

**THE CABINET**  
**Wednesday, 20th July, 2011**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Doyle, Hussain, Rushforth, R. S. Russell, Smith and Wyatt.

Councillor Whelbourn (Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lakin and McNeely.

**C31 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A member of the public asked if there was a database of children and young people with addictions, including alcohol?

The Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services provided information on the various databases being used.

**C32 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP**

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Economic Growth and Prosperity, introduced the minutes of the Local Development Framework Members' Steering Group held on 22nd June, 2011 and commented on the success of the recent Member Training event.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the Local Development Framework Members' Steering Group held on 22nd June, 2011 be received.

**C33 INDICES OF DEPRIVATION 2010**

Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Community Development, Equalities and Young People's Issues, introduced a report by the Chief Executive which set out details of the new Indices of Deprivation for 2010 which had been published by the Communities for Local Government on 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2011. The Indices were first developed to support the national Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in 2000 and aimed to provide a consistent measure of deprivation for all areas in England and assist in monitoring the gap between the most deprived areas and national or borough averages.

Rotherham was ranked 48<sup>th</sup> most deprived district in England in the first Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) in 2000. The revised 2004 Index placed Rotherham at 63<sup>rd</sup> and the Borough improved further to 58<sup>th</sup> in the 2007 Index. The IMD 2010 now ranked Rotherham 53<sup>rd</sup> out of 326 districts. Given the baselines used, the trends indicated that relative deprivation reduced in Rotherham after 1998 but increased again after 2005. Analysis of the nature and distribution of deprivation, change over time and the implications were outlined in the report submitted.

The Indices of Deprivation have been used in the past by the Government and other agencies in defining eligibility for regeneration funding including the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF). Rotherham was not eligible for WNF as the Government tightened the criteria to target 66 authorities rather than the 88 which were NRF funded.

Whilst there was no current proposal to replace WNF, Rotherham was still likely to benefit from small scale external funding or programmes which sought to target the most deprived areas. The more widespread deprivation indicated in the ID2010 compared with the ID2007 meant that more areas in the Borough could potentially benefit.

Data from the Crime Domain suggested that relative crime deprivation in Rotherham had increased, but the Borough had actually improved and closed the gap with England.

The increase in deprivation which the Indices had indicated may increase the benefits to Rotherham from funding which targeted areas of high deprivation. However, the degree to which the coalition Government would use the ID2010 to target resources towards areas of high deprivation was not yet clear.

Cabinet Members emphasised that there was now a major challenge to support deprived areas and people in need, particularly having regard to the significant loss of grant income.

Particular reference was made to crime and information was provided on the data available and the action being taken to continually reduce crime.

Resolved:- (1) That the report and the increase in deprivation in Rotherham be noted.

(2) That the concerns about the baseline used in the Indices of Deprivation 2010, which largely pre-dated the economic downturn and the anomalous trends within the Crime Domain, be noted.

(3) That the continued importance of monitoring actual changes measures by relevant indicators to supplement the Indices of Deprivation be noted.

(4) That it be noted that the most deprived areas in Rotherham had experienced the largest increase in deprivation and continue to need targeted assistance as do areas which were at risk of becoming very deprived.

(5) That a Scrutiny Review be undertaken to examine the impact of regeneration funding on deprivation in Rotherham

## C34

### HEALTH INEQUALITIES

Councillor Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, introduced a report by the Director of Public Health which detailed the 2011 Health Profile for Rotherham and gave the average male life expectancy as 76.6 years, 1.7 years worse than the England average. Female life expectancy was 80.7 years, 1.6 years worse than the England average. Life expectancy was 9.9 years lower for men and 5.9 years lower for women in the most deprived areas of Rotherham than in the least deprived areas.

Smoking rates and levels of adult obesity were above the England average. The percentage of adults eating poorly or exercising regularly from the Health Survey for England were far worse than the England average.

The most recent Index of Multiple Deprivation 2008/09 showed that 17% of the Borough was now amongst the 10% most deprived areas in England compared to only 12% in 2007.

Rotherham's position regarding the wider determinants of health was consistently worse than the England average.

Tackling health inequalities was about co-ordinating the efforts, resources and support of the NHS, RMBC and all local partners and not just how the new proposed Public Health budget would be spent.

Over the last 10 years, all age all cause mortality rates had fallen across the UK and in Rotherham; the Health Inequalities gap in Rotherham had widened. There was a need to understand the demographic pressures and changes as well as the patterns of illness and disease that were continuing to cause health inequalities in Rotherham.

Reference was made to the meeting that was taking place today with a suggestion that the Health and Wellbeing Board should take the lead by holding a Health Summit.

Resolved:- That a Health Summit be held with partners from the NHS, voluntary and community sectors to review the Council's Strategy for tackling health inequalities to be led by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.

**C35 APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER AND DEPUTY ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER**

The Leader introduced a report by the Chief Executive which set out details of how previously the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) had held the roles of Deputy Returning Officer and Deputy Electoral Registration Officer up to the point of his retirement on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2011.

Consideration now needed to be given to the future arrangements for filling the roles.

There were no additional financial implications.

Elections were conducted by the Returning Officer who had a personal responsibility in law. If no valid deputies for the roles referred to in the report submitted were in place, electoral procedures may be jeopardised and the Council would be in breach of the law and voters could be disenfranchised.

**Recommended:- (1) That it be noted the Chief Executive, in his capacity as Returning Officer, had appointed the Senior Manager, Legal and Electoral Services, as a Deputy Returning Officer.**

**(2) That the Senior Manager, Legal and Electoral Services, be appointed as Deputy Electoral Registration Officer.**

**(3) That it be noted that the duration of the above appointments would be linked to that of the appointment to the temporary post of Senior Manager, Legal and Electoral Services, whilst a more wide ranging management review was being undertaken for the future requirements of the Council.**

**C36 LOCALISM BILL**

The Leader introduced a report by the Chief Executive which set out details of the Localism Bill, which was the principal Bill to deliver the Government's stated commitment to devolve power to the lowest level, enabling communities to make decisions as part of the Big Society. An overview of the Bill as introduced was provided in a special Policy Briefing in December, 2010. The Bill had now completed the Commons stages with a number of amendments and now subject to scrutiny in the Lords.

To address the potential wide ranging implications for the Council, a cross-Council Working Group had been established. The Group was currently assessing the provisions of the Bill to identify governance, policy, service delivery and community implications. The findings to date were set out in the report.

There would be financial implications arising from the proposals in the Bill. The most critical was likely to be the proposed arrangements for any increase in Council Tax. In effect, it would be the Secretary of State that determined what the maximum increase would be unless the Council was prepared to hold a referendum on an alternative amount. There could also be considerable costs if the Council was required to undertake several procurement exercises in accordance with the provisions under the "Community Right to Challenge".

There would also be cost and functions associated with any moves for referendums and the maintaining of a list of "assets of community value" and associated functions.

Whilst the Bill set out detail in respect of many of the provisions, there were a significant number of so called "Henry VIII" powers where the legislation gave the Secretary of State new powers to determine the detail and to make changes to the detail. This created an uncertain environment for commencement of the provisions and future implementation. The Bill's provisions could also bring uncertainty to approaches to partnership working including the relationship with Parish Councils.

With regards to Planning Reform, in the short term, there may be a real threat to delivering sufficient housing starts to meet current and future needs due to the period of uncertainty whilst the Council revised its Local Development Documents to reflect local priorities. In the longer term, the greater local focus may also slow the pace of housing delivery overall.

Resolved:- (1) That the "five blocks" of Governance, Communities, Planning, Housing and Commissioning and Procurement approach to assessing the provisions of the Bill be noted.

(2) That the role of Elected Members in their communities be noted.

(3) That the awareness raising and consideration of the implications arising through the Member Development Programme and the reporting to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and staff sessions be noted.

(4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board request Scrutiny Commissions give detailed examination of issues arising in the Localism Bill.

(5) That further reports be received as the Bill passes through Parliament together with details of proposed implementation in Rotherham.

### **C37 REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN 2010/11**

Councillor Akhtar, Deputy Leader, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Finance which detailed how the Council budgeted to spend £216.985 million on its General Fund revenue account in 2010/11. Actual spend against this was £214.756 million, a saving against budget of £2.229 million (or 1.0%).

In addition, the schools budgeted to spend £185.276 million on their Delegated Budgets. Actual spend against this was £185.196 million, an underspend of £80,000 for the year which had been added to Schools' Reserves which as at 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2011, stood at £2.828 million.

The Housing Revenue Account in 2010/11 showed a variance to budget of +£4.118 million which had been met from HRA Reserves.

Reflecting the above outturn position, the Council's Revenue Reserves as at 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2011, stood at reserves available to support the budget £8.4 million and Earmarked Reserves (including Schools and HRA Reserves) of £31.3 million.

Decisions about the level of resources (including reserves and balances) that were deployed to deliver the Council's priorities involved risk and uncertainty. However, the impact of unforeseen circumstances and adverse variances against budget could be minimised by continuing improvements in financial management including the more effective management of financial risks.

(1) Resolved:- (a) That the Council's General Fund, Schools' and the Housing Revenue Outturn Position Statements for 2010/11 be noted.

(b) That the level of the Council's Revenue Reserves as at 31st March, 2011 be noted.

**(2) Recommend:- That under the Council's approved policy on the carry forward of year end balances on the Revenue Account, the underspends of £500,029 be carried forward into 2011/12.**

### **C38 CAPITAL PROGRAMME OUTTURN 2010/11 AND UPDATED ESTIMATES 2011/12 TO 2013/14**

Councillor Akhtar, Deputy Leader, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Finance which detailed how the Council's Capital investment into the regeneration and enhanced infrastructure of the Borough had been £99.633 million. The profile of the investment and updated future expenditure plans were reflected in the Directorate summary table set out in the report together with details of each Directorate programme attached at Appendices 1-4.

The current economic climate and the ongoing impact of the Government's austerity measures required that the Capital Programme be subject to continual oversight and, if necessary, revision to ensure that the Council's Capital Investment plans were aligned with strategic priorities and maximised the value from the limited capital resources available. The updated Programme had been prepared in light of the outcomes for local Government from the Comprehensive Spending Review and the capital resources known to be available to the Council for 2011/12 to 2013/14.

The Council was continuing to undertake a comprehensive review of its assets and buildings portfolio with the aim of rationalising both its operational and non-operational asset holdings which may contribute both a future capital receipt and a revenue saving.

The Capital Programme was funded through a number of sources; borrowing, both supported and unsupported (i.e. prudential borrowing), capital grants/contributions, Major Repairs Allowance, revenue contributions and capital receipts. Any uncertainty over the funding of the Programme rests on confirmation that grants/contributions and capital receipts continued to be available in coming years. Where funding sources were volatile in nature, the risks would be managed by reviewing and where necessary amending the Programme.

Cabinet Members welcomed the extensive investments taking place throughout Rotherham.

Resolved:- (1) That the 2010/11 Capital outturn position be noted.

**(2) Recommended:- That the updated 2011/12 to 2012/13 Capital Programme be approved.**

### **C39 RMBC ICT STRATEGY 2011 TO 2015**

Councillor Akhtar, Deputy Leader, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Finance which set out the new ICT Strategy for Rotherham Council which covered the period 2011-2015.

The Strategy covering the period 2008-2011 had been successfully completed and delivered significant improvements to ICT within the Council. The Strategy for 2011-2015 would build on the investments to support the delivery of services to customers and ensure that the Council continued to provide value for money.

The Strategy clearly set out where future ICT investment would be focused and the expected outcomes and benefits of that investment for a range of stakeholders including customers, citizens, businesses, staff, Members and partners.

Funding would come from several sources to support the implementation of the Strategy with the primary source being the ICT Capital budget. Budget allocation had already been secured for Riverside House, Rawmarsh Joint Service Centre, Housing Revenue Account investment in the Integrated Housing Management System, Computer Refresh and the 2008-2011 ICT Capital Budget.

Allowance had been made in the Medium Term Financial Strategy for the capital required to support the 2011-2015 ICT Capital Budget.

ICT underpinned many of the Council's activities. Carefully considered strategic investment in technology was essential if the Council was to realise the efficiency savings that technology could bring and ensure that it was prepared to deliver shared services where the opportunity arose.

Cabinet Members welcomed the previous Strategy, which had been implemented within the required timeframe and on budget.

Resolved:- (1) That the successful completion of the 2008-2011 ICT Strategy be noted.

(2) That the reasons for creating a new ICT Strategy and the benefits that this would deliver be noted.

(3) That the consultation and ratification process that the new ICT Strategy had been subjected to be noted.

(4) That the 2011-2015 ICT Strategy be approved.

#### **C40      DIGITAL REGION - PROJECT UPDATE**

Councillor Akhtar, Deputy Leader, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Finance, which gave an update on the South Yorkshire Digital Region project.

Digital Region was a high speed broadband network for South Yorkshire which would benefit the region's citizens, businesses and public sector organisations. The project was delivered by Digital Region Ltd. (DRL) which was created using funding from the ERDF by the 4 South Yorkshire Local Authorities.

The Digital Region project would see a total of 690 km of new duct put in place across the region allowing 97% of South Yorkshire to benefit from next generation, superfast broadband and its multitude of benefits to both businesses and households alike.

A total of 502 km of new fibre optic cable had been installed across South Yorkshire which equated to 92% of the 545 km to be installed in phase 1 of the network rollout. 31 telephone exchanges had now been completed out of the initial 36 planned for phase 1 and 54 for the complete network. This would mean that 180,000 premises now had the potential to be connected to the DRL network. By January, 2012, 82% of the households in South Yorkshire would have the option to connect to the DRL network.

99.4 km of new fibre optic cabling had been laid in Rotherham out of a total of 102.1 km for the entire Rotherham area. This meant that the Rotherham network was 97% complete. All 6 telephone exchanges for the Rotherham area had been upgraded and all 6 had been commissioned.

DRL had been awarded the contract for the Council's data and voice network (Minute No. 195 of 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2011). Civic Building would be live on the DRL network by the end of July, 2011. Riverside House would have 2 links into the Digital Region network for resilience, both along Main Street, 1 link going to the Rotherham North telephone exchange and 1 to the Rotherham Central exchange. Riverside's first DRL circuit would go live in September, 2011, with the second circuit going live shortly thereafter.

The DRL network would then be used to facilitate the transfer of servers and data from the old Civic data centre to the new data centre in Riverside House. The majority of the Council's buildings and schools would be migrated over to the new DRL network by April, 2012.

The Capital Programme included provision for a £2 million repayable loan to DRL to support the project. The cost of creating the Council's data network had been budgeted for in the 2011-2015 ICT Capital budget. The annual running cost of the network would be met from existing network budgets and was a reduction of £150,000 per annum when compared to the current cost of providing the network.

Cabinet Members welcomed the good progress being made, but also noted the risk and uncertainties associated with this project.

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

(2) That the Digital Region contract revisions and the progress of the Digital Region project be noted.

#### **C41           EMARKET PLACE SERVICE SOLUTION**

Councillor Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, introduced a report by the Chief Executive on the eMarketplace Service Solution. The eMarketplace was an online web based function which contributed directly to Putting People First and the transformation of Adult Social Care. The eMarketplace would promote both internal and external care providers, such as Assistive Technology, to service users and those who self-funded. Service providers would be on the site and available for customers and self-funders to purchase services from.

The eMarketplace was a leading edge technological solution for Rotherham to improve choice for service users and self-funders. It would enable the Council to respond to the significant challenge of personalisation, demographics and future demand. It would be branded as Rotherham Borough Council, accessible for all users and would provide access for providers to purchase services plus advice, information and signposting to preventative services to enable independence.

There was strong partnership working with all the authorities in Yorkshire and Humber. The procurement was regional and also included Manchester City Council, an approach supported by the Yorkshire and Humber Government Office and by the Association of Directors of Adults Services.

The Yorkshire and Humber Joint Improvement Partnership (JIP) had provided £500,000 Capital funding and the running of the eMarketplace site was to be cost neutral to the participating authorities. Doncaster Council was hosting the regional procurement and would be the first implementer in September, 2011, with Rotherham scheduled for March, 2012.

The intention of participating authorities in the procurement process was for a pricing schedule that meant the eMarketplace would be cost neutral to participating local authorities. It was anticipated that the application of the eMarketplace would reduce transactions costs. There would be a requirement for the system to have a resource in-house for day-to-day issues, but this should be held within current ITC services. It was proposed that the eMarketplace solution would be beneficial for Service users and deliver efficiencies.

Not agreeing to implement the eMarketplace service solution in Rotherham would result in delayed achievement of efficiencies and a poorer choice for Service users and self-funders. It would also result in SMEs in Rotherham not receiving full access to the growing demographics and consequently no improvement in the economic recovery in Rotherham.

It was possible that individual local authorities did not proceed to signing the Inter-Authority Agreement and there was a risk that the provider passed costs onto the local authority when commissioning services. This was mitigated in the cost to providers.

Resolved:- (1) That the signing of an inter-authority agreement with the preferred supplier for an eMarketplace service solution be supported.

(2) That the signing of a hosting agreement with Doncaster Council as the lead procurement authority be supported.

(3) That the benefits and the potential risks of this approach be noted.

#### **C42 RICHMOND PARK COMMUNITY BUILDING**

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Economic Growth and Prosperity, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services, which detailed a request from the Richmond Park Tenants and Residents Association (TARA), which leases the Richmond Park Community Building from the Council, to reconsider the previous decision to lease the building to the TARA at a nominal rent in accordance with policy proposals.

Following further work and investigation, it was proposed that the building be leased to the TARA on a 10 nominal rent basis ahead of the adoption of the community Asset Transfer Policy due to the deteriorating condition of the building and ongoing liability to the Council.

During 2010/11 the building was hired out by the TARA for approximately 4 hours with a £26 income. The associated running costs with the building were approximately £1,398 per annum.

A Health and Safety risk assessment had been carried out which resulted in the boiler being condemned. The Council would need to identify approximately £36,700 of Capital investment to undertake the repairs required to the building. Currently there was no budget provision to support this.

The market rental value was £3,500 per annum.

The building would be leased at a nominal £1 per annum rent as per the proposed Community Asset Transfer Policy.

The Neighbourhood Partnership Team would work with the TARA to ensure that their cash flow forecast was fully understood and adopted as a minimum business plan to ensure that the TARA could manage their obligations and realise their aspirations.

If the TARA were unable to manage the lease and maintenance costs associated with the building there was a risk the building would be transferred back to the Council.

Divergence from the previously published draft policy may cause uncertainty and hinder the adoption of a Council-wide Policy.

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

(2) That the Director of Asset Management negotiate the lease for a term to be agreed and monitor compliance with the terms of the lease with regards to the asset transferred further to a Service Level Agreement with Neighbourhoods and Adult Services.

(3) That Legal and Democratic Services complete the necessary documentation.

(4) That Housing and Neighbourhood Services provide the necessary support and monitor the community outcomes of the project for the duration of the lease.

#### **C43**

#### **RATIONALISATION OF PROPERTY ASSETS - ADOPTION OF AN ASSET TRANSFER POLICY**

Further to Minute No. 192 of 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2011, Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Economic Growth and Prosperity, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services, which set out the proposed Asset Transfer Policy.

Meetings had been held within Asset Management between the Director of Asset Management, the Estates Manager and the Land Property Team which had resulted in a revision to the previously submitted draft principles of an Asset Transfer Policy.

The streamlined Policy document set out the:-

- Policy.
- Qualifying criteria for the applicant.
- The asset subject to transfer.
- Assets that were to be excluded from transfer.
- Basis of asset transfer.
- Implementation of the Policy.
- Costs.

The rationalisation of property assets was essential to reduce budget pressures and to deliver front line services in the most cost effective way possible. Financial impacts upon individual assets would be reported as part of the Policy as well as risks and uncertainties.

(1) Resolved:- (a) That the Asset Transfer Policy, as detailed in the report submitted, be approved.

(b) That Legal and Democratic Services develop a generic agreement template to document the basis of Asset Transfers as at 7.4 in the report submitted.

(c) That Ward Councillors be consulted before any premises are disposed of.

**(2) Recommended:- That the Director of Asset Management exercise current delegated powers in relation to any asset that qualifies for disposal under the Policy.**

#### **C44 SERVICES FOR DISABLED CHILDREN**

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Economic Growth and Prosperity, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Children and Young Peoples' Services which detailed concerns expressed by professionals working in education, social care and health over an apparent lack of specialist provision or flexibility within existing resources which had led to children being placed out of area and particularly at residential special schools. Although the number of children concerned was small, the cost of such placements was very high and the pressures on the families, carers and children and young people involved could be extreme.

There was a need to develop the provision for children and young people who may benefit from a more flexible social care and education partnership and develop a comprehensive integrated approach to provision for disabled children and family support across the age ranges from diagnosis up to 25 years of age and to have those needs met within Rotherham.

The current position with regard to ongoing discussions and planning around the development of services to disabled children, including the background and rationale for the discussions, was set out in the report submitted. It reviewed all of the considered options for the development and, as a result of further recent analysis of data, presented the option, which if implemented, would achieve considerable efficiencies in cost of provision for looked after disabled children.

Both the Churchfields and Park Lea options had been discounted.

There was currently a deficiency in Service provision which could be overcome by implementation of the above proposals. Any surplus arising from the Churchfields receipt was to contribute to 'central capital funds'.

The Order centre site was technically complex to redevelop. The acquisition and redevelopment of a building for a "learning house" was subject to availability on the market. It was unlikely that children and young people with complex needs currently placed out of area could be brought back into Rotherham unless the proposal was carried out. The proposed development aimed to minimise the need for further such placements and created a saving in the medium to long term. The fact that a significant proportion of those attending out of area special schools would be reaching school leaving age during the preparatory period may present an opportunity to make further medium term revenue savings.

Resolved:- (1) That the proposals set out in the report submitted be approved.

(2) That the reconfiguration of the Orchard Children's Centre building to accommodate the reduction in current overnight respite services from two units to an eight bed short breaks and one emergency bed unit and on the same site be approved in principle.

(3) That the establishment and development of a 5 bedded medium to long term therapeutic residential unit within the Orchard Centre for children and young people with a range of cognitive, physical disabilities, learning difficulties, challenging behaviour and attachment disorders be approved.

(4) That the site at Churchfields be put back on the open market.

#### **C45 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs, indicated below, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006).

#### **C46 WORKSMART AND TOWN CENTRE ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY UPDATE**

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Economic Growth and Prosperity, introduced a report by the Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services on the implementation of the Town Centre Accommodation Strategy.

The finance and risks and uncertainties associated with this agreement were set out in detail as part of the report.

Cabinet Members asked that consideration be given to the time for the Library Service to be not available to be as short as possible or for temporary facilities to be provided.

Resolved:- (1) That the time frames for the moves into Riverside House and Bailey House be noted.

(2) That the services to be provided in Riverside House and Bailey House be noted.

(3) That the efficiencies realised by the adoption of agile working as part of the WorkSmart Programme be noted.

(4) That the impact on service delivery, as described in the report, be approved.

[Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act – information relates to business affairs]

#### **C47 LINKROTHERHAM/HEALTHWATCH REVIEW**

Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Community Development, Equalities and Young People's Issues, introduced a report by the Chief Executive on the findings and recommendations arising from the review of LINKrotherham undertaken jointly by the Council and NHS Rotherham.

The report also put forward transitional arrangements to establish a local HealthWatch as required by the Health and Social Care Bill.

The finance and risks and uncertainties associated with this agreement were set out in detail as part of the report.

Cabinet Members fully supported the establishment of a local HealthWatch that would benefit users and give value for money.

Resolved:- (1) That the outcome and conclusion of the review be noted.

(2) That the transitional arrangements to establish a local HealthWatch be approved.

(3) That the report be submitted to Rotherham NHS and Rotherham Hospital.

(4) That this matter be considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board and scrutinised by the Health Select Commission.

[Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act – information relates to business affairs]

#### **C48 REVIEW OF COMMUNITY LEGAL ADVICE SERVICES**

Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Community Development, Equalities and Young People's Issues, introduced a report by the Chief Executive on the review that had been undertaken of Social Welfare Law provision in Rotherham by an officer and Member Working Group.

It was proposed that a new delivery model for providing advice and information be implemented to improve advice provision in Rotherham. The new way of working proposed a more streamlined, cost effective service to the customer maximising the existing resources available in the Borough.

The finance and risks and uncertainties associated with this agreement were set out in detail as part of the report.

Cabinet Members noted the risks and uncertainties created by the reduced availability of funds.

Resolved:- (1) That the improvements realised in service delivery as a result of the proposals be noted.

(2) That the implementation of the new Service model to deliver Community Legal Advice, Social Welfare Law, information and advice, be approved.

(3) That the restructuring of RBT Welfare Rights Service, which would result in a reduction in staff from 7 FTE to 4 FTE and a change on focus for the Service from providing general welfare rights advice to a specialist appeals service to reflect the local needs of the advice sector, be approved.

(4) That information on the various Advice Services available throughout the borough be provided for all Cabinet Members.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act – information relates to business affairs)