

**CABINET MEMBER FOR SAFE AND ATTRACTIVE NEIGHBOURHOODS**  
**Monday, 5th September, 2011**

Present:- Councillor McNeely (in the Chair).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Goulty and Kaye.

**J19. ACCREDITATION AND SHARED POWER - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 9 of 20<sup>th</sup> June, 2011, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services submitted an update following consideration at the Safer Rotherham Partnership Executive Group and the Integrated Services – South Yorkshire Strategic Group.

It was recognised that within South Yorkshire there were different issues to be addressed and that the speed of implementation (some by pilot schemes) would vary. For Rotherham, it was necessary to make sure that the scheme considered local solutions and a full understanding of the impact of the introduction of the approach.

The SRP Executive had requested that 2 immediate issues be considered and reported back:-

- Which of the possible powers being available by the Chief Constable would Rotherham wish to prioritise for adoption?
- What localised service design to integrated working would we wish to consider?

The Chief Constable could grant accreditation for up to 43 powers but for South Yorkshire this had been limited to 21. The 21 powers were in the main quick “discharge” powers e.g. Fixed Penalty Notices for a range of anti-social issues. Of the 21, each local authority had been requested to identify 5 by which prioritisation could be focussed for initial implementation.

South Yorkshire Police had also been requested to consider the release of further powers outside the overall 21 being made available to strengthen the control of alcohol sale and use.

2 options for service delivery models had been suggested. Across South Yorkshire each district was drawing its bespoke model together. The 2 options were:-

- Delivery Model 1 – to create a new uniformed team of individuals with as many warranted powers as was practicable from all partner agencies. The team would be aligned to a geographical area within the district and would tackle any and all local issues in relation to public confidence and anti-social behaviour
- Delivery Model 2 - To allocate warranted powers to the right people, in the right uniform, in the right place at the right time. To ensure staffing was aligned to demand management and the requirements of the local areas in order to target public confidence and anti-social behaviour issues.

It was considered that Model 2 be pursued for Rotherham as it provided a realistic model that readily took on the improvements in shared working without the need of structure, governance and tasking change. It built on the pragmatic response model that had established identifiable services and did not over complicate branding requirements within communities whilst saving on new uniform design and procurement costs.

Resolved:- (1) That the following 5 powers be prioritised in the development of the Accredited Powers Scheme for Rotherham:-

- (i) Power to require giving of name and address
- (ii) Power to require name and address for anti-social behaviour
- (iii) Power to require persons aged under 18 to surrender alcohol
- (iv) Power to issue Penalty Notices for causing harassment, alarm or distress
- (v) Power to issue Penalty Notices for throwing fireworks.

(2) That the appraisal of the service delivery model for the development of enhancing integration of safer neighbourhood services with Rotherham be welcomed and Option 2 submitted in the report be confirmed as the model on which the scheme should be based.

(3) That the Safer Rotherham Partnership's Executive Group be advised of (1) and (2) above.

(4) That, once implemented, a report be submitted on the usage of the powers in the first 3 months.

## **J20. HISTORIC WARDEN FUNCTIONS - NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES**

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on an element of the non-core business tasks that were historically undertaken by Sheltered Housing Wardens but would not be undertaken by the new merged Service.

There were specific tasks that could be undertaken by EDS through a Facilities Management Framework and tasks that could continue to be managed by the Neighbourhood Centres Manager within the remit of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services. These were as follows:-

### EDS New Facilities Management Framework

- The Framework would need to be bespoke for each individual site and would set the foundations for fee proposals based on the tasks undertaken across the Neighbourhood Centre portfolio.
- It was proposed that the following areas of responsibility be handed over to EDS under Service Level Agreement arrangements:-
  - Cleaning of the Neighbourhood Centres – annual charge for the service approximately £146,908.05
  - Annual Programming:-  
Resetting of time clocks on heating systems

PAT testing  
Annual service of fire alarms, extinguishers etc.  
Decommissioning of the remainder of communal payphones  
Identify efficiency savings and work with Neighbourhood Centres Manager and partners to resolve  
Establish and prioritise forward investment programme  
Support management function with Neighbourhood Centres Manager and relevant in-house teams

Work to be retained by Neighbourhood and Adult Services

- Legionella Testing. In the interim this would be managed by the Neighbourhood Centres Manager and Home Enablers until 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2011. It would then be formally handed over permanently to Neighbourhood Champions.
- Fire Alarm Testing. It was proposed that the Neighbourhood Housing Officers who work geographically should test the fire alarms as required in all Neighbourhood Centres from 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2011. In the interim, Home Enabling Officers would carry out the weekly testing with immediate effect.
- Neighbourhood Centres Manager. For the short term, it was proposed that the role continued to be funded through the Housing Revenue Account and the post remain within the NAS Directorate to focus on the development of the Centres, supporting tenants and residents and acting as a co-ordinator for the Service Level agreement with EDS. It was proposed that, in line with the new service, that it be embedded into the role of the Home Enabler and combined within the current duties of the Neighbourhood Champions.
- Activity Co-ordination. The responsibility for undertaking communal activities had been assimilated into the new merged job descriptions of Home Enabler. This would offer a more flexible approach to how it delivered activities moving forward.
- Guest Bedrooms. It was proposed that a re-evaluation of the guest bedrooms be undertaken and, following contact with customers regarding the usage in 2008, further consultation be undertaken to gain a customer perspective on the future of guest bedrooms.
- Laundry Facilities. Due to the complexity of collecting monies, it was proposed that the function be incorporated into the tenant's rent and paid for as part of the communal facility charge i.e. that the weekly charge be increased from the current £4.08/£4.16 after 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2012 to a flat rate of £5.00 on schemes that had a laundry facility and collected via the OHMS system. A consultation programme would commence in September, 2011 to inform customers.
- Communal Payphones. It was proposed that a consultation exercise be undertaken on the potential to remove communal payphones taking into account current usage and any issues or objections customers may have.
- Consultation. The Neighbourhood Centres Manager would commence a consultation programme in September, 2011.

Discussion ensued on laundry facilities, the viability of such provision, usage, alternative methods of collecting monies and consultation with users.

Resolved:- (1) That the transfer of functions identified in Section 7.1, (New Facilities Management Framework), 7.2 (Cleaning) and 7.3 (Annual Programming) of the report submitted to Environment and Development Services be approved.

(2) That the commencement of a consultation exercise with tenants identified in 7.8, (Guest Bedrooms), 7.9, (Laundry Facilities) 7.10 (Communal Payphones), as set out in 7.11 of the report submitted, be approved with a further report being submitted on the outcomes in November, 2011.

(3) That further discussions take place, prior to consultation with tenants, with regard to laundry facilities.

#### **J21. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

#### **J22. PETITION - EASTWOOD VILLAGE**

The Democratic Services Manager reported receipt of a petition, containing 15 signatures, regarding Eastwood Village and the number of problems being experienced by residents.

Resolved:- (1) That the petition be received.

(2) That the issues raised be investigated and report submitted thereon.

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

#### **J23. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR - WICKERSLEY**

Further to Minute No. 10 of 20<sup>th</sup> June, 2011, the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services reported on the investigations and work that had taken place into the issues raised by the petitioners.

Resolved:- (1) That the Council's and partners' action in response to the petition be noted.

(2) That the plan for officers to directly meet with the lead petitioners and also introduce "community surgeries" with partners, to allow direct discussions with other local residents on concerns they held, be noted.

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

**J24. HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS STAGE 3 COMPLAINT**

It was noted that a meeting of a Complaints Panel held been held on 15th July, 2011, comprising Councillors Atkin (in the Chair), Nightingale and Whysall. The Panel heard a complaint received from Mr. L. relating to his belief that the Council's negligence had led to delays in completing Phase 2 of a planned regeneration in the Canklow area resulting in him being unable to develop a viable business or sell his property causing financial hardship.

The Panel had not upheld the complaint.

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

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