

**COUNCIL MEETING
2nd March, 2016**

Present:- The Mayor (Councillor Maggi Clark) (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Ali, Astbury, Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Buckley, Cowles, Currie, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Finnie, Fleming, Godfrey, Hague, Hoddinott, Hughes, Hunter, Jepson, Jones, Khan, Lelliott, McNeely, Middleton, Parker, Pickering, Pitchley, Read, Reeder, Reynolds, Roche, Roddison, Rose, Rushforth, Sansome, Sims, Smith, Steele, Taylor, John Turner, Julie Turner, C. Vines, M. Vines, Wallis, Watson, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

136. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor was pleased to announce that since the last Council Meeting she had represented the borough of Rotherham on 44 occasions many of which have been to do with young people. The Air Training Corps 75th Anniversary Parade and service saw around 800 air cadets from South Yorkshire including many from Rotherham march through Doncaster. Whiston Junior and Infant School showcased their amazing young pupils in their Whiston's Got Talent event, Rotherfeds One Billion and Rising flash mob in All Saints' Square saw young people from Canklow, East Herringthorpe, Dalton and Thrybergh use music and dance to spread a message of peace and call for violence against women to end and YMCA White Rose's Tribo Fogo used Clifton Park as a backdrop for a tribal theatrical enactment and all done with fire and music, beat boxing and skate boards.

The Town Hall Open Day was very successful with dozens of people taking the tours and visits were hosted from Thorpe Hesley Friday Club, Kimberworth WI, St John's Ambulance Rotherham District Division juniors and seniors, and members of REMA's hate crime project.

The Mayor attended the launch of the Carer's Constitution, the launch, at the District General Hospital, of a secondary breast cancer booklet, the launch of Active for Health at New York Stadium and the launch of the African Communities Network.

The Mayor also attended the opening of the Anne Frank exhibition in Riverside and the Steelos gallery at MAGNA and urged everyone to visit. Chinese New Year was celebrated with the Wah Hong Chinese Association and the dragon in the Town Hall foyer was made by the young people of Springwell Gardens to celebrate this.

On Monday the adventure that was the wonderful world of Grimm and Co. was entered into, which could only be described as magical and visitors needed to be prepared to be amazed. Rotherham was lucky to have this.

This was just a flavour of some of the positive things that have recently happened in Rotherham; however negative things that have happened in Rotherham were once again in the news.

First the Mayor wished to acknowledge the successful prosecutions in the child sexual exploitation trial. The Mayor hoped everyone would join her in thanking those brave young women who came forward and gave evidence in this case. One member, quite rightly, described them as torchbearers for everyone, who have spoken out not only for themselves but for other women. Hopefully their bravery would encourage more victims to come forward.

The Mayor also want to acknowledge the conviction of Mushin Ahmed's killers.

And finally on behalf of the Council could the Mayor send condolences to the family of Maltby pensioner, Tommy Ward, who last week died in hospital five months after he was severely beaten by robbers in his own home.

137. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chief Executive submitted apologies for absence from Councillors Burton, Cutts, Gosling, Hamilton, Mallinder, Price, Robinson, Russell, Tweed and Whysall.

138. PETITIONS

The Chief Executive submitted the following petitions which had been referred to the appropriate Directorates for consideration:-

- Containing 13 signatures from residents of Godstone Road objecting to the extension of the driveway for the Tasibee Group.
- Containing 102 signatures from affiliated societies and members objecting to the closure of the Biological Records Centre urging the Council to recognise the national importance of the Biological Records Centre and support it in its ongoing work.

139. COMMUNICATIONS

No communications had been received.

140. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Currie, Rose, Sansome and Whelbourn declared personal interests in the Notice of Motion – European Union (Agenda Item 16) on the grounds of their involvement with the steel industry.

141. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 27th January, 2016, be approved for signature by the Mayor.

Councillor Atkin referred to Page 29 of the agenda pack and the response to Councillor Reeder on Question 11 in her absence and asked if she had in fact put suggested roads forward for repair and was advised she had put five forward when the suggestion had been for three.

Councillor Currie again referred to Minute No. 125 and asked for a response to his query about risk registers and Licensing.

He also referred to Minute No. 129 and application RB2015/1169 and asked for written confirmation whether or not the Looked After Children Council had been written to as part of the formal consultation process.

Mover:- Councillor Read

Seconder:- Councillor Watson

142. MINUTES OF THE CABINET/COMMISSIONERS' DECISION MAKING MEETINGS

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making held on 15th and 23rd February, 2016, be adopted, with the inclusion of Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in the attendance.

Mover:- Councillor Read

Seconder:- Councillor Watson

143. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(1) Mr. Eyre referred to Facebook where he saw the post "Labour commits additional £10 million to fixing Rotherham's roads". Acting due to the upcoming election aside was there a list of priority roads which were in need of fixing and if so who chose the list, residents, councillors or officers or others?

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that as part of the Community Road Shows held last year residents gave feedback on the issues that were important to them, as part of that feedback the state of the roads was an area highlighted (Page 3 Views from Rotherham). The £10m would be allocated according to criteria in the published Highway Asset Management Plan. Any work carried out was based on condition data, which was collected by specialist surveying machinery and by Highways Inspectors carrying out walked visual surveys to a particular standard. This data together with information reported by Councillors and members of the public was brought together into a works selection matrix, which could be found in Section 11 of the Highways Asset Management Plan. The Highway Asset

Management Plan was on the website at -
http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/200083/roads_highways_and_pavements

In a supplementary question Mr. Eyre confirmed residents of Holderness and Rother Vale had contacted him regarding the condition of the roads in those areas and asked if the Council would look at out of centre roads such as on the B6067 Toad Lane.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, asked Mr. Eyre to report any roads of concern.

(2) Mrs. S. Hudson referred to some areas having buses which run every ten minutes while other areas, like Wentworth Parks in Swinton, have no service at all. Some residents report feeling isolated and abandoned by a lack of access to public transport. With an increasingly aging population aren't regular bus services essential in ALL areas?

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, thanked Mrs. Hudson for her question and agreed that high quality public transport was essential to communities across Rotherham. Bus services were de-regulated in the area and decisions about the routes and the frequency of buses were predominantly commercial decisions that were made by local bus companies.

A petition had been received by the Council and discussed with the Transport Executive.

Where bus companies do not operate a commercial service, a supported bus network could be introduced by South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive where defined criteria have been met. The current criteria aimed to provide access to a 30 minute daytime service within either 400m (or 5 min walk) or within 600m (7 or 8 min walk) to a frequent bus service of 10 to 15 minute frequency. This criteria extended to 800m on Sundays and evenings. Much of Wentworth Parks estate was within 600m of an available bus route and, therefore, was unlikely to benefit from a publically funded service.

The South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive were unable to support the petition, but the issue would continue to be raised on an ongoing basis.

In a supplementary question Mrs. Hudson asked if Leaders and Councillors would support the Swinton Councillors in their quest to ask companies to consider communities as well as profit, given that a lot of people were disabled and were unable to walk to a bus stop that was located a long way from where they lived.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, confirmed her willingness to provide support and would continue to raise this with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive regarding the petition and the access of local bus services for people.

(3) Mr. Cutts asked how many domestic properties were there with a “Rate Reduction” or “Council Tax Deduction” due to religious circumstances within the household, in Rotherham.

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, confirmed there was one domestic property in the borough which received a 50% Council Tax discount as all occupants in the property were part of the same Mormon religious community and met the specific criteria defined in the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

In a supplementary question Mr. Cutts confirmed he had overheard two members of staff referring to this property and asked if he may have a further meeting with either Councillor Alam or Councillor Watson.

144. REVENUE BUDGET SETTING REPORT 2016/17

Further to Minute No. 29 of the meeting of the Cabinet/Commissioners’ Decision Making Meeting held on 23rd February, 2016, consideration was given to the report which proposed a Revenue Budget for 2016/17 based on the outcome of the Council’s Financial Settlement, budget consultation and the consideration of Directorate budget proposals through the Council’s formal Budget and Scrutiny process (Overview and Scrutiny Management Board).

The Leader of the Council spoke of cuts that totalled £116 million. Today the funding gap had risen to £138 million. Over the next two years it would rise to £164 million and the numbers were difficult to comprehend.

About 1,500 fewer people were employed by Rotherham Council than six years ago and by 2025, another 1,500 jobs could be gone.

This was the reality of Tory austerity. Not some quick shift of funding, some short term cuts to balance the books, but a radical and fundamental shrinking of the state and the biggest change to local government funding since the Second World War.

The task was to defend the most vulnerable, to be more efficient, and to face the reality of a future in which the Council would be almost entirely dependent on council tax and business rates generated locally.

The Leader paid tribute to his Labour Group colleagues who have battled through this conundrum over the last few months and outlined the budget which would:-

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

- Demonstrate once again the commitment to ensuring Children's Services met the standards that Rotherham families needed. The package today totalled a budget increase of £12 million: including funding the larger compliment of children's social workers, meet the commitment to improve social worker pay moving towards a more permanent workforce - and increasing the amount of money available for long term support to survivors of child sexual exploitation.
- Secondly, it responded to public priorities around the local environment; litter, grass cutting. The additional funding was being protected for Streetpride made last year – and across the capital and revenue budgets more than a quarter of a million pounds would be made available for local projects determined by Members and delivered through Area Assemblies.

The extra investment in road resurfacing had already seen something like 70 streets resurfaced this year. In the capital budget today, the Council would commit to spend an extra £10 million over the next four years. That commitment would mean that the amount of money the Council spent on road maintenance would have been maintained at double the 2014/15 level every year for five years.

- Thirdly, because it was the right thing to do, and because it was known that the future of funding for Council services hinged on it, the Council would not reduce its commitment to deliver 10,000 more private sector jobs over the next ten years. The award winning RiDO team would be prevented from falling off the edge of the funding cliff as previous grant funding expired. In the capital budget an in-principle commitment was outlined to invest up to £17 million in the fabric of the town centre and a £5 million Development Fund would be brought forward as part of the capital programme, in line with our Growth Plan.
- Finally, the Council would continue to seek to mitigate the worst impacts of Tory austerity on those with the lowest incomes and continue to maintain the Council Tax Support scheme, so that those on the very lowest incomes were asked to pay no more than 8.5% of the full council tax bill, with continued support to fund support for local foodbanks, and credit union alternatives to payday lenders.

In such tough budget circumstances, it was right that the Council tried to protect frontline services and encourage efficiency. The revenue budget sought to maximise the available funding for residents' priorities by reducing the cost of capital debt and saved £2 million next year from PFI repayments.

To balance the budget, in the absence of government council tax freeze grant, a 1.9% council tax rise was being proposed, plus a further 2% rise in line with George Osborne's social care levy. In total, for the average Rotherham household this amounted to a 65p per week rise. For the poorest households, it was less than 6p per week.

Invest to save opportunities would continue to be pursued and more effective use of technology and even with plans for extra capital investment, the cost of the Council's borrowing over the next five years was expected to be 20% less than it had been for the last five years.

Despite all this, the budget pressures and need to reform the Council came together to make thinking differently about the services of the future, such as the Youth Service. Outside funding had been secured to support the ReachOut CSE project with Barnardo's and now a further look was required at how Early Help services reached the children who needed support.

At the same time Rotherham had the fourteenth most expensive adult social care in the country and one of the fastest growing elderly populations, so there was no choice but to act. Reforming the Re-enablement Service alone, bringing it into line with practice elsewhere in the country, would save more than £1m combined with working more closely with Health colleagues to help people to live independently into old age.

Where the Council could act in response to public concerns it was doing so with no school crossing patrols needing to be lost in the coming year as it was being explored with schools how funding could be secured for the long term. A further look would be made to the Visitor Centre to ensure the Civic Theatre was not inadvertently harmed.

This budget froze Councillors' allowances in cash terms at the levels they were last year, as approved by the Independent Review Panel, and it cut the cost of the Town Hall by more than £50,000.

In summary, the priorities of the public have been heard and this budget meant no community library closures, no school crossing patrols lost, no less litter picking, no reduction in household waste recycling centres and the town centre public toilets staying open.

It meant more permanent social workers, more road repairs, working for more jobs and businesses, more community events that would bring people together.

Mover: Councillor Read

Seconder:- Councillor Alam

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Councillor Parker proposed an amendment to Rotherham's Budget for 2016/17 and expressed his concerns about the Right to Buy Scheme and how only a third of the funds were retained by the Council. Stocks could not be replenished as rebuilding was restricted.

His proposals related to a feasibility study establishing a private limited housing company for the purposes of providing housing at affordable rates for Rotherham people. This company would bring financial benefits to the Council and numerous new housing stock of the sort that the Council were not restricted to what it could do.

Various options had been considered and discussions had taken place with senior officers about the viability of the option similar to a scheme in Sheffield City Council.

The amendment was for Housing for Affordable Rent:-

That this Council would provide the necessary funds of £70,000 to the Strategic Housing and Investment Manager for that department to carry out a feasibility study on the possibility that the Council should set up a Limited Liability Housing Company for the purposes of providing housing at affordable rents. This funding would be found by using £70,000 from the Transformation Reserves which is in the budget (this is identified on page 71 of the Council agenda papers).

Mover: Councillor Parker

Seconder:- Councillor Jepson

Councillors C. Vines and Reynolds spoke in favour of and applauded the amendment and suggested this should have been considered previously rather than too little being done too late.

Councillor Currie was in favour of a feasibility study being undertaken as long as this brought some good to the Council.

Councillor Wallis thanked Councillor Parker for his suggested amendment, but confirmed discussions were already taking place with officers regarding the pressures on the Housing Revenue Account and a response was provided within the Housing Strategy being put forward on this agenda. Whilst in principle the Cabinet Member did not disagree with what was being suggested, it was noted she had issue with the £70,000 and was not able to offer commitment.

The Leader of the Council was also unable to commit to the £70,000, but gave his personal assurance that this would be considered as part of the Housing Strategy and invited Councillor Parker to be part of the discussions with the Cabinet Member.

The vote was put for the first part of the amendment and LOST.

Councillor Parker went on to outline the second part to his amendment. This related to the redirection of funds for the promotion of inclusion and community cohesion, which had amounted to £1.6 million and described his own personal experiences of a local club's involvement in ensuring young people did not become socially isolated or excluded and suggested funds should be redirected accordingly to projects much like he had described.

He, therefore, suggested the amendment for Community Cohesion Redirection of Funds:-

That this Council shall actively promote the use of community cohesion funds in Rotherham to encourage all community groups that promote inclusion in their sports, youth and social activities. That they would positively discriminate in favour of e.g. youth sports clubs, youth clubs, scouts, cubs, girl guides, senior citizen clubs and activities.

Mover: Councillor Parker

Seconder:- Councillor Jepson

Councillor Reynolds was happy to support the amendment and described how this went some way to combatting particular issues.

Councillor Cowles believed this was the right way to go and supported the amendment, but in doing so suggested that further consideration be given to single faith schools which could address some of the integration issues.

Councillor Roddison described his own support to local groups and his use of his Community Leadership Fund in recognising the important contribution that these type of groups made to young people's lives. Whilst agreeing with the sentiment of bringing people together was unable to give his support to removing funds from an important budget without further clarity.

Councillor Parker pointed out he was not asking for removal of the funds purely for this to be redirected to various schemes.

The Leader was also unable to support the amendment on the absence of more solid information and believed this would be bad budgeting to accept it. However, he suggested this would be an excellent topic for Scrutiny to take forward and explore further on the contributed spend and activity.

There was obviously some good work taking place as outlined, but there was also an opportunity for Councillor Parker to be involved with his Area Assembly and discuss his proposals with them.

Councillor Steele welcomed the opportunity for further work by Scrutiny, but reiterated the funding opportunities through the Community Leadership Fund.

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

The vote was put for the second part of the amendment and LOST.

Debate, therefore, continued on the substantive motion by the Leader.

Councillor Vines was not in favour of the budget put forward by the Leader on the grounds that it did not go far enough into looking at the future for the borough and he would not support anything he had had little input into. Nothing was being done for the Council to review itself to look into making a profit for reinvestment. This Council would fail without proper investment which the Opposition Party had put forward an alternative budget which looked at investments last year.

Councillor Currie was happy to support the budget proposals and in doing so recognised the hard work that had gone into pulling the proposals together. However, he queried the questions about the Housing Revenue Account and was reassured by the further look at the reshaping of Early Help Service and would welcome a further discussion in this area with the relevant Cabinet Member.

Councillor Watson was also supporting the budget proposals which he regarded as sensible in the context of Central Government cuts. He drew particular attention to the heavy spend in Adult Social Care and the need to ensure that children and vulnerable people remained supported, whilst listening to budget feedback particularly around School Crossing Patrol Wardens.

Councillor Reeder referred to the £5 million that had been received from Central Government and whether this had been spent.

Councillor Jepson expressed his concern over staff losses, the cuts to the Youth Service and Parish Councils and suggested some consideration be given to redirecting the funds from Area Assemblies to Parish Councils.

Councillor Ellis spoke in favour of the budget which had been fully costed and worked through with no alternative option put forward by the leading opposition group.

Councillor Hoddinott spoke in favour of the proposals drawing attention to the School Crossing Patrol Wardens, which was a measure of listening to public consultation. £6.3 million had also been taken from the Council's budget through the academisation of schools.

Councillor Steele was in support of the budget proposals and described how the budget was spent and how this must be reconfigured in light of the budget cuts and the move to Council's becoming more self-sustaining. The Sheffield City Region, it was hoped, would bring business to the area.

Councillor Cowles referred to the number of proposed staff redundancies and the increase in senior management and social workers. He could have proposed an alternative budget, but felt there was little merit in doing so.

Councillor Reynolds described the exclusion of the opposition and how the suggestion of alternatives would have been simply voted against.

Councillor Alam offered his support to the budget which had been a challenging process and continued to support the elderly, children and vulnerable people.

Councillor Wallis in supporting the budget highlighted the hard work that had gone into the budget process and passed comment about the Housing Revenue Account and the significant challenge because of Government policy, the reserves that would increase at the year end, the spending decisions on the Capital Programme, the staggering high value property levy, reductions in the Revenue Support Grant, projected increase in the Right to Buy sales and the pay to stay legislation.

Councillor Parker referred to business acumen, the formation of the budget proposals and in dismissing his amendments believed those in charge were not capable of running the Council.

In his right to reply the Leader addressed many of the comments made and acknowledged the concerns about Youth Services by Councillor Currie, which would be subject to further discussion, confirmed to Councillor Reeder that the £5 million was to be spent this year and the year after, the unwelcome news about the reduction in support to Parish Councils as raised by Councillor Jepson, the level of scrutiny involvement in the budget process as raised by Councillor Reynolds, the lack of support to Councillor Parker's amendments to the budget proposals and suggested the opposition party look to submitting an alternative budget for consideration next year.

Resolved:- (1) That as set out in this report the proposals for a balanced revenue budget for 2016/17 and the impact of the budget proposals in 2017/18 and 2018/19 be approved.

(2) That the investment proposals as set out in the budget report (Appendix 2) noting that some of this investment is required to address inherent budget pressures and some is required to provide scope for growth and improvement be approved.

(3) That the proposed use of Reserves as set out in this report be approved.

(4) That the comments and advice of the interim Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services (Section 151 Officer), provided in compliance with Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, as to the robustness of the estimates included in the Budget and the adequacy of reserves for which the Budget provides be noted and accepted.

(5) That the consultation feedback from the public and partners following publication of Directorate budget savings proposals on the Council's website for public comment through to 12th February 2016 (Section 5 of this report and Appendix 3) be noted.

(6) That the proposed use of Capital Receipts to fund the first £2m of severance costs arising from service reconfiguration to deliver efficiencies and improved outcomes for clients and residents. See Efficiency Strategy (Appendix 4) be approved.

(7) That the planned review of Habershon House Outdoor Education Centre which will report back to Cabinet in June 2016 (Paragraph 3.27) be noted.

(8) That an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the Borough's element excluding precepts) of 3.95% - this being comprised of a 2% precept for Adult Social Care services (a new precept announced in the provisional settlement in December 2015 for Authorities with Adult Social Care responsibilities) and a 1.95% increase in the Council's own basic level of Council Tax be approved.

(8) That the precept figures from South Yorkshire Police Authority, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority and the various Parish Councils and Parish Meetings within the Borough be incorporated, when known, into the recommendation.

Mover:- Councillor Read, Leader

Seconder:- Councillor Alam

(The Mayor – Councillor Clark, Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Ali, Astbury, Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Buckley, Currie, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Godfrey, Hoddinott, Hughes, Jones, Khan, Lelliott, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Read, Roche, Roddison, Rose, Rushforth, Sansome, Sims, Smith, Steele, Taylor, Wallis, Watson, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen voted in favour of the proposals)

(Councillors Cowles, Finnie, Fleming, Hague, Hunter, Jepson, Middleton, Parker, Reeder, Reynolds, John Turner, Julie, Turner, C. Vines and M. Vines voted against the proposals)

145. SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17

Consideration was given to the report introduced by the Leader which set out details of the calculation of the Council Tax for Rotherham's parished and unparished areas for the financial year 2016/17 incorporating the new 2% Adult Social Care "Precept" encouraged by the Government and included both the Police and Crime Commissioner's and the Fire and Rescue Authority's Precepts as well as parish councils' precepts.

Resolved:- (1) That it be noted that:-

(a) the Council Tax Base for the whole Council area for 2016/17 calculated on 27th January 2016 (minute C117) is 67,149.57 Band D Equivalent Properties (item T) in section 31B of the Local Government Act 1992 as amended (the Act)).

(b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish Precept relates the tax base is as set out in the table below:-

Parished Areas	Tax Base	Total Precept (£)
<u>Parish Council/Meeting</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
Anston	2,823.90	262,750
Aston-cum-Aughton	4,174.58	256,904
Bramley	2,267.36	115,516
Brampton Bierlow	1,224.22	64,782
Brinsworth	2,303.47	225,222
Catcliffe	585.51	58,586
Dalton	2,398.29	136,000
Dinnington St John's	2,246.51	178,146
Firbeck	135.40	7,500
Gildingwells	40.82	-
Harthill with Woodall	623.55	42,305
Hellaby	239.92	8,803
Hooton Levitt	51.86	-
Hooton Roberts	81.82	1,600
Laughton-en-le-Morthen	433.45	22,034
Letwell	66.58	1,778
Maltby	3,967.32	183,700
Orgreave	543.41	20,650
Ravenfield	1,008.45	38,025
Thorpe Salvin	199.64	8,026
Thrybergh	805.97	57,766
Thurcroft	1,952.45	151,373
Todwick	641.12	42,925
Treeton	841.84	53,000
Ulley	65.51	6,213
Wales	1,977.89	149,232
Wentworth	547.41	17,284

Whiston	1,452.06	71,650
Wickersley	2,606.33	147,940
Woodsetts	589.37	59,839
TOTAL	36,896.01	2,389,549

(2) That, as outlined in in the Budget Report to Cabinet Meeting on 23rd February 2016, the Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 (excluding Parish Precepts), is £89,188,081 (including an Adult Social Care Precept).

(3) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with section 31-36 of the Act:-

a. £201,910,549 being the net aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils (£2,389,549) (Gross Council Expenditure less income and Specific Grants other than the Business Rates Retention Scheme, Settlement Funding Assessment Grants and other non-ringfenced grants.).

b. £106,332,919 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of the Business Rates Retention Scheme, Settlement Funding Assessment grants and other non-ringfenced grants, set out in 31A (3) of the Act.

c. £4,000,000 being the amount which the Council estimates will be payable in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Council Tax Balance).

d. £91,577,630 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3a above exceeds the aggregate of 3b and 3c above, calculated by the Council in accordance with section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (Item R in the formula in section 31B of the Act).

e. £1,363.7858 being the amount at 3d above (Item R divided by Item T 1a above) calculated by the Council in accordance with section 31B of the Act as the relevant basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).

f. 2,389,549 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as per section 1b above.

g. £1,328.2003 being the amount at 3e above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3f above by the figure at 1a above (item T in the formula in Section 31B (1) of the Act calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the relevant

basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no parish precept relates. (Band D Council Tax for Rotherham MBC services).

h. The following amounts be calculated by the Council as the relevant basic amounts of Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate, being the amounts given by adding the amount at 3g above to the amount of the special items section 1(b) determined as the parish precept (column B) divided by parish tax base (column A) , in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act:

Parished Areas	£
Anston	1,421.25
Aston-cum-Aughton	1,389.74
Bramley	1,379.15
Brampton Bierlow	1,381.12
Brinsworth	1,425.98
Catcliffe	1,428.26
Dalton	1,384.91
Dinnington St. John's	1,407.50
Firbeck	1,383.59
Gildingwells	1,328.20
Harthill with Woodall	1,396.05
Hellaby	1,364.89
Hooton Levitt	1,328.20
Hooton Roberts	1,347.76
Laughton-en-le-Morthen	1,379.03
Letwell	1,354.90
Maltby	1,374.50
Orgreave	1,366.20
Ravenfield	1,365.91
Thorpe Salvin	1,368.40
Thrybergh	1,399.87
Thurcroft	1,405.73
Todwick	1,395.15
Treeton	1,391.16
Ulley	1,423.04
Wales	1,403.65
Wentworth	1,359.77
Whiston	1,377.54
Wickersley	1,384.96
Woodsetts	1,429.73

(4) That the relevant basic amount of Council Tax including Adult Social Care “precept” for the year for those parts of the Council’s area to which no parish precepts relate (3g above) then multiplied by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act is applicable to the dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D (rounded to the nearest penny - calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands is as follows.

Tax Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	868.43	1,013.17	1,157.91	1,302.65	1,592.12	1,881.60	2,171.08	2,605.29
Adult Social Care Precept	17.04	19.88	22.72	25.55	31.23	36.91	42.59	51.11
Total for Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council only	885.47	1,033.05	1,180.63	1,328.20	1,623.35	1,918.51	2,213.67	2,656.40

(5) That the amounts below (as presented in Section 1 of Appendix B) being the amounts shown in Appendix A section 3(h) as the relevant basic amount of Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of the Council’s area to which Parish Precepts relate and the amount at Appendix A 3g (the relevant basic amount of Council Tax including Adult Social Care “precept” for those parts the Council’s areas to which no parish precepts relate), then multiplied by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, (rounded to the nearest penny) calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Tax Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Parished Areas	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Anston	947.5 0	1,105.4 2	1,263.3 4	1,421.2 5	1,737.0 8	2,052.9 2	2,368.7 5	2,842.5 0
Aston-cum-Aughton	926.5 0	1,080.9 1	1,235.3 3	1,389.7 4	1,698.5 7	2,007.4 0	2,316.2 4	2,779.4 8
Bramley	919.4 4	1,072.6 8	1,225.9 2	1,379.1 5	1,685.6 2	1,992.1 0	2,298.5 9	2,758.3 0
Brampton Bierlow	920.7 5	1,074.2 1	1,227.6 7	1,381.1 2	1,688.0 3	1,994.9 5	2,301.8 7	2,762.2 4
Brinsworth	950.6 6	1,109.1 0	1,267.5 5	1,425.9 8	1,742.8 6	2,059.7 5	2,376.6 4	2,851.9 6
Catcliffe	952.1 8	1,110.8 7	1,269.5 7	1,428.2 6	1,745.6 5	2,063.0 4	2,380.4 4	2,856.5 2
Dalton	923.2 8	1,077.1 6	1,231.0 4	1,384.9 1	1,692.6 6	2,000.4 2	2,308.1 9	2,769.8 2
Dinnington St John's	938.3 4	1,094.7 3	1,251.1 2	1,407.5 0	1,720.2 7	2,033.0 5	2,345.8 4	2,815.0 0
Firbeck	922.4 0	1,076.1 3	1,229.8 7	1,383.5 9	1,691.0 5	1,998.5 2	2,305.9 9	2,767.1 8
Gildingwells	885.4 7	1,033.0 5	1,180.6 3	1,328.2 0	1,623.3 5	1,918.5 1	2,213.6 7	2,656.4 0
Harthill with Woodall	930.7 0	1,085.8 2	1,240.9 4	1,396.0 5	1,706.2 8	2,016.5 2	2,326.7 5	2,792.1 0
Hellaby	909.9 3	1,061.5 9	1,213.2 4	1,364.8 9	1,668.1 9	1,971.5 1	2,274.8 2	2,729.7 8
Hooton Levitt	885.4 7	1,033.0 5	1,180.6 3	1,328.2 0	1,623.3 5	1,918.5 1	2,213.6 7	2,656.4 0
Hooton Roberts	898.5 1	1,048.2 6	1,198.0 2	1,347.7 6	1,647.2 6	1,946.7 6	2,246.2 7	2,695.5 2
Laughton-le-Morthen	919.3 6	1,072.5 8	1,225.8 1	1,379.0 3	1,685.4 8	1,991.9 3	2,298.3 9	2,758.0 6
Letwell	903.2 7	1,053.8 2	1,204.3 6	1,354.9 0	1,655.9 8	1,957.0 8	2,258.1 7	2,709.8 0
Maltby	916.3 4	1,069.0 6	1,221.7 9	1,374.5 0	1,679.9 4	1,985.3 9	2,290.8 4	2,749.0 0
Orgreave	910.8 0	1,062.6 1	1,214.4 1	1,366.2 0	1,669.7 9	1,973.4 0	2,277.0 0	2,732.4 0
Ravenfield	910.6 1	1,062.3 8	1,214.1 5	1,365.9 1	1,669.4 4	1,972.9 8	2,276.5 2	2,731.8 2

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Thorpe Salvin	912.2 7	1,064.3 2	1,216.3 6	1,368.4 0	1,672.4 8	1,976.5 8	2,280.6 7	2,736.8 0
Thrybergh	933.2 5	1,088.7 9	1,244.3 4	1,399.8 7	1,710.9 5	2,022.0 3	2,333.1 2	2,799.7 4
Thurcroft	937.1 6	1,093.3 5	1,249.5 5	1,405.7 3	1,718.1 1	2,030.5 0	2,342.8 9	2,811.4 6
Todwick	930.1 0	1,085.1 2	1,240.1 4	1,395.1 5	1,705.1 8	2,015.2 2	2,325.2 5	2,790.3 0
Treeton	927.4 4	1,082.0 2	1,236.5 9	1,391.1 6	1,700.3 0	2,009.4 5	2,318.6 0	2,782.3 2
Ulley	948.7 0	1,106.8 1	1,264.9 3	1,423.0 4	1,739.2 7	2,055.5 0	2,371.7 4	2,846.0 8
Wales	935.7 7	1,091.7 3	1,247.7 0	1,403.6 5	1,715.5 7	2,027.4 9	2,339.4 2	2,807.3 0
Wentworth	906.5 2	1,057.6 0	1,208.6 9	1,359.7 7	1,661.9 4	1,964.1 1	2,266.2 9	2,719.5 4
Whiston	918.3 6	1,071.4 3	1,224.4 9	1,377.5 4	1,683.6 5	1,989.7 8	2,295.9 0	2,755.0 8
Wickersley	923.3 1	1,077.2 0	1,231.0 8	1,384.9 6	1,692.7 2	2,000.5 0	2,308.2 7	2,769.9 2
Woodsetts	953.1 6	1,112.0 2	1,270.8 8	1,429.7 3	1,747.4 4	2,065.1 6	2,382.8 9	2,859.4 6

(6) That both the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire and Rescue Authority have issued Precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below, and that the Council in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate Council Tax Requirement including Police and Crime Commissioner and Fire and Rescue for unparished areas (rounded to the nearest penny) shown in the table (a) below and in table (b) (as set out in Section 3 in Appendix B) (for those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate) as the amounts of Council Tax for 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings for

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

(a)

Tax Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	868.43	1,013.17	1,157.91	1,302.65	1,592.12	1,881.60	2,171.08	2,605.29
Adult Social Care Precept	17.04	19.88	22.72	25.55	31.23	36.91	42.59	51.11
Total for Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council only	885.47	1,033.05	1,180.63	1,328.20	1,623.35	1,918.51	2,213.67	2,656.40
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner (To be confirmed)	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
Aggregate Council Tax Requirement (unparished areas)	1,032.67	1,204.77	1,376.89	1,548.99	1,893.21	2,237.43	2,581.66	3,097.98

And (b)

Tax Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Aggregate Council Tax Parished Areas								
Anston	1,094.70	1,277.14	1,459.60	1,642.04	2,006.94	2,371.84	2,736.74	3,284.08
Aston-cum-Aughton	1,073.70	1,252.63	1,431.59	1,610.53	1,968.43	2,326.32	2,684.23	3,221.06
Bramley	1,066.64	1,244.40	1,422.18	1,599.94	1,955.48	2,311.02	2,666.58	3,199.88
Brampton Bierlow	1,067.95	1,245.93	1,423.93	1,601.91	1,957.89	2,313.87	2,669.86	3,203.82
Brinsworth	1,097.86	1,280.82	1,463.81	1,646.77	2,012.72	2,378.67	2,744.63	3,293.54
Catcliffe	1,099.38	1,282.59	1,465.83	1,649.05	2,015.51	2,381.96	2,748.43	3,298.10
Dalton	1,070.48	1,248.88	1,427.30	1,605.70	1,962.52	2,319.34	2,676.18	3,211.40
Dinnington St John's	1,085.54	1,266.45	1,447.38	1,628.29	1,990.13	2,351.97	2,713.83	3,256.58

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Firbeck	1,069.60	1,247.85	1,426.13	1,604.38	1,960.91	2,317.44	2,673.98	3,208.76
Gildingwells	1,032.67	1,204.77	1,376.89	1,548.99	1,893.21	2,237.43	2,581.66	3,097.98
Harthill with Woodall	1,077.90	1,257.54	1,437.20	1,616.84	1,976.14	2,335.44	2,694.74	3,233.68
Hellaby	1,057.13	1,233.31	1,409.50	1,585.68	1,938.05	2,290.43	2,642.81	3,171.36
Hooton Levitt	1,032.67	1,204.77	1,376.89	1,548.99	1,893.21	2,237.43	2,581.66	3,097.98
Hooton Roberts	1,045.71	1,219.98	1,394.28	1,568.55	1,917.12	2,265.68	2,614.26	3,137.10
Laughton-en-le-Morthen	1,066.56	1,244.30	1,422.07	1,599.82	1,955.34	2,310.85	2,666.38	3,199.64
Letwell	1,050.47	1,225.54	1,400.62	1,575.69	1,925.84	2,276.00	2,626.16	3,151.38
Maltby	1,063.54	1,240.78	1,418.05	1,595.29	1,949.80	2,304.31	2,658.83	3,190.58
Orgreave	1,058.00	1,234.33	1,410.67	1,586.99	1,939.65	2,292.32	2,644.99	3,173.98
Ravenfield	1,057.81	1,234.10	1,410.41	1,586.70	1,939.30	2,291.90	2,644.51	3,173.40
Thorpe Salvin	1,059.47	1,236.04	1,412.62	1,589.19	1,942.34	2,295.50	2,648.66	3,178.38
Thrybergh	1,080.45	1,260.51	1,440.60	1,620.66	1,980.81	2,340.95	2,701.11	3,241.32
Thurcroft	1,084.36	1,265.07	1,445.81	1,626.52	1,987.97	2,349.42	2,710.88	3,253.04
Todwick	1,077.30	1,256.84	1,436.40	1,615.94	1,975.04	2,334.14	2,693.24	3,231.88
Treeton	1,074.64	1,253.74	1,432.85	1,611.95	1,970.16	2,328.37	2,686.59	3,223.90
Ulley	1,095.90	1,278.53	1,461.19	1,643.83	2,009.13	2,374.42	2,739.73	3,287.66
Wales	1,082.97	1,263.45	1,443.96	1,624.44	1,985.43	2,346.41	2,707.41	3,248.88
Wentworth	1,053.72	1,229.32	1,404.95	1,580.56	1,931.80	2,283.03	2,634.28	3,161.12
Whiston	1,065.56	1,243.15	1,420.75	1,598.33	1,953.51	2,308.70	2,663.89	3,196.66
Wickersley	1,070.51	1,248.92	1,427.34	1,605.75	1,962.58	2,319.42	2,676.26	3,211.50
Woodsetts	1,100.36	1,283.74	1,467.14	1,650.52	2,017.30	2,384.08	2,750.88	3,301.04

(7) That, in accordance with the principles determined by the Secretary of State and set out in the Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2016/17, that Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's relevant basic amount of Council Tax for the year 2016/17 (as defined by Section 52ZX of the 1992 Local Government Act as amended by Section 41 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014) is not excessive.

Mover:- Councillor Read, Leader

Secunder:- Councillor Alam

(The Mayor – Councillor Clark, Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Ali, Astbury, Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Buckley, Currie, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Godfrey, Hoddinott, Hughes, Jones, Khan, Lelliott, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Read, Roche, Roddison, Rose, Rushforth, Sansome, Sims, Smith, Steele,

Taylor, Wallis, Watson, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen voted in favour of the proposals)

(Councillors Cowles, Finnie, Fleming, Hague, Hunter, Jepson, Middleton, Parker, Reeder, Reynolds, John Turner, Julie, Turner, C. Vines and M. Vines voted against the proposals)

146. CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET SETTING REPORT - 2016/17 TO 2020/21

Further to Minute No. 30 of the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting held on 23rd February, 2016 consideration was given to a report which presented the Council's new Capital Strategy and the proposed Capital Programme for the period 2016/17 to 2020/21 and to confirm that there were adequate levels of resources available to finance the Capital Programme.

The Capital Strategy and proposed Capital Programme 2016/17 to 2020/21, which set out the Council's future capital investment plans, would ensure that investment decisions were clearly aligned with the Council's strategic priorities and vision for Rotherham.

Councillor Vines sought clarification on whether the details as set out in the report were finalised or whether the contents remained fluid and was advised by the Leader that the final version of the document would be taken in the new municipal year.

Resolved:- That the new Capital Strategy, as presented in Appendix A and Capital Programme, as presented in Appendix B (for £279.095m in the period 2016/17 to 2020/21), which will require prudential borrowing of £53.602m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five year period, for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs, be approved.

Mover:- Councillor Read

Seconder:- Councillor Alam

147. PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2016/17 - 2018/19

Further to Minute No. 31 of the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting held on 23rd February, 2016 consideration was given to the report which presented the Local Government Act 2003 and supporting regulations which required the Council to 'have regard to' the CIPFA Prudential Code and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice and prepare, set and publish prudential indicators and treasury indicators that ensured the Council's capital expenditure plans and affordable, prudent and sustainable in the long-term.

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

The Prudential Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy together formed part of the process which ensured the Council met the balanced budget requirement under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

The report set out the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits for 2016/17 and Prudential Indicators for 2016/17 to 2018/19 and had been presented to the Audit Committee in furtherance of its delegated role of scrutiny on Treasury matters, including the Treasury Management Strategy and related policies.

In accordance with the Prudential Code for Capital Finance, the Secretary of State's Guidance on Local Government Investments, CIPFA's Code of Practice for Treasury Management in Local Authorities and with Council policy, the (Interim) Strategic Director of Finance and Customer Services was required, prior to the commencement of each financial year to seek the approval of the Council to the following:-

- i. The Prudential Indicators and Limits for 2016/17 to 2018/19
- ii. A Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement which sets out the Council's policy on MRP
- iii. An Annual Treasury Management Strategy in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management including the Authorised Limit
- iv. An Investment Strategy in accordance with the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) investment guidance

Albeit a technical and complex report the key messages were:-

- a. Investments – the primary governing principle would remain **security** over return and the criteria for selecting counterparties reflected this. Cash available for investment would remain low, resulting in low returns;
- b. Borrowing – overall, this would remain fairly constant over the period covered by this report and the Council would remain under-borrowed against its borrowing requirement due to the higher cost of carrying debt. New borrowing would only be taken up as debt matures; and,
- c. Governance – strategies were reviewed by the Audit Committee with continuous monitoring which included Mid-Year and Year End reporting.

Councillor C. Vines sought clarification on the fluidity of the documentation and progress and was advised by the Leader that this document would follow the normal democratic route through Cabinet and any updates formally agreed and approved.

Resolved:- (1) That prudential indicators and limits for 2016/17 to 2018/19 contained in the report be approved.

(2) That the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement contained in Appendix A which sets out the Council's policy be approved.

(3) That the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17 to 2018/19 and the Authorised Limit Prudential Indicator be approved.

(4) That the Investment Strategy for 2016/17 to 2018/19 be approved.

Mover:- Councillor Alam

Seconder:- Councillor Read

148. ROTHERHAM TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Further to Minute No. 17 of the meeting of the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting held on 15th February, 2016, consideration was given to the report which provided details of the Rotherham Transport Strategy (2016-2026) and the policy framework which set out the strategic approach and the vision and management of transport in Rotherham.

The Strategy addressed fundamental challenges in Rotherham to support economic recovery in the borough and the impact on safety, health and climate change.

The Strategy also explained how the Council would build on its strong transport policy direction set out internationally, nationally and locally in the Sheffield City Region. It featured proposals to continue to improve the safety and condition of the road network in Rotherham and to support sustainable and affordable transport modes and ensure that fairness, safety and sustainability would be embedded in the transport projects delivered.

Transport projects would work to deliver the aims of the Rotherham Growth Plan and those of the Sheffield City Region. The Strategy set out a series of challenges, objectives, themes and actions that would contribute to the overall vision that by 2026 Rotherham would enjoy sustainable growth and sustainable travel choices.

Councillor Sansome referred to the consultation process and asked if this had been fully exhausted to allow for some consideration to be given to the businesses on Aldwarke Lane who had suffered and for these matters to form the basis of further discussion at the Transport Liaison Group to see if some of the issues could be addressed.

Councillor Lelliott confirmed the consultation process had finished, but would endeavour to speak to Councillor Sansome regarding his concerns.

Mover:- Councillor Lelliott

Seconder:- Councillor Sims

149. ROTHERHAM'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2016-19

Further to Minute No. 18 of the meeting of the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting held on 15th February, 2016, consideration was given to the report detailed the extensive consultation on the Housing Strategy which had taken place with staff, partners, residents and other stakeholders with over 2,000 responses. Members have been engaged in the review and refresh of the Housing Strategy with a Members Seminar held on 4th February 2015.

The Strategy had now been refreshed and the new draft, which covered the period between January, 2016 and December, 2018, was based on a sound evidence base and reflected the views of people living and working in Rotherham under five themes:-

- Increasing the number of homes – **housing growth**.
- Ensuring affordable rented/**social housing** is available for those who cannot afford or do not want to buy a home.
- Improving quality in the **private rented sector**, the fastest growing tenure in Rotherham.
- Increasing opportunities for first time buyers and other households seeking **affordable home ownership**.
- Ensuring a wide range of **specialist housing** that is suitable for older people and other specific groups.

The draft Housing Strategy provided residents with a clear and accessible document setting out how the Council was responding to the various housing challenges and what it intended to do. It also pulled together in a single document, the key housing aims and objectives from other more detailed plans.

The Strategy had been written at a time that could herald the most significant changes for housing in a generation. The Housing and Planning Bill was progressing through the parliamentary system and if passed would bring enormous changes to planning, house building and social housing systems. Amidst the undoubted opportunities elements of the Bill provide, there were also very real challenges ahead, particularly for social housing system, which would make it increasingly difficult for people on modest incomes to afford suitable rented accommodation.

The Council would have to operate with a much lower level of resources than in previous years due to Government public spending cuts, and the social rent reduction which further reduced the Housing Revenue Account capacity to deliver housing growth and other key services. This would be compounded by the Enforced Sale levy which Government intended to

impose on local authorities to pay for housing association Right to Buy discounts. The Council must, therefore, work in innovative and entrepreneurial ways with partners to deliver on the housing growth ambitions.

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, endorsed the report and in doing so highlighted the additional pressures as a result of an ageing population, which could be alleviated with good quality housing options.

Councillor Cowles made reference to the challenges facing Eastwood, being tough on anti-social behaviour and asked how many fines had actually been issued.

Councillor Reeder sought clarification on the number of new homes delivered during the years 2014/15 and 2015/16.

Councillor Currie welcomed this report and supported the hard work that had gone into its production.

Councillor C. Vines made reference to the vision of achieving high quality homes for people to live in by 2043 and asked what kind of properties were likely to be built. He further expressed his concern at Council properties being affected by damp and mould.

In addition, he referred to the increasing numbers of homes being built each year and pointed out Rotherham was short of decent homes for people to live in.

Councillor Whelbourn asked for a regular monitoring process and suggested this be considered by the relevant scrutiny commission on a regular basis.

Councillor John Turner was unable to support the report on the grounds that he considered Rotherham to have reached its critical mass and described problems with traffic congestion in various areas.

Councillor Pitchley drew attention to the four main priorities which the Housing Strategy was helping to address and asked was this not what everyone wanted for the people of Rotherham.

Councillor Lelliott referred to the problems with condensation in some properties and suggested an invitation be extended to Councillor Wallis to see how the issues being referred to could be resolved.

Councillor Jepson was in attendance at the information sharing seminar on this subject and suggested that this Strategy and the Local Plan be considered together rather than individually.

Councillor M. Vines referred to the suggested positive effect with Selective Licensing in some areas and sought clarification on the prosecution rates of those landlords in conflict.

In addressing the comments raised Councillor Wallis explained that a court date for prosecutions had been confirmed for later this month with three hearings listed and fourteen pending. A more detailed response to the concerns of Councillor M. Vines would be provided in writing.

With regards to the queries from Councillors Jepson and Whelbourn it was pointed out that this Strategy should follow the same scrutiny process.

Councillor Wallis welcomed an invitation by Councillor C. Vines to visit the houses he raised of concern, but pointed out that 99% of housing stock met the decent homes standard.

With regards to the types of homes likely to be built, this would be a range of housing that met the needs of the people in the borough with smaller affordable properties that were attractive for potential residents.

In terms of measuring housing growth, the figures relating to the number of new homes delivered during the year were actuals for 2014/15 and projected additional numbers for 2015/16.

In addressing the concerns raised by Councillor Cowles, Councillor Wallis explained how the Selective Licensing Scheme was going a long way to addressing some of the concerns in Eastwood and was more than prepared to meet the difficulties in Eastwood.

Resolved: That the Housing Strategy 2016-19 be approved and adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Wallis

Seconder:- Councillor Roche

150. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION DEVOLUTION DEAL

Consideration was given to the report which detailed the economic devolution deal which would involve the establishment of a new, directly elected Sheffield City Region Mayor, who would act as Chair of a Sheffield City Region Mayoral Combined Authority, working alongside Local Authority Leaders in exercising a number of powers and functions devolved from central Government.

The Leader outlined the benefits of the previous devolution deals and the need for more jobs and businesses.

To meet that challenge more local control was required over the policies that impacted on the economy, infrastructure spending, adult skills, more control over public transport and better programmes to help those furthest from the labour market.

The devolution deal offered the opportunity to mix and match funding streams and allow for decisions about EU funding to be made more locally.

The Leader explained about how he did not want an Elected Mayor initially, but had negotiated a deal which was worth living with one.

The City Region would support developments in the local areas and going forward consideration would be given as to how to secure more investment in affordable housing, requiring closer working with City Region partners.

The Leader respected the concerns raised so far so highlighted:-

- The proposal was solely concerned with economic issues, matching the “economic footprint” of the Sheffield City Region – it was not about creating a “super-council”.
- The proposal did not remove any existing powers from Councils – it was specifically about *devolving* decision making down from the Government.
- The powers being exercised under the devolution proposals were not being lifted from Councils, the Mayor would not replace any decisions currently made by Councils.
- The proposed Mayor would have specific responsibility with regards to transport, but Council Leaders would continue to sit and make decisions with regards to other policy areas, as currently, in what was effectively a Combined Authority Cabinet – which the Mayor would chair. He or she would be one voice amongst ten.
- Budgets or strategies proposed by the Mayor could be vetoed by a vote of two thirds of Combined Authority Councils.

Councillor Watson offered his support to the proposals and whilst being cynical initially recognised the importance of working together.

Councillor Cowles referred to the mandatory Elected Mayor and whether this was another layer of bureaucracy, the sharing of services across the region and any other areas of activity and how this would happen if there was some unwillingness across partners.

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Councillor C. Vines commented on the little information about the City Region being shared, the change of heart around the Elected Mayor and the benefits to Rotherham. He also referred to shared services and the devolution that had already taken place in Scotland and Wales

Councillor Currie supported this as a way forward for Rotherham and welcomed the local empowerment.

Councillor Hoddinott referred to the discussions that had taken place in the Chamber towards the end of 2015 and the probable imposition of an Elected Mayor. This was a good deal for Rotherham even with an Elected Mayor and the Council should not throw away the chance of giving South Yorkshire more control and power and take forward the opportunity of the devolution of powers from Whitehall to have a say in what was happening locally and come together as a northern powerhouse.

Councillor Reynolds asked about the administrative set up costs, how this would be managed and the cost to the taxpayers of Rotherham.

Councillor Jepson reluctantly supported the proposals, but was not altogether convinced the Mayor was the best option and sought assurances for Rotherham.

Councillor John Turner described his reservations around the proposal and spoke from experience.

Councillor Parker referred to the previous disagreement with an Elected Mayor, the reasons for the change of direction and the details of what the Enabling Order included, which was being voted on.

Councillor Steele supported the proposals and the work that had taken place. This deal would bring jobs and growth to the economy along with powers to the Elected Mayor.

The Leader in addressing the comments made by Elected Members confirmed to Councillor Reynolds that administration costs to Rotherham would be in the region of £35k per year and could involve up to sixty staff, but the benefits to the Rotherham taxpayers was much higher.

To answer Councillor Cowles the Leader explained that he had changed his view around an Elected Mayor, but there would be procedures in place moving forward. In terms of shared services there was to be further exploration as to whether there was any mileage to support this deal.

To answer the queries by Councillor Currie, the Leader confirmed the negotiations would continue, towards what was possibly an Independent Yorkshire, and welcomed more information for the school curriculum and giving local accountability to the education system.

The Leader referred to there being a Northern Powerhouse which could lead to improved infrastructure through this deal. Councillor Jepson's concerns about planning and consideration was being given to the drawing up an advisory plan which all Councils would sign up to that would alleviate some concerns.

In response to concerns by Councillor C. Vines and the opposition to the Elected Mayor, once the details had been considered in depth the deal included a mandatory Elected Mayor.

Resolved:- (1) That the devolution agreement be endorsed as set out at Appendix A in order for Central Government to develop the necessary legislation to put it on a statutory footing during 2016/17.

(2) That the work that had taken place since the 'deal' was proposed in October 2015 – in particular those matters detailed in paragraphs 2.4; 2.5 and Appendix B be noted.

(3) That the results of the City Region's consultation exercise that had taken place between October 2015 and January 2016 – including the summary of the consultation detailed in section 5 and Appendix C be noted.

(4) That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive (in consultation with the Leader and Commissioners as appropriate) to consent to an Enabling Order.

Mover: Councillor Read

Seconder:- Councillor Watson

151. NOTICE OF MOTION - EUROPEAN UNION

Moved by Councillor Fleming and seconded by Councillor John Turner

Due to the negative impact that the "Treaty of Lisbon" such as **Section 2: Aids granted by States – Article 107 (ex Article 87 TEC)** and EU procurement rules have on the ability and cost of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council to fulfil its obligations, this Council agrees that Great Britain would be better off outside the European Union.

EU state aid rules do not allow aid such as emergency loans or Government guarantees on loans to steel manufacturers in financial difficulties.

This puts the jobs of people who work in the steel industry and live in Rotherham or surrounding areas directly under threat.

This Council, therefore, resolves to:-

Call on the Government: To consider supplying state aid to the steel industry immediately.

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Call on the Government: For Great Britain to leave the European Union and regain control of sovereign laws.

An amendment to the original motion was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Jepson to replace the next to last paragraph to read:-

Call on the Government to provide state aid to the same level as the German Government presently provide to their steel industry and for the same period of time.

The amendment to the motion was put and carried and became part of the substantive motion.

The amended motion was put and LOST.

(Councillors Currie, Rose, Sansome and Whelbourn declared personal interests in the Notice of Motion – European Union (Agenda Item 16) on the grounds of their involvement with the steel industry)

152. STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meetings of the Standards Committee be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Hughes

Secunder:- Councillor Pitchley

153. AUDIT COMMITTEE

Resolved:- That the reports and minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee be adopted.

Councillor Currie requested that when the report on the transportation arrangements for children was considered by the Audit Committee that consideration also be given to referring this report to the Corporate Parenting Panel.

Mover:- Councillor Wyatt

Secunder:- Councillor Hughes

154. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Resolved:- That the reports and minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Roche

Secunder:- Councillor Watson

155. PLANNING BOARD

Resolved:- That the reports and minutes of the meetings of the Planning Board be adopted.

Reference was also made to Minute No. 89 and the health check undertaken during October 2015 by the Local Government Association where this Council's Development Management Service was currently found to be within the top ten highest performing local authorities in England. Special thanks were passed on to all those involved.

Mover:- Councillor Atkin

Seconder:- Councillor Middleton

156. STAFFING COMMITTEE

Resolved:- That the reports, recommendation and minutes of the meetings of the Staffing Committee be adopted.

Mover:- Councillor Watson

Seconder:- Councillor Alam

157. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO DESIGNATED SPOKESPERSONS

There were none.

158. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN

(1) Councillor Sansome asked, given the need to improve care in the face of Tory cuts for the Council and NHS, could the Cabinet Member give an update on health and social care integration and the partnerships needed to make that happen?

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, confirmed that the Government cuts were having an impact on the services being provided. However, in that context good progress had been made, but there was still a way to go. He confirmed the Care Act 2014 had set out the need for health and social care to work together for better outcomes for customers.

The key point about the Act was for the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Council to come together to produce a spending plan using the Better Care Fund.

Part of this was about developing partnerships and was pleased to report that the Chief Executive Officers and also the Chairs of the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Hospital Trust have stated independently that their relationship with the Council was the best it had ever been.

RMBC Adult Care and Housing had embarked on a number of joint service initiatives with Health. These include the following:-

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Better Care Fund: This was a joint funding agreement between Health and Social Care to transform services through integration initiatives including the following:

RMBC Vulnerable Persons Team. Located in Adult Social Care: Nationally recognized as a leading initiative to improve services and support to vulnerable adults. Including adult survivors of Child Sexual Exploitation. The Team was funded via the Better Care Fund, Public Health and the Council. This was one of the smallest teams within RMBC whose input in supporting child sexual exploitation survivors had resulted in the successful prosecutions against perpetrators of child sexual exploitation.

The Perfect Locality: This was a joint development exercise by RMBC with Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humberside NHS Foundation Trust, the Rotherham Foundation Trust, and Rotherham CCG to improve services. Through working in partnership with Health the following improvements were intended to come through:-

- Reduction in citizens being bounced around the system.
- Maximum choice and control for citizens to remain as independent as possible.
- Keeping people safe when needed and doing so in a personalised framework.
- Good support for carers.
- Timely assessments and reviews.
- Promoting well-being.
- Reduction in costs of care and particularly residential care placement.

In all there were eighteen funding streams in the Better Care Fund which were working to improve the health of Rotherham people.

Another service was the Council's Occupational Therapy Service, jointly commissioned with Health to provide an integrated service for people across the borough with physical disability.

Finally, a recent meeting was held with the Hospital Trust and the Clinical Commissioning Group to plan a locality based approach with seven key hubs where a joint service was intended to be offered with one named contact person for the user. It was expected that this programme would be rolled out quickly starting with a pilot in the central area of Rotherham.

Councillor Sansome welcomed the detailed response from the Cabinet Member and hoped to receive regular updates on the progress of Adult Social Care in light of the austerity cuts.

(2) Councillor Hoddinott asked what percentage of secondary schools and what percentage of primary schools in Rotherham delivered age-appropriate sex and relationship education?

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, confirmed that the information the Local Authority had to make a judgement on the percentage of primary and secondary school which delivered age appropriate sex and relationship education was taken from the schools that had either achieved a bronze or silver award in the Rotherham Healthy Schools Accreditation Scheme from 2013 to the present day.

He was confident that this currently stood at 69% of Primary Schools and 75% of Secondary Schools.

Sex and Relationship Education (SRE) was a very broad area including such areas as anti-bullying, healthy relationships, friendships, on-line consent, Child Sexual Exploitation, sexting and in secondary schools this would include such subjects as sexually transmitted infections, contraception and pornography.

Schools did not have to teach SRE, except the element outlined in the science curriculum.

Where schools did teach SRE they had to have a policy and it should be delivered in an age appropriate way.

The Local Authority offered support and advice to schools on policy development and good practice in curriculum delivery as well as network meetings and training events. This had included:-

- Since September 2015 the Authority had offered schools specific support with the delivery of anti-bullying programmes. This had been well received by schools and the Authority were seeking to continue this support during the next academic year.
- Primary and Special schools also had access to the Rotherham Health School scheme of work for Personal, Social and Citizenship education and there were relationship units for children aged five to eleven.
- 'The Rollercoaster – The ups and Downs of Puberty' resource which helped staff to deliver puberty work which was often a topic which schools found challenging.
- Childline delivered a session to the majority of primary schools to Year 5 and 6 on the types of abuse including sexual abuse.
- All secondary schools, Pupil Referral Units and Special Schools had accessed the Theatre in Education performances for awareness of Child Sexual Exploitation.

- Barnardo's were offering 'Real Love Rocks' – four one hour sessions covering healthy relationships to primary and secondary schools. Discussion regarding use of primary version in special schools was being considered.

In a supplementary question Councillor Hoddinott expressed her disappointment that schools did not have to carry out this education, but would have liked to have seen 100% of schools delivering the education in order to protect young people. A discussion was held that morning in the Improving Lives Select Commission and asked if the Cabinet Member would be willing to support the Commission and attend the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission as part of the Prevent and CSE Strategy and how to work with schools and improve the work schools did with the current SRE part of the curriculum.

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, confirmed that earlier this year he had written to the Secretary of State stressing the importance of SRE education in schools and asking for this to be made compulsory. He confirmed he was more than willing to accept the invitation from the Improving Lives Select Commission.

(3) Councillor Pitchley asked if there had been any developments in devising an ageing well policy, if any progress was being made and how were carers and users involved?

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, explained that some authorities divided their overall strategy approach into a starting well, a living well and an ageing well programme. Rotherham had not got down that route, but the two areas that the Cabinet Member was responsible for – Public Health and Adult Social Care – had already in place many of the components of an Ageing Well Programme found in those local authorities.

The Casey Report referred to taking into account the voices of the people more and like other Directorates, Public Health and Adult Social Care have taken this on board. To that end senior officers and the Cabinet Member had met with a wide range of groups such as the Pensioner Action Group, Dementia Association, Age UK, the partially sighted group and Speak Out to seek their views and make it clear to them that the Council intended to consult with them on all plans.

It was recognised that Rotherham, like other local authorities, had an increasing ageing population which would increase in age with a wide range of other services. Steps were already being taken to develop a strategic approach to a housing policy for the aged looking carefully at the future needs and requirements, but again consulting local people.

Public Health and Adult Social Care have agreed to review and put together an integrated and holistic strategy on what was already being done in terms of the healthy ageing approach. The review would also

seek to identify a framework of where it liked to be in the future and would be engaging carers and customers once practice had been explored and local mapping completed.

(4) Councillor Reeder asked whether there were any domestic properties in Rotherham that were exempt from paying Council Tax or had a reduction in it because they had a prayer room in their property or on their land.

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, confirmed that the Council Tax legislation did not have any discounts/reductions for a prayer room.

(5) Councillor Reeder asked if the Council still had the multihog, where it had been used in the last three months and for how long?

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that the multihog had been available to undertake urgent repairs to potholes in the Area Assembly areas as follows:-

Area Assembly	From	To
Rother Valley South and Wentworth Valley	16th November 2015	11th December 2015
Rotherham North and Wentworth North	14th December 2015	22nd January 2016
Rotherham South and Wentworth South	25th January 2016	19th February 2016
Rother Valley West and Rother Valley South	22nd February 2016	18th March 2016

In a supplementary question Councillor Reeder asked if she could have any input to where the multihog was used.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed the multihog was assigned to areas where it had been requested to deal with pothole repairs. If Councillor Reeder had suggested areas for the multihog if she passed on the details the Cabinet Member would endeavour to follow these up.

(6) Councillor Reeder queried why at the end of every street were there road works, but no work going on.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that highway works were co-ordinated to keep disruptions to motorists to a minimum. Rotherham Council's own works were programmed to be completed as efficiently as possible taking into account working restrictions and operational delivery. The Cabinet

Member was happy to investigate any individual cases if the details were passed on.

(7) Councillor Reeder asked who was paying for the roadworks on Doncaster Road and Clifton Lane at the Park's entrance, how much it was costing and would it ever be finished?

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that the road works were being paid for by grant awards made to the Council through the Sheffield City Region Regional Growth Fund under the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP), as the scheme aimed to improve the facilities at the junction for cycling and pedestrians. The works were now substantially complete. The carriageway approaches to the junction would also be resurfaced at the same time to avoid the need to revisit the area in future, and the works were due to get underway next week and last for two weeks. The resurfacing element would be funded directly by the Council's highway maintenance funds. This element represented approximately £90k of the total cost of £470k, with the STEP fund providing the rest of the funding.

(8) Councillor Reeder referred to the roundabouts at Masbrough and Parkgate which had just been marked out again and were totally confusing. Had something come from the Government or someone at a desk who did not live in Rotherham who never used roads and had a bit of spare time on their hands because that was what it seemed like.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that the markings at both roundabouts were changed primarily to improve traffic flow through the respective junctions. In the case of Taylors Lane (Parkgate) roundabout the changes were also required to accommodate a one lane exit from the roundabout onto Taylors Lane when a new traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing was installed.

Councillor Reeder also contacted Streetpride direct to ask the same question and that an Officer from the Transportation Unit responded on the 17th February, 2016 by email and included copies of the road marking drawings associated with the junctions in question.

(9) Councillor Reeder asked if the Council had received the rest of the money owed by the group who took the Council to Court over the selective licensing and costs awarded to the Council.

Councillor Wallis, Cabinet Member for Housing, confirmed that the Council successfully defending the claim made by Rotherham Action Group Limited at Judicial Review in the High Court, sitting in Leeds, the company were ordered in May 2015 to pay the Council £23,128.40 in costs. To date a total of £18,663.72 had been recovered leaving a balance of £4,464.68. The company currently had no further assets.

In a supplementary question Councillor Reeder asked if it was likely the Council would receive the rest of the money.

Councillor Wallis, Cabinet Member for Housing, explained that this depended on whether the company had any further assets, but it was highly unlikely and a judgment would have to be made on the Council using funds to chase a debt it may never recover. Only limited information could be shared, but the Council were encouraging Rotherham Action Group to fulfil their moral and legal duty to the Council.

(10) Councillor Reeder asked if the Council could explain what community cohesion meant to them and how much money from the tax payers of Rotherham had been spent on this in the last three years and could a report be provided on what the money had been spent on.

Councillor Read, Leader, replied that the Local Government Association described a cohesive community as one where:-

- There was a common vision and sense of belonging for all communities.
- The diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances were appreciated and positively valued.
- Those from different backgrounds had similar life opportunities.
- Strong and positive relationships were being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods.

The Council had no specific budget for community cohesion and suggested this may be an area that Scrutiny may wish to look at the various budget lines and looked forward to taking forward any recommendations around this.

In a supplementary question Councillor Reeder asked if figures could be provided on what had been spent over the last three years as this was taxpayers' money.

Councillor Read, Leader, explained there was no specific budget line for community cohesion and from information already shared today it would appear that there was £1.6 million of Council activity which it was thought related to community cohesion. A request had been made for Scrutiny to look at this in more depth and come forward with recommendations.

(11) Councillor Reeder asked if the Council could tell her please how much of Council taxpayers' money, at these times if cuts to all services, were spent on a High Court Injunction to stop the problem of child sexual exploitation in Rotherham being published in the newspapers?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that if the question referred to an Injunction by the Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Board in 2012, in respect of redactions made by the author of a Serious Case

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Review, the cost of external legal advice was £343.75 plus VAT, in addition to the cost of in-house legal resources.

(12) Councillor Reeder stated that, having read the Casey Report, it referred to the Cabinet and three Advisors to the Cabinet and how effective they were. This also included Chairs and Vice-Chairs and the amount of money they were getting out of the public purse and a recommendation was they should cease. It is not time that it did?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that Cabinet Advisors were referred to in the Casey Report, but could find no reference to Chairs and Vice-Chairs.

He confirmed that since he was appointed Leader on 4th March, 2015 and appointed his Cabinet no Advisors had been appointed.

In a supplementary question Councillor Reeder asked if Advisors would be appointed again in the future and would this return to jobs for the boys.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed there would be no return to Cabinet Advisors.

(13) Councillor Reeder asked, with an average increase of 39% over the last seven years to a sum of £129,301 in 2014 to the lesbian and gay society, what was the sum given in 2015 and could the accounts for the previous years be seen?

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, confirmed the Council had never paid any payments over the last seven years to a group called the lesbian and gay society.

In a supplementary question Councillor Reeder suggested this may have been a company called Shield.

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, confirmed that a sum of £129,301 was paid by the Council during the 2013/14 financial year under a contractual arrangement to a social enterprise called Shield and the details of these could be found via the Charities Commission or Companies House.

(14) Councillor Cowles asked if it was agreed that the production of 600 pages of documentation on a Thursday evening to be read, even briefly, by the following Wednesday was both a futile and facile exercise and with 63 Members an estimated 36,000 pieces of paper was printed. Surely this did not make sense in this day and age and suggested Members be provided with a few pieces of paper pointing to the start and the end of a section. All the paperwork was available electronically and suggested the printing of such papers be abandoned and asked the Leader if he would go away and look at this.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed Members did receive their papers in both electronic and hard copy means, but expressed some concern if for example the budget papers were top and tailed in a way being described without allowing all Members to see the full document. He believed the Council would then be failing in its transparency and ethics. To be truthful the agenda papers were substantial, but they had been through Scrutiny the Cabinet and out for public consultation so Members had had the chance to engage with a lot of the documentation for a longer period of time.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles echoed his earlier point about the number of printed pages and how this could be accessed electronically so why did the Council need to go to all this effort to print this paper. It did not make sense.

Councillor Read, Leader, explained that Members could choose to access the papers electronically, but by not supplying the details the Council would be failing in its transparency duty. He did take the point about the substantial number of pages being printed.

(15) Councillor Cowles asked, following the statements made on Look North by ladies from agencies involved in CSE at the time, stating that they had informed all the relevant parties, Police, Officers and Members, was he still determined to continue to provide 100% support to those Members identified as not fit for purpose?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that everyone watched with horror at reliving some of those experiences of last week.

The Leader was not aware of any specific allegations against any continuing Member who was not suspended from the Labour Group at this moment in time. He had revisited the Casey Report last night and the phrase "not fit for purpose" and confirmed he had never given his support to any Elected Member who was deemed not fit for purpose.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles confirmed the Leader could defend the undefendable, but pointed out the Leader had said the positives from this would be seeing justice done. This was not true as it was Orwellian, but it was clear that Labour Councillors were more equal than others and had never been accountable or responsible for anything that failed and asked if the Leader agreed.

Councillor Read, Leader, pointed out that you only had to look at the people that had lost their jobs at this Council to see that this statement was not true.

(16) Councillor Cowles referred to HS2, should it go ahead, where would this party be voting, with regard to the siting of the proposed station, Meadowhall or Sheffield City centre.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy confirmed that in response to the consultation on High Speed Two Phase Two the Council responded in support of High Speed Two and its importance to the Sheffield City Region (SCR), and further, for the location of the proposed South Yorkshire hub station at Sheffield Meadowhall, which was the Government's stated preferred location for the station in South Yorkshire. This position would continue to be supported and would ask Government to confirm the Meadowhall station location when making its final decision in late 2016.

(17) Councillor Cowles stated that Members had been informed that the preparation of plans to tackle the ongoing mess in Eastwood would take up to four months to prepare and asked was this timescale not only an insult to Members' intelligence but also another kick in the teeth for the long suffering residents of the area?

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that whilst there had been some improvement in Eastwood with the number of fly-tipping incidents falling, and a good take-up of the Selective Licensing Scheme, it was recognised that there was further work to do. Officers were working on a new approach which would involve the Council's Street Cleansing Enforcement Teams, Education and the voluntary sector, and it was anticipated that this would be available not later than the end of the month; it would not take four months to prepare. Members should note that this would be the start of a process, and that it would not solve the problems in Eastwood overnight, changing patterns of behaviour could take some time.

At the same time, there were two other pieces of work that would have a wider impact on environmental quality. Firstly, officers were reviewing the way in which Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance Services were provided and, secondly there was a review of (environmental) enforcement. Because those work streams would probably have an impact on the scope of staff roles and responsibilities, there would be the need to consult on any proposals that emerged, therefore, it was expected that the work would be completed and implemented by the end of the June. This may be where the confusion had arisen.

In a supplementary question Councillor Cowles was pleased to hear that it would not take four months and may be where the confusion had crept in. However, he was concerned that people kept talking about improvements and there were no metrics that showed what these improvements were. He had talked to the people in Eastwood and it would appear that any reduction was caused by apathy where people were so fed up at reporting issues that they no longer reported and, therefore, people thought that things were improving when in actual fact they were not. He wanted to ensure that there was no complacency in this Council and that Eastwood was not taken for granted just because it was there. It was a problem and it needed to be dealt with to avoid the problem spreading anywhere else.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed she agreed with the comments made by Councillor Cowles and assured him that there would be no complacency and that she would make things happen sooner rather than later.

(18) Councillor Currie asked why the minutes of the Licensing Board/Committee were not in the White Book anymore?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that the Council's Licensing function was placed under the control of the Government appointed Commissioners in February 2015 and was no longer under the control of this Council meeting.

In a supplementary question Councillor Currie asked if this was the case why were the Audit Committee minutes included when Audit was also under the control of the Commissioners.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed Audit fell outside the control of the Commissioners and was an executive arrangement of the Council.

(19) Councillor Currie asked were the Special Responsibility Allowances of the Chair of Audit and Licensing at a reduced rate whilst these functions were in control of the Commissioners?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that the Special Responsibility Allowances for the Chair and Vice-Chair of Licensing were currently paid at 50% as per the decision of the Commissioners and to take effect from 1st September, 2015.

However, the Special Responsibility Allowance to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Audit Committee was paid in full with effect from the Annual Meeting in May, 2015.

(20) Councillor Currie asked what the estimated cost to the Council was of the European Referendum?

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that the cost of the EU Referendum would be met entirely by Central Government, as was the case with national elections. Work was currently ongoing so it was unable to provide a cost at this time.

(21) Councillor Currie stated his concern that children's learning was disrupted by using schools as polling stations. Had any alternatives been looked at?

COUNCIL MEETING - 02/03/16

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, thanked Councillor Currie for his question and confirmed the one advantage was that the elections were known a long time in advance, apart from the referendum. Lots of schools that were used as polling stations often used the day in their inset quota to avoid any education disruption.

At the last election the Council used 132 polling stations of which 34% (46) were schools. At the last election, only 29 schools closed on polling day. Alternative arrangements were being considered, but in some areas of the borough the use of a school was the only option.

There would be a limited number of elections between now and 2020 because of the change to the Council's electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections every four years.

In a supplementary question Councillor Currie asked that the arrangements continue to be looked at to seeking alternative venues to schools as polling stations.

Councillor Watson, Deputy Leader, confirmed that this would continue to be monitored.

(22) Councillor Currie stated that it was encouraging to see more investment into improving the roads. Could the reporting tool used by Sheffield be looked at to give the public an increased involvement?

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, confirmed that the Highway Service would contact Sheffield City Council to see how their customers reported highway issues, how this compared to the Council's current reporting methods to determine if there were opportunities to improve service delivery. The Authority wanted to make it as easy as possible for customers to contact it.

In a supplementary comment Councillor Currie welcomed this as the reporting in Sheffield was internet based and very specific. He had also asked the former Strategic Director to look into this, but he had since left the authority.

(23) Councillor Reynolds asked who and what was exempt from Council Tax?

Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting, confirmed that Section 4 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 detailed the exemptions from Council Tax that may be applied by a local authority:-

- Class B - unoccupied property owned by a charity
- Class D – unoccupied property due to person being in prison
- Class E – unoccupied due to person having gone to live in care
- Class F – Council Tax payer deceased, no probate granted

Class G – occupation prohibited by law
Class H – dwelling held for a Minister of Religion
Class I – person living elsewhere to receive personal care
Class J – person living elsewhere to provide personal care
Class K – dwelling left empty by a student
Class L – mortgagee in possession
Class M – student halls of residence
Class N - dwellings occupied only by full time students, school or college leavers or by certain spouses or dependents of students
Class O – UK armed forces accommodation
Class P – visiting forces accommodation
Class Q – property left empty by a bankrupt person
Class R – unoccupied caravan pitch or boat mooring
Class S – occupied only by persons under 18 years old
Class T – unoccupied annexe to an unoccupied dwelling
Class U – dwellings occupied only by severely mentally impaired persons
Class V – main residence of a person with diplomatic immunity/privilege
Class W – occupied annexe to an occupied dwelling

Special conditions applied to each of these exemption classes. Further information and details with regard to those special conditions could be obtained from the Council's Local Taxation Service.

(24) Councillor Reynolds referred to the fact that he had had no reply at all to his question to the Chief Executive of Magna regarding the viability of Magna following the advice of Councillor Lelliott and asked why there was such hostility.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, advised, in response to the question regarding the viability of the Magna Trust, that the Trust's accounts were public documents that could be obtained from Companies House and that the latest accounts for the year ending 29th March, 2015 were available.

In a supplementary question Councillor Reynolds asked why he could not be given this basic factual information.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, reiterated that Magna was a private company and not one owned by the Council and which was why it had to file its accounts at Companies House.

(25) Councillor Reynolds asked whether the Labour Councillors were still in denial in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed he did not believe they were. He was clear a year ago when he took on the Leader role that if he found anyone that was he did not want anything to do with them. He gave his assurances that things would not return to the way they were before the Commissioners and that this Council would be run very different from what it had been previously.

(26) Councillor Parker asked if the Leader and the Council would join with him in supporting and thanking all the young ladies that had endured the trauma of child sexual exploitation but then had been so brave to stand up in Court and give evidence which had resulted in bring these barbaric individuals to justice.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed he did support Councillor Parker and that these young ladies were truly remarkable and inspirational and hoped more people would be brought to justice in the future.

In a supplementary comment Councillor Parker pointed out that these young ladies deserved all the help and support they required now and into the future.

(27) Councillor Parker asked if the Leader could tell the people of Rotherham if the Council was assisting all the young ladies and their families now that the trial was completed and how it was assisting them to move on with their lives.

Councillor Read, Leader, thanked Councillor Parker for his question and confirmed the Council was.

All the witnesses involved in 'Operation Clover' had been supported by South Yorkshire Police, Council Officers and colleagues in the voluntary sector. The quality of the support available had been commended by Judge Sarah Wright, as she passed sentence on all those found guilty of a number of heinous crimes against children last week. This marked the culmination of the first part of the ongoing Clover Operation, which was continuing into 2017.

The Council would continue to support victims and survivors of CSE and other forms of sexual abuse, and the Leader was pleased to confirm that to date, around 500 people have benefited from the new counselling and therapeutic services the Council had established, together with voluntary sector partners, since October 2014.

It must be recognised that the support offered was needs-led and therefore dictated by the individuals or families accessing it. Whilst the Council was actively encouraging people to come forward, it recognised that it could take months or years before any individual was ready to take the first significant step in seeking help to come to terms with their abuse. Post-disclosure support and therapy could again take months and years before that individual could move on with their lives.

Support was taking many different forms: case studies included families who had needed to relocate where support for things such as organising the logistics of relocation, settling children into new schools and changing utilities had been needed. Others had required more therapeutic intervention, counselling, group work and art therapy.

In a supplementary question Councillor Parker explained the aim of his question was purely to get an assurance that these young ladies would not be forgotten now the trial was over. They were going to need support for some time and did not wish to see them forgotten.

Councillor Read, Leader, associated himself with those remarks and confirmed they would need support for a long time and potentially for the rest of their lives. What was required were permanent arrangements in place with rolling contracts to ensure the support was available.

(28) Councillor Parker asked, now that the present sexual exploitation trial in Sheffield was resolved and the verdict was known, could the Leader please tell the people of Rotherham how the investigation into the misconduct of some Councillors both past and present was proceeding.

Councillor Read, Leader, thanked Councillor Parker for his question, but pointed out he was not in a position to disclose anything further other than what was already in the public domain as there were still investigations ongoing.

In a supplementary question Councillor Parker asked for reassurance that investigations were ongoing and that Councillors, both past and present, would be held to account based on material included in the Jay Report as there were clearly Councillors that did know and did nothing at any time and they should be brought up on a charge of misconduct in a public office.

Councillor Read, Leader, confirmed that where there were any allegations of a criminal nature of any former or sitting Councillor these would be investigated separately from any involvement of the Leader

(29) Councillor John Turner asked would the ruling party join with the opposition to stop the hedonistic increase in building and thence population in Rotherham? The growth was producing reduced green space, increased pollution, doubling premature death, increased accidents, road congestion, schools, hospitals and surgeries saturation. Rotherham had already exceeded its critical mass.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, confirmed that without sufficient new homes and jobs Rotherham would not prosper. The Authority would not provide the new homes its residents needed. The Authority would not secure the jobs that Rotherham and the City Region wanted to attract. Investment would go elsewhere. To meet

those pressing needs, the Council had adopted the Local Plan Core Strategy setting targets for new homes and jobs over the next 15 years.

The Council had fought hard at the public inquiry into the Core Strategy to secure an appropriate target. It had achieved a growth target that was significantly less than the development lobby wanted and the independent inspector initially proposed. Developers wanted the previous regional plan target of 24,000 new homes for Rotherham. The inspector proposed 17,000. The Authority had successfully argued for a target of 14,000 new homes. This gave a challenging but achievable target for growth that minimised the loss of greenfield land, but would ensure that the local infrastructure was sustainable for the highway network and educational places.

In a supplementary comment Councillor John Turner suggested that Members in the future, when they found themselves in many traffic junctures/accidents or frustrations with the health care, to remember him briefly and his comment about critical mass and keeping Rotherham as a wholesome place.

159. URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items.

160. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no confidential matters for consideration.

161. CATHERINE PARKINSON

The Mayor recognised that this was Catherine Parkinson's last Council Meeting as Interim Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services.

The Mayor asked everyone to join her in thanking Catherine for all her support here in Rotherham and wished her all the best for the future and invited everyone to show appreciation by a round of applause.