhoods Manager, Ext 3134  
matthew.finn@rotherham.gov.uk**

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> July 2010</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods General Fund Revenue Outturn 2009/10</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

### **5. Summary**

This report details the revenue outturn position for Neighbourhoods services accounted for in the General Fund. A separate report will cover Housing Revenue Account (HRA) services.

The budgets within Neighbourhoods have been monitored all year with management actions taken to reduce the financial pressures on the Service.

The final 2009/10 outturn position is a net overspend of £482k. (+11.6%) This is an improvement on the previous forecast outturn position which showed a forecast overspend of £610k. (£128k better).

It should be noted that a request to carryforward the unspent balance of Members' Community Leadership Fund (£41,386) will be included in the consolidated outturn report to Cabinet.

### **6. Recommendations**

**THAT THE SCRUTINY PANEL NOTES THE REPORT.**



## 7. Proposals and Details

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

<b>SERVICE</b>	<b>Annual Budget (Net)</b>	<b>Outturn to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010</b>	<b>Variance from Budget Deficit/(Surplus)</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	£000	£000	£000	%
Asylum	0	0	0	
Housing Access	349	330	(19)	-5.4
Housing Choices	265	247	(18)	-6.8
Older People's Housing Services	(165)	427	592	+138.6
Safer Neighbourhoods	2,622	2,672	50	+1.9
Business Regulation	571	466	(105)	-8.2
Neighbourhood Partnerships	478	460	(18)	-3.8
Neighbourhood Investment	53	53	0	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,173</b>	<b>4,655</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>11.6%</b>

Detailed analysis of the key areas of overspend are included in Appendix 1. The most significant area of overspend being £592k in the Independent Support Service (Wardens) or Older People's Housing Services which has been reported as a pressure throughout the year. These costs in 2009/10 have been partially offset through management actions and savings across wider Neighbourhood Services (-£110k).

### Key Details

#### 7.1 Independent Support Service (Wardens) (£592k Overspend)

The Independent Support Service (Wardens) or Older People's Housing Service, is currently subject to a full management review, with the potential to integrate this area with Domiciliary Care within Adult Services being explored. At the beginning of the year it was recognised that there would be a potential overspend against this budget in the event that short term measures could not be identified to reduce the expenditure or increase income until the outcome of this review is finalised.

Management Actions to mitigate some of the spending pressure in this service throughout the year has included the use of Care Enablers at no additional cost and only paying a single rate for overtime to cover for the high levels of sickness and vacancies.

## **7.2 Safer Neighbourhoods (£50k Overspend)**

An overspend in the Anti Social Behaviour Team of (£78k) mainly relating to salary and redundancy costs has been partially offset by savings on overtime and supplies and services relating to special projects within the Enviro-Crime team.

## **7.3 Business Regulation (-£105k Underspend)**

Tight Vacancy Management across the whole of the Service has resulted in an underspend for the Business Regulation Service.

## **7.4 Neighbourhood Partnerships (-£18k Underspend)**

The underspend relates to the Members Community Leadership Fund of (£41k) and an application will be made to Cabinet to carry this forward.

## **7.5 Housing Access (-£19k Underspend)**

The underspend arose as a result of reduced insurance charges to the Service.

## **7.6 Housing Choices (-£18k Underspend)**

Savings as a result of the moratorium on supplies and services within the Homelessness and Advice Service have resulted in an underspend against the annual budget.

## **7.7 Agency & Consultancy**

Neighbourhoods have spent £36k in 2009/10 on agency staff that are all on contract and this is broken down as follows:

<b>Area</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
Business Regulation	Food & Drugs	4,571
Business Regulation	Licensing	1,121
Safer Neighbourhoods	Community Safety Unit	17,905
Safer Neighbourhoods	Community Protection	2,561
Housing Choices	Dispersed Units	9,861
<b>Total</b>		<b>36,019</b>

These costs are included in the forecasts included in 7.1-7.6 above.

There has been no spend on Consultancy within Neighbourhoods in 2009/10.

## **8. Finance**

Financial implications for each service area have been discussed in section 7 above.

Requests for carry forwards totalling £41,386 will be made to Cabinet as part of the Council's overall Outturn report:

Community Leadership Fund	£41,386
---------------------------	---------

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

Confirmation of this outturn position is subject to external audit verification during June/July.

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

The delivery of the Council's overall Revenue Budget within the limits determined for 2009/10 is vital to achieving the Council's Policy agenda. Financial performance is a key element within the assessment of the Council's effective use of resources.

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

- Report to Cabinet February 2009 – Proposed Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2009/10
- The Council's Medium Term Financial strategy (MTFS) 2007 – 2010.

The contents of this report have been discussed with the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adults and the Strategic Director of Finance.

**Contact Name:** Mike Shaw, Finance Manager  
Extension 2031  
mike.shaw@rotherham.gov.uk

**Reasons for Variance from Appr**

<u>Division of Service</u>	<u>Under (-) / Over (+) Spending (£)</u>	<u>Under / Over Spending as a % of Approved Budget</u>
<b><u>SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS</u></b>		
MANAGEMENT & ADMIN	20,906	5.3%
COMMUNITY PROTECTION	-249	0.0%
PEST CONTROL SERVICE	11,361	22.8%
ENVIRO-CRIME TEAM	-68,979	-19.6%
CLOSED LANDFILL SITES	-2,619	-3.8%
NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS	8,279	1.3%
COMMUNITY SAFETY UNIT (CSU)	3,412	1.6%
	78,059	63.4%
ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR		
HOME OFFICE ASB CHALLENGE/SUPPORT	0	0.0%
ROTHER VALLEY STH MOB CCTB PROJECT	0	0.0%
CSU CORE STAFF	0	0.0%
SAFER ROTTERHAM PARTNERSHIP - REV	0	0.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>50,171</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
<b><u>BUSINESS REGULATION</u></b>		
HEALTH & SAFETY	-27,991	-16.2%
FOOD & DRUGS	-77,947	-13.3%
ANIMAL HEALTH	-694	-1.5%
TRADING STANDARDS	-58,309	-20.5%
LICENSING	12,387	12.4%
BEREAVEMENT SERVICES PARTNERSHIP	47,017	11.2%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>-105,538</b>	<b>-18.5%</b>
<b><u>NEIGHBOURHOOD INVESTMENT</u></b>		
HOUSING MARKET RENEWAL MASTERPLANNING	0	0.0%
ENERGY ADVICE	580	3.2%
GROUNDWORK TRUST	0	0.0%
HCA NEW BUILD	351	100.0%
REGISTERED SOCIAL LANDLORD PARTNERSHIP INCOME	-1,145	4.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>-215</b>	<b>-0.4%</b>
<b><u>NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIPS</u></b>		
MEMBERS COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP FUND	-41,386	-37.4%
MANAGEMENT & ADMIN/AA/LABGI	23,164	6.3%
LOCAL AMBITION PROGRAMME	893	100.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>-17,329</b>	<b>-3.6%</b>
<b><u>HOUSING ACCESS</u></b>		
AGENCY, GRANTS & ENFORCEMENT	5,953	233.8%
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	-1,930	-23.2%
1980 ACT VARIABLE ADVANCES	-184	-100.0%
HMA GENERAL	-14,596	-90.4%
HOUSING ASSOCIATION - MORTG. ETC	1,987	22.9%
HOME IMP LOANS PHY H'CAP GEN	54	50.0%
HGF MANAGEMENT & ADMIN	-7,064	-2.9%
MEDICAL MOBILITY & COMMUNITY CARE	-3,453	-4.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>-19,233</b>	<b>-5.5%</b>
<b><u>HOUSING CHOICES</u></b>		
LIGHTING OF STAIRCASES	0	0.0%
CLEANING OF COMMUNAL DWELLINGS	0	0.0%
RIGHT TO BUY FLAT SERVICE	-616	-22.8%
RUSH HOUSE GENERAL	0	0.0%
HOMELESSNESS & ADVICE	-26,793	-17.6%
DISPERSED UNITS	0	0.0%
	7,628	37.0%
KEY CHOICES PROPERTY MANAGEMENT		
EMPLOYMENT SOLUTIONS	0	0.0%
EVICTON/REPOSESSION PREVENTION	0	0.0%
LOW RISK-CREDIT CRUNCH	0	0.0%
HIGH RISK-HOMELESS PREVENTION LOANS	1,039	100.0%
CASE RESOLUTION PHASE 2	400	100.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>-18,343</b>	<b>-6.9%</b>
<b><u>ASYLUM SEEKERS</u></b>		
ASYLUM SEEKERS	0	0.0%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b><u>INDEPENDENT SUPPORT SERVICE</u></b>		
INDEPENDENT SUPPORT SERVICE	592,318	359.8%
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>592,318</b>	<b>359.8%</b>
ESTATES DIVISION - GENERAL	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>481,830</b>	

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> July 2010</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Housing Investment Programme (HIP) 2009/10 and Other Capital Schemes.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods and Adult Services</b>

**5. Summary**

The report sets out the final outturn position for the Housing Investment Programme (HIP) and Non HIP Capital Schemes for 2009/10. The programme shows a year end underspend of £910k (1.15%) against budget.

**6. Recommendations**

**THAT THE SCRUTINY PANEL NOTES THE REPORT.**

## **7. Proposals and Details**

- 7.1 HIP schemes totalling £78.770m were approved by the Cabinet Member on 19th October 2009 which represented a slight over programming of £37k on the HIP budget. The outturn position for each of the schemes within the HIP are included in Appendix 1.
- 7.2 The final outturn position is £77.860m which represents an underspend of £910k against the Programme. Within this overall underspend, it is worth noting that schemes managed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd (£63.283m) underspent by £1.090m, whilst there was a £180k overspend (1.1%) on the £15.532m schemes managed by the Council. The following paragraphs provide the Cabinet Member with explanations for the variances from the approved Programme.

### **2010 Ltd Managed Schemes**

- 7.3 For the schemes managed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd, £62.148m has been spent which equates to an underspend of £1.092m against the approved Programme (£63.238m).

### **Decent Homes – Phase 2**

- 7.4 The Environmental Works budget of £5.400m outturned at £4.083m, an underspend of £1.317m. As previously reported to Cabinet Member, the late start of the programme and the subsequent inclement weather together with delays to the work being undertaken by the IHSP have all contributed to the large in year underspend.
- 7.5 The Decent Homes Void Programme budget was reduced by £200k to £1.300m as a result of the approved budget virement to cover the replacement of Central Heating systems. Final expenditure was £1.375m, an overspend of £75k (5.75%).
- 7.6 The Refurbishment Programme of £37.626m was projecting an overspend of £0.609m but this increased at outturn to £935k. This is mainly due to the final account for Connaught being significantly over budget by £0.573m and a higher than anticipated spend on Asbestos Surveys due to some unplanned reactionary work being undertaken.
- 7.7 There was an underspend on the Windows Replacement Programme of £630k which is due to the late start on site of the third contractor (Bramalls with Yorkshire Windows) and delays due to the inclement weather.

### **Other Decent Homes Schemes**

- 7.8 Replacement of Central Heating Schemes was forecasting a balanced budget as a result of the £0.200m approved budget virement from the Decent Homes Void Programme mentioned above but the outturn was actually £60k under the budget of £1.2m.

### Other Capital Projects

- 7.9 The Disability Discrimination Act Works had a budget allocation of £300k and final expenditure of £170k which mainly relates to essential improvements and investments within neighbourhood centres, as per the report to Cabinet Member of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009. The resulting £130k underspend was utilised to fund the additional costs that were incurred by 2010 Ltd. as a result of flooding within the Borough earlier in the year as agreed with Cabinet Member.
- 7.10 Energy Performance Certificate Surveys overspent by £26k as more surveys on void properties have been completed than originally anticipated.
- 7.11 Capitalised Revenue Repairs underspent by £32k as the anticipated volume of these works has not materialised.

### RMBC Managed Schemes

- 7.12 The remainder of the programme is monitored by the Council and £15.712m was spent against the budget of £15.532m, an overspend of £180k.

### Fair Access to All: Disabled Adaptations, Public and Private Sector

7.13	Final Expenditure:		Approved Programme
	Public Sector	£1.714m	£1.800m
	Private Sector	£1.530m	£1.415m
	Total	£3.244m	£3.215m

Problems with 2010 Rotherham Ltd's invoicing system earlier in the year resulted in delays and incorrect or duplicate invoices being received making this demand led, over subscribed budget hard to monitor. Significant progress has been made since then with the backlog of works previously reported being cleared but the large value of the majority of jobs has led to an overspend of £115k on Private Sector and an underspend of £86k on Public Sector Adaptations.

## **Regeneration/Neighbourhood Renewal: Public Sector**

### **Non-Traditional Investment - Structural**

- 7.14 Work commenced in mid-November but with the late start and the inclement weather expenditure outturned at £2.127m against the budget of £3.047m, an underspend of £920k. This will fully utilise the £1.400m of Capital Receipts set aside for this project, with any remaining MRA funding being rolled forward to 2010/11.

### **Dis-Investment Non-Traditionals**

- 7.15 This budget overspent by £116k due to a greater number of acquisitions and a greater number of properties demolished than were included in the original forecast.

### **Small Environmental Schemes**

- 7.16 There is an underspend on these schemes of £57k due to the request for savings to be made earlier in the year when RTB sales were low.

### **Sheltered Housing Modifications**

- 7.17 There is an underspend on these schemes of £95k as a result of unforeseen delays of around 2-3 weeks during the year due to inclement weather. The schemes should be finalised in April 2010 with the corresponding amount of RHB Grant being rolled forward to fund this.

## **Regeneration/Neighbourhood Renewal: Private Sector**

### **Dinnington Transformational Change Masterplan**

- 7.18 The outturn of £182k is £604k under budget due to several large schemes not now progressing until 2010/11. These include the Monksbridge acquisition (£290k), the North Anston Gateway (£100k), Scarsdale environmental works (£100k), 2010 Decent Homes environmental projects (£56k) and town centre projects of £33k. These schemes will be delivered in 2010/11 with the corresponding amount of RHB Grant being rolled forward to fund them.

### **Private Sector Support**

- 7.19 The £87k underspend is related to the funding allocation for on going loan applications in support of the Canklow clearance project which were committed in 2009/10 but the agreements were only signed this month.



### **Thurcroft**

- 7.20 Problems in sourcing the appropriate materials and the recent inclement weather conditions have caused delays to this project resulting in an underspend of £84k.

### **Pathfinder Projects**

- 7.21 The Pathfinder programme has received £10.9m of grant funding overall, including £0.5m of additional funding received to compensate spend shortfalls from other local authorities. The Pathfinder met and exceeded its spend and output targets with £11.4 million of projects delivered in the period between the HIP and EDS capital schemes. All expenditures were claimed in March and April 2010.

The £1.494m overspend at the end of March 2010 includes £888k enabling and Wath town centre improvements and £606k acquisition costs for privately owned property in Canklow which has progressed more rapidly than predicted.

### **Other Projects**

#### **Growth Point Programme**

- 7.22 Expenditure and resources relating to the Growth Point Programme has been added to the Programme for the first time following confirmation of the resources available. Expenditure of £344k related to the acquisition of properties on Oldgate Lane, Thrybergh. Funding for 2009/10 of £861k was received and the difference will be rolled forward into 2010/11.

#### **HCA New Build – Wood Street/School Street**

- 7.23 Resources from the Homes and Communities Agency for Phase 1 and 2 were received in 2009/10 and the expenditure relating to the schemes is detailed within Appendix 1. The remainder of grant will be rolled forward to 2010/11.

### **Non HIP Schemes**

- 7.24 There are currently approved schemes to the value of £537k within the Non HIP Capital Programme for Neighbourhoods. Details of the progress on Non HIP Schemes are listed in Appendix 2.
- 7.25 Landfill Sites originally had a budget allocation of £1.169m which was reduced to £250k as a result of the difficulty in obtaining specialist input to undertake the complex site investigations, which have been further delayed by adverse weather conditions. Final expenditure was £232k.

- 7.26 Safer Stronger Communities Fund (Area Based Grant) had a budget of £82k and final expenditure of £59k. The Safer Neighbourhoods Team has confirmed a roll forward of any unspent resources.
- 7.27 There was an underspend of £10,611 against the Air Quality Grant which will be rolled forward into 2010/11.
- 7.28 Expenditure of £230k has been added to the Non HIP Capital Programme for Neighbourhoods for the payment to Great Places Housing Association for the purpose of enabling 10 affordable dwellings for social rent in Aston. Funding is from previous Section 106 resources.

## 8. Finance

- 8.1 The following table shows the resources used to finance the HIP expenditure of £77.860m in 2009/10.

Source	£m
Capital Allocations and Credit Approvals	1.289
Regional Housing Board	2.574
Pathfinder Grant	6.918
General Fund Contribution	0.566
ALMO Funding	50.000
Major Repairs Allowance	11.189
Capital Receipts	1.720
Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay (RCCO)	2.100
Disabled Facilities Grant	0.849
Growth Programme Funding	0.345
HCA New Build Grant	0.114
Other Contributions	0.196
<b>Total</b>	<b>77.860</b>

## 9. Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1 As in previous years, the HIP is supported by Right to Buy Receipts, of which the Council has no direct control, but monitors the level closely. Current forecasts are the level of sales originally forecast will be achieved.
- 9.2 Any unspent MRA and RHB grant will be rolled forward and added to the 2010/11 HIP for which a revised programme will be submitted to Cabinet Member shortly.

**10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The HIP supports the following Corporate Plan Priority and Cross Cutting Themes and is central to the longer term Housing Strategy:

- Rotherham Safe
- Sustainable Development
- Fairness

**11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 16<sup>th</sup> March 2009  
Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 15<sup>h</sup> June 2009  
Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009  
Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 27<sup>th</sup> July 2009  
Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 19<sup>th</sup> October 2009  
Report to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods 18<sup>th</sup> January 2010

**Contact Names: Mike Shaw**  
Finance Manager  
Extension 2031  
mike.shaw@rotherham.gov.uk

	REVISED APPROVED PROGRAMME 2009/10 £	OUTTURN EXPENDITURE 2009/10 £	VARIANCE 2009/10
<b>DECENT HOMES - PHASE 2</b>			
Refurbishment	37,625,752	38,561,067	935,315
Windows	12,000,000	11,369,490	-630,510
Environmental Works	5,400,000	4,082,577	-1,317,423
DSO DH Void Programme	1,300,000	1,374,686	74,686
Capital Management Fee	4,516,878	4,443,250	-73,628
<b>Phase 2 Sub Total</b>	<b>60,842,630</b>	<b>59,831,070</b>	<b>-1,011,560</b>
<b>OTHER DECENT HOMES SCHEMES</b>			
Replacement of Central Heating	1,200,000	1,140,122	-59,878
Electrical Board & Bond	80,000	61,436	-18,564
CO Meters to Vulnerable Properties	25,000	23,041	-1,959
Install Smoke Alarms & CO Meters to Solid Fuel Properties	0	-433	-433
<b>Other Decent Homes Sub Total</b>	<b>1,305,000</b>	<b>1,224,166</b>	<b>-80,834</b>
<b>TOTAL DECENT HOMES EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>62,147,630</b>	<b>61,055,236</b>	<b>-1,092,394</b>
<b>OTHER CAPITAL PROJECTS</b>			
District Heating Conversions	500,000	492,537	-7,463
Disability Discrimination Act Works	300,000	169,617	-130,383
One-Off Properties	100,000	111,443	11,443
Victim Support Scheme/Safer Homes	50,000	49,908	-92
EPC Surveys	80,000	106,070	26,070
Capitalised Revenue Repairs	60,000	28,131	-31,869
<b>Other Capital Projects Sub Total</b>	<b>1,090,000</b>	<b>957,706</b>	<b>-132,294</b>
Flood Costs	0	134,857	134,857
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORED BY 2010</b>	<b>63,237,630</b>	<b>62,147,799</b>	<b>-1,089,831</b>
<b>FAIR ACCESS TO ALL</b>			
<b>PRIVATE SECTOR</b>			
Disabled Facilities Grants (Private Sector)	1,415,000	1,529,859	114,859
<b>PUBLIC SECTOR</b>			
Disabled Adaptations (Public Sector)	1,800,000	1,713,809	-86,191
<b>Fair Access To All Sub Total</b>	<b>3,215,000</b>	<b>3,243,668</b>	<b>28,668</b>
<b>REGEN./NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL</b>			
<b>PRIVATE SECTOR</b>			
Home Assistance Grants	65,000	33,296	-31,704
Maltby Transformational Change Masterplan(RHB)	320,000	290,686	-29,314
Dinnington Transformational Change Masterplan(RHB)	787,000	182,322	-604,678
Rural & West Baseline Report (RHB)	50,000	66,999	16,999
Private Sector Support(RHB)	380,000	292,815	-87,185
Move on Accommodation(RHB)	0	-1,424	-1,424
Thurcroft(RHB)	669,000	585,289	-83,711
Pathfinder Projects	5,500,000	6,994,410	1,494,410
<b>PUBLIC SECTOR</b>			
Non-Traditional Investment - Structural	3,047,080	2,126,888	-920,192
Dis-Investment Non-Traditionals	300,000	416,370	116,370
Small Environmental Schemes	100,000	42,927	-57,073
Sheltered Housing Modifications(Part RHB)	838,000	743,084	-94,916
Garage Site Investment	100,000	107,283	7,283
<b>Regeneration/Neighbourhood Renewal Sub Total</b>	<b>12,156,080</b>	<b>11,880,945</b>	<b>-275,135</b>
<b>OTHER - PUBLIC SECTOR</b>			
Research & Information	50,000	21,150	-28,850
'Key Choices' Property Shop	86,000	82,420	-3,580
Bond/Rent In Advance Scheme	25,000	25,000	0
<b>Other Public Sector Sub Total</b>	<b>161,000</b>	<b>128,570</b>	<b>-32,430</b>
<b>HCA NEW BUILD</b>			
Wood Street/School Street (Phase 1)	0	81,470	81,470
Newland Avenue (Phase 2)	0	10,238	10,238
Stone Park (Phase 2)	0	5,515	5,515
Albert Road (Phase 2)	0	14,023	14,023
Rother View (Phase 2)	0	713	713
Albany Road (Phase 2)	0	2,205	2,205
<b>GROWTH POINT PROGRAMME</b>			
Growth Programme Acquisitions	0	344,836	344,836
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORED BY RMBC</b>	<b>15,532,080</b>	<b>15,712,183</b>	<b>180,103</b>
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>78,769,710</b>	<b>77,859,982</b>	<b>-909,728</b>
<b>Exp.as a % of Programme</b>		<b>98.85</b>	

<b>RESOURCES USED</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>
SCE( R )	1.289	1.289
MRA	13.065	10.869
MRA - C/F from 2008/09 - Non-Traditional Properties	0.320	0.320
Capital Receipts - Non-Traditional Properties	1.400	1.400
Almo Funding	50.000	50.000
HCA New Build Grant	0.000	0.114
DFG	0.849	0.849
RCCO	2.100	2.100
GF Contribution	0.566	0.566
Growth Programme Funding	0.000	0.345
Regional Housing Board	3.187	2.417
Regional Housing Board C/F from 08/09	0.157	0.157
Pathfinder resources	5.500	6.918
Other contributions	0.000	0.196
Receipts	0.300	0.320
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>78.733</b>	<b>77.860</b>

**NEIGHBOURHOODS NON - HIP PROGRAMME 2009-10****APPENDIX 2**

	<b>APPROVED PROGRAMME 2009/10 £</b>	<b>OUTTURN EXPENDITURE 2009/10 £</b>
Greasbrough Cemetery Development	183,675	0
Air Quality Grant	19,757	9,146
Contaminated Land Grant	950	0
Safer Stronger Communities Fund (Area Based Grant)	82,323	59,445
Landfill Sites	250,000	231,984
Great Places Housing Association	0	230,000
<b>TOTAL NEIGHBOURHOODS NON-HIP PROGRAMME</b>	<b>536,705</b>	<b>530,575</b>

# Introductory Tenancies

By

Steve Clarke & Jenny Swales

for

Scrutiny Panel 2010

# Types of Tenancies

- Introductory Tenancies
- Secure Tenancies
  - Most RBC Tenancies are secure
  - “Secure” because if the tenant complies with the terms of the tenancy agreement s/he can keep the tenancy for as long as s/he wishes.

# Introductory Tenancies

- Introduced as a tool to tackle anti-social behaviour (but can be used for any breach of tenancy) e.g.
  - Selling drugs/drug abuse
  - Threats/use of violence
  - Verbal abuse/harassment/racial abuse
  - Loud music
  - Arguing/door slamming
  - Threats/damage to others property



# Introductory Tenancies

- Adopted by Rotherham from October 2003
- All new tenants **MUST** be ITs (unless immediately before the start of the tenancy they were a secure tenant of another LA or assured tenant of a Housing Association).
- 12 months ‘trial period’.
- If no breaches of tenancy agreement, tenant automatically becomes secure tenant after 12 months.
- No Security, No right to buy

# Introductory Tenancies

- To end the tenancy RBC must serve the tenant with a Notice of Proceedings for Possession (“NPP”).

# Introductory Tenancies

- inform the tenant that s/he has the right to request a review of the decision to seek a possession order & the time in which the request must be made i.e. 14 days from date tenant served with the NPP (Leaflet).
- inform the tenant that if s/he needs help or advice about the NPP, s/he should take it immediately to CAB/Housing Aid Centre/Law Centre/Solicitor.
- Personal service or post through letterbox.

# Introductory Tenancies

- Review – If tenant wants an oral hearing s/he has to request it within 14 days of receipt of NPP. **NB** request need not be in writing.
- Oral hearing conducted by elected members.
- Tenant has to be given at least 5 days notice of the date of the review hearing – if less than 5 days notice given, hearing can only proceed with consent of tenant/representative.

# Introductory Tenancies

- Prior to the hearing Tenants will be supplied with the written evidence relied on by RBC. This may include:
  - chronology of events;
  - witness statements from officers (which may include hearsay from unidentified complainants);
  - witness statements from identified complainants.

# Introductory Tenancies

Members of the review panel follow the procedure BUT can deviate from this in order to ensure a tenant has a fair hearing as long as the following principles are maintained:

- (i) Tenant can be heard & hear evidence against them;
- (ii) be accompanied and/or represented by another person (professionally qualified or not) – a representative has the same rights as the tenant;

# Introductory Tenancies

- (iii) call persons to give evidence;
- (iv) put questions to any person who gives evidence at the review panel (but not witnesses who have not attended but have given statements); and
- (v) make representations in writing.

# Introductory Tenancies

- Guidance suggests reviews should be conducted as far as practicable as an ‘inquisitorial’ hearing rather than as a court style ‘adversarial’ hearing.
- Make tenant/representative aware at outset as to how members intend to conduct the review.



# Introductory Tenancies

- Vulnerable Tenants - need special consideration.
- Officers should have made early contact with support agencies to explore solutions/additional support rather than immediately evict.
- Be aware of different cultures/languages.

# Introductory Tenancies

- **Members of the Review Panel must:**
  - (i) review the evidence before them;
  - (ii) disregard any evidence that is not credible or irrelevant;
  - (iii) check the NPP is valid; and
  - (iv) decide on balance of probabilities (i.e. more probable than not) whether tenant has breached terms of tenancy agreement.

# Introductory Tenancies

- If proper notice of the review hearing is given to the tenant but the tenant does not attend – members must take into account all the circumstances (including any explanation given for the tenant's absence) and can either:
  - (i) proceed in the tenant's absence; or
  - (ii) give directions re. future conduct of review.

# Introductory Tenancy

- If tenant requests a postponement of the hearing members can grant or refuse as they see fit – they should provide reasons if they refuse.
- The hearing can be adjourned at the request of tenant/representative or if Members wish to adjourn – But the same members must sit at the adjourned hearing or there has to be a complete rehearing. Can have 1 of the original members missing but only with the consent of tenant/representative.

# Introductory Tenancies

- Review must be carried out and tenant supplied with written reasons before date specified in NPP i.e. date after which possession proceedings can be begun.

# Introductory Tenancies

- A written decision letter must be served on the tenant which clearly sets out:
  - (i) what evidence was heard;
  - (ii) which facts were established as agreed;
  - (iii) which facts were in dispute; and
  - (iv) the findings of the review panel and the reasons for the findings.

# Introductory Tenancies

- If the tenant fails to vacate the property the Council must apply for a possession order.
- Possession proceedings must be issued in the County Court before the end of the 12 month trial period - otherwise the introductory tenancy will automatically become a secure tenancy.

# Introductory Tenancies

- **Court must order possession if we prove:**
  - (i) the tenancy was an IT
  - (ii) the NPP was valid (& review properly carried out if requested).
  - (iii) court proceedings were begun after the date stated in the NPP.
- Court can only postpone possession for up to 14 days (or up to 6 weeks in cases of “exceptional hardship”).



# Introductory Tenancies

- If the review upheld service of the NPP the only viable way of challenge is by judicial review.
- Application High Court.
- E.G. no reasonable authority could have come to that decision, failure to conduct hearing properly, failure to give proper reasons.

# Extending the Introductory tenancy

- Extension of 12 months trial period by further 6 months so total of 18 months.
- Introduced June 2005
- Used for more minor breaches e.g.:
  - occasional noise
  - minor damage to home
  - upkeep of home/gardens

## Continued...

- Serve notice of extension at least 8 weeks before end of 12 months trial period.
- Notice must give reasons and deal with review procedure.
- Tenant must request review within 14 days of service of notice.
- Oral/Written review.

## Continued

- Must give tenant at least 10 clear days notice of date of review and if oral review, time and place.
- Tenant must supply any written representations to RBC at least 2 clear days before the date of the review.
- Same rights for tenant as in review of NPP.

# Questions

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS**  
**Monday, 21st June, 2010**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillor Goulty.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kaye.

**J15. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

Resolved:- (1) That the attendance of the Council on other Bodies be as follows:-

Decent Homes Partnering Broad	2 reps. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	
Rotherham Licence Watch Steering Group	Councillor Wootton (Chair of Licensing Board)	
Rotherham Rent Bond Guarantee Scheme	Councillor Akhtar 1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	
Rush House Management Committee	1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	
Social Concerns Committee Churches Together	1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	
South Yorkshire Trading Standards Executive Committee	Councillors Akhtar and Jack	
South Yorkshire Trading Standards Sub-Group	2 reps. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	
National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection – Yorkshire and Humberside Division	4 reps. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel Councillor Wyatt	
Women’s Refuge	1 rep. from Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel	

Transform South Yorkshire Board

Councillor Akhtar

(2) That the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel be requested to nominate representation to those indicated above.

(3) That the Director of Independent Living and the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods ensure that the Cabinet Member receives an annual report, or briefing note as appropriate, on each of the above organisations.

**J16. HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS YEAR END PERFORMANCE REPORT 2009/10**

The Landlords Relations Manager presented the submitted report which outlined the Key Performance Indicator year end results for the Housing and Neighbourhoods element of the Directorate.

It was reported that the Indicators managed by Housing and Neighbourhoods, for the second successive year, 9 (100%) of the KPIs achieved their target. 78% of the Indicators had improved from the previous year.

For the Indicators managed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd., 7 (78%) of the KPIs achieved their targets compared to 50% the previous year. 67% of the Indicators improved from last year.

The report drew attention to the following highlights:-

- Private sector vacancies brought back into use or demolished (Neighbourhoods)
- National Indicator 158% Non-Decent Council Housing (2010 Rotherham Ltd.)
- National Indicator 155 Number of Affordable Homes delivered (Neighbourhoods)
- National Indicator 156 Number of Households Living in Temporary Accommodation
- Rental Indicators (2010 Rotherham Ltd.)
- NM185 – Repairs Appointments made and kept
- BV211a – Programmed/Responsive
- Target Setting 2010/11

Attention was also drawn to the following:-

- reduction in void rent loss compared to last year.
- the potential for a “Short Notice” inspection, and actions already taken, and planned to deal with this eventuality.
- delivery of Decent Homes – monitoring of the programme to ensure delivery by December 2010.

Resolved:- (1) That the year end position and excellent performance

**3J CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS - 21/06/10**

results be noted.

(2) That the provision of separate quarterly reports for Housing and Neighbourhoods and ALMO performance be approved.

**J17. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

**J18. 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD. BUSINESS PLAN**

The Landlords' Relations Manager presented 2010 Rotherham Ltd.'s business Plan which was reported to its Board on 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2010.

An Appendix attached to the report showed that, as a result of various savings initiatives (including the new operational model agreed by Cabinet Member on 7<sup>th</sup> June, Minute No. 5 refers), the business plan for core services was now in balance.

However, reference was also made to the challenging financial position in respect of the Property Services trading account. It was confirmed that considerable management action was being taken supported by the medium term financial strategy, to ensure that the company remained a viable business.

Resolved:- That 2010 Rotherham Ltd.,'s business plan, and current actions, be noted.

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

**J19. NEIGHBOURHOODS STAGE 3 COMPLAINT PANEL**

The Director of Independent Living presented the outcome of a Complaints Panel held been held on 2nd June, 2010, comprising Councillors Atkin (in the Chair), Dodson and Walker. The Panel heard a complaint received from Mr. C. relating to the Council's Allocation Policy and the time taken to be rehoused. Further more detailed information about the case was given.

It was reported that the Panel had not upheld the complaint. However consideration was given to the following recommendations of the Panel:-

“That the Housing Allocation Policy be reviewed and a report on the conclusions of the review be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods regarding applicants who were



statutorily overcrowded but living in temporary accommodation and therefore classified as “locally overcrowded” and placed in the General Plus group rather than the Priority group. “

An explanation of the definition “overcrowding” was provided, together with details of how the procedure currently operated.

Those present discussed the current terminology and definition and were of the opinion that the current policy was satisfactory and thus a review was not necessary.

Resolved:- (1) That the outcome of the Stage 3 Complaint be noted.

(2) That the recommendation to review the Housing Allocation Policy be not agreed, but the language of the policy be clarified.

(3) That the Director of Independent Living provides the Cabinet Member with a briefing note in respect of the Council’s current policy on “overcrowding” within the Housing Allocation Policy and any learning from the complaint.

(Exempt under Paragraph 2 of the Act – information which is likely to reveal the identity of individuals)

**J20. INTRODUCTORY TENANCY REVIEW PANEL**

It was noted that an Appeals Panel had been held on 11th June, 2010, comprising The Mayor (Councillor McNeely) (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Ellis, to review a decision to terminate an Introductory Tenancy.

The Panel had confirmed the decision made on 10th May, 2010.

Those present confirmed a commitment to zero tolerance.

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

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

**SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**3rd June, 2010**

Present:- The Mayor (Councillor McNeely) (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Blair, Cutts, Ellis, Nightingale and Walker.

Councillors Akhtar and Pickering were in attendance at the invitation of the Chair.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gamble, Hodgkiss and P. A. Russell.

**1. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL CLARKE**

The Chair referred to the recent death of Councillor Michael Clarke and the tragic events that had occurred in Cumbria.

The Panel held a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

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

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) The Panel congratulated the Chair on her recent appointment as Mayor.

(2) The Chair welcomed Councillor Ellis to her first meeting of the Panel and all those who had chosen to remain Panel Members.

(3) It was noted that Co-optees would be appointed at the next meeting.

**5. THE YEAR AHEAD**

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Key Areas of Responsibility

- Neighbourhood Management
- Area Assemblies
- Strategic Housing e.g. Private Sector housing investment/statutory enforcement powers
- Housing Management (through 2010 Ltd.)
- Homelessness
- Adaptations

- Sheltered Housing
- Building Council housing
- Community Safety and Safer Neighbourhood Teams
- Regulatory function e.g. Licensing and Trading Standards

#### Top 10 Key Achievements 2009/10

- Achieved targets for 100% KPIs – 2<sup>nd</sup> year running
- 13% reduction in level of crime – 3,000 fewer victims
- Retained Customer Service Excellence Standard
- Delivered 373 affordable homes during 2007/10
- Secured £7.4M to build 127 Council houses
- 994 empty properties brought back into use
- Reduced use of temporary accommodation by 60%
- 94% of Council stock meets Decent Homes Standard
- Attained the Crime and Justice Pioneer Area Status and launched the 'Policing Pledge' with South Yorkshire Police

#### Significant Challenges

- HRA Business Plan and Financial Management within the ALMO
- Future of the ALMO
- New TSA Regulatory Framework for social housing
- Resources for improving the quality of life within neighbourhoods
- Single Conversation
- Delivery major housing programmes including new build Council housing
- Perception of Crime and Disorder

#### The Year Ahead

- Get agreement for a new investment plan to continue the regeneration of Rotherham
- Tackle anti-social behaviour – reduce enviro-crime and noise nuisance
- Build 172 new Council houses
- Tackle deprivation through the 3 'Local Ambition Projects'
- Reshape the Sheltered Housing Warden and Care Enabler Services
- Complete the Decent Homes Programme
- Undertake a housing stock options appraisal

#### The following issues were also highlighted:-

- New Government – new challenges – the HCA was to claw back funding – hopefully would not affect the Programme
- Cabinet Member Portfolios still to be agreed but likely that Waste Collection would be coming to the Directorate and this Scrutiny Panel
- Discussions regarding the Single Conversation with the HCA were ongoing. Consultation with stakeholders and partners had been completed and a plan would be in place shortly

Councillor Akhtar was thanked for his presentation.

## 6. THE YEAR AHEAD

The Chair reported that she would like the Panel to look back at the impact of Scrutiny since its inception 10 years ago; the reviews undertaken, what impact the recommendations had had, if they had all been implemented and if not why not.

The Climate Change Review at the last meeting had proved very interesting but too big a subject to be discussed as a whole so the various strands would be discussed throughout the year.

The Chair also suggested the private rented sector, housing opportunities for young people and under occupancy.

The Panel was then invited to put their suggestions forward:-

- Garages
  - o Funding
  - o Why the ringfencing was removed
  - o Actual costs
  - o Private garage owners/Council tenants
  - o Demand
  - o Garages used for storage
  - o Decommissioned sites that there were no longer funding for
- Anti-social behaviour with regard to Council tenancies
  - o Need for closer working relationship with CYPS
- Noise nuisance
  - o Licensing and Planning
- Housing Market Renewal
  - o Funding in light of the new Coalition Government
  - o Possible option B's for proposed development
  - o How to manage public expectations
- Decent Homes – Environmental Works
- Sheltered Housing Warden and Care Enabler Service

## 7. REVIEW OF COUNCIL ACTIVITIES AROUND CLIMATE CHANGE

Following on from the 22<sup>nd</sup> April Scrutiny Panel meeting (Minute No. 91 refers), a report of the inquiry into Council activity to combat climate change was considered.

Discussion ensued on the actions arising from the meeting.

With regard to Sustainable Schools and Education, it was noted that a

Working Group had been set up to look at the Schools' Vegetable Patch Program linking in with community allotment plots and was to be considered as a community cohesion project. Consideration would be given as to which part of the Borough to pilot the project.

Resolved:- (1) That the Regional LGA Board be requested to look at the possibility of the region switching to desalinisation and also the possibility of Rotherham becoming part of the nation quick charge network for electric vehicles.

(2) That the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel be requested to consider:-

(a) "are we incorporating learning more into our schools to build new industries in the region for the future?"

(b) the feasibility of dedicated school buses along the model adopted in Europe and the United States.

(c) the feasibility of utilising school roofs to generate energy via solar panels

(3) That the Director of Independent Living ascertain from 2010 Rotherham Ltd. the position with regarding to installing water meters in all Council properties in a drive to improving water efficiency within the region.

(4) That the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel be requested to consider the possibility of a timed switch off of street lighting at night and the timing of waste collections in the Borough i.e. late night collections.

(5) That the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel be asked if the Council was doing enough as a Fair Trade organisation.

(6) That with regard to sustainable procurement practices, that the Rotherfed Co-optees be requested to discuss with their organisation how current work could benefit Rotherfed and vice versa.

(7) That a report be submitted on what the Council did to raise public awareness/education with regard to climate change.

## **8. UPDATE ON 2010 ROTHERHAM LTD. VOID TURNAROUND PERFORMANCE**

Further to Minute No. 56 of 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2009, Jane Davies-Haire, Landlord Relations Manager, reported on the detailed work that had been carried out by the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Performance Team and 2010 Rotherham Ltd.'s Empty Homes and Performance Teams on void turnaround performance. A new calculation methodology was also

proposed from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2010.

As at December, 2009, 3 of the 7 recommendations had been complete and the remaining 4 on target for completion. A summary of progress was as follows:-

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

2010 Rotherham Ltd. had reviewed and clarified the process and clear information was made available to tenants via the website ( a decision was taken to retain the decorating allowance at £25). Complete.

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

The “Fond Farewell” scheme had been up and running since October, 2009, and was still being evaluated. If it was identified that the scheme was saving money over and above that paid out, then consideration would be given to extending the scheme.

*Recommendation 7 – That action taken towards the recommendations of 2010 Rotherham Ltd.’s Empty Homes Service Review ‘Every Day Counts’ be monitored and reported back to the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel in due course*

A further 2 of the 16 actions had now been completed (14 in total) – review of decoration allowance and review of all new procedures. The 2 remaining actions (incentives to stay and review of the process of backdating tenancy commencement dates) were still to be completed.

A database of all properties that had been empty for over 16 weeks had been compiled and was monitored/updated weekly. A target was set to reduce the number of properties empty for longer than 16 weeks from 116 in November, 2009 to 75 by the end of March, 2010. As at 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010, the figure stood at 76 with a further target set of 25 by March, 2011.

As a result of concerns raised by Members, the Council had carried out a series of reality checks and reported to 2010 that performance did not include voids requiring Decent Homes and other major works. 2010 had conducted an internal review of processes and agreed that the overall “turnaround” figure should include all void properties.

As a result of the new methodology to be used, performance would appear to drop in 2010/11 compared to previously reported figures. Sub-indicators and targets would be developed so that it would be possible to monitor separately performance on routine ‘simple’ voids and on more complex voids. 2010 was to produce a detailed report setting out the new

methodology and, once approved, would be implemented as from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2010.

2010 had put a significant amount of additional resources into reducing the overall number of empty Council-owned properties and as at 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2010, 248 properties stood empty compared with 386 at the end of September, 2009. Of the 248, 50 were not available for letting due to Neighbourhood Investment Service decisions (19), non-traditional properties undergoing major refurbishment works (21) and Warden flats requiring further assessment before being let (10).

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

- New methodology made sense
- Proposed required major structural work could legally be excluded from the figures
- Push nationally to illustrate rent loss through voids rather solely turnaround times
- Every property was treated on an individual basis
- Standard of re-lets – representatives of Rotherfed to carry out spot checks?
- Why can there not be 24 hour turn round of a property given that in many cases there were pre-termination notice so any problems resolved at the pre-termination inspection?
- Decent Homes coming to an end so there should be no more complex voids

Resolved:- (1) That it be noted that the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review have now been addressed by 2010 Rotherham Ltd.

(2) That it be noted that the methodology used by 2010 Rotherham Ltd. to calculate void turnaround times would change as from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2010.

(3) That the evaluation of the Fond Farewell Scheme be submitted to this Scrutiny Panel when completed.

(4) That a report be submitted on private sector landlords and void properties.

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

The Panel noted the decisions made under delegated powers by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Neighbourhoods held on 1<sup>st</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> March, 6<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> April, 2010.

It was noted that the Proposed Housing Investment Programme (HIP) 2010/11 (Minute No. J.156 of 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2010), had not been submitted to the Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

Resolved:- That the following reports be submitted to the Panel:-

Bereavement Service

Dog Control Orders – Review of Stray Dog Arrangements (J158 of 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010)

Proposed Changes to the Board of 2010 Rotherham Ltd. (J159 of 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010)

Housing Revenue Account Budget Monitoring to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010 (J171 of 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010).

**10. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22nd April, 2010, were agreed.

**11. PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 26<sup>th</sup> February, 12<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> March and 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2010, were noted.



**PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**11th June, 2010**

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor McNeely); Councillors Austen, Gilding, J. Hamilton, License, Steele, Swift and Whysall.

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

**1. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL CLARKE**

Members stood as a token of respect to the late Councillor Clarke, who had been a valued Member of this Committee.

**2. NEW MEMBERS**

The Chairman welcomed Councillors Steele and Whysall to their first meeting.

**3. CO-OPTED MEMBERS**

Nominations were noted for co-opted membership of the Scrutiny Panels.

Resolved:- That co-option arrangements be agreed with each Scrutiny Panel Chairman.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

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

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

**6. PAYMENT OF INVOICES WITHIN THIRTY DAYS - FORMER BVPI8.**

Sarah McCall, Performance Officer, presented the submitted report setting out details of the former Best Value Performance Indicator 8 which measured the payment of undisputed invoices within 30 days. The Council had agreed an average annual target of 97.5% for performance of BVPI8 for 2009/10.

Outturn performance for recent years has achieved:

2006/07	91%
2007/08	94%
2008/09	92%

Performance against BVPI8 was not as consistent as it should be and it had been recognised that the Council should act to instil and embed good practice in this area and work was ongoing to this effect.

Outturn performance for the new financial year achieved 94.65%.

If the Council under performed on BVPI8 then this may have an effect on our CPA score. Vulnerable smaller suppliers may also experience financial difficulties due to delayed payment which goes against our commitment to the SME Friendly Concordat.

Making late payments to suppliers could damage relationships between the Council and suppliers and could potentially cause cash flow difficulties for suppliers, dependant on invoice values and suppliers' turnover. It was possible that late payments could result in suppliers putting our account 'on stop' which could cause delays to Council projects. Ultimately late payment could result in the matter being referred to court.

Detailed consideration was given to all the matters set out in the report.

Resolved:- (1) That the current position in respect of BVPI8 be noted.

(2) That a report be submitted to this Committee highlighting maverick spend and relevant processes.

(3) That relevant Procurement Champions attend this Committee to detail key issues of poor performance.

## 7. PROCUREMENT LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Sarah McCall, Performance Officer, presented the submitted report setting out details of the local indicators developed in 2007 to measure the Council's procurement function in terms of delivery of the Procurement Strategy and day-to-day management of the procurement function. The suite of indicators was updated in 2009 to ensure effective monitoring.

The report set out details of the indicators, targets and performance for the year 2009-2010.

A number of issues were raised by the Committee.

Performance against these LPIs would reflect how the Corporate Procurement Strategy was being implemented and embedded across the Council which could impact on the Council's ability to evidence value for money and CPA/CAA scores.

Sarah was asked to raise the issues discussed today at the Procurement Panel to be held on 14th June, 2010.

Resolved:- (1) That current performance be noted.

(2) That the auditing of top suppliers for equality and diversity purposes be reviewed by the Democratic Renewal Scrutiny Panel.

## **8. PROCUREMENT STRATEGY ACTION PLAN.**

Sarah McCall, Performance Officer, presented the submitted report setting out details of the purpose of the Procurement Strategy which was to set out how the Council intended to procure its goods, works and services in order to support the Authority's overall aims and objectives over the life span of the Strategy. It outlined the Council's current position and clearly pointed to areas where we needed to improve, with a supporting action plan to deliver those areas. The action would be managed by the Council's Procurement Panel.

The Strategy was aligned with the Council's Corporate Commissioning Framework which examined how the Council could strategically pull together all commissioning activity to ensure maximum gain from any efficiencies that may be generated.

If the actions in the above plan were not met the refreshed Corporate Procurement Strategy may not be fully implemented and embedded across the Council which could impact on the Council's ability to evidence value for money and CAA scores.

Resolved:- That the current position in respect the action plan be noted.

## **9. DRAFT SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT**

Consideration was given to a draft of the Annual Report, circulated at the meeting.

Resolved:- That any comments on the draft be forwarded to the Scrutiny Team.

## **10. DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME**

Consideration was given to this Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11.

Reference was made to a number of important issues, such as flooding, that needed continual scrutiny and also to change to occur due to the new Coalition Government.

**16D PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 11/06/10**

Resolved:- That a draft programme be developed based on today's discussion.

**11. CORPORATE IMPROVEMENT BOARD - TO APPOINT TWO SCRUTINY MEMBERS**

The Committee expressed the view that its role was to scrutinise corporate improvement rather than be Members of the Corporate Improvement Board.

**12. MEMBERS' TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL - TO APPOINT TWO SCRUTINY MEMBERS**

Resolved:- That Councillors Austen and Steele be appointed.

**13. MINUTES.**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 30th April, 2010 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**14. WORK IN PROGRESS**

Councillor Austen reported on the following :-

- VAR
- Councillor Hussain's portfolio
- new Council Website
- Domestic Violence/Alcohol/Drug abuse

Councillor Whysall reported upon the image and renaissance of Rotherham.

Councillor Jane Hamilton reported upon the Children's Plan.

The Chairman reported on the following:-

- floods
- NHS Rotherham
- Use of Agency Staff and Consultants

**15. CALL-IN ISSUES**

There were no formal call in requests.