

**When telephoning, please ask for:** Liz Reid-Jones  
**Direct dial** 9148214  
**Email** lreid-jones@rushcliffe.gov.uk

**Our reference:** LRJ  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 7 December 2011

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL will be held on Thursday 15 December 2011 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Head of Corporate Services

## **AGENDA**

Opening Prayer

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes

To receive as a correct record the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday 22 September 2011 (pages 1 - 9).

4. Mayor's Announcements
5. Leader's Announcements
6. Chief Executive's Announcements
7. Local Development Framework – Draft Core Strategy Proposals

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) is attached (pages 10 - 14).

8. The Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places

The report of Head of Corporate Services is attached (pages 15 - 38).

9. Electoral Review – Proposed Council Size Submission

The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 39- 86).

10. Review of Scheme of Delegation

The report of the Head of Corporate Services is attached (pages 87 - 119).

11. To answer questions under Standing Order 11(2).

<b>Meeting Room Guidance</b>
------------------------------

**Fire Alarm - Evacuation** - in the event of an alarm sounding you should evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble in the Nottingham Forest car park adjacent to the main gates.

**Toilets** - Facilities, including those for the disabled, are located opposite Committee Room 2.

**Mobile Phones** – For the benefit of other users please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

**Microphones** - When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.



**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COUNCIL  
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

**PRESENT:**

Councillor G S Moore – Mayor  
Councillor I I Korn – Deputy Mayor

Councillors J R Bannister, D G Bell, Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, N A Brown, B Buschman, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combellack, J A Cranswick, B G Dale, G Davidson, A M Dickinson, J E Fearon, M G Hemsley, R Hetherington, R M Jones, K A Khan, N C Lawrence, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, G R Mallender, S E Mallender, Mrs J M Marshall, D J Mason, F J Mason, B A Nicholls, E A Plant, F A Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, D V Smith, Mrs J A Smith, P Smith, J A Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, B Tansley, H Tipton, T Vennett-Smith

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

A Graham	Chief Executive
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
L Reid Jones	Democratic Services Manager
D Swaine	Head of Corporate Services

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillors L J Abbey, R A Adair, Mrs S P Bailey, R L Butler, L B Cooper, J E Cottee, J E Greenwood, Mrs M M Males, D G Wheeler

**OPENING PRAYER**

The Meeting was led in prayer by the Mayor's Chaplain.

**21. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**22. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 June 2011 were received as a correct record and signed by the Mayor, subject to the replacement of the words 'no view' with the word 'likelihood' in paragraph 7 of page 14 in order that the sentence read 'Councillor Jones stated that if the motion deleted the reference to where the government should spend the money he would support it, however there was no likelihood that the money would be moved'.

**23. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Members that he had undertaken 46 engagements since the last meeting of Council. He thanked the Deputy Mayor for covering for him

at some engagements. He drew Members' attention to the busy summer and highlighted four events which he recommended Members should attend: the Hickling Scarecrow show, Sutton Bonington Show, Keyworth Show and the Radcliffe Carnival. The Mayor commented that the Baptist and Methodist Churches in Musters Road were an asset to West Bridgford and they have been beautifully restored.

The Mayor informed Members that he had presented 25 year service awards to two depot employees and was pleased with their positive feedback about the organisation. He continued by highlighting the work of Cultural Services, in particular the 4,000 visitors to Lark in the Park, the Armed Forces Day and Proms in the Park, the Rushcliffe Country Park Green Flag award and the Rushcliffe Sports Awards. The Mayor was pleased to say that the fundraising appeal was successful and the Maggie's Nottingham Cancer Care Centre would be opening on 2 November. He thanked Councillor Plant for her contribution by running the half marathon recently. In finishing the Mayor asked Members to make themselves available to present wreaths on Remembrance Sunday in the Borough.

#### **24. Leader's Announcements**

The Leader was pleased to inform Members that the Council had been successful in achieving the East Midlands Regional Member Development Charter. The work had been led by Councillor D Mason through the Member Development Group. The Leader presented the Mayor with the certificate and trophy. The Mayor added his congratulations to all those involved in achieving the Charter.

#### **25. Chief Executive's Announcements**

The Chief Executive informed Council that he had received a phone call from the Chief Executive of Nottinghamshire Cricket Club to say that Trent Bridge had been allocated an Ashes Test match in both 2013 and 2015. It was the only ground outside of London to be allocated a match for both years. He conveyed his thanks to everyone who had supported the bid, in particular the Council's decision to invest in the cricket club some five years ago. The Mayor said this was excellent news for the Borough particularly in respect of the economy.

#### **26. Electoral Review**

The Mayor introduced officers from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). Dr Peter Knight, Commissioner, Joan D'souza, Review Manager and Jessica Metheringham-Owlett, the Review Officer gave a presentation on the electoral review of Rushcliffe. Ms D'souza outlined the role of the LGBCE and informed Council that the aim of the review was to ensure that each councillor represented approximately the same number of electors.

Ms D'souza went on to explain the criteria for starting a review, these being 30% of wards having an electoral variance of more than 10% from the average and/or one ward having an electoral variance more than 30% from the average. She informed Council that in Rushcliffe nine wards (32%) had

electoral variances of more than 10% from the average, the highest being Stanford at 24%.

Ms D'souza said that the review would decide the ward boundaries for the entire borough and not only the wards where there were levels of electoral inequality. The review process would determine the total number of Councillors, the number and names of wards and the ward boundaries. In terms of timescale this would be determined based on the type of review, and could be anything from 26 to 62 weeks.

Ms D'souza explained that the review had to comply with statutory criteria based on the principles of electoral equality, community identity and effective and convenient local government. The review process covered a preliminary stage during which time the Council would submit its proposal for council size. After this there would be information gathering by the Commission, draft recommendations published by them and then a period of consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this the Commission would publish their final recommendations which would be implemented by order in the Houses of Parliament. Ms D'souza stressed the characteristics of a good review and how important it was to ensure that representations were based on evidence, not only assertion or assumption.

In response to questions Dr Knight informed Council that this review was separate from the Parliamentary Constituencies review. He said that in terms of council size it was better to decide a number of councillors and fit the wards around that figure. It was usual for the Commission to give a 'minded to figure' and for the final recommendation to be very close to this.

Dr Knight confirmed that the final recommendation was not put to Council but was a Commission decision. He said that people would be able to make a submission and comment on the Commission's draft recommendation and submissions were given equal merit. Dr Knight stated that electorate forecasts were taken into consideration, based on predicted housing growth. In relation to multi-member wards Dr Knight stated that in the absence of a Council resolution asking for single member wards the statutory criteria would be applied to come up with an appropriate council size meaning mixed member wards. With regard to parishes, Dr Knight informed Members that the Commission looked to avoid splitting villages and communities and used the parishes as building blocks for the review process. The only statutory power in relation to parishes was the ability to ward a parish where a new ward boundary went through a parish.

The Mayor thanked Dr Knight, Ms D'souza and Ms Metheringham-Owlett for their presentation and drew Member's attention to the Parish Forum event on 26 October 2011 which they would be attending in order to make the Parish and Town Councils aware of the process.

## **27. Financial Outturn and Statement of Accounts 2010/11**

Councillor Cranswick, seconded by Councillor Nicholls, proposed the Financial Outturn and Statement of Accounts 2010/11, which had been considered by the Corporate Governance Group on 13 September 2011. Councillor Cranswick stated that the revenue outturn indicated that the Council's activities

had been achieved with the allocated resources and with an overall saving on services. The total spend on services had been £13,407,600 against a revised estimate of £14,292,100. The savings on services had amounted to £885,000 which had reduced to £654,000 when a windfall refund of VAT was taken into account. Overall the amount taken from General Fund balances had reduced from the original planned level of £519,000 to £236,000.

Councillor Cranswick stated that the Council was required to publish the Statement of Accounts by 30 September. The External Auditor was also required to issue the audit opinion on the accounts and present the Annual Governance report to Members by 30 September. He informed Members that the Statement of Accounts had been completed later than usual this year and as a result the Auditor had not been able to complete his audit work as planned. As a consequence Councillor Cranswick proposed that the final full governance report be presented by the Auditor to Members, through the establishment of a special committee. He proposed that the Committee be constituted for this year only and consist of the Members of Corporate Governance Group, the Leader of the Council (or his nominated representative), the Leader of the Opposition (or his nominated representative), and the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Resources. He explained that it was not uncommon for authorities to establish such special arrangements this year owing to some significant changes in accounting practice which had been imposed nationally.

Councillor Cranswick thanked officers for all their efforts, acknowledging that it had been a difficult year, particularly in terms of changes to financial standards, the introduction of two new finance systems within the Council and the green bin collection charge.

Councillor Davidson stated that, as the previous Chairman of Corporate Governance Group, he was familiar with the changes in accounting procedures and he welcomed the forthcoming stability in them. He thanked the staff for their work. He supported the establishment of the special committee to finalise the accounts.

Councillor MacInnes welcomed the budget underspends which had been achieved without any reduction in service standards. He welcomed that this and the Four Year Plan meant the Council was entering a new financial year in a relatively good financial position. He thanked staff for their energy.

Councillor S Mallender stated that it had been a difficult year for many Councils, and stated that she supported the setting up of a special committee.

Councillor Clarke echoed Councillor Cranswick's comments and stated that the pressures on the department had been abnormal during the last financial year. He concluded by stating that it showed the level of competency amongst officers and that they should be congratulated.

**RESOLVED that:**

- a) The outturn for 2010/11 and the Statement of Accounts be approved;
- b) The proposed carry forward of budget provision to 2011/12 of £50,260 be approved;

- c) A special committee be established with delegated authority to:
  - i. Receive and endorse the auditor's Annual Governance Report;
  - ii. Approve any necessary amendments to the Statement of Accounts
  - iii. Approve the letter of Representation;
  - iv. Approve any necessary amendments to the Annual Governance Statement;
  
- d) The special committee be constituted for consideration of the 2010/11 accounts only and consist of Members of the Corporate Governance Group, the Leader of the Council (or his nominated representative), the Leader of the Opposition (or his nominated representative) and the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Resources.

## 28. **Notice of Motion**

Proposed by Councillor S Boote and seconded by Councillor Davidson:

'In view of the unexpectedly large revenue being generated by the charges for emptying green bins, Council requests that Cabinet considers, as part of the budget setting process, the scope to reduce the annual charge for the green bin collection 2012/13'.

In proposing the motion Councillor S Boote explained that its intention was not to abolish the charge for the green bin service and he recognised that the Council needed to generate income from residents. He stated that it was timely to consider the charge given that the scheme had generated more money than had been anticipated.

Councillor S Boote acknowledged that the budget workshops had identified savings, with the biggest potential saving of £200,000 being from the green bin charge. Furthermore the charge had been agreed by Cabinet and Council. He continued by stating that the charge had impacted on households, and a fairer charge was required. He added that 26,000 households had registered for the service resulting in an income of £683,000 for the Council, against an original forecast of £340,000. By reducing the charge to £10 per bin, Councillor S Boote stated, the impact on council tax payers would be more acceptable and the Council would still generate an income of £434,000. In concluding Councillor S Boote stated that he believed the recycling rates could be increased if the charge was reduced and it would encourage more households to take up the service. This would lead to more positive recycling and less flytipping and bonfires in the Borough.

Councillor Cranswick stated that the Council had generated £683,000 in income from 29,000 bins and the take up was increasing. 74% of households who previously had a green bin, were now using the service and this was increasing on a daily basis. Furthermore a reduction in the charge next year would result in an extra charge in future years to make up the shortfall in income. Councillor Cranswick stated that the scheme had been very successful and it made no sense to reduce the charge.

Councillor MacInnes stated that the Council had a robust and well identified consultation mechanism in terms of the financial strategy and the budget workshops. He said he would be supporting the motion however there should be concessions for people on benefits.

Councillor D Boote was of the view that the charge was unfair as it taxed vulnerable people the most as they were paying a larger proportion of their income on Council services. Furthermore they could not afford a green bin at that price or the cost of taking waste to the tip. She concluded by saying that the charge should cover the cost and therefore should be smaller than the current £25.

Councillor Vennett-Smith said that the charge should be looked at on a proportionate basis for those least able to pay. He stated that the scheme had been a success with the £25 charge and people who said they would not pay for the service had decided not to continue with it. He believed that it could be fewer if the income could be used to offset the charge, for the benefit of everyone. He reminded Members that it was a voluntary scheme, however it had been a great success and therefore the Council had been proved right in making the decision to charge £25.

Councillor Khan said that he felt the £25 was excessive and that £10 would be sufficient, however he accepted the Council needed to generate income in the current financial climate. He was of the opinion that the charge felt like an additional council tax. He stated that the Council had an excellent reputation for its green policies and it would be a generous gesture to reduce the charge, consistent with protecting and preserving the environment.

Councillor R Mallender stated that there was a difference between agreeing with a charge and having to pay it. He believed that on principal people should not pay for the service and any charge should be based on the weight of waste to encourage residents to recycle more.

Councillor D Mason stated that the scheme had been a huge success which would help protect other important services. She said she was not aware of any increase in fly-tipping as a result of the charge. She reminded Council that many residents were very happy with the current charge, although she recognised that some were not and did not have to take up the service as it was not mandatory.

Councillor Lawrence said he was puzzled as to why the motion had been presented. He stated that Cabinet had been required to make a balanced judgement and it was important they were not put in a position where other options for savings with a far more significant impact had to be considered.

Councillor S Mallender stated that many residents had joined the scheme begrudgingly as they had too much waste to compost. She stated that she wanted to see the Council as a leader for recycling. She added that the motion gave the opportunity to reduce the charge to zero for those in receipt of Council Tax benefits.

Councillor Clarke was of the opinion that Councillor S Boote did not want to admit the phenomenal success of the green waste scheme, and the effort staff



had made to make it a success. He said that the budget workshops were the place to consider the budget and that residents had voted in favour of it by registering for the scheme. Councillor Clarke continued by saying that the budget workshops identified the need to maximise income and introduce a charge. He added that the success of this voluntary scheme helped reduce the amount of savings required from elsewhere. In conclusion Councillor Clarke remarked that the green waste service was a high quality, value for money service that the Council should be proud of.

Councillor Davidson said that there was no doubt the scheme had been very successful and staff had worked very hard to make it work. However this did not mean residents paid with a glad heart, more with a grudge in his view. He stated that the unfairness of the impact of the charge was significant and more should be done to encourage recycling.

Councillor S Boote concluded the debate by stating that the scheme should continue and noted that in some ways it had been too successful. He stated that although 26,000 households had signed up to the scheme there were still 19,000 households who had not taken up the service. He agreed with Councillor Clarke in that the money generated from the scheme could be used for other services but felt that the green waste service should not be used as a cash cow. Councillor Boote stated that he was asking Cabinet to look at whether the charge could be reduced.

The motion was put the vote and declared lost.

## 29. **Questions**

### a) **Question from Councillor R M Jones to Councillor J N Clarke**

If the Government decides in principle to proceed with the HS2 train line, what are Councillor Clarke's opinions about the potential benefits to the Borough if the route of the north eastern spur were to go through East Midlands Parkway?

Councillor Clarke said there were a lot of ifs in the question and at this stage the benefits were totally unknown. He stated that the money would still be better spent elsewhere, for example improving the current infrastructure on the Midland Mainline, and the A453 dualling.

#### *Supplementary question*

Councillor Jones asked that given the government's experience in different decades and the seeming necessity for more train lines and getting freight off the road, why was the Leader not prepared to take the view that the HS2 line should go through East Midlands Parkway.

In response Councillor Clarke said that if there was a potential benefit to Rushcliffe then this was to be welcomed. He said that he had not said it shouldn't take place at all but that the original motion referred to a delay. Councillor Clarke was still of the opinion that the money could be better used in the short term and he was not convinced that the HS2 would give benefits on a cost effective basis.

**b) Question from Councillor S J Boote to Councillor D M Mason**

What is Councillor Mrs Mason's opinion on the potential for producing renewable energy (e.g. from wind, ground source, solar thermal or solar photovoltaic) from the Council's land and buildings?

Councillor Mason responded by saying that there was always potential in anything to generate renewable energy, but this needed to be investigated properly before a judgement could be made. She said that technology needed more time to develop. Furthermore it was important that financial viability and return on investment and pay back period were taken into consideration particularly when spending residents' money.

*Supplementary question*

Councillor S Boote stated that Council in September 2010 Council had recognised the scope for renewable energy and as such asked what progress had been made by Council.

Councillor D Mason informed Council that Cabinet had approved the Carbon Management Plan in June 2011, which set out the intention to investigate the potential of photovoltaic panels however the question was not only about installing the panels on Council buildings but the real and tangible environmental and financial benefits.

**c) Question from Councillor S J Boote to Councillor D M Mason**

What feedback has been received from the public on the quality of street cleaning (either for the better or for the worse) since the Council's local street cleaners in the villages were made redundant at the end of June?

Councillor D Mason stated that there had been 13 street cleansing complaints for July and August which was the same as the previous year. Furthermore there had been proportionately fewer complaints in August 2011, which suggested that the new street cleansing rounds were having a positive impact.

*Supplementary question*

Councillor S Boote asked what response there had been from the Parish Councils and community groups with regard them taking on a role in street cleansing.

Councillor D Mason stated that this was being discussed by the Environment and Waste Management (EWM) Member Group and they were awaiting the outcome.

**d) Question from Councillor S J Boote to Councillor D M Mason**

Following Council's resolution at the June meeting to seek improvements in grass cutting and tree maintenance, what progress has been made in putting mechanisms in place to achieve these improvements?

In response Councillor D Mason stated that the Council had a contract in place to ensure that all proactive and reactive tree maintenance required by the Council was undertaken. Regarding grass cutting the County Council had increased their frequency of highway verge grass cutting from four to five times per year in the Rushcliffe area. Councillor D Mason said that as part of the Streetwise and Recycling2go service review the Council was exploring a range of service delivery options including by land owners.

*Supplementary question*

Councillor S Boote asked what the approximate timescale for considering options was, and whether this would be in time for the growing season.

Councillor D Mason stated that the question had been asked of other landowner and the Council was ready to talk to them. She said it was part of the on-going EWM review.

**30. Local Government Act 1972**

The Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, proposed that the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item of business in pursuant to section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that it was likely that exempt information may be disclosed as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Act.

**31. Management issues Requiring Council Decision**

Councillor Clarke presented a report which set out management issues requiring a decision of Council including the appointment to the post of Section 151 Officer. He informed Council that due to a number of issues that had arisen in the Council's financial services it was necessary to appoint a new Section 151 Officer as soon as possible. Councillor Clarke informed Council that in the interim the service was being well maintained and managed by temporary officers and the permanent staff.

Councillors Davidson, MacInnes, and S Mallender thanked the Chief Executive for the way he had handled the issue.

The Chief Executive thanked Members for working positively with him on the issue. He confirmed that the situation was being handled in line with the Council's Officer Employment Procedure Rules and external support had been given as necessary to those involved.

Councillor Clarke concluded that the Council should be grateful for the expertise of the Chief Executive in dealing with the issue as efficiently as possible.

**RESOLVED that:**

- a) the formal request for the existing Section 151 Officer to relinquish his statutory duties be agreed;
- b) the Deputy Chief Executive (CB) be appointed to the role of Section 151 Officer;
- c) the necessary steps be taken to secure the services of a new Head of Service for Finance.

The meeting closed at 9.05 pm.

MAYOR

## REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PR)

### Summary

1. This report explains how the Core Strategy proposals have progressed since early 2010 and in particular, the influence of the election of the Coalition Government in May 2010. Until recently, the Council has been preparing an Aligned Core Strategy with the other local authorities in the Nottingham Housing Market Area. As it has not been possible to reach agreement on the distribution of new housing across the housing market area, Rushcliffe Borough Council has now prepared a separate Core Strategy.
2. The report explains Policy 2 – The Spatial Strategy in some detail, identifying the strategic locations where around 9,900 new homes could be built. This includes major sites where planning permission already exists i.e. Sharphill and Cotgrave Colliery, other sites under consideration i.e. Bingham and RAF Newton and subject to the A453 being improved, land south of Clifton. Also growth is proposed around the remaining 4 large settlements of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington. These proposals were supported by the Local Development Framework (LDF) Group on 12 October 2011 and Cabinet on 29 November 2011.
3. The remainder of the draft Core Strategy was considered by Cabinet on 29 November 2011 and by the LDF Group on 7 December 2011. The entire draft Core Strategy (**Appendix A – to follow**) will be published on 8 December incorporating any amendments agreed by the LDF Group on the 7 December. The draft Core Strategy is recommended to Council for approval.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council agree:

- i. the draft Core Strategy, in order that it be published for a six week period of representations; and
- ii. that the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) be given delegated authority, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, to effect such changes as are considered necessary to strengthen or to provide clarity to the draft Core Strategy up to its publication, provided that such changes are neither strategic nor directional, in order to ensure its soundness.

## **Background**

4. In February 2010 the Council, together with the other local authorities comprising the Nottingham Housing Market Area (NHMA) published an 'Option for Consultation' in respect of their Aligned Core Strategies. The document included a suite of policies of which arguably the most significant was Policy 2 – The Spatial Strategy. This identified where strategic housing growth would be located. In Rushcliffe, the scale of housing growth was determined by the Regional Strategy target of 15,000 new homes by 2026. Furthermore, a Regional Strategy requirement meant that major urban extensions had to be proposed south of Clifton and east of Gamston. These were only included with great reluctance by Members because there was no other option and they proved to be extremely unpopular with residents.
5. In May 2010 the new coalition Government announced that Regional Strategies would be abolished and Councils would be free to determine their own level of new housing provision. Consequently in September 2010, the Council resolved to review the Regional Strategy housing target and approved the Fresh Approach document.
6. Together with the other NHMA authorities, new research was commissioned earlier this year to provide evidence as to the level of new housing that should or could be provided for. From this evidence it has been accepted that at least 48,000 homes are needed across the NHMA. Much of the need generated relates to the City but because the required housing cannot be physically accommodated within the City boundary some of it will have to be located in the surrounding boroughs. It is therefore incumbent upon the Council, through the Fresh Approach initiative to develop Policy 2 – 'The Spatial Strategy' to ensure that, through sustainable development there is sufficient housing growth to meet the inherent needs of the Borough and make a contribution to the wider needs of the NHMA. Clearly, any proposals have to be justified and defended, if necessary, at an Examination in Public.

## **Policy 2 -The Spatial Strategy**

7. Most of the potential strategic housing sites in the Borough have been the subject of planning applications during some parts of 2010 and 2011. Planning permission has been granted at Cotgrave Colliery and the application for land south of Clifton has been withdrawn. Current applications are still being assessed at RAF Newton and north of Bingham. In view of the considerable community consultation that has been undertaken in respect of all of these sites it was decided not to carry out any further exercises during 2011.
8. One of the policies in the Option for Consultation document referred to above was for rural development to be concentrated around the most sustainable settlements. It is proposed to retain this policy and so, as part of the Fresh Approach initiative, intensive visioning and consultation was undertaken in East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington during this summer. These events proved to be very successful and as a result, it is proposed that provision for 1,500 new homes should be made across the 4 villages.
9. During 2011 the Government published a draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for consultation. This is intended to replace the wealth of existing planning policy. The draft National Planning Policy Framework

(NPPF) includes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and supports the Government's pro-development agenda.

10. Having regard to the draft NPPF, other clear pro-development messages coming out of Government and the results of the Fresh Approach work; it has been possible during 2011 to realistically assess the capacity of the Borough for sustainable housing growth. In order to reduce the risk of the draft Core Strategy being found to be unsound at examination, it has been necessary to consider all the options for sustainable development. The draft proposals were endorsed by the LDF Group on the 12 October 2011 and then at Cabinet on 29 November 2011.
11. In summary, it is proposed that allocations should be made at:
  - Edwalton (Sharphill) – 1,200 homes and remove from the Green Belt
  - Cotgrave Colliery – 470 homes and remove from the Green Belt
  - North of Bingham – 1,000 homes
  - Former RAF Newton – 550 homes and remove from the Green Belt.
12. It is also proposed that there should be growth around the following villages at locations yet to be determined:
  - East Leake – minimum 400 homes
  - Keyworth – minimum 450 homes
  - Radcliffe on Trent – minimum 400 homes
  - Ruddington – minimum 250 homes
13. It is proposed that, subject to the improvement to the A453 taking place, land south of Clifton should be identified as a potential direction for growth. It is now considered that up to 2,500 homes should be provided during the plan period.
14. In total, provision is being made for a minimum of 9,900 homes over the plan period. The evidence indicates that around 3,500 of these will cater for the housing need in Rushcliffe with the remainder contributing to the needs of the NHMA as a whole.

### **Alignment of Core Strategies**

15. As referred to above, the Council has been working with the other local authorities in the Nottingham Housing Market Area i.e. Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling and Nottingham City to develop aligned Core Strategies. Although there is now general agreement that a minimum of 48,000 new homes are required, there is not a consensus as to how these homes should be distributed. Consequently, it will not be possible to produce a set of aligned strategies that meet the overall housing need of the NHMA and this will result in there being an unacceptable risk of the strategies being found to be unsound by the Planning Inspectorate. To minimise this risk, it has been necessary for the Council to produce a Core Strategy that is specific to Rushcliffe and not strictly aligned to the other NHMA authorities. Nevertheless, except for Policy 2, there will still be significant alignment between the policies of the NHMA authorities.

16. All the remaining policies in the Core Strategy although subject to some amendment, are largely as set out in the 2010 Option for Consultation document referred to above, save for the removal of two policies and the introduction of another. As such, they were originally drafted to cover the whole of the NHMA. Work has since been undertaken to largely remove references to other parts of the NHMA so that the policies are now specific to Rushcliffe. Unfortunately, given the scale and multiplicity of the work being undertaken it has not been possible to totally finalise every element of the draft Core Strategy prior to the deadline for publishing this report. A draft of the Core Strategy, with the main outstanding matters highlighted, will be published on 8 December following scrutiny by the LDF Group on 7 December (**appendix A – to follow**).
17. The drafting of the Core Strategy to its present stage has been fully informed by Sustainability Appraisal outcomes, other statutory assessment work and the significant consultation feedback received by the Council during the various stages of community engagement that have been undertaken.
18. Alongside the Core Strategy, the Council's Local Plan Proposals Map will need to be revised in order to identify the changes to Green Belt boundaries and the detailed boundaries of strategic allocations (e.g. for the Melton Road, Edwalton urban extension) that are all identified in the draft Core Strategy. These revisions will be published as part of the representation process for the draft Core Strategy.
19. Subject to approval by Council, and any final amendments in order to ensure its soundness, the draft Core Strategy will be published for a six weeks representation period early in the New Year. Allowing for the finalisation of all supporting documentation and organisation of the consultation process, this is likely to be in early February. Thereafter, the intention is that the Core Strategy will be submitted for public examination by June 2012, with the aim that the public examination hearing will hopefully take place during Summer 2012.
20. Having particular regard to the draft NPPF with its presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is important that the Council has a Local Development Framework in place at the earliest opportunity. To not do so would increase the risk of speculative planning applications for major developments being successful.

### **Financial Comments**

The Government has introduced a "new homes bonus" to help deliver the spatial strategy for an area and to help meet the objectives of communities affected by development. A report was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 October explaining the arrangements and proposing how the new homes bonus could be applied.

In addition, the Government are currently consulting on new arrangements for business rates whereby authorities are incentivised to promote economic growth. Therefore, land allocated to employment, once developed and occupied, may provide further funds through these incentives.

## **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

Draft policy 9 specifically includes measures to 'design out' crime.

## **Diversity**

The draft Core Strategy has been subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment and, where appropriate, amendments have subsequently been made to policies to satisfy the outcomes of the assessment.

### **Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

- 1) Core Strategy Option for Consultation – Report of Consultation and Response to Comments, December 2011
- 2) Core Strategy Option for Consultation – Summary of Public Engagement Events and Exercises
- 3) Core Strategy Summary of Consultation for the Fresh Approach
- 4) Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – Summary of Actions, December 2011
- 5) Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – Summary for Potential Housing Options, December 2011
- 6) Core Strategy Equality Impact Assessment – Summary of Actions, December 2011

All background documents are available at: [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy)



## REPORT OF THE HEAD OF CORPORATE SERVICES

### Summary

This report sets out proposals for revised polling districts and polling places following a periodic review undertaken in line with the Council's responsibilities under the Electoral Administration Act 2006.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- i. Council approve the (a) recommendations at paragraph six of the report setting out changes to polling districts, polling places and polling stations, and (b) proposed revised schedule of polling districts and polling places as set out in **Appendix 2**.
- ii. Council requests that the Head of Corporate Services formally publish the Review report and its findings on 23 December 2011.
- iii. Should a polling place be unavailable in the run up to an election, the (Acting) Returning Officer be given the authority to select an appropriate alternative and formal retrospective approval be sought by Council following the election should this be a permanent proposed change.

### Details

#### *Reason for review*

1. Under the Representation of the People Act 1983, the Council has a duty to divide the Borough into polling districts and to designate a polling place for each of these districts. The Electoral Administration Act 2006 requires the Council to carry out a review of these polling districts and places every four years as a minimum. The Council previously conducted a review in December 2007 and therefore, in line with the statutory timeframe, it is required to undertake a further periodic review and complete this by 31 December 2011.
2. As part of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's Electoral Review it may be necessary to undertake a further review of polling districts, places and polling stations due to potential Borough ward boundary changes. This review would be carried out prior to the next Borough Council elections due to be held in May 2015. This is also the case in relation to the outcomes of the Parliamentary Constituencies Review.

3. When undertaking a review the Council is required to give due regard to the following considerations:
- It must seek to ensure that all electors have such reasonable facilities for voting as are practicable in the circumstances.
  - It must seek to ensure that so far as is reasonable and practicable every polling place is accessible to electors who are disabled.
  - Where possible, the polling place should be in its own polling district.
  - No polling place should be shared by two wards.
  - Where possible, “natural” boundaries should be used, e.g. railways, major roads, etc.
  - All properties in a minor road or estate should, ideally, be in the same polling district.
  - Polling places should be “logical”; that is, electors should not have to pass another polling place to get to their own.
4. The review process required the Council to consult on the existing polling districts, polling places and polling stations. This exercise sought representations from people or organisations that had particular expertise in relation to access to premises or facilities for persons who have different forms of disability. The consultation also included all Borough Councillors, all Parish/Town Councils and the local political parties. The consultation exercise ran from 1 August to 30 September 2011.
5. A total of 46 responses were received to the consultation with 78% of these responses being supportive of retaining the existing arrangements (36 of the 46). Where no responses requesting changes were received it is proposed to retain the existing arrangements.
6. Ten of the responses requested changes to polling districts and/or polling places and details of these responses are set out at **Appendix 1**. Each of these ten responses has been evaluated to determine if changes are necessary as part of the review process and these evaluations are set out as follows.

***a) Response 1 - North Keyworth Ward – Crossdale Drive Primary School***

This response highlighted issues regarding closing the primary school on election day. No complaints have been received by the (Acting) Returning Officer from electors regarding the use of the school as a polling station and there is no record of the Head Teacher expressing concern about the closure of the school. North Keyworth Ward comprises one polling district (FF). The review identified that the only suitable building for the polling district is the Primary School.

### ***Recommendation – No Change***

**It is recommended to continue to use Crossdale Primary School as a polling station but the (Acting) Returning Officer contact the school to determine whether it is possible to use the facility without the Head teacher taking the decision to close the school.**

### ***b) Response 2 - Lady Bay Ward***

This response highlighted issues regarding the closure of the Lady Bay Primary school on election day. Two complaints have been received during the last four years regarding the closure of the school and the impact this can have on childcare provision.

The Lady Bay Ward is currently made up of two polling districts (J1 and J2). Lady Bay Primary School lies in polling district J2 but serves as the polling place for both polling districts (J1 and J2). On the day of the election the Head Teacher makes a decision to close part of the school.

In view of the issues highlighted consideration has been given to alternative options which could prevent the need to close the school on election day. The options identified are set out below:

#### ***Option 1 - Change the polling place to All Hallows Church Hall***

- Whilst this would achieve the result of having a polling place within the polling district of J1 there are issues about the suitability of the venue as it is on a narrow side street away from the centre of the polling district. Therefore it is not prominent and access is not as good as at present with the use of the primary school
- If this venue were used solely as the polling place for district J1 it would still be necessary to retain the school as the polling place for district J2 meaning the Head Teacher may still decide to close the school on election day.
- If this venue were used as the polling place for both polling districts a large proportion of electors from the J2 district would have to travel a substantial distance to the new polling place, where access is less suitable than it is with the existing arrangements.

#### ***Option 2 - Retain Lady Primary Bay School as the polling place for both polling districts***

- Lady Bay Primary School is not situated in polling district J1, however it is located on a major road through the ward, is on a bus route and has good parking provision. Therefore it serves well as polling place for both polling districts and as such this option presents the most sensible way forward.

## **Recommendation – No Change**

**It is recommended to continue to use Lady Bay Primary School as a polling place for both polling districts. Additionally the (Acting) Returning Officer contact the school to ascertain whether there is a way of using the facility without the Head Teacher taking the decision to close the school.**

### ***c) Response 3 Lutterell Ward***

The response suggested the creation of a new polling place. Presently Lutterell Ward is made up of two polling districts (K1 and K2). The polling places are the Community Centre on Walcote Drive (K1) and the temporary Polling Station in the Car Park of the Church of Latter Day Saints Stanhome Square (K2).

In view of the issues highlighted consideration has been given to alternative options which are set out below:

#### *Option 1 - No Change*

- Retain the existing districts and polling places as no complaints have been received by the (Acting) Returning Officer regarding the distance to travel to vote at the current polling stations by any elector.

#### *Option 2 – Redraw the polling district boundaries and replace Walcote Drive Community Centre with Rugby Road Community Centre*

- Move Boxley Drive, Greythorn Drive, Halberton Drive, Laughton Avenue, Waddington Drive, Walcote Drive, Westville and Worwood Drive into polling district K2
- Use Rugby Road Community Centre as a polling place for K1
- No longer use Walcote Drive Community Centre as a polling station for K2
- Continue to use the temporary polling station in the car park of the Church of Latter Day Saints
- Car parking at Rugby Road Community Centre is limited and access to car park not ideal.

The advantages and disadvantages of these options have been considered in detail. These considerations have taken into account access to polling station venues, awareness and understanding of the existing arrangements, potential implications of the electoral review to be undertaken in 2015 and the resources required to enable a change. Furthermore consideration has also been given to making changes to polling stations in view of the forthcoming Police Commissioner elections to be held in November, and the implications for vehicle and pedestrian access at that time of year.

#### ***Recommendation – Option 1 - No Change***

**It is recommended to continue to use Walcote Drive Community Centre and the temporary polling station in the car park of the Latter Day Saints Stanhome Square. However the issue may be re-considered as part of**

**the forthcoming electoral review and feedback from the Police Commissioners elections to be held in 2012.**

**d) Responses 4, 5 and 6 Manvers Ward**

The response received from Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council requested a reduction in the number of polling stations thus resulting in a reduction in costs. Manvers Ward is currently made up of three polling districts (NN1, NN2 and NN3).

Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council's submission suggested reducing the number of polling places to the one at Upper Saxondale for the electors that currently vote there, with the remaining electors voting at Grange Hall. The proposals submitted by Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council do not meet the legislative requirements in terms of ensuring that all electors have such reasonable facilities for voting as are practicable in the circumstances, primarily as Grange Hall is not in the ward.

Other submissions have been received in support of retaining the existing polling places, including a petition with 773 signatures. The size and shape of the Ward lends itself to being split into three polling districts as there are three residential areas which are set apart from each other.

***Recommendation – No Change***

**It is recommended that the three existing polling districts and polling places be retained.**

**e) Responses 7 and 8 Trent Ward**

This response also highlighted the Parish Council's request of reducing costs by reducing the number of polling stations. Trent Ward is currently made up of four polling districts (OO1, OO2, TT1 and TT2). Two are situated within Radcliffe on Trent (OO1 and OO2), while the other two are the villages of Shelford and Newton (TT1 and TT2). Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council would like to stop using Craig Moray Community Centre and only use Grange Hall for polling districts OO1 and OO2 in an attempt to save costs.

Other submissions have been received in support of retaining the existing polling places, including a petition with 773 signatures.

If Grange Hall was the only polling place this would result in almost 3500 electors voting there. To achieve this there would need to be two polling stations located within Grange Hall. Therefore the only cost saving that would be made would be the hire charge for Craig Moray Community Centre which currently stands at £100. There is also the added inconvenience for the electors in the distance to travel to Grange Hall for those that currently vote at Craig Moray Community Centre.

***Recommendation – No Change***

**It is recommended to retain the two existing polling districts and polling places within Radcliffe on Trent in addition to the ones in Shelford and Newton.**

## **f) Response 9 Bingham East Ward**

This response identified the issues of the closure of the Robert Miles Primary School on election day and suggested using Bingham Methodist Hall as an alternative. Bingham East Ward is currently made up of two polling districts C1 and C2, both of which use the Robert Miles Primary School.

The options available are set out below:

### *Option 1 – Polling District C1: Retain Robert Miles School as the Polling Station*

- Robert Miles Primary School has served as a polling station in Bingham for many years
- The (Acting) Returning Officer was asked by the school to use alternative premises this year as a result of the number of bank holidays and the impact that closing the school for the day would have caused. A remedy was achieved to suit all parties on this occasion.
- The school has good access and ample parking provision.

### *Option 2 – Polling District C1 and C2: Replace Robert Miles School with Bingham Methodist Hall*

- Bingham Methodist Hall situated on Market Street has been used as a polling station in the past and would be a suitable alternative as it is central and has parking provision.

### **Recommendation – Option 2**

**It is recommended to replace Robert Miles Junior School with Bingham Methodist Hall for polling district C1 and C2, given the issues regarding using the school and its suitability as an alternative venue.**

## **g) Response 10 Bingham West Ward**

The responses highlighted the unsuitable location and accessibility of the current polling place and the perceived effect that this was having on turnout. Bingham West Ward is currently made up of three polling districts (D1, D2 and D3). The first two are located in Bingham whilst the third is the hamlet of Saxondale. The Town Pavilion is the only building in the ward suitable to be used as a polling station and is currently used for all three polling districts.

One response to the consultation suggested that the use of the Town Pavilion has had a negative impact on turnout in the West Ward compared to the East Ward. However turnout was 41.44% in 2011 for when the Town Pavilion was used as the venue for the west ward, compared with 38.37% for turnout when the Methodist Church Hall was the venue in 2007. These figures indicate that there has not been a negative impact on turnout.

The options available are set out below:

### *Option 1 - No Change*

- Town Pavilion be used for all three polling districts in the west ward
- No evidence of negative impact of location on turnout
- No alternative premises available in polling districts D2 and D3

### *Option 2 - Replace Town Pavilion with Community Centre on Chestnut Avenue*

- The ward boundary is adjacent to Chestnut Avenue and as such the Community Centre lies just outside the ward boundary
- The Community Centre is slightly more central to the ward.

The advantages and disadvantages of these options have been considered in detail. These considerations have taken into account access to polling station venues, awareness and understanding of the existing arrangements, potential implications of the electoral review to be undertaken in 2015 and the resources required to enable a change. Furthermore consideration has also been given to making changes to polling stations in view of the forthcoming Police Commissioner elections to be held in November, and the implications for vehicle and pedestrian access at that time of year.

### ***Recommendation – Option 1 - No change***

**It is recommended that the Town Pavilion be retained as the polling place for the three polling districts in the ward. However the issue may be re-considered as part of the forthcoming electoral review and feedback from the Police Commissioners elections to be held in November 2012.**

### **Schedule of Polling Stations**

7. If the recommendations as set out in the report are agreed then it is necessary to revise the schedule of polling places. As such a revised schedule of polling places is attached at **Appendix 2** for approval.

#### **Financial Comments**

If changes are made to the polling districts and polling places then there could be a resource implication depending on the nature of the change. It is anticipated that these costs would be met from existing budgets.

#### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no direct section 17 issues.

#### **Diversity**

There are no direct diversity implications arising from this report however it is essential that the determination of polling districts and places is consistent with the principle of ensuring fair and equitable access to democratic processes.

#### **Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

Notice of Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places  
Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places guidance  
Acting Returning Officers Proposals  
Submissions to consultation received

## Polling District, Polling Places and Polling Stations Review

### Summary of Consultation Comments Requesting Changes to Polling Districts and/or Polling Places

No.	Polling Place	Access Issues	ARO Comments	Submission
1	Crossdale Drive Primary School, Crossdale Drive, Keyworth  <i>North Keyworth Ward</i>	No access issues	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter from ward member requesting the use of an alternative venue such as the Fairway Pub or the playgroup annex to the school to prevent closure of the whole school based on complaints he receives for the whole school being closed for the day</li> </ul>
2	Lady Bay Primary School, Junior School Building, Trent Boulevard, West Bridgford  <i>Lady Bay Ward</i>	Small step into premises	The current polling station is in the adjoining polling district. Alternative suitable proposals welcomed for consideration in J1 polling district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter Received from a resident requesting that All Hallows Church Hall be used instead of Lady Bay Primary School in order to avoid the current disruption to pupils education and the need for working parents to find and pay additional childcare.</li> </ul>
3	Community Centre, Walcote Drive, West Bridgford  <i>Lutterell Ward</i>	No access issues	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Ward Member proposing a new polling station be created for the following area at The Community Centre, Rugby Road:</li> <li>• Northwold Avenue, East View, Castle View, Rugby Road, Roecliffe, Loughborough Road, Swithland Drive, Burnside Road and Kingswood Road</li> </ul>



No.	Polling Place	Access Issues	ARO Comments	Submission
4	Radcliffe on Trent Sports Association Pavilion, Bingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent  <i>Manvers Ward</i>	Permanent ramp	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Parish Council requesting this polling station no longer be used and that electors vote at Grange Hall. The parish council believe there is currently over provision of polling stations. They believe the 5 stations could be reduced to 2, one at upper saxondale and one at Grange Hall. Their reasoning is based on expenditure incurred in having so many stations.</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received by 10 electors</li> <li>• Letter of Support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Labour Party together with a petition signed by 773 electors</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Resident Association</li> </ul>
5	British Legion Hall, 17 Main Road, Radcliffe on Trent  <i>Manvers Ward</i>	No access issues	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Parish Council requesting this polling station no longer be used and that electors vote at Grange Hall</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received by 5 electors</li> <li>• Letter of Support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Labour Party together with a petition signed by 773 electors</li> </ul>

No.	Polling Place	Access Issues	ARO Comments	Submission
6	<p>Wellspring Church, Westminster Drive, Upper Saxondale, Radcliffe on Trent</p> <p><i>Manvers Ward</i></p>	Permanent ramp	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Parish Council requesting this polling station be retained</li> <li>• Letter of Support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Labour Party together with a petition signed by 773 electors</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Resident Association</li> </ul>
7	<p>Craig Moray, Community Centre, 42 Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent</p> <p><i>Trent Ward</i></p>	Permanent ramp	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Parish Council requesting this polling station no longer be used and that electors vote at Grange Hall</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received by 10 electors</li> <li>• Letter of Support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Labour Party together with a petition signed by 773 electors</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Resident Association</li> </ul>
8	<p>Grange Hall, Vicarage Lane, Radcliffe on Trent</p> <p><i>Trent Ward</i></p>	No access issues	No identified problems or issues, no change proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter received from Parish Council requesting this polling station be retained</li> <li>• Letter of Support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Labour Party together with a petition signed by 773 electors</li> <li>• Letter of support to retain polling station received from Radcliffe on Trent Resident Association</li> </ul>

No.	Polling Place	Access Issues	ARO Comments	Submission
9	Robert Miles Junior School, Market Place, Bingham  <i>Bingham East Ward</i>	No Access Issues	No comments made	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter received from Bingham Labour party requesting that Bingham Methodist Hall be used instead of Robert Miles School so that the school is not closed and doesn't disrupt education and cause problems for working parents. They believe both wards could be accommodated in the Methodist hall.</li> </ul>
10	Town Pavilion, Brendon Grove, Bingham  <i>Bingham West Ward</i>	No Access Issues	No Comments made	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter Received from Bingham Town Council requesting Bingham Methodist Church be used as a polling station rather than the Town Pavilion as they feel it is too far out</li> <li>Letter received from Bingham Labour party requesting that Bingham Methodist Hall be used instead of The Town Pavilion due to difficulty in accessing the town pavilion from pedestrians on the other side of Nottingham road and that The Methodist Hall be used for both wards.</li> <li>Letter received from Ward Member requesting that Bingham Methodist Hall be used instead of the Town Pavilion due to its location and difficulty in accessing based on an informal survey of conversation with residents and the low turnout in the West Ward compared to the east ward. It is argued that the Methodist Hall is on a bus route and that access to it on foot is better as it is completely flat and level</li> <li>Letter received from East Ward Member requesting that Bingham Methodist Hall or Chestnut Avenue Community Centre should be used instead of the Town Pavilion due to its location and difficulty in accessing and lower turnout figures.</li> </ul>

## Rushcliffe Borough Council

## Proposed Revised Schedule of Polling Districts and Polling Places

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
Abbey	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Abbey <b>F1</b>	<b>Part of the Abbey ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Abbey Road (Part), Albert Road, Blake Road, Brockley Road, Cyril Road, Davies Road, Eltham Road, Florence Road, Mabel Grove, Priory Road, Radcliffe Road, Tudor Square (Part) and Violet Road.	Abbey Park Community Centre, Buckfast Way, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Abbey <b>F2</b>	<b>Part of the Abbey ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Abbey Circus, Abbey Road (Part), Abingdon Road, Bisham Drive, Bolton Close, Buckfast Way, Burleigh Road (Part), Cambridge Road, Dale Close, Dunster Road (Part), Fountains Close, Furness Close, Gardens Court, Gordon Road, Hexham Close, Mayflower Close, Mountsorrel Drive, Nearsby Drive, Newstead Drive, Oxford Road, Rodney Road (Part), Rufford Way, Tewkesbury Close, Trevor Road (Part) and Waltham Close.	Abbey Park Community Centre, Buckfast Way, West Bridgford
Bingham East	No.1 Polling District Bingham East <b>C1</b>	<b>Parish of Bingham (East Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Abbey Road, Banes Road, Brownes Road, Butt Road, Carr Road, Chapel Lane, Chaworth Road, Cherry Street, Chestnut Avenue, Church Close, Church Lane, Church Street, Cogley Lane, Crow Court, Douglas Road, East Grove, East Street, Eaton Place, Fairfield Street, Fosters Lane, Gillotts Close, Grantham Road (Part), Green Court, Grove Road, Holme Road, Kirkhill, Langar Road, Langtry Gardens, Manor Road, Market Place, Market Street, Moor Lane, Musters Road, Newgate Street, Nottingham Road, Nursery Road, Old Mill Court, Porchester Road, Priors Close, Rupert Road, Rutland Road, St Marys Road, School Lane, Spinney Road, Stanhope Way, Station Street, Tithby Road (Part), Union Street, Victoria Road and Wiverton Road.	Bingham Methodist Hall, Market Street, Bingham

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	No.2 Polling District Bingham East <b>C2</b>	<b>Parish of Bingham (East Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Ash Close, Aspen Close, Avocet Close, Banks Crescent, Beech Avenue, Beetham Close, Belvoir Vale Grove, Blackthorn Close, Cedar Close, Dark Lane, Derry Lane, Dove Close, Elm Avenue, Fisher Lane, Goldcrest Close, Granby Lane, Grantham Road (Part), Hazel Close, Holly Close, Juniper Gardens, Kestrel Drive, Larch Close, Long Acre, Long Acre East, Mallard Close, Maple Close, Melvyn Drive, Nightingale Way, Oak Avenue, Osprey Close, Partridge Close, Perry Grove, Pinfold, Poplar Close, Raymond Drive, Rowan Close, Sandpiper Close, Skylark Close, Swallow Drive, Sycamore Close, The Banks, The Paddock, Tithby Road (Part), Walkers Close, Willow Road and Woodpecker Close.	Bingham Methodist Hall, Market Street, Bingham
Bingham West	No.1 Polling District Bingham West <b>D1</b>	<b>Parish of Bingham (West Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Arden Grove, Ashdown Grove, Balmoral Road, Bishops Road, Bowland Road, Brendon Grove, Brewsters Close, Carnarvon Close, Carnarvon Place, Charnwood Grove, Chesterfield Avenue, Copeland Grove, Cropton Grove, Edinburgh Drive, Forest Road, Fosse Road (Part), Garden Road, Gardeners Close, Glendoe Grove, Granby Court, Grizedale Grove, Hardwick Grove, Harrison Court, Harvest Close, Hill Drive, Kielder Drive, Langdale Grove, Margaret Place, Milburn Grove, Newstead Grove, Newton Avenue, Nottingham Road, Orchard Avenue, Quantock Grove, Queens Court, Radnor Grove, Ringwood Road, Rockingham Grove, Rothbury Grove, Rufford Grove, Shelford Drive, Sherwood Grove, Stainmore Court, Stainmore Grove, Thoresby Road, Welbeck Grove, Western Avenue, Westfield Road, Windsor Court and Wychwood Road.	Town Pavilion, Brendon Grove, Bingham
	No.2 Polling District Bingham West <b>D2</b>	<b>Parish of Bingham (West Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Angelica Court, Betony Close, Bluebell Bank, Calder Gardens, Champion Way, Celandine Gardens, Charlock Gardens, Cherwell Gardens, Coltsfoot Close, Cowslip Close, Fosse Road (Part), Frome Gardens, Harebell Gardens, Honeysuckle Grove, Lune Way, Mallow Way, Meadowsweet Hill, Medway Drive, Mill Hill Road, Primrose Bank, Sorrel Drive, Speedwell Close, Swale Grove, Tansy Way, Tees Court, The Foxgloves, The Teasels, Tithby Road (Part), Trefoil Close, Valerian Way, Welland Gardens and Wharf Gardens	Town Pavilion, Brendon Grove, Bingham

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	No.3 Polling District Saxondale <b>D3</b>	<b>Parish of Saxondale</b>	Town Pavilion, Brendon Grove, Bingham
Compton Acres	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Compton Acres <b>G1</b>	<b>Part of the Compton Acres ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Ascott Gardens, Beaulieu Gardens, Broadstone Close, Chine Gardens, Compton Acres, Cranberry Close, Durlston Close, Finsbury Park Close, Greenwich Park Close, Heathervale, Leigh Close, Lulworth Close, Lydney Park, Lyme Park, Mulberry Close, Parkstone Close, Purbeck Drive, Redwood, Ruddington Lane, Studland Way, Sundridge Park Close, Syon Park Close, Wareham Close and Wimborne Close.	Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Compton Acres <b>G2</b>	<b>Part of the Compton Acres ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Acorn Bank, Alton Close, Barley Croft, Barndale Close, Beaufort Court, Belgrave Mews, Belton Drive, Blanford Gardens, Botany Close, Bressingham Drive, Broadleigh Close, Brompton Way, Charlecote Park Drive, Claremont Drive, Cloverlands, Court Gardens, Cranford Gardens, Dorset Gardens, Ennismore Mews, Europa View, Exbury Gardens, Farview Court, Flawborough Rise, Green Leys, Harston Gardens, Hatfield Drive, Heather Croft, Hyde Park Close, Kensington Park Close, Kew Close, Killerton Park Drive, Knightsbridge Drive, Linksfield Court, Little Hayes, Maythorn Close, Melford Hall Drive, Mickleborough Way, Orchid Close, Regents Park Close, Ringstead Close, Rugby Road, Saltby Green, Sloane Court, Stonesby Vale, Thurloe Court, Whatton Drive, Wheatcroft View and Wisley Close.	Mobile Station, Compton Acres Shopping Centre, Compton Acres
	No.3 Polling District Bridgford Compton Acres <b>G3</b>	<b>Part of the Compton Acres ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Bede Ling, Bruce Drive, Gresham Close, Gresham Gardens, Little Bounds and Wilford Lane.	Gresham Sports Park, Gresham Park Road, Off Wilford Lane, West Bridgford
Cotgrave	No.1 Polling District Cotgrave <b>T1</b>	<b>Parish of Cotgrave (Manor Ward)</b>	Cotgrave Methodist Church Hall, Bingham Road, Cotgrave
	No.2 Polling District Cotgrave <b>T2</b>	<b>Parish of Cotgrave (Ash Lea Ward)</b>	Cotgrave Leisure Centre, Woodview, Cotgrave

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
Cranmer	Aslockton <b>A</b>	<b>Parish of Aslockton</b>	Thomas Cranmer Centre, Main Street, Aslockton
	Scarrington <b>SS</b>	<b>Parish of Scarrington</b>	The Institute, Hawksworth Road, Scarrington
	Whatton-in-the Vale <b>AD</b>	<b>Parish of Whatton-in-the-Vale</b>	Jubilee Hall, Whatton in the Vale
Edwalton Village	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Edwalton Village <b>H1</b>	<b>Part of the Edwalton Village ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Alford Court, Alford Road (Part), Boundary Road, Croft Road, Endsleigh Gardens, Firs Road, Grange Park, Grange Road, Highgrove Gardens, Hilton Crescent, Hilton Grange, Hollies Drive, Hollycroft, Leahurst Gardens, Leahurst Road, Lutterell Way, Melton Gardens, Melton Road (Part), Ridgway Close, Robinia Court, Rydal Gardens, St Lukes Close, Spinney Close, Sutherland Drive, Trevor Road, Valley Gardens and Valley Road.	St Lukes Church Hall, Leahurst Road, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Edwalton Village <b>H2</b>	<b>Part of the Edwalton Village ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Alford Road (Part), Apple Tree Close, Beech Close, Birkdale Close, Cherry Tree Lane, Earlswood Drive, Edwald Road, Edwalton Close, Edwalton Lodge Close, Gleneagles Court, Green Acre, Hallfields, Hawthorn Close, Hill Farm Court, Hollinwell Court, Landmere Lane, Lytham Drive, Machins Lane, Manor Close, Melton Road (Part), Rochford Court, Sharphill Road, The Paddocks, Turnberry Court, Vicarage Green, Village Close, Village Street, Wellin Close, Wellin Lane, Wentworth Way and Wood View.	Edwalton Church Hall, Vicarage Green, Edwalton
Gamston	Gamston <b>Z</b>	<b>Parish of Gamston</b>	The Institute (Village Hall), Main Road, Gamston

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	Holme Pierrepoint <b>EE</b>	<b>Parish of Holme Pierrepoint</b>	Gedling & Sherwood CC, Regatta Way, Holme Pierrepoint
	No.1 Polling District Gamston <b>I1</b>	<b>Part of the Gamston ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Ashridge Way, Belfry Way, Bleaberry Close, Braefell Close, Burnbank Close, Coxmoor Close, Esk Hause Close, Gillercomb Close, Glenridding Close, Hawkshead Close, Heron's Court, Kingfishers Court, Langstrath Drive, Lindrick Close, Longlands Drive, Newlands Close, Oakmere Close, Portinscale Close, Rosthwaite Close, Saunton Close, Seathwaite Close, Seatoller Close, Skelwith Close, Thirlmere (Part), Ullscarf Close, Wasdale Close, Watendlath Close, Westerhope Close and Woburn Close.	Gamston Community Hall, Ambleside, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Gamston <b>I2</b>	<b>Part of the Gamston ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Angletarn Close, Blencartha Close, Bowscale Close, Brockhole Close, Castlerigg Close, Coledale, Fellbarrow Close, Fleetwith Close, Graystones Close, Kirkfell Close, Levens Close, Lingmell Close, Lodore Close, Lonscale Close, Mardale Close, Mellbreak Close, Oxendale Close, Rannerdale Close, Scafell Close, Seatallan Close, Silverhow Close, Skiddaw Close, Stockgill Close, Thirlmere (Part), Thornthwaite Close, Threlkeld Close, Whinlatter Drive, Yewbarrow Close and Yewdale Close.	Gamston Community Hall, Ambleside, West Bridgford
Gotham	Barton-in-Fabis <b>B</b>	<b>Parish of Barton-in-Fabis</b>	Village Hall, Barton-in-Fabis
	Gotham <b>AA</b>	<b>Parish of Gotham</b>	Village Memorial Hall, Nottingham Road, Gotham
	Thrumpton <b>ZZ</b>	<b>Parish of Thrumpton</b>	Village Hall, Thrumpton
Lady Bay	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Lady Bay <b>J1</b>	<b>Part of the Lady Bay ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Adbolton Grove, Chatsworth Road, Gertrude Road, Holme Grove, Holme Road (Part), Julian Road, Mona Road, Oak Tree Close, Pierrepoint Road, Rutland Road (Part), Seymour Road and Trent Boulevard (Part).	Lady Bay Primary School, Junior School Building, Trent Boulevard, West Bridgford



Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Lady Bay <b>J2</b>	<b>Part of the Lady Bay ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Belvoir Road, Crosby Road, Edward Road, Ella Road, Fleeman Grove, Hardwick Grove, Holme Road (Part), Lady Bay Road, Melbourne Road, Newhall Grove, Oakfields Road, Radcliffe Road, Richmond Road, Ropsley Crescent, Rutland Road (Part), Trent Boulevard (Part), Trevelyan Road and Woodland Road.	Lady Bay Primary School, Junior School Building, Trent Boulevard, West Bridgford
Leake	No.1 Polling District East Leake <b>X1</b>	<b>Parish of East Leake (Castle Ward)</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, East Leake
	No.2 Polling District East Leake <b>X2</b>	<b>Parish of East Leake (Stonebridge Ward)</b>	East Leake Leisure Centre, Lantern Lane, East Leake
	No. 3 Polling District East Leake <b>X3</b>	<b>Parish of East Leake (Woodgate Ward)</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, East Leake
	West Leake <b>AC</b>	<b>Parish of West Leake</b>	Village Hall, West Leake
Lutterell	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Lutterell <b>K1</b>	<b>Part of the Lutterell ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Boxley Drive (Part), Burnside Road, Castle View, Collington Way, East View, Giles Avenue, Greythorn Drive (Part), Halberton Drive, Haven Close, Kingswood Road, Laughton Avenue, Loughborough Road, Northwold Avenue, Rugby Road, Squires Way, Stowe Avenue, Uppingham Crescent, Waddington Drive (Part), Walcote Drive (Part), West View, Westville and Worwood Drive.	Community Centre, Walcote Drive, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Lutterell <b>K2</b>	<b>Part of the Lutterell ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Beaumont Gardens, Boxley Drive (Part), Branston Gardens, Canberra Crescent, Canberra Gardens, Cheshire Court, Colston Crescent, Cropston Close, Denton Drive, Fairland Crescent, Glebe Farm Close, Greythorn Drive (Part), Ives Close, Kingswood Close, Knights Close, Lancelyn Gardens, Lansdowne Drive, Lyndhurst Gardens, Melrose Gardens, Mickleborough Way, Newton Drive, Oakham Road, Queensbury Avenue, Roecliffe, Rosewood Gardens, Spinney Hill, Stanhome Drive, Stanhome Square, Swithland Drive, Waddington Drive (Part), Walcote Drive (Part) and Willwell Drive.	Mobile Station, Car Park, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Stanhome Square, West Bridgford

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
Manvers	No.1 Polling District Radcliffe Manvers <b>NN1</b>	<b>Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent (Manvers Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Blakeney Road, Brickyard Lane, Carter Avenue, Covert Crescent, Cropwell Road, Dewberry Lane, Dormy Close, Dowson Close, Grantham Road, Harlequin Close, Harlequin Mews, Hillside Road, Hudson Way, Johns Road, Marl Road, Meadow End, Morton Close, Morton Gardens, Northfield Avenue, Nursery Close, Nursery Road, South Avenue, Thomas Avenue, Woodland Close, Woodside Avenue and Woodside Road.	Radcliffe on Trent Sports Association Pavilion, Bingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent
	No.2 Polling District Radcliffe Manvers <b>NN2</b>	<b>Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent (Manvers Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Bailey Lane, Barrington Close, Beech Close, Church Close, Cutlers Court, Douglas Close, Granville Crescent, Greenway Close, Hall Close, Hogg Lane, Holme Lane, Jasper Close, Kingsway, Lamcote Gardens, Lees Barn Road, Lime Close, Main Road, Maple Close, Mount Pleasant, Nottingham Road, Orchard Close, Orford Avenue, Paddock Close, Portage Close, Prince Edward Crescent, Regina Close, St Catherine Street, St Lawrence Boulevard, Saskatoon Close, Shadwell Grove, Sycamore Close, Sydney Grove, The Chestnuts, The Green, The Woodlands, Vancouver Avenue, Vicarage Lane, Water Lane, West End Villas, Wharf Lane (Part), Whitworth Drive, Willow Close, Yew Tree Close and Yonge Close.	British Legion Hall, 17 Main Road, Radcliffe on Trent
	No.3 Polling District Radcliffe Manvers <b>NN3</b>	<b>Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent (Manvers Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Berkeley Crescent, Bloomsbury Mews, Buckingham Drive, Carnaby Close, Chelsea Mews, Covent Gardens, Grosvenor Close, Hammersmith Close, Home Farm Lane, Mayfair, Queen Marys Close, Saxondale Drive, Serpentine Close, Shaftesbury Avenue, Westminster Drive and Whitehall Court.	Wellspring Church, Westminster Drive, Upper Saxondale, Radcliffe on Trent
Melton	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Melton <b>L1</b>	<b>Part of the Melton ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Alford Road (Part), Burleigh Road (Part), Corvedale Walk, Covert Road, Cromford Road, Devonshire Road, Dovedale Road, Dunster Road (Part), Exeter Road, Glenmore Road, Haddon Road, Hill Close, Leahurst Road (Part), Mellors Road, Melton Road (Part), Mowbray Gardens, Parkcroft Road, Rodney Road, St Helens Road, Stamford Road, Stokesay Walk, Taunton Road, Teme Court, Trevor Road (Part), Villiers Road, Wenlock Drive, Whitcliffe Gardens and Willoughby Road.	West Bridgford Sports Club, Stamford Road, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Melton <b>L2</b>	<b>Part of the Melton ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Annesley Road, Byron Road, Carnarvon Road, Clumber Road, Edwinstowe Avenue, Ethel Road, Exchange Road, Glebe Road, Gordon Road, Highfield Grove, Highfield Road, Ludlow Avenue, Manvers Road, Marlborough Court, Portland Road, Rectory Road (Part), Stanley Road, Tavistock Road, Terrian Crescent and Tudor Road.	West Bridgford Junior School, Exchange Road, West Bridgford

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
Musters	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Musters <b>M1</b>	<b>Part of the Musters ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Bromley Road, Chaworth Road, Devonshire Road, Eton Road, Hampton Road, Kingston Road, Loughborough Road (Part), Musters Crescent, Musters Road (Part), North Road, South Road, West Avenue and Wordsworth Road.	West Bridgford Baptist Church, Melton Road, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Musters <b>M2</b>	<b>Part of the Musters ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Boundary Road, Bracey Rise, Dorchester Gardens, Ellesmere Road, Grainger Avenue, Haileybury Crescent, Haileybury Road, Harrow Road, Loughborough Road (Part), Malvern Crescent, Malvern Road, Musters Road (Part), Peveril Drive, Ralf Close, Repton Road, Selby Road, Sherborne Road, Wilfrid Grove and Willow Road.	St Pauls Church Hall, Boundary Road, West Bridgford.
Nevile	Hickling <b>DD</b>	<b>Parish of Hickling</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, Hickling
	Kinoulton <b>II1</b>	<b>Parish of Kinoulton</b>	Village Hall, Kinoulton
	Owthorpe <b>II2</b>	<b>Parish of Owthorpe</b>	Village Hall, Kinoulton
	Upper Broughton <b>O</b>	<b>Parish of Upper Broughton</b>	Village Hall, Upper Broughton
North Keyworth	Keyworth North <b>FF</b>	<b>Parish of Keyworth (North Ward)</b>	Crossdale Drive Primary School, Crossdale Drive, Keyworth
Oak	Car Colston <b>Q1</b>	<b>Parish of Car Colston</b>	Car Colston & Screveton Village Hall
	Screveton <b>Q2</b>	<b>Parish of Screveton</b>	Car Colston & Screveton Village Hall
	East Bridgford <b>W1</b>	<b>Parish of East Bridgford</b>	East Bridgford Methodist Chapel, Main Street, East Bridgford

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	Kneeton <b>W2</b>	<b>Parish of Kneeton</b>	East Bridgford Methodist Chapel, Main Street, East Bridgford
Ruddington	No.1 Polling District Ruddington <b>RR1</b>	<b>Parish of Ruddington (Camelot Ward)</b>	Village Hall, Wilford Road, Ruddington
	No.2 Polling District Ruddington <b>RR2</b>	<b>Parish of Ruddington (Easthorpe Ward)</b>	Village Hall, Wilford Road, Ruddington
	No.3 Polling District Ruddington <b>RR3</b>	<b>Parish of Ruddington (Flawford Ward)</b>	St Peters Rooms, Church Street, Ruddington
	No.4 Polling District Ruddington <b>RR4</b>	<b>Parish of Ruddington (Manor Ward)</b>	St Peters Rooms, Church Street, Ruddington
Soar Valley	Kingston Upon Soar <b>HH</b>	<b>Parish of Kingston-upon-Soar</b>	Village Hall, Kingston on Soar
	Ratcliffe Upon Soar <b>PP</b>	<b>Parish of Ratcliffe-upon-Soar</b>	Village Hall, Kingston on Soar
	Sutton Bonington <b>XX</b>	<b>Parish of Sutton Bonington</b>	Village Hall, St Annes Lane, Sutton Bonington
South Keyworth	No.1 Polling District Keyworth South <b>GG1</b>	<b>Parish of Keyworth (South Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Alder Way, Ash Grove, Ashley Crescent, Ashley Road, Beech Avenue, Cherry Hill, Church Drive, Crantock Gardens, Elm Avenue, Elm Close, Fairway, Highview Avenue, Laburnum Avenue, Larch Way, Laurel Avenue, Lilac Close, Limetree Close, Lyncombe Gardens, Maple Close, Meadow Drive, Mount Pleasant (Part), Nicker Hill (Part), Rannock Court, Rannock Gardens, Rowan Drive, Selby Lane, The Ridings, Walton Court, Walton Drive, Widmerpool Lane, Willow Brook, Windmill Court, Wolds Drive (Part), Wolds Rise and Wynbreck Drive.	Village Hall, Elm Avenue, Keyworth

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	No.2 Polling District Keyworth South <b>GG2</b>	<b>Parish of Keyworth (South Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Barrow Slade, Blind Lane, Brookview Drive, Bunny Lane, Cedar Drive, Charnwood Avenue, Chestnut Close, Croft Road, Dale Road, Debdale Lane (Part), East Close, Fairham Road, Far Pastures Close, Gorse Road, Hawthorn Close, Hayes Road, Holmsfield, Intake Road, Lings Lane, Main Street, Manor Road, Nottingham Road, Park Avenue, Park Avenue East, Plantation Road, Rose Hill, Roseland Close, Spinney Road, Thelda Avenue, The Square, West Close, Woodleigh, Wrights Orchard and Wysall Lane.	Village Hall, Elm Avenue, Keyworth
Stanford	Bradmore <b>E</b>	<b>Parish of Bradmore</b>	Methodist Community Hall, Bradmore
	Bunny <b>P</b>	<b>Parish of Bunny</b>	Village Hall, Bunny
	Costock <b>S</b>	<b>Parish of Costock</b>	Village Hall, Costock
	Normanton-on-Soar <b>KK</b>	<b>Parish of Normanton-on-Soar</b>	Village Hall, Normanton on Soar
	Rempstone <b>QQ</b>	<b>Parish of Rempstone</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, Rempstone
	Stanford on Soar <b>VV</b>	<b>Parish of Stanford-on-Soar</b>	Village Hall, Normanton on Soar
Thoroton	Elton-on-the-Hill <b>LL1</b>	<b>Parish of Elton-on-the-Hill</b>	Village Hall, Orston
	Flawborough <b>LL2</b>	<b>Parish of Flawborough</b>	Village Hall, Orston
	Flintham <b>Y</b>	<b>Parish of Flintham</b>	Flintham Village Hall, Inholms Road, Flintham
	Granby cum Sutton <b>BB</b>	<b>Parish of Granby cum Sutton</b>	Village Hall, Granby
	Hawksworth <b>CC</b>	<b>Parish of Hawksworth</b>	Church Hall, Hawksworth
	Orston <b>LL3</b>	<b>Parish of Orston</b>	Village Hall, Orston
	Shelton <b>UU1</b>	<b>Parish of Shelton</b>	Manor House Farm, Thoroton
	Sibthorpe <b>UU2</b>	<b>Parish of Sibthorpe</b>	Church Hall, Hawksworth

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
	Thoroton <b>YY</b>	<b>Parish of Thoroton</b>	Manor House Farm, Thoroton
Tollerton	Tollerton <b>AB1</b>	<b>Parish of Tollerton</b>	Methodist Church Hall, Burnside Grove, Tollerton
	Clipston <b>AB2</b>	<b>Parish of Clipston</b>	Methodist Church Hall, Burnside Grove, Tollerton
Trent	No.1 Polling District Radcliffe Trent <b>OO1</b>	<b>Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent (Trent Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Birkin Avenue, Butler Avenue, Chatsworth Avenue, Chestnut Grove, Cliff Crescent, Cliff Drive, Cliff Way, Clumber Drive, Fernwood Drive, Grandfield Avenue, Grandfield Crescent, Haddon Way, Hamilton Drive, Hopewell Close, Malkin Avenue, Newstead Avenue, Newton Avenue, Oak Tree Avenue, Park Road, Penrith Avenue, Queens Road, Richmond Drive, Ridge Lane, Rockley Avenue, Shelford Close, Shelford Road (Part), Stanford Gardens, Thoresby Close, Trent View Gardens, Valley Road, Wakefield Avenue, Welbeck Road and Westcliffe Avenue	Craig Moray, 42 Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent
	No.2 Polling District Radcliffe Trent <b>OO2</b>	<b>Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent (Trent Ward) (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Albert Street, Bingham Road, Bolton Terrace, Brielen Court, Brielen Road, Brookfield Close, Cherrytree Close, Cropwell Gardens, Cropwell Road, Eastwood Road, Gatcombe Close, Glebe Lane, Golf Road, Grantham Road, Harewood Close, Hunt Close, Lincoln Grove, Lorne Grove, Main Road, Manvers Grove, New Road, Oakfield, Oakfield Court, Palin Gardens, Radcliffe Residential Park, Richmond Terrace, Rushcliffe Avenue, Saddlers Gate, Shelford Road (Part), Station Terrace, The Crescent, Victoria Street, Walkers Yard, Walnut Grove and Wharf Lane (Part).	Grange Hall, Vicarage Lane, Radcliffe on Trent
	Shelford <b>TT1</b>	<b>Parish of Shelford and Newton (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Bosworth Close, Burden Lane, Church Street, Hawthorn Close, Julian Lane, Main Road, Manor Lane, Millers Close, Pinfold Lane, Shelford Hill, Shelford Road, Stoke Ferry Lane, Water Lane and West Street.	Village Hall, Church Street, Shelford
	Newton <b>TT2</b>	<b>Parish of Shelford and Newton (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Fairway Crescent, Friar Walk, Main Street, Newton Aerodrome, Newton Gardens, Shelford Road and Trenchard Close	Newton House Farm, Main Street, Newton

Ward	Polling District	Areas within polling District	Polling place
Trent Bridge	No.1 Polling District Bridgford Trent Bridge <b>N1</b>	<b>Part of the Trent Bridge ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Balmoral Avenue, Bridge Grove, Epperstone Road (Part), Henry Road (Part), Loughborough Road (Part), Millicent Grove, Millicent Road, Musters Road (Part), Patrick Road, Rushworth Avenue, Sandringham Avenue, Trent Side, Welbeck Road and William Road.	West Bridgford Methodist Church Hall, Musters Road, West Bridgford
	No.2 Polling District Bridgford Trent Bridge <b>N2</b>	<b>Part of the Trent Bridge ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Avon Gardens, Carlyle Court, Carlyle Road, Chantrey Road, Charnwood Grove, Chestnut Grove, Elm Tree Avenue, Epperstone Road (Part), George Road, Henry Road (Part), Loughborough Road (Part), Melton Grove, Melton Road, Musters Road (Part), Peveril Court, Rectory Road (Part), Victoria Road and West Avenue.	Social Centre, Catholic Church, Victoria Road, West Bridgford
	No.3 Polling District Bridgford Trent Bridge <b>N3</b>	<b>Part of the Trent Bridge ward</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Bridgford Road, Central Avenue, Church Croft, Church Drive, Colwick Road, Edwalton Avenue, Fox Road, Hawksworth Road, Hound Road, Orston Road East, Park Avenue, Pavilion Road, Radcliffe Mount, Radcliffe Road, Rectory Road (Part), Rosebery Avenue, Scarrington Road, Stratford Road, Thoroton Road and Wellington Crescent.	West Bridgford Methodist Church Hall, Musters Road, West Bridgford
Wiverton	Colston Bassett <b>R</b>	<b>Parish of Colston Bassett</b>	The Village Hall, Colston Bassett
	Cropwell Bishop <b>U</b>	<b>Parish of Cropwell Bishop</b>	Cropwell Bishop Community Building, The Old School, Fern Road, Cropwell Bishop
	Cropwell Butler <b>V1</b>	<b>Parish of Cropwell Butler</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, Cropwell Butler
	Langar <b>JJ1</b>	<b>Parish of Langar-cum-Barnstone (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Barnstone Road, Belvoir Crescent, Bingham Road, Butlers Field, Church Lane, Coach Gap Lane, Colston Bassett Road, Cropwell Road, Earl Howe Crescent, Harby Road, Langar Lane, Langar Woods Park Homes Estate, Main Street, Musters Road and Willow Lane.	Langar C E Primary School, Church Lane, Langar
	Barnstone <b>JJ2</b>	<b>Parish of Langar-cum-Barnstone (Part)</b> comprising the area which includes the following streets:- Granby Lane, Langar Road, Main Road, Orchard Close, Park Road, The Brambles and Works Lane.	The Institute, Barnstone
	Tithby and Wiverton <b>V2</b>	<b>Parish of Tithby and Wiverton</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, Cropwell Butler

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Areas within polling District</b>	<b>Polling place</b>
	Wiverton Hall <b>V3</b>	<b>Parish of Wiverton Hall</b>	Village Hall, Main Street, Cropwell Butler
Wolds	Normanton-on-the-Wolds <b>MM1</b>	<b>Parish of Normanton-on-the-Wolds</b>	Burnside Memorial Hall, Church Hill, Plumtree
	Plumtree <b>MM2</b>	<b>Parish of Plumtree</b>	Burnside Memorial Hall, Church Hill, Plumtree
	Stanton on the Wolds <b>WW</b>	<b>Parish of Stanton-on-The Wolds</b>	Willow Brook School, Off Stanton Lane, Stanton on the Wolds
	Widmerpool <b>AE</b>	<b>Parish of Widmerpool</b>	Rugby Club Pavilion, Willoughby Road, Widmerpool
	Willoughby-on-the-Wolds <b>AF</b>	<b>Parish of Willoughby-on-the-Wolds</b>	Village Hall, London Lane, Willoughby on the Wolds
	Thorpe-in-the-Glebe <b>AG1</b>	<b>Parish of Thorpe-in-the-Glebe</b>	Village Hall, Wysall
	Wysall <b>AG2</b>	<b>Parish of Wysall</b>	Village Hall, Wysall



## **REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

### **Summary**

As part of the Electoral Review Process this report sets out the proposed Council size as recommended to Council by Cabinet.

### **Recommendation**

It is RECOMMENDED that Council:-

- i. agrees the Council size submission (attached) as recommended by Cabinet which proposes a reduction from 50 to 45 Councillors, and
- ii. requests that the Chief Executive make arrangements for the document to be sent to the Commission as the Council's agreed submission.

### **Detail**

1. At its meeting on 29 November 2011 the Cabinet considered a report setting out the proposed Council size submission as part of the Electoral Review process. Cabinet endorsed the submission and recommended it to Council for approval. In order to meet the timetable set by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), Cabinet requested that the Chief Executive send the document to the Commission, as the Council's provisional submission, prior to its consideration by Council. This was sent to the Commission on 30 November 2011.
2. The report considered by Cabinet highlighted that at its meeting in March 2011 Council considered a report regarding the submission of a formal request to the LGBCE for a further electoral review of the Borough. Having considered the report Council requested that the Chief Executive write to the Commission asking them to undertake a further electoral review. Subsequently a written request was submitted to the Commission on 14 March who responded on 4 April indicating that the Borough had been identified as potentially requiring an electoral review.
3. In May 2011 the Commission confirmed that an electoral review of the Borough would be undertaken with a view to this commencing in January 2012. The reason for this decision was that 32% of the Council's wards had a variance of 10% above or below the average electorate per Councillor. Furthermore these imbalances were unlikely to be corrected by foreseeable changes to the electorate in the next five years.
4. As part of the preliminary stages of the review the Commission met officers of the Council together with Political Group Leaders in August 2011 and provided

a presentation to full Council in September 2011, setting out further details of the review process. A presentation was also provided to the Parish and Town Councils at the Parish Forum Event held on 26 October 2011.

5. The review process requires the Council to make a submission setting out its proposals for Council size evidencing the reasoning and rationale for this. This is then considered by the Commission prior to the commencement of the more detailed and in-depth formal review process. Attached to this report is the provisional Council size submission as recommended by Cabinet. As part of the review process the submission is evaluated to determine if it is justified, reasoned and evidence based.
6. Guidance issued by the LGBCE suggests that the following issues should be considered when developing a proposal for Council Size:
  - ***Managing the business of the Council and the roles and responsibilities of Councillors*** - The model of local governance used by the local authority impacts on the workload of Councillors and the working practices of the Council, and therefore will have an effect on the number of councillors needed.
  - ***The functions of Scrutiny, Member Panels and Groups and Regulatory Committees*** - The structure and responsibilities of these functions impacts on the workload of Councillors.
  - ***Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community*** - The role and responsibilities of Councillors, especially if there have been any significant changes since the introduction of the Local Government Act 2000 (LGA) and the Local Government Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIH 2007).
7. The above issues are considered in the Submission, which presents the case for the recommended Council size. The Submission has been drafted taking into account the Commission's guidance and examples of best practice as highlighted by the Commission.
8. The Submission identifies that it may be possible to reduce the size of the Council from 50 to 45 Councillors. Based on the information set out in the Submission a reduction in Council size of this nature would not affect the ability of Councillors to carry out an effective representation role. It would also not be detrimental to the internal management of the Council. However such a reduction would require adjustment of the existing governance structure to evaluate the appropriate number and composition of the Council's Committees.
9. The Submission indicates that a reduction in Council size from 50 to 45 Councillors is likely to address issues of electoral equality and support consistency across the Borough. The Submission identifies that a figure of 45 Councillors could be achieved through provision of single and multi-member wards dependant on ward size adopted.
10. It is recognised that the proposed reduction will initially impact on existing ward boundaries, however at this preliminary stage the Submission can only reflect a proposal in relation to Council size. It cannot propose any changes to ward boundaries.

11. If the Commission accepts the Council size submission then it is anticipated that the review process would commence early in the new-year. Initially there would be a six to eight month period to facilitate discussion of the Council size enabling interested parties to make further representations to the Commission.
12. Following this the Commission would undertake the more detailed review process by engaging with interested parties. This would commence in Spring 2012. The Commission would then publish draft recommendations in September 2012 and following consultation on these it would publish final recommendations in early 2013. These final recommendations would then be implemented by order in the Houses of Parliament.

### **Risk and uncertainties**

13. Failure to ensure electoral representation is fair and equitable restricts the Council's ability to deliver services reflective of local need, demand and choice. Disproportionate electorate to Councillor numbers reduces capacity to ensure understanding of local representation and ensure it properly reflects community identity.
14. As highlighted in this report 32% of the Council's wards have a variance of 10% above or below the average electorate per Councillor meeting the Commission's criteria for initiating an electoral review. Therefore it is essential that a reasoned and justified submission on Council size is made by the authority at this formative stage. This will enable the Council to influence and inform the review process ensuring its proposals will provide sufficient Councillors for effective and convenient governance and community leadership.
15. A reduction in the number of Councillors would require an adjustment of the Council's governance arrangements and the number and composition of its committees. Therefore it is essential that any proposed changes are evidence based and justified in order to ensure there are sufficient Councillors to deliver a revised governance structure.

### **Financial Comments**

A reduction in the number of Councillors would have a financial impact as it may reduce the cost of allowances. If the review process were to reduce the number of Councillors then it may be necessary to review the Members Allowance Scheme in line with any review of governance arrangements. This will ensure that any future proposed changes to the number of committees and their composition is reflected in Councillors allowances.

### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no direct implications from this report.

### **Diversity**

There are no direct equality and diversity implications arising from this report.

**Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

Periodic Electoral Review of the Borough of Rushcliffe - May 2000

Cabinet Report and Resolution 8 February 2011 – Electoral Review Opportunity

Local Government Boundary Commission for England - Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance – Electoral equality / Convenient and effective local government – May 2011

Council Report 3 March 2011 – Electoral Review Opportunity – Cabinet Recommendation

Minutes of Council 3 March 2011 – Electoral Review Opportunity – Cabinet Recommendation

Cabinet Report and Resolution 29 November 2011 – Electoral Review Proposed Council Size Submission



Rushcliffe  
Borough Council

# **RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **SUBMISSION ON COUNCIL SIZE**

## Executive Summary

This submission proposes reducing the size of the Council from 50 to 45 Councillors. Based on the evidence set out in this submission a reduction in Council size of this nature would not affect the ability of Councillors to carry out an effective representation role. It would also not be detrimental to the internal management of the Council.

A reduction in Council size from 50 to 45 Councillors will address issues of electoral equality and support consistency across the Borough. It will also ensure representation is reflective of community identify and supports effective and coherent local government. A figure of 45 Councillors could be achieved through provision of single and multi-member wards dependant on ward size.

This proposed reduction will require ward boundary changes however at this preliminary stage this submission is only proposing the reduction in Council size.

Based on the electorate at 1 September 2011 the average electors per Councillor for the Borough is 1728. Compared with neighbouring authorities Rushcliffe has less electorate per Councillor than any other Council, meaning it has a high number of Councillors. The table below sets out the ratio of electors to Councillors across other Nottinghamshire authorities.

**TABLE 1**

Authority	Electorate	Number of Councillors	Number of Electorate per Councillor
Ashfield	90,322	33	2,737
Bassetlaw	86,396	48	1,800
Broxtowe	84,546	44	1,922
Gedling	88,440	50	1,769
Mansfield	81,653	36	2,268
Mansfield *Pre electoral review	81,653	46	1,773
Newark and Sherwood	85,846	46	1,866
Rushcliffe	86424	50	1,728

In the Borough there are 9 wards which are more than 10% above or below this average. These are set out below.

**TABLE 2**

Ward	Number of Cllrs	Electorate 1 September 2011	Variance + or - average figure
Gamston	2	4024	+16%
North Keyworth	1	1414	-18%
South Keyworth	3	4173	- 19%
Lady Bay	2	3835	+ 11%
Nevile	1	1548	- 11%
Soar Valley	1	2094	+21%
Stanford	1	2131	+23%
Trent	2	3837	+11%
Wiverton	2	3086	-11%

The table evidences the significant variances in electorate per Councillor across the 28 wards.

The Local Government Boundary Commission's criteria for initiating an electoral review are:

- More than 30% of a Councils wards having an electoral imbalance of more than 10% from the average ratio for that authority
- One or more wards with an electoral imbalance of more than 30%
- The imbalance is unlikely to be corrected by foreseeable changes to the electorate

The previous table evidences that the Council meets the Commission's criteria with 32% of its wards having a variance 10% above or below the average. Furthermore these imbalances are unlikely to be corrected by foreseeable changes to the electorate in the next five years.

A Council size of 45 could provide an average electorate per Councillor ratio of 1921 (based on the electorate figure at 1 September 2011). Such a figure could address the electoral inequality across the Borough and provide more effective representation reflective of community identity.

# CONTENTS

<b>1. BACKGROUND</b>	
1.1. <i>Rushcliffe Borough Council</i>	4
1.2. <i>Periodic Electoral Review 1999</i>	5
1.3. <i>Electoral Review Process</i>	5
1.4. <i>Guidance on Calculating Council Size</i>	6
<b>2. MANAGING THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL</b>	
2.1. <i>Context</i>	6
2.2. <i>Roles and Responsibilities of Councillors</i>	7
2.2.1. Full Council	
2.2.2. Cabinet	
2.2.3. Delegations to Officers	
2.2.4. Notification of Cabinet Decisions	
2.3. <i>Functions of Scrutiny, Member Panels and Groups and Regulatory Committees – Structure and Responsibilities</i>	8
2.3.1. Overview and Scrutiny	
2.3.2. Call-in of Key Decisions of the Cabinet	
2.3.3. Delivery of the Council's Four Year Financial Plan	
2.3.4. Regulatory Committees	
2.3.5. Other Less Frequent Committees and Member Groups	
2.4. <i>Number of Committee Places</i>	15
2.5. <i>Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community</i>	16
<b>3. PARISH/TOWN COUNCILS</b>	20
<b>4. OUTSIDE BODIES</b>	21
<b>5. PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS</b>	21
<b>6. POPULATION AND ELECTORATE FORECASTING</b>	22
<b>7. CONCLUSION</b>	23
7.1. <i>Managing the business of the Council and the roles and responsibilities of Councillors</i>	
7.2. <i>Functions of Scrutiny, Member Panels and Groups and Regulatory Committees</i>	
7.3. <i>Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community</i>	
<b>8. LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	27



# 1. BACKGROUND

## 1.1 *Rushcliffe Borough Council*

Rushcliffe lies south of Nottingham and the River Trent. It extends across towards Newark in the north east and Loughborough in the south west, covering an area of 157 square miles. Although parts of the Borough lie close to Nottingham, Rushcliffe has a strong identity of its own. The Borough has a population of approximately 112,000 and it is most affluent area within the county, with low levels of unemployment and crime and higher than average incomes, however there are small pockets of deprivation.

There are 50 Borough Councillors across 28 wards comprising 10 single Councillors wards, 14 wards with two Councillors, and four wards with three Councillors. All Councillors are elected for a four year term.

The main centre of population is the urban area of West Bridgford with the remaining area of the Borough being 58 Parishes, 40 of which elect Parish Councillors.

The Borough electorate as at 1 September 2011 is 86,424 and the Borough has a high level of electoral turnout as follows:

Local Election 2011 - 50.75%  
Parish Election 2011 - 45.62%  
Referendum 2011 - 51.8%  
Parliamentary Election 2010 - 73.8%  
European Election 2009 - 46.07%

Following the Local Government Act 2000 (LGA 2000) the Council has operated executive arrangements with the Leader appointed for a four year term at the Annual Council following the local elections. The Cabinet comprises six Members including the Leader with each Cabinet Member being a portfolio holder. Member Groups commissioned by the Cabinet are set up, when necessary to consider particular topics and issues.

The Council has four Scrutiny Groups with additional task and finish Member Panels being set up when necessary.

At its meeting in March 2011 Council considered a report regarding the submission of a formal request to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) for a further electoral review of the Borough. Having considered the report Council requested that the Chief Executive write to the Commission asking them to undertake a further electoral review for the Borough. Subsequently the Chief Executive wrote to the Commission on 14 March who responded on 4 April indicating that the Borough had been identified as potentially requiring an electoral review.

In May 2011 the Commission confirmed that a further electoral review of the Borough would be undertaken with a view of this commencing in January 2012. As part of the preliminary stages of the review the Commission met with Council Officers and the Political Group Leaders in August 2011 and provided a presentation to Full Council in September 2011 setting out further details of the review process.

The review process requires the Council to make a submission setting out its proposals for Council size evidencing the reasoning and rationale for this. This is then considered by the Commission prior to the commencement of the more detailed and in-depth formal review

process. Consequently this submission, recommended by Cabinet for endorsement by Council at its meeting on 15 December represents the Council's proposals for Council size.

## **1.2 Periodic Electoral Review 1999**

A Periodic Electoral Review of the Borough was undertaken by the Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) commencing in May 1999 and concluding in May 2000. At that time the Borough Council had 54 Councillors across 29 wards. This was reduced to 50 Councillors across 28 wards.

The Periodic Electoral Review's primary objective was to consider the most appropriate electoral arrangements for the Borough and, so far as reasonably practicable ensure that the number of electors represented by each Councillor was as nearly as possible the same.

At stage one of the Periodic Electoral Review the Borough Council identified three options for consideration in relation to Council size. Two of these options were based on retaining the Council size of 54 with one option being a reduction to 45. At the time the Commission noted that the Borough Council had introduced new political management structures, in line with the Government's White Paper *Local Leadership, Local Choice*. This had led to the development of the Scrutiny function and a reduction in the number of Committees.

As such the Commission were satisfied that at stage one of the Periodic Electoral Review a more significant reduction in the Council size would not be detrimental to the internal management of the Council and would not affect the ability of Members to carry out an effective representational role.

When conducting the Periodic Electoral Review the LGCE established that:

- In 14 of the then 29 wards the number of electors represented by each Councillor varied by more than 10% from the average for the Borough and five wards varied by more than 20% from the average;
- At the time electoral equality was not expected to improve with the number of electors per Councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 13 wards and by more than 20% in seven wards.

The LGCE concluded that:

- The Council should have 50 Councillors (a reduction of 4) across 28 wards (one fewer);
- The boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified and nine wards should retain their existing boundaries; and
- Elections of the whole Council should continue to take place every four years.

## **1.3 Electoral Review Process**

The initial stage of an Electoral Review is to determine a preferred Council size. This is the number of Councillors required to deliver effective and convenient local government (choosing the appropriate number of Members to allow the Council and individual Councillors to perform most effectively).

This will subsequently determine the average (optimum) number of electors per Councillor to be achieved across all wards of the authority. This number is reached by dividing the

electorate by the number of Councillors on the authority. Guidance from the LGBCE states that “All proposals on Council size, whether for changing the existing size or not, should be justified and evidence must be provided in support of the proposal.”

#### **1.4 Guidance on Calculating Council Size**

Schedule 2 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the act) sets out statutory criteria to which the LGBCE are to have regard when conducting electoral reviews. In broad terms the commission is to have regard to the need to:

- equality of representation
- reflecting the identities and interests of local communities; and
- effective and convenient local government

Guidance issued by the LGBCE suggests that the following issues should be considered when developing a proposal for Council size:

***Managing the business of the Council and the roles and responsibilities of Councillors*** - The model of local governance used by the local authority impacts on the workload of Councillors and the working practices of the Council, and therefore will have an effect on the number of Councillors needed.

***The functions of Scrutiny, Member Panels and Groups and Regulatory Committees*** - The structure and responsibilities of these functions impacts on the workload of Councillors.

***Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community*** - The role and responsibilities of Councillors, especially if there have been any significant changes since the introduction of the Local Government Act 2000 (LGA) and the Local Government Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIH 2007).

These issues are considered in this submission, which presents the case for the recommended council size for Rushcliffe Borough Council. This report concludes that the optimum council size to enable convenient and effective local government for the Borough is 45 Councillors.

## **2. MANAGING THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL**

### **2.1 Context**

The LGA 2000 fundamentally altered the political management of local authorities by separating executive from non-executive functions. Previously the Council had a range of committees each with its own remit and responsibility for overseeing a function of the Council.

The LGA 2000 is significant as, whilst Full Council now sets the broad Policy and Budgetary framework, executive decision-making is the responsibility of the Cabinet. There is no requirement for the Executive to be politically proportionate and it is comprised solely of the Members of the controlling Group. The role of the executive is to carry out all of the local authority's functions which are not the responsibility of any other part of the Council, whether by law or under its Constitution<sup>1</sup>. The roles of both Cabinet Members and non-executive Members are set out within the Constitution at Part 2 – Articles – Page 2 – Article 2 – Members of the Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> RBC Constitution – Part 2 Articles – Page 17 – Article 7 – The Cabinet  
RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011

## **2.2 Roles and Responsibilities of Councillors**

### **2.2.1 Full Council**

The Council currently has 50 Councillors, elected every four years. All Councillors are Members of Full Council which is responsible for appointing the Leader, the Committees of the Council (excluding Cabinet Members), and for setting its Budget and Policy framework on the recommendation of the Cabinet.

The Council has five scheduled meetings per year including Annual Council and these are well attended by Councillors.

An analysis of the meetings of Council covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as appendix A. The average length of a Council meeting is two hours, with the longest one lasting three hours. Taking into account the number of Council meetings, the length of them and the number of agenda items is not considered that a reduction in the number of Councillors would have a detrimental impact on function and role of Council.

### **2.2.2 Cabinet**

The Council operates a Leader and Cabinet model. The Cabinet comprises the Leader, who is elected by the Council for a term of four years, following the local elections and five other Councillors, appointed by the Leader. The Constitution provides for the Cabinet to consist of up to 10 Members (including the Leader and Deputy Leader). From May 2011 the Council has operated the 'Strong Leader Model' in line with the requirements of the LGPHI<sup>2</sup> 2007 and to ensure more efficiency and accountability in decision-making.

Individual Members of the Cabinet have an allocated portfolio. All Cabinet decisions are taken collectively in Cabinet meetings. The Cabinet meets every month. In addition the Cabinet collectively meets monthly with the Senior Management Team and each Cabinet Member has regular briefing meetings with the relevant Deputy Chief Executive and Heads of Service. Cabinet meetings are attended by some opposition Councillors, although they do not participate in the meetings.

At this time the Council is not aware of any further major change in legislation that would give the Cabinet greater or fewer responsibilities and would justify the need for a review in the size of the Cabinet.

Given the experience of running a Cabinet of six Members it is felt that this number and the division of portfolio responsibilities enables effective and convenient leadership of the authority. The exact nature of the portfolios and what they consist of is kept under review to ensure alignment with Council structures. The Cabinet portfolios were last revised in May 2011 at the time the Leader appointed the five other Cabinet Members. The number of portfolios is considered appropriate at this time.

An analysis of the meetings of Cabinet covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as appendix B. There have been 19 meetings over the two years, averaging 40 minutes. On average Cabinet considers five reports at a meeting, the most being eight and the least being one. The Cabinet is operating effectively with six Members, each with a designated portfolio. Therefore a reduction in Council size would not have a detrimental impact on the work of Cabinet as it would not result in a reduction in Cabinet positions.

---

<sup>2</sup> Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007  
RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011

The Cabinet also commission Member Groups to undertake specific task and finish work when necessary. These Groups usually comprise nine Members, chaired by a Cabinet Member and their composition is usually politically representative. It is important to recognise that the number, frequency and purpose of these Member Groups are determined by Cabinet. As such the number of Members required to deliver these Groups is clearly within the control of Cabinet. Therefore a reduction in the number of Members would inform Cabinet's decisions to establish such Groups in future whilst not restricting its ability to do so when it was deemed appropriate and necessary.

An analysis of the meetings of Member Groups commissioned by Cabinet covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as appendix C. Of the three Groups set up in this period, the Shared Services Group met on only one occasion. The other two Groups had three and five meetings each. Based on the evidence a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a detrimental impact on Cabinet's ability to commission Member Groups when necessary.

### **2.2.3 Delegations to Officers**

The Council has a well-developed and comprehensive Scheme of Delegation to Officers which sets out where the responsibility and extent of delegation lies<sup>3</sup>. This Scheme of Delegation is presently under review, however no significant changes are proposed as the purpose of the review is to ensure the scheme accurately reflects the way the Council delivers its services and its management structure.

### **2.2.4 Notification of Cabinet Decisions**

All Councillors are provided with the Forward Plan<sup>4</sup> which details the proposed decisions to be taken by the Cabinet and Council. This is circulated to all Councillors each month and published on the Council's website.

Following each meeting of Cabinet details of the decisions taken are circulated to all Councillors normally within 2 working days. Key decisions<sup>5</sup> of the Cabinet come into effect seven working days (not including the day of the meeting) after the meeting, unless five Councillors give notice in writing to the Chief Executive requesting a 'call-in'<sup>6</sup>. If no notice requesting a call-in is received within the 7 working day period the decision will come into effect.

## **2.3 FUNCTIONS OF SCRUTINY, MEMBERS PANELS AND GROUPS AND REGULATORY COMMITTEES – STRUCTURE AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **2.3.1 Overview and Scrutiny**

The LGA 2000 required each local authority to set up a Scrutiny process. Since its introduction the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function has been reviewed as result of working practice, experience and best practice. The last review of the Scrutiny function was undertaken in April 2007<sup>7</sup>. This review increased the number of Scrutiny Committees from two to four. Each of these Scrutiny Committees comprises nine Members.

---

<sup>3</sup> RBC Constitution – Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions – Page 1

<sup>4</sup> RBC Constitution – Part 4 – Rules of procedure – Access to information – Page 24 'The Forward Plan'

<sup>5</sup> RBC Constitution – Part 2 – Articles – Article 13 – Page 31

<sup>6</sup> RBC Constitution – Part 4 – Rules of Procedure – Page 16 'Call-in of Key decisions procedure' – page 45.

<sup>7</sup> Council 12 April 2007 – Report of the Chief Executive – Review of Scrutiny and Member Development  
RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011

The terms of reference for the four Scrutiny Committees are set out in the Council's Constitution<sup>8</sup>. The Performance Management Board and Corporate Governance Group's terms of reference focus on reviewing the Council's governance and performance whilst the Community Development Group and Partnership Delivery Group deal more with policy development and forward thinking.

An analysis of the meetings of four Scrutiny Committees covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as appendix D.

The Scrutiny Committees can commission Member Panels to undertake in-depth Scrutiny of particular service areas or topics. These Member Panels usually have nine Members and are politically balanced. Membership is drawn from all non-executive Councillors. Cabinet Members are also invited to present evidence, but do not take part in the determination of the conclusions or recommendations of the Panels. An analysis of the meetings of Member Panels commissioned by Scrutiny covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as appendix E. Over this period four Member Panels have been convened. One Group met on one occasion whilst one has met on nine occasions and has been reconstituted as a Cabinet Member Group. The number, frequency and purpose of these Member Panels are determined by Scrutiny Committees. As such the number of Councillors required to deliver these Groups is within the control of the Scrutiny Committees and forms part of their role in managing their work programmes.

At presents the total number of Councillors required to fill the existing Scrutiny Committee places totals 36. It is recognised that a reduction to 45 Councillors would have a consequential effect on the ability to fill the existing 36 positions. There would only be 38 Members to draw from as Cabinet Members and the Mayor do not serve on Scrutiny Committees. Whilst on the face of it the number of Councillors appears sufficient it does not take account of allocations on other Committees.

Therefore this submission highlights that at some point in the future it will be necessary to review the existing Scrutiny arrangements to reflect a reduction in the number of Councillors. Such a review would need to consider the size of the Scrutiny Committees and their role, giving regard to the operation of effective Scrutiny enabling non-executive Members to influence policy. Regard would also have to be given to the impact of proposals within the Localism Bill and the use of Member Panels to undertake and deliver specific 'task and finish' based Scrutiny exercises as opposed to a standing committee considering periodic agenda items or annual reports.

Should there be a reduction in the number of Councillors it would be necessary to have revised arrangements for Scrutiny Committees in place from the commencement of the municipal year following the 2015 local elections. This would require Council to agree such changes prior to commencement of the municipal year 2015/16 so that at its Annual Meeting in May 2015 it could appoint the new number of Councillors to the revised Scrutiny Committee positions.

### ***2.3.2 Call-in of Key Decisions of the Cabinet***

The Scrutiny call-in facility is a transactional part of the decision making process which sets out arrangements for Scrutiny to consider key decisions made by the Council's Cabinet. Therefore consideration of a call-in request is separate to the proposed or planned work programmes of the Scrutiny Committees.

---

<sup>a</sup> RBC Constitution - Part 2 - Articles of the Constitution – Page 13  
RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011

As part of revisions to Council's Constitution, agreed by Council in December 2010, changes were made to the arrangements for consideration of call-in requests by a Scrutiny Committee. These changes updated the process and timescale for submission of a valid call-in and also clarified the procedure to be followed when a call-in was considered.

In view of the fact that prior to the revisions of the Council's Constitution Scrutiny call-ins were considered by one Scrutiny Committee only Performance Management Board (PMB). It is not believed that changes to the Scrutiny Committee structure, as a result of a reduction in the number of Councillors, would have a negative effect on the call-in process.

An analysis of the 'call-in' meetings covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix F. The call-in process occasionally results in a special meeting of a Scrutiny Committee in order to meet the timescales. In view of the small number of requests submitted and considered a reduction in the number of Councillors would not restrict the ability to deliver the call-in process. A revised Scrutiny Committee structure would still accommodate the call-in of key decisions of the executive so the transactional facility would remain in place.

### ***2.3.3 Delivery of the Council's Four Year Financial Plan***

At its meeting in March 2011 Council considered and agreed its Financial Plan and Strategy 2011/12 to 2015/16. As part of the agreement of this strategy a Four Year Financial Plan was approved. This plan sets out the Council's approach to service reform and redesign in order to meet the challenges it faces.

The Four Year Financial Plan contains within it details of proposals for business cost reduction, income maximisation and service redesign based on the outcome of the budget setting workshops held with Members in the run up to the budget setting for 2011/12. The plan indicated that major proposals for service redesign would be developed and reviewed using Member Groups commissioned by the Cabinet.

At its meeting on 24 May 2011 Cabinet agreed to the establishment of two Member Groups in order to oversee and scrutinise the service reviews of the Environment and Waste Management's Streetwise, recycling2go, medical waste and bulky waste services and the Community Shaping's community facilities management and sports development services. These two Member Groups comprise nine Members and are chaired by a Cabinet Member. The Groups are politically balanced. It is anticipated the work of these two Member Groups will be undertaken over a period of six months with the findings of the completed reviews being considered by Cabinet. Further Member Groups are anticipated during the life of the Four Year Financial Plan.

It is envisaged that meetings of these Member Groups will be held every month and the dates and times of the meetings will be co-ordinated to avoid clashes with other existing Committee meetings. Whilst it is not considered that a reduction in the number of Councillors to 45 would have a negative effect on the work and role of these Member Groups, it is important to recognise that the establishment of any further such Cabinet Groups, or Member Panels commissioned by the Scrutiny Committees, would need to be carefully considered to ensure there was sufficient Member and officer capacity to support them. This principle should inform any review of the existing Scrutiny arrangements to reflect any reduction in Councillors with consideration being given to the use of task and finish Panels as an alternative to standing Scrutiny Committees.

## **2.3.4 Regulatory Committees**

### **a) Development Control Committee**

The Development Control Committee meets once a month to determine planning applications. Its meetings are scheduled so to avoid clashes with meetings of other Committees. The scheme of delegation to Council officers means that the majority of planning applications are determined without the need for consideration by the Committee.

The Committee comprises 15 Members and is appointed at Annual Council. Its membership was reduced in April 2007 from 25 to 15 Members when Council agreed a review of Scrutiny and Member Development<sup>9</sup>. The Leader and the Deputy Leader are ex-officio non-voting Members of the Committee.

The Development Control Committee is politically representative and its Members and substitutes have to undertake compulsory training prior to sitting on the Committee.

An analysis of the meetings of the Development Control Committee covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix G.

Development Control Committee meetings last an average of two hours, with the longest meeting being three hours 25 minutes, and the shortest one hour. The meetings have on average seven items on the agenda. Whilst the time commitment for Members of the Committee can be considerable, this should be taken in the context of the overall number of planning applications received. In 2009/10 1,145 applications were received of which 85 were decided by Committee. In 2010/11 1,177 were received with 79 being decided by Committee. Therefore, on average 7% of applications are determined by Committee.

In view of the number of meetings each year of the Development Control Committee, the percentage of planning applications dealt with by way of officer delegation and the number of agenda items and duration of meetings a reduction in Council size to 45 Councillors would not have a negative effect on the work of the Committee. However it is likely that its size would need to be reconsidered as it is recognised that a reduction in the number of Members would lessen the number available to serve on the Committee. Any changes to the number of positions on the Committee would have to be agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015.

At present 10 (66%) of the 15 Members of the Development Control Committee (excluding the Leader and Deputy Leader who are ex officio Committee Members) also sit on other Committees with 7 (47%) being Members of a Scrutiny Committee. Therefore being a Development Control Committee Member and a Member of another Committee would still apply if the number of Members was reduced but it could increase the ratio of Committee positions per Member.

### **b) Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee**

The Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee comprises 15 Members and is appointed at Annual Council. It is chaired by the Cabinet Member with the portfolio for Community Protection and it is politically representative. Its Members have to undertake training prior to their first meeting.

---

<sup>9</sup> Review of Scrutiny and Member Development – Report of the Chief Executive – Council 12 April 2007  
RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011



The Committee meets on average twice a year. An analysis of the meetings of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix H. The Committee met only three times during this period and considered between two and six items at their meetings.

A sub-Committee of three Members of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee sits to hear licensing applications, appeals, cases of none compliance etc. The sub-Committee is drawn from Members of the full Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and it meets on an ad-hoc basis when required.

An analysis of the meetings of the Sub-Committee covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix I. The sub-Committee met on nine occasions. Meetings varied in length from between 50 minutes and 3 hours 45 minutes with the average length of a meeting being 2 hours 5 minutes.

In view of the frequency, number of items of business and length of meetings of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and the Sub-Committee a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a negative impact on the Council fulfilling its regulatory function. However the size of the Committee will need to be reconsidered as it is recognised that a reduction in the number of Members would lessen the number available to serve on the Committee. If the Committee were reduced to 12 Members then this would reduce the demand for Committee places by three across all of the Councillors. A Committee comprising of 12 Councillors would still be able to deliver the Council's Alcohol and Entertainments licensing functions and also provide sufficient Councillors from which to draw the sub-Committees. Any changes to the number of positions on the Committee would have to be agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015.

### **c) Licensing Committee**

The Licensing Committee comprises of 5 Members and is appointed at Annual Council. It is chaired by the Cabinet Member with the portfolio for Community Protection and it is politically representative. Its Members have to undertake training.

The Committee deals with the consideration and determination of applications where objections have been received from statutory consultees and also appeals in relation to hackney carriage and private hire licensing. The Licensing Committee has met only once during the period May 2009 to April 2011 to consider two appeals. Based on this evidence it is highly unlikely that a reduction in the number of Members would have a negative impact on the delivery of the Council's duties.

### **d) Standards Committee**

There is a requirement under the Local Government Act 2000 for each authority to have a Standards Committee.

The Standards Committee comprises 12 Members (6 elected Members and 6 co-opted independent Members) and is appointed at Annual Council. The Full Committee has two meetings scheduled each year. However due to the fact the localism agenda indicated an end to the present ethical standards regime a decision was made that meetings of the Committee would be convened when details of the revised ethical standards regime had been announced. The last formal meeting was held in June 2010 when the Committee considered an annual review of the ethical standards regime.

In September 2009 Council agreed a 'Member Complaints Procedure' which formalised the arrangements for dealing with Member conduct issues by way of sub-Committees of the Standards Committee.

Because of the unknown impact of the localism agenda on the future of the ethical standards regime, at this time, it is not possible to identify the number of Councillors required for Standards Committees in future. Furthermore such Committees may no longer be required if the changes do not reflect the existing arrangements that are in place. If in future a Committee was required then, should there be a reduction in the number of Councillors, its size would have to be considered. Any such arrangements would have to be agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015.

### **2.3.5 Other less frequent Committees and Member Groups**

In addition to the Committees previously detailed there a number of other Committees that meet infrequently. These Committees do not have set work programmes and scheduled established meeting patterns. As such their meetings and business are managed on an 'as necessary basis' and because of this a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a negative impact on their role and work. A more detailed appraisal of each of the Committees is provided below:

#### **a) Employment Appeals Committee**

This Committee comprises of five Members (including the Leader and Deputy Leader) and is appointed at Annual Council. It is politically representative. It hears and determines appeals in accordance with the Council's procedures in respect of dismissal arising from misconduct and capability only. Therefore it meets on an ad-hoc basis and during the period May 2009 to April 2011 the Committee met on three occasions.

Due to the frequency of meetings of the Employment Appeals Committee it is not felt that a reduction in the number of Members would not have a negative impact on the Council maintaining and delivering its role.

#### **b) Interviewing Committee**

This Committee comprises of 5 Members (including the Leader and Deputy Leader) and is appointed at Annual Council. It is politically representative. It makes recommendations for appointment to the post of Chief Executive subject to Council approving the appointment. It also deals with the appointment of Deputy Chief Executives. Due to the limited amount of times this Committee is required to meet a reduction in the number of Members wouldn't negatively impact upon its role.

#### **c) Local Development Framework Group**

The Local Development Framework Group comprises of 15 Members and is appointed at Annual Council. It is politically representative. This Committee deals with progression of the Core Strategy and it meets three times per year. It is chaired by the Cabinet Member with the Portfolio for Sustainability and this year the vice chairman is the Chairman of the Development Control Committee.

An analysis of the meetings of the Local Development Framework Group covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix J. There have been six meetings during this period ranging in length from 1 hour 25 minutes to 3 hours 15 minutes.

Due to the frequency of the Groups meetings and the fact that its role is linked to development of Core Strategy a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a negative effect upon its role or function. However its size will need to be reconsidered as it is recognised that a reduction in the number of Councillors would lessen the number available to serve on the Committee. Any changes to the number of positions on the Committee would have to be agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015.

#### ***d) Member Development Group***

The Member Development Group comprises nine Members and is appointed at Annual Council. It is politically representative and is chaired by the Cabinet Member with the portfolio for Environment. It was established in 2005 with the first Member Learning and Development Policy being agreed by Council in 2008. A revised policy was agreed by Council in December 2010. The Council achieved Member Development Charter Status in 2011.

An analysis of meetings of the Member Development Group covering the period May 2009 to April 2011 is attached as Appendix K. Through achieving Charter Status in 2011 and leading attendance at the regional Nottinghamshire Member Development Programme which ran from September 2010 to March 2011, the Council has a strong and well established commitment to Member Development. Additionally in 2011 a successful Member Induction programme has been, and is continuing to be, delivered building on the significant Member commitment to development. The programme is regularly reviewed by the Member Development Group to ensure it meets Members' needs, is more tailored to individuals and makes best use Members' time and available learning techniques.

Those Members new to the Council are encouraged to attend all the development/induction sessions with the exception of those relating to the Development Control, Licensing and Standards Committees and Employment Appeals Sub-Committee which are only compulsory for Members of those Committees/Sub-Committees and their substitutes.

It is fully recognised that the call made on the time of new Members by the induction programme is demanding but it has been drawn up with the specific aim of ensuring that Members have the information they need to undertake their roles. The programme is divided between compulsory and discretionary sessions.

In view of the Councils clear commitment to Member Development a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a negative impact on it as the number of Members of the Committee could be reviewed if necessary.

#### ***e) Civic Hospitality Panel***

This Panel comprises of six Members and is appointed at Annual Council. It is chaired by the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor is the Vice Chair. The Leader of the Council and the Deputy Leader are also Panel Members. The Panel is politically representative.

The Panel meets once a year to consider the forthcoming civic arrangements for the mayoral year. On this basis it is not anticipated that a reduction in the number of Councillors would have a negative impact the Panel's role.

## f) *Timing of Committee Meetings*

Committee meetings are held in the evening commencing at 7.00 pm as it is recognised that daytime meetings can limit the availability of Councillors. On occasions meetings of Member Groups or Panels take place at alternative times in consultation with Members. The meeting time was considered by Members as part of the Climate Change Member Panel and the Constitution Review Member Panel and it was agreed there should be no change in times.

### 2.4 *Number of Committee Places*

The following table sets out the number of seats on each Committee and number of times that Committee has met during the period May 2009 to April 2011.

**TABLE 3**

Committee, Group or Panel	Number of seats				Number of meetings May 2009 – April 2011
	Total	Exec	Non Exec	Comment	
Cabinet	6	6	0		19
Performance Management Board	9	0	9		12
Community Development Group	9	0	9		8
Corporate Governance Group	9	0	9		13
Partnership Delivery Group	9	0	9		11
Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee	15	1	14	Cabinet Member - chair	3
Development Control Committee	17	2*	15	*Leader & Deputy Leader = ex officio Members	24
Employment Appeals Committee	5	2	3	Leader = Chair Deputy Leader = Member	3
Interviewing Committee	5	2	3	Leader = Chair Deputy Leader = Member	0
Licensing Committee	5	1	4	Cabinet Member - chair	1
Standards Committee	6	0	6	+ 6 co-optees	3
Local Development Group	15	1	14	Cabinet Member - chair	6
Member Development Group	9	1	8	Cabinet Member - chair	5
Civic Hospitality Panel	6	4	2	Chair Mayor - chair Deputy Mayor, Vice Chair and Leader / Deputy Leader - Members	2
<b>Total seats available for non-executive Members.</b>			105		

With a current Council size of 50 Members there is an average of 2.44 Committee positions for each non-executive Councillor (43 Members across 105 positions). This takes into RBC Proposed Council Size Submission – Electoral Review CAB 29/11/2011

account those Committees with Cabinet Members as the Chair and or Vice Chair and excludes the Mayor, as the holder of this position is not appointed to any Committee.

With a reduction in the number of Members to 45 and excluding Cabinet Members and the Mayor, the non-executive Councillor to Committee position ratio would be 2.76, based on the present number of Committee positions (38 Members across 105 positions).

Whilst this slightly increases the present ratio it does not take into account the scope to reduce the number positions on Committees particularly the Development Control Committee, the Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee and the Standards Committee. Also in view of the requirements in respect of the Local Development Framework it is suggested that it will be necessary to consider the composition of the Local Development Group at some point in the future.

The ratio also factors into the calculation for Committee positions Committees such as the Employment Appeals Committee and the Interviewing Committee. However the frequency of the meetings of these Committees suggest that they have limited impact on the work of their Members so the number of positions required to fulfil them is not actually representative of the workload such a position brings.

Additionally the ratio of non-executive Councillor to Committee positions does not take into account the frequency of the Committees and the length of the meetings. For example if a Committee only meets on an infrequent basis, a non-executive Member may be a Member of it, however it does not place significant demands on their time. Examples of this would be the Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee which provides 14 positions for non-executive Members however during the period May 2009 to April 2011 it only met three times totalling 3 hours 15 minutes.

It is recognised that in determining the optimum number of Councillors to run the Council, there has to be certainty that there will be a sufficient number to enable meetings to be well enough attended. However it is also important for Councillors to have sufficient time to act as effective 'community leaders' being out in the community they represent. Therefore a review of the Committee structure, as a consequence of a reduction in the number of Members would facilitate this.

## ***2.5 Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community***

### **Survey of Members – workload**

It is recognised that Committee meetings only form part of the Councillor role. Therefore a survey of all 50 Members was conducted to inform this submission. This survey was conducted in October 2011 and both electronic and hard copies were provided to all Councillors in order for them to respond. 39 of the 50 Councillors responded to the survey providing a response rate of 78%. The survey was split into a series of sub headings and an analysis of the responses is as set out at appendix L.

#### ***a) General***

The results indicated that:

- 38% of respondents were also Parish or Town Councillors (15 of 39)
- 56% of respondents participated in other community Groups
- 8% of respondents were also County Councillors (3 of 39)

Responses regarding employment status indicated that follows:

- 59% were retired or not working
- 18% worked part time
- 23% worked full time

The responses indicated that 44% of Councillors held ward surgeries with the frequency of these varying. The responses also indicated that Councillors would make themselves available at the request of residents.

### ***b) How Councillors' Time is Spent***

The survey included questions about how Borough Councillors spent their time over the period of a month. The questions covered the time spent preparing for meetings and the responses indicated that:

- 66% spent between 1-10 hours reading papers in preparation for meetings.
- 34% spent between 11-15 hours (or more) reading papers in preparation for meetings

The responses show that two thirds of respondents were spending between one and ten hours per month on this activity, with the remaining third spending between eleven and fifteen hours per month. Although the results do not indicate why one third spends more time than the other two thirds on this activity it may be that it relates to Committee positions with the role of Chair and Vice Chair demanding more of some Councillors in relation to the time spent reading papers preparing for meetings.

The questions also covered time spent in meetings and the responses indicated that:

- 50% spent between 1-5 hours a month in informal meetings with other Members
- 84% spent between 1-10 hours per month in formal council meetings (Full Council, Cabinet, and Scrutiny)
- 75% spent between 1-10 hours per month in other standing Committees (such as Development Control)
- 77% spent between 1-10 hours per month in Member Panels or Groups.

The returns indicate that 84% of respondents spent between 1-10 hours per month in formal Council meetings. Additionally 75% spent between 1-10 hours per month in other standing Committees. It is likely that attendance relates to those meetings or Committees, or Member Groups or Panels that have regular scheduled meetings and not those which meet on an ad-hoc basis.

### ***c) Ward Activities***

The questions also covered ward activities including how much time Councillors spent meeting ward residents, solving problems for residents and time spent attending local meetings and forums. The responses indicated that:

- 81% spent between 1-10 hours per month meeting residents in their ward
- 17% spent between 11-15 hours per month meeting residents in their ward
- 63% spent between 1-10 hours per month getting problems solved for their residents.

The returns indicate that 98% of respondents spent between 1-15 hours per month per month meeting residents in their ward. It was not possible from the results to determine differences between wards and whether single or multi Member wards make any difference

to these figures. It was also not possible to determine if the amount of time spent per month meeting residents in a ward relates to the number residents, the number of the electorate or the make-up of that ward and the issues it may be facing. However the results indicate that of those Councillors responding to the survey a high percentage spent time meeting residents in their wards with two thirds spending between 1-10 hours per month getting problems solved for their residents.

#### **d) Parish or Town Council Activities**

The survey included questions regarding time spent on Parish or Town Council activities with 15 of the 39 respondents indicating they were Parish or Town Councillors. The responses indicated that:

- 55% spent between 1-15 hours per month reading papers in preparation for Parish meetings
- 81% indicated they spent between 1 to 10 hours in formal Parish meetings per month
- 57% indicated they spent between 1 to 11 hours dealing with issues raised by constituents in the Parish

The returns indicated that Borough Councillors who were also Parish or Town Council Councillors could spend time on Parish activities in addition to their Borough Councillor roles. It was not possible from the survey results to determine the impact that a Parish Council could have upon the role of the Ward Councillor other than to ascertain that it could place a demand on their time.

#### **e) Councillors' Workload**

The survey asked questions about Councillor workload to establish if respondents believed this had increased in the last two years. The results indicated that:

- 62% indicated their workload as a Borough Councillor had increased
- 38% did not believe their workload as a Borough Councillor had increased
- 69% indicated that their workload as a Parish Councillor had increased
- 31% did not believe their workload as a Parish Councillor had increased

The results indicate that 62% of respondents believed that their workload as a Borough Councillor had increased over the last two years. In some cases it is possible this could be attributed to Councillors taking on new roles with extra responsibilities following changes to Committee positions. Additionally it could be attributed to particular issues or topics that have increased the workload of Councillors in their roles as community leaders such as large planning applications or other issues of community concern. Responses also indicated that increases in email correspondence had increased their workload.

The survey indicated that 22 of the Councillors who responded are spending more hours working as a Councillor compared to what they had done previously with 10 indicating they had changed the way they worked in order to be more efficient.

The results identified that there were some differences as to how Councillors spent their time in their community leadership roles. The majority of respondents indicated they were spending somewhere between 1 to 10 hours per month or 11 to 15 hours per month on a particular activity, such as reading papers in preparation for meetings or meetings with residents. Whilst how a Councillor spends their time can be subjective the results showed that Councillors have a workload and this places demands on them.

From the results of the survey it is difficult to establish if a reduction in the number of Councillors would disproportionately increase Councillor workloads. This is because some of the differences in workload and time spent on activities could be related to a Councillors particular role, issues within their ward or the taking on of a new Committee position.

With regard to the workload of Councillors arising from Committee positions, such as time spend reading papers in preparation and time spend in meetings, a reduction in the number of Councillors does not necessarily equate to increased workloads. This is because a review of the Committee structure would aim to reduce the number of Committee positions therefore reducing the number of Councillors to fill Committees. In simple terms a reduction in the number of Councillors should not increase the workload resulting from Committee membership, as it would be offset by a reduction in the number of Committee positions required to deliver the Councils business. An increase in Councillor workload resulting from Committee business would only occur if the existing Committee structure was retained after a reduction in the number of Councillors. Alternatively an increase in workload would result if the number of Committee positions increased following a reduction in the number of Councillors.

#### ***f) Representational Role***

In terms of the representational role of Borough Councillors the key issue is whether changes to the electorate per Councillor ratio, as a consequence of a reduction in the number of Councillors would make workloads unmanageable. As the review process is based upon the principle of ensuring electoral equality it is not anticipated that a reduction in the number of Councillors would lead to unmanageable workloads arising from the representational role of community leaders. The survey results indicate that the level of workload resulting from a Councillors community leadership role, such as time spent meeting residents or solving resident's problems was presently manageable. Therefore this provides some tolerance for changes in this area of workload which would be offset by greater equality of Councillor per electorate across the Borough.

As part of the process for reducing the number of Borough Councillors and determining the ward profiles consideration would have to be given to the alignment of Borough Councillors to particular Parish Councils, taking into account the size of Parish electorates to ensure these were proportionate. This process should help to assist with addressing issues of workload arising from Parish Council membership and business.



### 3. PARISH / TOWN COUNCILS

There are 58 Parishes in the Borough, 40 of which elect Parish / Town Councillors. Details of the borough wards and the Parishes within these are set out in the table below.

**TABLE 4**

Borough Ward	Number of Borough Councillors	Parish/Town Councils
Abbey:	2	0 Parish councils
Bingham East:	2	Part of Bingham Town Council
Bingham West:	2	Part of Bingham Town Council
Compton Acres	2	0 Parish councils
Cotgrave	3	Cotgrave Town Council
Cranmer	1	2 Parish Councils
Edwalton Village	2	0 Parish councils
Gamston	2	1 Parish Council
Gotham	1	2 Parish Councils
Lady Bay	2	0 Parish councils
Leake	3	1 Parish Council
Lutterell	2	0 Parish councils
Manvers	2	Part of Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council
Melton	2	0 Parish councils
Musters	2	0 Parish councils
Nevile	1	3 Parish Councils
North Keyworth	1	Part of Keyworth Parish Council
Oak	1	1 Parish Council
Ruddington	3	1 Parish Council
Soar Valley	1	2 Parish Councils
South Keyworth	3	Part of Keyworth Parish Council
Stanford	1	6 Parish Councils
Thoroton	1	3 Parish Councils
Tollerton	1	1 Parish Council
Trent	2	1 Parish Council and Part of Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council
Trent Bridge	2	0 Parish councils
Wiverton	2	4 Parish Councils
Wolds	1	6 Parish Councils

There are eight wards and 16 Councillors with no Parish or Town Councils, these being the wards in the urban West Bridgford area. Of the remaining 34 Councillors the ratio of Borough Councillors to Parish/Town Councils varies, the highest being in two wards (Stanford and Wolds) with one Borough Councillor to six Parish Councils. The lowest being three wards with four Borough Councillors to one Parish Council.

Inevitably any changes to ward boundaries would impact on the ratio of borough Councillors to Parish/Town Councils. However as the Parish boundaries are used as the building blocks for the electoral review it is not envisaged this would constitute a negative impact. This is because the process would facilitate borough wards being realigned with the relevant Parishes where necessary, enabling changes to the number of Borough Councillors to be made to reflect this. As the Parish boundaries significantly inform the review process it is believed that a reduction to 45 Councillors would still enable Parish Councils to clearly identify with the relevant and appropriate Borough Councillor.

As part of the Councillor workload survey Borough Councillors that currently have Parish Councils within their ward were asked what impact this has upon their workload as a Ward Councillor. It was generally agreed that having a strong Parish Council that is the voice of local residents can mean that the Ward Councillor is lobbied on local matters more rigorously and their casework may increase as a result. The frequency of Parish Council meetings is unique to each Parish and Ward Councillors may use their discretion to decide how frequently they attend these.

Given the somewhat unquantifiable impact that the existence of Parish Councils has upon the role of the local Ward Councillor and that the Parish wards are likely to inform the electoral review process a reduction in Borough Councillors should not have a significant impact on the Parish Councils. If the Parish ward boundaries are used as the building blocks for the electoral review process then this should help to ensure Borough Councillors are aligned to Parish or Town Councillors in a way that is more consistent with electoral equality.

In addition to Parish or Town Councils the Borough nominates nine Members to the West Bridgford Local Area Forum which was previously established by the County Council. If a reduction in the number of Councillors to 45 were to have an impact on the warding arrangements within the area of the Forum then it would be necessary to reconsider the number of Borough Councillors nominated to it. At this stage of the review it is not possible to predict with any certainty if any such changes at ward level will occur, however if changes are made to the relevant wards then it may be necessary to realign the Area Forum and reconsider its membership.

#### **4. OUTSIDE BODIES**

There are currently 63 places on Outside Bodies for Councillors. This list has been regularly reviewed in recent years to ensure that nomination of Members on outside bodies supports the priorities of the Council. The frequency with which these Outside Bodies meet and the time commitment required from their Members is diverse. A reduction in the number of Councillors would require consideration to be given to the number of appointments to outside bodies, taking into account the merit of each such appointment and the ability of the nominee to fulfil the role. However it is not believed that the level of representation of Members on outside bodies is significant enough to materially affect the electoral review process.

#### **5. PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS**

Rushcliffe Partnership is a body that brings together local public, private, community and voluntary sector organisations. It works with the local community to identify and tackle key issues in a more coordinated way. The structure of the Partnership consists of a Strategic Board (formerly the 'Local Strategic Partnership'), the Executive Group and six Theme Groups. The Strategic Board provides strategic direction to the Rushcliffe Community Partnership. All Partner organisations are represented on the Board, which meets every three months. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman are elected annually by the Board.

The Leader and Cabinet Member with portfolio for Environment are appointed to the Strategic Board of the partnership. As such a reduction in the number of Councillors would not affect the Council's ability to support, inform and direct the partnership.

## 6. POPULATION AND ELECTORATE FORECASTING

As part of the development of this submission consideration has been given to likely or anticipated development in the Borough in order to establish if this would potentially address or increase the areas of electoral inequality. Research indicates that the electorate has increased from 82,590 in 2001 to 86,424 at 1 September 2011. As part of this process consideration has also been given to the issue of demographics and potential changes to population size.

The level of permitted and expected development in the Borough has been evaluated and calculated as a projected electorate for 2016 in the relevant wards. This calculation recognised that the actual number of properties proposed may not directly equate to an increase in the electorate. Furthermore the number of properties proposed or permitted may not equate to the number of houses actually built and inhabited in the anticipated timescale. Additionally the changes may not be in place with sufficient time for them to impact on the 2016 electorate figures.

When considering potential electorate forecasts for 2016 consideration has been given principally to permitted development and the potential increase in houses. This was then used to develop figures for potential electorate increases based on average household size predictions taking into account previous census data. These estimated figures did not indicate that permitted or potential development constructed and inhabited by 2016 would resolve the issues of electoral inequality in the Borough. The estimated figures indicated that the potential changes to the electorate from housing growth by 2016 would increase the variances and as such strengthen the need for an electoral review.

The size of the Borough's population based on an Office of National Statistics mid-year estimate in June 2010 is 112,800. It is recognised that population does not immediately equate to electorate as parts of the population will not be eligible to vote and parts choose not to register. Whilst it is recognised that population, rather than the electorate can place demands on the Council and in turn the role and work of Councillors it is not envisaged that significant changes will occur that would impact on the review.

To deliver good representation and to ensure links with and understanding of all parts of the community it is essential the community recognise their local Councillor. Therefore a reduction in the number of Councillors could assist this process by making it clear who the representative was by linking the Councillor to a distinct community. Based on alignment with the electorate per Councillor average this will require ward profiling but this will assist in addressing the considerable existing variances (32% of wards above or below a 10% variance of the present average).

## **7. CONCLUSION**

Giving regard to the issues that should be considered when developing a proposal for Council Size a reduction in the number of Councillors from 50 to 45 is proposed. In summary the reasons supporting this proposal are set out as follows:

### ***7.1 Managing the business of the Council and the roles and responsibilities of Councillors***

As previously set out in this submission the model of governance used by the local authority impacts on the workload of Councillors and the working practices of the Council and will therefore have an effect on the number of Councillors needed. At present the number of Committee positions reflects the number of Councillors. If the number of Councillors were reduced then consequently consideration would have to be given to the number of Committee positions. However such a process would enable the Council to consider the role of its Committees, the number of Councillors required to fulfil that role and if the Committee is integral to the management of the Councils business. Such a process would enable the Council to review its governance arrangements in line with the localism agenda coinciding with potential wider changes to the way it does business.

A reduction in the number of Councillors, and any subsequent review of governance arrangements would help to ensure the roles and responsibilities of Councillors were clearly focused. As previously stated it is recognised that in determining the optimum number of Councillors to run the Council, there has to be certainty that there will be a sufficient number to enable meetings to be well enough attended. However it is also important for Councillors to have sufficient time to act as effective 'community leaders' being out in the community they represent. Therefore a review of the Committee structure, as a consequence of a reduction in the number of Members would facilitate this.

### ***7.2 Functions of Scrutiny, Member Panels and Groups and Regulatory Committees***

Paragraphs 2.3 within this submission set out the existing Committees of the Council, their role and function and the frequency of their meetings. Table 3 on page 17 sets out the present Committee positions and the frequency of those Committee's meetings over a two municipal year period.

This submission states that a reduction in the number of Councillors to 45 would not have a negative impact on these functions, but recognises it would require changes to the existing arrangements. The submission highlights examples of where these changes could reduce the number of Committee positions and these are set out below:

- a) At present there are 4 Scrutiny Groups comprising 36 Councillors. Appendix D provides an analysis of the meetings of these Scrutiny Groups over the two year period May 2009 to April 2011. This submission recognises that the existing Scrutiny arrangements could not be sustained with a reduction in the number of Councillors to 45. As such the Scrutiny arrangements would require review with revised arrangements being agreed and in place for the Annual Council in May 2015. This review would not lessen or restrict the Scrutiny function, but enable it to refocus and realign;
- b) Appendix G sets out an analysis of meetings of the Development Control Committee which comprises of 15 Councillors. In 2009/10 1,145 applications were received of which 85 were decided by Committee. In 2010/11 1,177 were received with 79 being decided by Committee. Therefore on average 7% of applications are

determined by Committee. Whilst the time commitment for Members of the Committee can be considerable, it should be taken in the context of the overall number of planning applications received. It should also be noted that the Committees membership was reduced from 25 to 15 in April 2007 and this 40% reduction in membership did not negatively impact on its role or functions. It is recognised that the Committee's size would need to be reviewed and changes agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015;

- c) Appendix I sets out an analysis of meetings of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee. Presently the Committee comprises 15 Members and its sub-Committees are made up of three Councillors. This submission highlights that if the Committee were reduced then this would reduce the demand for Committee places across all of the Councillors. For example a Committee comprising 12 Councillors would still be able to deliver the Council's Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing functions and also provide sufficient Councillors from which to draw the sub-Committees. Any changes to the number of positions on the Committee would have to be agreed prior to the annual council in May 2015, in order that its membership was appointed and in place from the start of the municipal year following the local elections of 2015;
- d) Because of the uncertainty of the future of the ethical standard framework it is not clear what arrangements will replace the existing Standards Committee which is made up of 6 Councillors and 6 co-opted independent Members. As such Committees may no longer be required in future then it is difficult to accurately predict the number of positions require to fill it. If a Standards Committee were to continue then a reduction in the number of Councillors would require its size to be reviewed and any arrangements would have to be agreed prior to the Annual Council in May 2015;
- e) This submission also gives regard to the other less frequent Committees and Member Groups. These Committees do not have set work programmes and scheduled established meeting patterns. As such their meetings and business are managed on an 'as necessary basis. Because of this a reduction in the number of Councillors would not have a negative impact on their role and work;
- f) There are currently 63 places on Outside Bodies for Councillors. This submission highlights that this list has been regularly reviewed in recent years to ensure that nomination of Members on outside bodies supports the priorities of the Council. The frequency with which these Outside Bodies meet and the time commitment required from their Members is diverse. It is recognised that a reduction in the number of Councillors would require consideration to be given to the number of appointments to outside bodies, taking into account the merit of each such appointment and the ability of the nominee to fulfil the role. However the level of representation of Members on outside bodies is not significant enough to materially affect the electoral review process.

### ***7.3 Representational Role: Representing Electors to the Council and the Council in the Community***

The key factors to consider in respect of the representational role of Councillors are set out as follows:

- a) In the development of this submission a survey of Councillors' workloads was conducted. An appraisal of the results of this survey is set out at paragraph 2.5. An analysis of the responses is also provided at appendix L. The survey results indicated that Councillors believe that their workloads have increased over the last two years. The results also identified that there were some differences as to how Councillors spent their time in their community leadership roles. This submission recognises that a reduction in the number Councillors could potentially increase workloads however this would be offset by changes to the Committee structure and a reduction in the number of Committee positions. This process would assist in clarifying the role, remit and work of the Committees, providing an opportunity to ensure focused work programmes. In turn this could free up the time Councillors may have to spend preparing for and participating in meetings giving them more time to spend in the communities they represent;
- b) In terms of the representational role of Borough Councillors the key question is whether changes to the electorate per Councillor ratio, as a consequence of a reduction in the number of Councillors would make workloads unmanageable. As the review process is based upon the principle of ensuring electoral equality it is not anticipated that a reduction in the number of Councillors would lead to unmanageable workloads arising from the representational role of community leaders. The workload survey results indicated that the level of workload resulting from a Councillor's community leadership role, such as time spent meeting residents or solving resident's problems was presently manageable. Therefore this could provide tolerance for changes in this area of workload which would be offset by ensuring greater equality of Councillor per electorate across the Borough;
- c) This submission highlights that there are 58 Parishes in the Borough, 40 of which elect Parish / Town Councillors. Details of the Borough wards and the Parishes within these are set out in Table 3 on page 21. It is recognised that any changes to ward boundaries would impact on the ratio of borough Councillors to Parish/town Councils. But because the Parish boundaries are used as the building blocks for the electoral review this would not have negative impact. Furthermore this would facilitate borough wards being realigned with the relevant Parishes where necessary, enabling changes to the number of Borough Councillors to be made to reflect this. As the Parish boundaries will significantly inform the review process a reduction to 45 Councillors would still enable Parish Councils to clearly link to the relevant community and appropriate Borough Councillor;
- d) This submission has considered the likely or anticipated development in the Borough in order to establish if this would potentially address or increase the areas of electoral inequality. As part of this process consideration was also given to the issue of demographics and potential changes to population size. Additionally the level of permitted and anticipated development in the Borough has been evaluated and calculated as a projected electorate for 2016 in the relevant wards. This calculation recognised that the actual number of properties developed did not directly equate to electors and as such was likely to be greater than any actual increase. This work did not indicate that permitted or anticipated development constructed and inhabited by 2016 would lead to changes in the electorate significant enough to address the issues of electoral inequality in the Borough.

The evidence presented in this document substantiates that there is a coherent and justified case for the optimum number of Councillors to be 45. This number would require changes to the governance arrangements of the Council and the arrangements of its Committees, however 45 would provide sufficient Councillors to deliver such a revised structure. At present the Councillor to Committee position ratio is 2.44 as explained at paragraph 2.4. If

the number of Councillors were reduced to 45 then based on existing non-executive Committee positions this ratio would increase to 2.76, however this does not take into account reducing the number of Committee positions.

If the number of Committee positions was reduced by 15 (which for the purposes of this submission equates to one less Scrutiny Group and three less Members on two regulatory Committees) then based on 45 Councillors the ratio of Councillor to non executive Committee positions becomes 2.36, which is comparable with the existing ratio of 2.44. Whilst this statement is based on a simple calculation it indicates why 45 is considered to be the right number of Councillors. This is because 45 Councillors would provide a sufficient number from which to compose revised Committees and their memberships, ensuring the business of the Council was delivered.

This submission proposed that a reduction to 45 Councillors is sustainable and would provide sufficient Councillors for the Council to do business. It would also ensure the considerable variances in electorate per Councillor across the Borough were addressed, and that communities identities were more clearly linked to the appropriate Borough Councillor.

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>A</b>	Analysis of meetings of Council covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>B</b>	Analysis of meetings of Cabinet covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>C</b>	Analysis of the meetings of Member Groups commissioned by Cabinet covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>D</b>	Analysis of meetings of the four Scrutiny Committees covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>E</b>	Analysis of the meetings of Member Panels commissioned by Scrutiny covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>F</b>	Analysis of Scrutiny call-ins covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>G</b>	Analysis of meetings of the Development Control Committee covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>H</b>	Analysis of meetings of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>I</b>	Analysis of the meetings of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>J</b>	Analysis of the meetings of the Local Development Framework Group covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>K</b>	Analysis of meetings of the Member Development Group meetings covering the period May 2009 – April 2011
<b>L</b>	Councillor work load survey October 2011 – analysis of returns



**Analysis of meetings of Council May 2009 – April 2011**

Council – 50 Members

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
May 2009	42	60 minutes	<b>Annual Council</b>
June 2009	45	80 minutes	<b>4R 5Q 0M</b>
September 2009	41	180 minutes	<b>2R 4Q 3M</b>
December 2009	48	155 minutes	<b>6R 1Q 2M</b>
March 2010	45	105 minutes	<b>4R 1Q 0M</b>
May 2010	48	65 minutes	<b>Annual Council</b>
June 2010	36	95 minutes	<b>4R 3Q 0M</b>
September 2010	40	135 minutes	<b>2R 7Q 2M</b>
December 2010	44	150 minutes	<b>6R 1Q 1M</b>
March 2011	45	175 minutes	<b>4R 8Q 0M</b>

R = Reports

Q = Questions from Members

M = Notice of Motions

## Analysis of meetings of Cabinet May 2009 – April 2011

## Cabinet – 6 Members

Date of Meeting	Number of Members Present	Length of Meeting	Number of Items considered
May 2009	6	25 minutes	4
June 2009	6	25 minutes	5
July 2009	6	85 minutes	8
September 2009	6	60 minutes	3
October 2009	4	30 minutes	6
November 2009	6	60 minutes	8
December 2009	6	25 minutes	6
January 2010	5	105 minutes	1
February 2010	6	60 minutes	6
March 2010	5	20 minutes	6
May 2010	6	45 minutes	5
June 2010	6	25 minutes	6
July 2010	5	15 minutes	2
September 2010	5	30 minutes	4
October 2010	5	25 minutes	5
November 2010	6	25 minutes	5
December 2010	4	30 minutes	6
January 2011	5	25 minutes	3
February 2011	6	50 minutes	5

**Analysis of meetings of Member Groups May 2009 – April 2011**

<b>Name of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Number of Meetings</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
East Leak Leisure Centre Working Group	8	3	Jun 2009 - July 2010
Shared Services Member Group	5	1	September 2009
Customer Services Group	9	5	March 2010 – March 2011

## Analysis of meetings of Scrutiny Committees May 2009 – April 2011

## Community Development Group – 9 Members

Date of Meeting	Number of Members Present	Length of Meeting	Number of Items considered
July 2009	8	105 minutes	5
October 2009	9	135 minutes	4
January 2010	9	165 minutes	3
April 2010	9	110 minutes	5
July 2010	8	130 minutes	5
October 2010	9	135 minutes	3
January 2010	9	95 minutes	3
April 2011	7	60 minutes	3

## Corporate Governance Group – 9 Members

Date of Meeting	Number of Members Present	Length of Meeting	Number of Items considered
May 2009	8	95 minutes	7
May 2009	7	110 minutes	5
June 2009	9	55 minutes	4
September 2009	9	80 minutes	8
November 2009	9	60 minutes	7
February 2010	8	105 minutes	6
May 2010	7	110 minutes	5
May 2010	9	125 minutes	6
June 2010	8	55 minutes	5
September 2010	9	60 minutes	7
November 2010	9	90 minutes	7
January 2010	8	100 minutes	7
April 2010	8	45 minutes	6

**Partnership Delivery Group - 9 Members**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
June 2009	9	135 minutes	4
August 2009	8	190 minutes	5
September 2009	8	130 minutes	4
November 2009	7	150 minutes	5
January 2010	8	160 minutes	3
March 2010	8	90 minutes	4
June 2010	8	140 minutes	4
September 2010	9	170 minutes	4
November 2010	9	145 minutes	3
January 2011	9	150 minutes	3
March 2011	9	140 minutes	4

**Performance Management Board – 9 Members**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
June 2009	8	130 minutes	4
August 2009	9	135 minutes	7
October 2009	9	55 minutes	4
December 2009 (special)	9	120 minutes	1 call in
February 2010	7	70 minutes	4
April 2010	9	85 minutes	3
June 2010	9	105 minutes	4 inc 1 call in
August 2010	9	125 minutes	7
November 2010	9	125 minutes	5
November 2010	9	125 minutes	2 inc 1 call in
February 2011	9	90 minutes	4
April 2011	7	35 minutes	3

**Analysis of meetings of Member Panels May 2009 – April 2011**

<b>Name of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members</b>	<b>Number of Meetings</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Off Street Parking	8	1	October 09
Climate Change	8	4	June – December 09
Leisure Facilities Strategy Group	8	9	September 09 – March 10
Constitution Review	9	4	August – November 10

Scrutiny Committee Call-Ins May 2009 – April 2011

Date	Topic	Action
November 2009	Community Hub	Special Performance Management Board (PMB) held December 2009
June 2010	Public Toilets – Bridgford Park	Heard at PMB June 2010
November 2010	Parkwood Leisure contract	Special meeting of PMB November 2010

## Analysis of meetings of Development Control Committee May 2009 – April 2011

Committee – 15 Members + 2 Ex Officio

Date of Meeting	Number of Members Present	Length of Meeting	Number of Items considered	
			Applications	Tree Preservation Orders
May 2009	16	90 minutes	9	0
June 2009	17	135 minutes	9	0
July 2009	13	130 minutes	16	0
August 2009	15	105 minutes	7	0
September 2009	15	120 minutes	9	1
October 2009	14	110 minutes	12	0
November 2009	16	125 minutes	7	0
December 2009	15	125 minutes	3	1
January 2010	14	65 minutes	4	1
February 2010	14	60 minutes	3	0
March 2010	15	100 minutes	4	0
April 2010	15	60 minutes	4	1
May 2010	16	140 minutes	5	0
June 2010	13	60 minutes	2	0
July 2010	16	85 minutes	5	0
August 2010	15	70 minutes	5	1
September 2010	17	145 minutes	8	0
October 2010	16	60 minutes	6	0
November 2010	19	175 minutes	5	0
December 2010	18	100 minutes	6	1
January 2011	17	155 minutes	7	0
February 2011	15	115 minutes	9	0
March 2011	15	205 minutes	12	0
April 2011	15	65 minutes	5	0



**Analysis of meetings of Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee  
May 2009 – April 2011**

Committee –15 Members

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
November 2009	12	45 minutes	3
July 2010	14	80 minutes	6
November 2010	13	70 minutes	2

**Analysis of meetings of Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Sub - Committee  
May 2009 – April 2011**

Sub Committee – 3 Members

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>
July 2009	3	75 minutes
September 2009	3	50 minutes
November 2009	3	55 minutes
December 2009	3	160 minutes
December 2009	3	85 minutes
May 2010	3	225 minutes
June 2010	3	85 minutes
October 2010	3	250 minutes
November 2010	3	155 minutes

**Analysis of meetings of Local Development Framework Group  
May 2009 – April 2011**

15 Members

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>
September 2009	13	115 minutes
November 2009	15	195 minutes
December 2009	15	190 minutes
July 2010	12	100 minutes
December 2010	13	115 minutes
March 2011	14	85 minutes

**Analysis of meetings of Member Development Group May 2009 – April 2011**

9 Members

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
February 2010	8	85 minutes	1
July 2010	8	115 minutes	4
September 2010	9	140 minutes	3
November 2010	8	120 minutes	4
February 2011	6	110 minutes	3

## ***Councillor Workload Survey***

The response rate was 78% (39 of the 50 Councillors). The survey was split into a number of headings and analysis of the responses is provided as follows:

### ***Information about you***

- 38% of respondents indicated they were also Parish or Town Councillors (15 of 39)
- 56% of respondents indicated that they participated in other community groups
- 8% of respondents indicated they were also County Councillors (3 of 39)

The survey highlighted the employment status of respondents as follows:

- 59% were retired or not working
- 18% worked part time
- 23% worked full time

### ***About your ward***

- 44% of respondents held ward surgeries (17 of 39)

The frequency of these surgeries varied from monthly, bi-monthly or on an ad-hoc basis. The responses indicated that Councillors would make themselves available at the request of residents however it was difficult to determine from the returns how much time could be allocated to this activity

### ***How Borough Councillors spend their time***

#### *Time spent per month reading papers in preparation for Borough Council meetings*

- 37% indicated between 1-5 hours
- 29% indicated between 6-10 hours
- 13% indicated between 11-15 hours
- 21% indicated more than 15 hours

*The returns show that 66% of respondents indicated that they spent between 1-10 hours reading papers in preparation for meetings. The remaining 34% indicated that spent between 11-15 hours (or more) reading papers in preparation for meetings.*

#### ***Time spent per month in meetings***

- 50% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours a month in informal meetings with other members
- 84% indicated they spent between 1-10 hours per month in formal council meetings (Full Council, Cabinet, and Scrutiny)

- 75% indicated they spent between 1-10 hours per month in other standing committees (such as Development Control)
- 77% indicated they spent between 1-10 hours per month in member panels or groups
- 85% indicated they spent under 5 hours a month on training and development
- 70% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours in party meetings per month
- 74% indicated they spent under 5 hours an month meeting with RBC staff

### ***Time spent on ward activities***

#### ***Hours per month meeting residents in their ward***

- 2% indicated they spent less than 1 hour
- 50% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours
- 31% indicated they spent between 6-10 hours
- 17% indicated they spent between 11-15 hours

*The returns show that 81% of respondents indicated that they spent between 1-10 hours per month meeting residents in their ward. 17% of respondents indicated that they spent between 11-15 hours per month meeting residents in their ward with no respondents indicating they spent more than 15 hours.*

#### ***Hours per month getting problems solved for their residents***

- 11% indicated they spent less than 1 hour
- 34% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours
- 29% indicated they spent between 6-10 hours
- 18% indicated they spent between 11-15 hours
- 8% indicated they spent more than 15 hours

*The returns show that 63% of respondents indicated that they spent between 1-10 hours per month getting problems solved for their residents.*

#### ***Hours per month attending local meetings and forums***

- 3% indicated they spent less than 1 hour per
- 16% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours
- 37% indicated they spent between 6-10 hours
- 26% indicated they spent between 10-15 hours
- 18% indicated they spent more than 15 hours

*The returns show that 63% of respondents indicated they spent between 6 to 15 hours per month attending local meetings and forums.*

## **Time spent on activities as a Parish or Town Councillor per month**

(15 of 39 respondents indicated they were Parish or Town Councillors)

### ***Hours per month reading papers in preparation for parish meetings***

- 25% indicated they spent less than 1 hour
- 36% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours
- 13% indicated they spent between 6-10 hours
- 6% indicated they spent between 11-15 hours
- 19% indicated they spent more than 15 hours

*The returns show that 55% of respondents indicated that they spent between 1-15 hours per month reading papers in preparation for parish meetings.*

### ***Hours per month spent in formal Parish or Town Council meetings***

- 6% indicated they spent less than 1 hour
- 31% indicated they spent between 1-5
- 50% indicated they spent between 6-10
- 13% indicated they spent between 11-15

*The returns show that 81% of respondents who were parish councillors indicated they spent between 1 to 10 hours in formal parish meetings per month.*

*None of the respondents indicated that they spent more than 15 hours per month in formal parish or town Council meetings*

### **Hours per month dealing with issues raised by constituents in the Parish**

- 19% indicated they spent less than 1 hour
- 44% indicated they spent between 1-5 hours
- 13% indicated they spent between 6-11 hours
- 25% indicated they spent between 11-15 hours

*The returns show that 57% of respondents who were parish councillors indicated they spent between 1 to 11 hours dealing with issues raised by constituents in the parish.*

*None of the respondents indicated that they spent more than 15 hours per month dealing with issues raised by constituents*

***Time spent on activities as a County Councillor***

(3 of the 39 respondents indicate they were also County Councillors)

***Hours per month spent reading papers in preparation for meetings (County Councillors)***

- 33% indicated they spent between 11-15 hours
- 33% indicated they spent more than 15 hours

*The returns showed that the 3 respondents who were County Councillors provided differing return for the number of hours reading papers in preparation for meetings.*

***Hours per month spent in formal County Council meetings (County Councillors)***

- 33% indicated they spent between 6-10 hours
- 66% indicated they spent more than 15 hours

***Percentage of respondents who believe their workload has increased in the last 2 years***

- 62% of respondents believed their workload in their role as a Borough Councillor had increased in the last 2 years
- 38% of respondents did not believe their workload in their role as a Borough Councillor had increased in the last 2 years
- 69% of respondents believed their workload as a Parish Councillor had increased in the last 2 years
- 31% of respondents did not believe their workload as a Parish Councillor had increased in the last 2 years



## REPORT OF THE HEAD OF CORPORATE SERVICES

### Summary

This report sets out the findings of the review Scheme of Delegation and Article 12 – Officers, in the Council’s Constitution as recommended by Cabinet.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council agrees the proposed revisions to the Scheme of Delegation - Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Article 12 – Officers within the Council’s Constitution.

### Detail

1. In line with the review of the Council’s Constitution previously agreed by Council the Scheme of Delegation contained within Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions has been reviewed. Article 12 – Officers has also been reviewed. This work has been undertaken to ensure both documents accurately reflect the Council’s structure and the way in which its functions and services are delivered. These were last reviewed by Council in March 2008.
2. At its meeting on 29 November 2011 Cabinet considered the recommendations of the Corporate Governance Group, made at its meeting on 22 November 2011, following its consideration of the review and proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegation and Article 12 – Officers.
3. Attached as **Appendix A** is the proposed revised Scheme of Delegation and attached as **Appendix B** is a revised Article 12 – Officers. The proposals do not suggest any significant changes to the Scheme of Delegation as their main purpose is to ensure the scheme accurately reflects existing roles and responsibilities. With regard to Article 12 – Officers the revisions take into account the revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules within Part 4 of the Constitution. This ensures they accurately reflect the process for the approval of appointments to the roles of the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executives, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer. Article 12 has also been updated to ensure the roles of the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer are accurately reflected. In summary the proposed amendments as recommended to Council by Cabinet are as follows:

#### *Scheme of Delegation - Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions*

- *The proposed changes are highlighted by way of track changes in the attachment **Appendix A**.*
- *The list of Committees appointed by the Council at section two has been updated so that titles are correct and up to date.*

- *The Scheme of Delegation has been updated to reflect the correct officer titles for the Heads of Services as set out at paragraph 1.2 of section four.*
- *The delegation to the Monitoring Officer has been set out so it is specific for that role. This is consistent with how the delegation to the Section 151 Officer was set out and ensures that these delegations relate to the specific roles rather than to post titles. This ensures the delegation to these two specific roles is clear.*
- ***Appendix 1** of the Scheme sets out the areas of responsibility for each Head of Service and this has been updated to ensure they accurately reflect the existing Council structure, areas of responsibility and operational service delivery.*
- *The areas of responsibility for the Heads of Service take into account some of the quasi-judicial functions the Council delivers. As such amendments have been made to the delegation to the Head of Environment and Waste Management so that it accurately reflects delivery of private hire and hackney carriage vehicle and driver licensing, the Licensing Act 2003 and the Gambling Act 2005. The specific delegations in relation to these functions are set out at **Appendix 2 and 3** of the Scheme.*
- *Additionally changes have been made to accurately reflect responsibility for Street Trading consents with the Head of Environment and Waste retaining responsibility for these with the addition of Mobile Snack Bars on trunk roads.*
- *The delegation to the Head of Planning and Place Shaping in relation to the development control function, which was contained in the pre-revised Scheme of Delegation, is retained at **Appendix 4**. Additions have been made to this as set out at points vii) and viii). Point vii) relates to the approval of expenditure of Section 106 agreements over a £5,000 threshold. Point viii) enables the Head of Service to implement or amend conservation areas boundaries in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Ward Member(s). This will ensure in future that such issues will not require the approval of Cabinet.*

#### *Article 12 – Officers*

- *This has been updated in order to accurately reflect the functions of the roles of Chief Executive, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer.*
- *Article 12 now sets out the functions of these three roles with the Scheme of Delegation setting out specific areas of responsibility and authority*
- *Text relating to the roles of the Deputy Chief Executives within the previous Council structure has been revised in order to accurately reflect the Council's existing structure*
- *Text relating to Borough Officers have been removed as these roles no longer exist within the Council*
- *The article has also been revised to ensure it accurately reflects the process for the approval of appointments to the posts of Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive(s), the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer as set out within the Officer Employment Procedure Rules at Part 4 of the Constitution.*

#### **Risk and uncertainties**

4. It is essential that the Council has a Scheme of Delegation that clearly sets out areas of responsibility and authority. If the Scheme of Delegation is not up to

date and accurate there is a risk that it will not properly reflect roles and responsibilities.

5. Article 12 – Officers should be accurate and up to date. If it is not accurate it is unlikely to be consistent with the Scheme of delegation and as such will not properly reflect roles and responsibilities.

#### **Financial Comments**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

#### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no direct implications from this report.

#### **Diversity**

There are no direct equality and diversity implications arising from this report.

#### **Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

Council Report and Resolution 16 December 2011- Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Constitution Review  
Rushcliffe Borough Council Constitution - Scheme of Delegation - Part 3 –  
Responsibility for Functions  
Rushcliffe Borough Council Constitution - Article 12 – Officers  
Corporate Governance Group Report 22 November 2011– Scheme of Delegation  
Cabinet Report and Resolution 29 November 2011– Review of Scheme of Delegation

## RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNCTIONS

### 1. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOCAL CHOICE FUNCTIONS

The strategies and plans set out in Article 4.1 include the local choice functions, which will be the responsibility of the full Council. Other plans and strategies will be the responsibility of the Cabinet.

### 2. RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNCIL FUNCTIONS

(a) The following Committees will be appointed by the Council, with the terms of reference set out within the constitution (Articles 6 to 9)

Community Development Group

Corporate Governance Group

Partnership Delivery Group

Performance Management Board

Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee

Development Control Committee

Licensing Committee

Employment Appeals Committee

Interviewing Committee

Standards Committee

(b) The following member groups will also be appointed

Civic Hospitality Panel

Local Development Framework Group

Member Development Group

### 3. RESPONSIBILITY FOR EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

Executive powers have not been granted to individual members of the Cabinet, with the following exceptions.

The Cabinet Portfolio holder for Finance has been given delegated authority to approve capital grants in accordance with policy approved by the Council from time to time.

The Council will be responsible for the delegation of any functions, including executive functions, as set out in the scheme of delegation.

### 4. SCHEME OF DELEGATION

#### 1. General

1.1 Pursuant to Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 and Section 15(2) of the Local Government Act 2000, the Council delegates the following powers -

- (A) **to each Committee of the Council**, full powers to act in all matters covered by the Committee's Terms of Reference;
- (B) **to each Officer** (see 1.2 below), full powers to act in all matters within their area of responsibility (unless delegated to a Committee), including responsibility for all day to day management and operational decisions.

1.2 For the purposes of the Scheme of Delegation reference to delegation to an Officer shall mean one of the following officers unless specifically indicated otherwise:

Chief Executive (Head of Paid Service)  
Deputy Chief Executives

*Heads of Service*

- [Head of Community Shaping](#)
- [Head of Corporate Services](#)
- Head of Environment and Waste Management
- [Head Financial Services](#)
- [Head of Partnerships and Performance](#)
- Head of Planning and Place Shaping
- [Head of Revenues and ICT Services](#)

1.3 The exercise of such powers shall be subject always to the provisions of any Standing Order or Financial Regulation for the time being in force, except where such Order or Regulation has been specifically waived by resolution of the Council or as otherwise provided for in this Constitution.

1.4 The areas of responsibility of each Head of Service are set out (but not by way of limitation) in the relevant section of Appendix 1 to this Scheme of Delegation, but subject to any qualification, requirement to consult others or to refer a matter to a Committee or to the Council for consideration, as may be specified.

2. Delegation to Officers - General

2.1 In cases of doubt as to which Officer has responsibility for a matter, the Chief Executive shall decide.

2.2 The delegation to Officers at paragraph 1.1(B) above shall include the power -

- (i) to authorise the exercise of the delegated powers of decision by such other officers as may be deemed appropriate for the proper and efficient performance of the work;
- (ii) to designate particular officers as "appropriate" or "proper" officers for the purposes of any statutory provisions, including where necessary or convenient having regard to any

professional or technical requirements, an officer who is not an employee of the Council;

- (iii) following consultation with the Chief Executive to authorise particular officers in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1972 and Section 60(2) of the County Courts Act 1984 (conduct of court proceedings by officers who are not solicitors);
- (iv) to make any determination, serve any notice or make any Order under statutory provisions;
- (v) to authorise the Head of ~~of Legal and Democratic Services~~ Corporate Services and the Senior Solicitor to prosecute in respect of any offence under any statute, order, regulation or byelaw, subject to the Head of Corporate Services ~~Legal or the Senior Solicitor and Democratic Services~~ being satisfied as to the evidence;
- (vi) to sign cards of identity and cards of authorisation which, in the opinion of the officer, are required to enable an officer to enter premises for the proper performance of their duties.

2.3 Every Officer may take any necessary emergency action for the safety of the public or the protection of the property of the Council.

2.4 Other Officers as designated by the Chief Executive may act in place of the Officer concerned in exercise of any power conferred on an Officer by this Scheme of Delegation whenever a post is vacant or the Officer is for any reason unable to act.

### 3. The Council

3.1 Notwithstanding the powers delegated to Committees or Officers the Council retains the right to exercise such powers.

3.2 For the avoidance of doubt, but not by way of limitation, the matters set out in Article 4 of the Constitution shall be reserved to the Council.

### 4. The Cabinet

Notwithstanding the powers relating to executive functions which are delegated to Officers, the Cabinet retains the right to exercise such powers.

### 5. Delegation to Particular Officers - Corporate Matters

#### **Chief Executive**

The Chief Executive as Head of the Paid Service shall be authorised to:-

- (i) ~~to~~ deal with all matters relating to the recruitment, appointment, remuneration, conditions of service, discipline, dismissal,

superannuation, qualifications, training, promotion, safety and provision of welfare facilities of all employees of the Council (save himself) which have not been delegated to a Committee, except that

(a) a committee of Council will appoint Deputy Chief Executives

(b) appointment and dismissal of the roles of:

(i) Monitoring officer as appointed pursuant to Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989; and

(ii) the officer having responsibility for the Council's financial affairs pursuant to Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972.

shall be reserved to the Council.

NOTE: In exercising these powers the Chief Executive shall have regard to any procedures, code of practice or guidance approved by the Council in relation to the matter concerned.

(ii) To settle any claims against the Council in consultation with the Monitoring officer and the Section 151 officer.

~~(ii)~~(iii) to make such arrangements as may be necessary or appropriate to facilitate management consultation with employees or employee representatives in respect of employment related issues.

~~(iii)~~(iv) to make appointments to Committees, including Scrutiny Committees, in respect of seats allocated to the respective political groups in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

~~(iv)~~(v) to make appointments to other Member Groups in respect of seats allocated by the Council to the respective political groups in accordance with the wishes of those respective groups.

~~(v)~~(vi) to agree member nominations for Conferences after consultation with the leaders of any political groups that would be entitled to nominate members for attendance if political proportionality principles are applied.

~~(vi)~~(vii) to make any Order requested by the Chief Constable and authorised by the Home Office prohibiting the holding of public processions, and in the absence of the Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executives or the Head of ~~Legal and Democratic Services~~ Corporate Services shall be so authorised.

in respect of any Order made under vii above, the Chief Executive or other officers indicated above are authorised to affix the seal of the Council, such sealing to be witnessed solely by the officer concerned.

| ~~(vii)~~(viii) \_\_\_\_\_ to consent to police requests for authorisation under Section 30 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 after consultation with the appropriate Cabinet portfolio holder.

| ~~(viii)~~(ix) \_\_\_\_\_ in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the appropriate Cabinet member with responsibility for the service area concerned, to authorise the taking or carrying out of action, notwithstanding anything in the Council's Standing Orders or Financial Regulations, where he considers that circumstances exist that make it expedient or necessary for action to be taken prior to the time when such action could be approved through normal Council procedures. A report on such action, and the circumstances justifying the exercise of the delegated powers, shall be made to the next meeting of the Cabinet or the Council as appropriate.

PROVIDED THAT where an urgent decision relates to a key decision as defined in Article 13 of this Constitution, the procedures set out in Rules 15 and 16 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules shall be followed.

AND PROVIDED THAT where an urgent decision is required in relation to any matter which falls outside the budget or policy framework, the procedure set out in the Budget and Policy Framework Rules (Rule 9) shall be followed.

### **Section 151 Officer**

The Section 151 Officer shall be authorised:-

- (i) to make the necessary arrangements for the proper administration of the Council's financial affairs for the purposes of Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- (ii) without prejudice to the generality of (i),
  - to make arrangements for the provision and operation of any treasury management, banking and insurance services including the authorisation of any transaction; signing of cheques or other financial instrument; provision of indemnities; agreement of terms for the raising, repayment or cancellation of loans, investments and leases; and at the Section 151 Officer's absolute discretion to authorise other officers of the Council to perform all or any of the above.
  - to take any action to recover debts due to the Council and to write off debts considered to be irrecoverable for any proper reason
  - to authorise arrangements for the disposal of surplus or obsolete assets and consequential accounting entries



- to determine all financial matters specified within statutory provisions and not reserved therein to the Council
- to allocate budgetary provision from approved contingencies and earmarked reserves
- to make arrangements for the provision of an Internal Audit service to the Council

### Head of Legal and Democratic Services Monitoring officer

The ~~Head of Legal and Democratic Services~~Monitoring officer shall be authorised:-

- (i) to exercise the required discretion whether or not to prosecute or defend legal proceedings on behalf of the Council in accordance with Section 222 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- (ii) to take all necessary steps in legal proceedings against any person or body authorised by the Council.
- (iii) to take all necessary steps to defend the Council in legal proceedings against the Council brought by any person or body.
- (iv) to certify resolutions and documents as being true copies and authorise the Senior Solicitor to do so.
- (v) With the Senior Solicitor or his/her representative to obtain Counsel's Opinion or instruct Counsel to appear on behalf of the Council whenever he considers such action advisable.
- ~~(vi)~~ (vi)—to sign on behalf of the Council any deed or other document authorised by the Council or which it is necessary or desirable to give effect to any decision of the Council, unless any enactment otherwise requires or authorises or the Council has authorised some other person for some specific purpose.
- ~~(vi)~~(vii) To act as principal advisor on ethical standards issues and Councillor conduct

**Head of Community Shaping**

Housing advice and assistance  
 Temporary accommodation  
 Housing strategy  
 Affordable homes  
[Choice Based Lettings](#)  
[First Lets](#)  
 Domestic Violence  
 Health Promotion  
 Community safety  
 Community partnership and development  
 Environment  
 Halls, pavilions and other facilities  
[Land availability – housing and employment](#)  
~~Leisure policy and~~  
 Sport development  
[Planning Policy](#)  
 Country Park  
 Parks and playing fields  
 Health development  
 Arts and events  
[In consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Finance to approve community grants](#)

**Head of ~~Legal and Democratic Services~~ Corporate Services**

[Corporate Administrative Support](#)  
[Complaints and Ombudsman](#) liaison  
[Constitution](#)  
 Data protection and Freedom of Information  
[Ethical Standards](#)  
 Elections  
 Electoral registration  
 Legal services, ~~and advice and advocacy~~  
~~Civic~~ Mayor's Office  
 Member Services  
[Performance Management](#)  
[Strategic Human Resources](#)

**Head of Environment and Waste**

Abandoned Shopping and Luggage Trolleys – Schedule 4 Environmental Protection Act 1990  
 Air Quality Management  
 Animal Welfare  
 Anti-Social Behaviour (reactive investigations)  
 Contaminated Land  
 Dog Control

Fleet Management  
Food Safety  
Health and Safety at Work (Enforcement)  
[Health Promotion](#)  
Highway Matters other than Agency  
Home Energy Conservation  
Houses in Multiple Occupation  
Infectious diseases and food poisoning  
Land Drainage  
Licensing and registration functions ([as set out in Appendix 2](#))  
[Gambling functions \(as set out in Appendix 3\)](#)  
MOT Testing  
Overcrowding  
Park maintenance, grass cutting and horticulture  
Pest Control  
Pollution Control  
Private sector housing (including Disabled Facilities Grants and Discretionary Grants)  
Public Health  
Statutory Nuisances  
Street Trading Consents including mobile snack bars on trunk roads  
Street Sweeping and Litter Collection  
Waste Management  
Water quality

#### Head of [Financial Services](#)

[Strategic Finance](#)  
[Risk Management](#)  
[Civil Contingency](#)  
[Emergency Planning](#)  
Procurement

#### Head of Planning and Place Shaping

[Building Control](#)  
[Dangerous structures](#)  
[Demolition control](#)  
Conservation and Design  
[Engineering/drainage](#)  
Environmental Improvements  
Development Control (subject to Appendix 4)  
Hedgerow regulation and protection  
[\(Land availability—housing and employment\)](#)  
Listed Buildings  
Local land charges and local searches  
Planning and Transportation Policy  
[Public rights of way](#)  
Street naming and numbering  
[Tree Advice and Landscaping](#)  
[Tree Preservation Orders](#)

## Head of Partnerships and Performance

~~Building Control~~

~~Dangerous structures~~

~~Demolition control~~

Car Parks and Parking Enforcement

Communications

Customer Services

Leisure facilities (partnerships)

[Leisure policy](#)

~~Transformation and key projects~~

~~Concessionary fares~~

## Head of Revenues and ICT Services

[Administration of Housing and Council Tax Benefits](#)

Action to recover debts and to write off debts considered to be irrecoverable

Authorisation of surveillance under RIPA

~~Corporate Policy~~

~~Strategic Finance~~

~~Human Resources Strategy~~

~~Planning Policy~~

~~Property<sup>2</sup>~~

Collection and Recovery of Council Tax

Collection and Recovery of Business Rates

Corporate Mail (incoming/outgoing)

Capital works schemes and planned maintenance

Detection, investigation and prosecution of Benefit Fraud

Civic Centre Facilities Management

Construction and Design

Energy efficiency

~~Engineering and Drainage~~

Estates Management

Flood risk and prevention

Information Systems Strategy

ICT Security and procurement

ICT Infrastructure and software development

Markets

Payment of Housing and Council Tax Benefits

Management of footpath and bridleway diversions and creation orders under T&CPA

[Public Rights of Way<sup>1</sup>](#)

Property [\(acquisitions and disposals\)<sup>2</sup>](#)

Strategic Asset Management

~~Tree Advice and Landscaping~~

~~Tree Preservation Orders~~

Statutory compliance in respect of: asbestos, legionella, DDA, Energy Performance of Buildings Directive

Valuations and impairment review

~~In consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Finance to (i) approve hardship relief from rates and Discretionary Rate Relief for categories of relief falling outside of~~

the Council's policy on Discretionary Rate Relief and (ii) determine applications for a reduction of council tax under section 13A of Local Government Finance Act 1992.

---

**Note:** ~~Head of Revenues and ICT Head of Planning and Place Shaping~~

- 1 *Ward Member(s) shall be consulted before commenting on proposals for diversions and other alterations to public rights of way.*

*Ward Member(s) shall be consulted before making any order relating to a public right of way and, in the event of any such Ward Members objecting, to consult the Cabinet before deciding whether to make the order.*

- 2 *The delegation in relation to the acquisition or disposal of land excludes the following:*

- (a) where the consideration to be paid or received by the Council exceeds £10,000 in amount or value; and*
- (b) in the case of disposal, where the consent of the Secretary of State would be required (unless a general consent applies), or where there is a requirement to advertise the disposal of open space land under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972.*

*The acquisition or disposal of land in these circumstances will be the responsibility of the Cabinet.*

## Head of Environment and Waste Management

### Licensing and Registration Functions

Acupuncture, tattooing, ear piercing  
and electrolysis  
Alcohol and Entertainments (Licensing  
Act 2003)  
Amusement with Prizes (Gaming  
Machines)  
Animal boarding establishments  
Camp sites  
Cinemas  
Dangerous wild animals  
Dog breeding  
Establishments for massage and  
special treatment  
Food premises  
Food registration  
Gambling  
Game dealers  
Game Dealers (Excise)  
Game Keepers  
Guard dogs  
Hackney carriage/private hire (**see  
following \*note and table 1**)  
House to House Collections  
Mobile Home sites  
Pet animals  
Private water supplies  
Processes subject to control under  
Part 1 of the Environmental Protection  
Act  
Riding establishments  
Scrap metal dealers  
Sex establishments  
Societies Lotteries  
Street Collections  
Theatres  
To Kill Game  
Track Betting

**\*NOTE:**

In respect of any proposed decision to refuse a hackney carriage or private hire driver's licence, or any proposal to revoke such a licence under delegated powers, the Head of Environment and Waste Management shall give the applicant or licensed driver a right of appeal to the Council's Licensing Committee PROVIDED THAT no right of appeal to the Licensing Committee shall apply in the following cases:-

- a) where the Head of Environment and Waste Management is of the opinion that information which he reasonably considers necessary to enable him to determine whether an applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a driver's licence has not been provided by the applicant;
- b) where an applicant has been convicted of an offence of a type shown in column 1 of Table 1 and the application is made within the period shown in column 2 of the date of conviction;
- c) where an applicant has failed the medical examination arranged by the Council; and
- d) where the applicant has failed the Council's driving ability and knowledge test.



TABLE 1

<b>Type of Offence</b> (as described in the <i>Council's Guidelines Relating to the Relevance of Previous Convictions</i> ) References to paragraph numbers below are references to paragraphs within the Guidelines	<b>No right of appeal to Licensing Committee within period of</b>
<b>Dishonesty</b> - para. (a)	3 years
<b>Violence</b>  Murder, manslaughter/culpable homicide while driving, arson, racially aggravated assault – para. (b)(i)  Grievous bodily harm, robbery, racially aggravated offences under Ss. 30, 31 and 32 of the Crime and Disorder Act - para. (b)(ii)  Other violent offences - para. (b)(iii)	7 years   6 years  2 years
<b>Drugs</b> – para. (c)	3 years
<b>Indecency</b> – para. (d)	7 years
<b>Motoring</b>  Major traffic offences - para. (e)(i)(isolated offence)  Major traffic offences - para. (e)(i) (more than one offence)  Minor traffic offences - para. (e)(ii) (more than one offence)	4 months  3 years  4 months
<b>Disqualification</b> – paras. (e)(iv) and (g)(i)  Drink driving  Other	  3 years free of conviction from restoration of licence  18 months free of conviction from restoration of licence
<b>Offences under the Town Police Clauses Acts and Part II of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976</b>  Isolated offence - para. (f)  More than one offence - para. (f)	  4 months  18 months

Licensing Act 2003

Matter to be dealt with	Full Committee	Sub Committee	Senior Licensing Officer
Application for personal licence		If a police objection	If no objection is made
Application for personal licence with unspent convictions		All Cases	
Application for premises licence/club premises certificate	If a relevant representation is made that means the creation of a new Saturation Zone.	If a relevant representation is made	If no relevant representation is made
Application for provisional statement	If a relevant representation is made that means the creation of a new Saturation Zone.	If a relevant representation is made	If no relevant representation is made
Application to vary premises licence/club premises certificate	If a relevant representation is made that means the creation of a new Saturation Zone.	If a relevant representation is made	If no relevant representation is made
Application to vary designated personal licence holder		If a police objection	All other cases
Request to be removed as designated personal licence holder			All cases
Application for transfer of premises licence		If a police objection	All other cases
Application for interim authority		If a police objection	All other cases
Application to review premises licence/club premises certificate		All cases	
Decision on whether a complaint or objection is irrelevant, frivolous, vexatious etc			All cases
Decision to object when Local Authority is a consultee and not the lead authority		All cases	
Determination of a police representation to a temporary event notice		All cases	

NB A particular case where appropriate may be dealt with otherwise than is indicated in the appendix 1 but no case will be dealt with at a lower level than prescribed

**Gambling Act 2005 - Delegation Scheme**

1. The power to set fees under any regulations made under section 212 of the Gambling Act 2005 shall be delegated to the Head of Environment and Waste Management subject to the provisions of that section and such regulations.
2. The power of the Licensing Authority to;
  - a. make representations as a responsible authority under Part 8 of the Act (i.e. premises licences, provisional statements etc)
  - b. propose to attach a condition to a premises licence in accordance with section 169(1)(a) of the Act in addition to the mandatory or default conditions
  - c. propose the exclusion of a default condition from a premises licence under S169(1)(b) of the Act
  - d. as a responsible authority, request a review of a premises licence under sections 197 or 200 of the Act
  - e. give a notice of objection to any of the following:
    - i. temporary use notice under S221 of the Actshall be delegated to the Head of Environment and Waste Management.
3. The power to:
  - a. to determine that any representations received under Part 8 of the Act are vexatious, frivolous, or certainly will not influence the Authority's determination of an application
  - b. reject all or part of any application for a review of a premises licence in accordance with Section 198 of the Act
  - c. revoke a premises licence for non-payment of the annual fee (s193)
  - d. to serve notification of intended refusal of any of the following:
    - i. Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit (Schedule 10 paragraph 10)
    - ii. Prize Gaming Permits (Schedule 14 paragraph 11)
    - iii. Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits (Schedule 13 paragraph 6)

and also, in the latter case, notice of intention to grant the application but for a smaller number of machines than specified and/or a different category of machines from that specified in the application.

- e. Serve notification of lapse of any of the following:
  - i. Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit (Schedule 10 paragraph 14 and 15 (1)(b))
- f. Serve notice of intention to cancel or vary any of the following:
  - i. Club Gaming Permit or Club Gaming Machine Permit (Schedule 12 paragraph 21)
  - ii. Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits (Schedule 13 paragraph 16)
- g. Create and amend the Authority's application procedures in relation to applications for the following in accordance with any relevant legislation:
  - i. Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permits (Schedule 10 paragraphs 5 and 7)
  - ii. Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits (Schedule 13 paragraph 2)
  - iii. Prize Gaming Permits (Schedule 14 paragraphs 6 and 8)

shall be delegated to the Head of Environment and Waste Management.

- 4. The power to appoint authorised persons under section 304 of the Act shall be delegated to the Head of Environment and Waste Management.
- 5. The power to issue formal cautions and/or instruct the Senior Solicitor to commence and defend proceedings under the Gambling Act 2005, its subordinate legislation, (and any legislation which may subsequently amend or replace it) be delegated to the Head of Environment and Waste Management.
- 6. The power to commence and defend proceedings both criminal and civil under the Gambling Act 2005 and its subordinate legislation, (and any legislation which may subsequently amend or replace it) be delegated to the Head of Corporate Services.
- 7. In relation to the following matters the Authority will, in the majority of cases, follow the table of delegated functions set out below. This table indicates the lowest level of the authority which will normally exercise the delegation, though the Authority reserves the right (where appropriate), for any particular matter to be dealt with at a higher level whilst having due regard to any statutory requirements. For example, an officer may choose not to exercise their delegated power and refer the matter to the Licensing Sub-Committee or the Sub-Committee itself may choose to refer the matter to the Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee.

Matter to be dealt with	Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee	Licensing Sub-Committee	Officer
Application for a premises licence (including applications for re-instatement under S195)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Representation made and not withdrawn (S154 (4)(a)) and/or</li> <li>ii. Where the Licensing Authority considers that a condition should be added to the licence under S169(1)(a) or a default condition should be excluded under section 169(1)(b) unless the applicant and any persons making representations agree to this course of action and that a hearing is unnecessary</li> </ul>	No representation made or representations have been withdrawn
Application to vary premises licence		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Representation made and not withdrawn (S154 (4)(b)) and/or</li> <li>ii. Where the Licensing Authority considers that a condition should be added to the licence under S169(1)(a) or a default condition should be excluded under section 169(1)(b) unless the applicant and any persons making representations agree to this course of action and that a hearing is unnecessary (S187(3))</li> </ul>	No representation made or representations have been withdrawn
Application for transfer of premises licence		Representation made and not withdrawn (S154 (4) (c))	All other cases
Application for provisional statement		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Representation made and not withdrawn (S154 (4)(d)) and/or</li> <li>ii. Where the Licensing Authority considers that a condition should be added to the licence under S169(1)(a) or a default condition should be excluded under section 169(1)(b)</li> </ul>	No representation made or representations have been withdrawn

Matter to be dealt with	Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee	Licensing Sub-Committee	Officer
Review of a premises Licence		All cases	
Consideration of Temporary Use Notices (including notices modified under section 223)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. All cases where an objection notice has been received unless each person who would be entitled to make representations agrees that a hearing is unnecessary and the Head of Environmental Health is satisfied that a counter notice is not required (S 222 and 232).</li> <li>ii. All cases where a counter notice may be required (S232(3))</li> </ul>	All other cases (S232)
Application for Club Gaming/Club Machine permits, renewals and variations (including those leading to cancellation of permit) under Schedule 12 paragraph 15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Objection made and not withdrawn (Schedule 12 paragraph 28 (2))</li> <li>ii. Refusal of permit proposed on the grounds listed in Schedule 12 paragraph 6(1)(a)-(d), or paragraph 10(3) as applicable unless Authority and all relevant parties agree that a hearing is unnecessary (Schedule 12 paragraph 7)</li> </ul>	All other cases
Cancellation of Club Gaming / Club Machine Permits under Schedule 12 paragraphs 21, and 22 (non payment of annual fee)		All cases	
Applications for other permits registrations and notifications			All cases

Matter to be dealt with	Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee	Licensing Sub-Committee	Officer
Cancellation (under Schedule 13 paragraphs 16, and 17 (non payment of annual fee)) and variation of Licensed Premises Gaming Machine permits under Schedule 13 paragraph 16		All cases where permit holder requests a hearing under paragraph 16 (2) or makes representations	All other cases

8. The Head of Environment and Waste Management be given delegated power to administer and carry out all other functions of the Licensing Authority capable of delegation under the Gambling Act 2005 and its subordinate legislation, (and any legislation which may subsequently amend or replace it), which is not otherwise delegated to the Licensing Authority, the Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee or its Sub-Committees. This includes for example, but is not limited to:
- (i) to serve and receive service of all notices, counter notices, etc required or permitted to be served under the Act
  - (ii) to determine points of clarification required for hearings
  - (iii) to agree that a hearing is unnecessary
  - (iv) to adjourn hearings where all parties are in agreement
  - (v) to determine applications where representations are withdrawn before the hearing
  - (vi) to extend time limits
  - (vii) to give effect to the decisions of the Magistrates Court on appeal

## Head of Planning and Place Shaping

### Development Control

- (i) Applications made under the following statutory provisions shall be referred to Development Control Committee for decision or to make observations, as may be required, in the circumstances (a) to (f) set out below:-

*Town and Country Planning Acts*

*General Development Order*

*Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act*

*Advertisement Regulations*

~~*Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 – applications for street trading consents in respect of mobile snack bars on trunk roads*~~

- (a) where, following consultation in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice on Planning Applications, the Head of Planning and Place Shaping and Ward Member(s) have different views;
- (b) where the application has been submitted by the Borough Council;
- (c) where the application has been submitted by the County Council; except minor development relating to existing operational premises (eg school classrooms, fences, etc);
- (d) where the Council is being consulted by an adjoining authority on an application (except where a response is required prior to the next meeting of the Development Control Committee);
- (e) where the application involves any Member or senior officer\* as applicant or agent, or where a Ward Member declares an interest;
- (f) where a Section 106 planning agreement is required, unless the agreement relates to standard drainage requirements or the proposed agreement complies with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- (ii) to consult Ward Member(s) before making a Tree Preservation Order or serving a Building Preservation Notice, except where immediate action is required
- (iii) to refer to Development Control Committee any Tree Preservation Order where a valid objection has been received following the service of notice in accordance with the relevant Regulations



- (iv) to refer to Development Control Committee for decision any application to lop, top or fell trees included in a Tree Preservation Order where compensation may be payable if the application is refused
- (v) to refer to the [Head of Corporate Services or the Senior Solicitor](#) for determination applications for Certificates of Lawful Use or Development
- (vi) to consult Ward Members before commenting on proposed traffic regulation orders.
- [\(vii\) to consult the relevant Cabinet portfolio holder before approving the expenditure of section 106 agreement monies where such expenditure exceeds £5,000.](#)
- [\(viii\) In consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Ward Member\(s\) to exercise the power necessary to implement or amend conservation area boundaries as set out within Section 69 of the Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990.](#)

*\* Senior officer shall mean any officer of the Council at Grade LS11 or above, and shall also include any other post specified in the Employee Code of Conduct for this purpose.*

### **ARTICLE 12– OFFICERS**

#### **12.1 Management structure**

(a) **General**

The full Council may engage such staff (referred to as officers) as it considers necessary to carry out its functions.

(b) **Executive Officers**

The full Council or a Committee appointed for this purpose will approve appointments to the following posts, who will be designated executive officers:

*Chief Executive*

*Deputy Chief Executive*

The Chief Executive shall determine the nature and functions of the Councils Management Structure in line with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

(c) **Monitoring officer and Section 151 officer**

The full Council or a Committee appointed for this purpose will approve appointment to the roles of Monitoring officer and Section 151 officer.

(d) **Structure**

The Head of paid service will determine and publicise a description of the overall structure of the Council showing the management structure and deployment of officers. This is set out at Part 7 of this Constitution.

#### **12.2 Functions and areas of responsibility**

##### **Chief Executive**

- (a) Overall corporate management and operational responsibility (and Head of Paid Service) including overall management responsibility for all officers.
- (b) Provision of professional advice to all parties in the decision making process.
- (c) Together with the Monitoring officer, responsibility for a system of record keeping for all the Council's decisions.
- (d) Representing the Council on partnership and external bodies.
- (e) Other duties as required by statute or the Council.

## **Deputy Chief Executives**

- (a) Together with the Chief Executive and other Deputy Chief Executives ensure that the Council's objectives are achieved and contribute to the development and implementation of strategic policy.
- (b) At the direction of the Chief Executive to oversee the delivery and development of services in line with the Councils Scheme of Delegation.
- (c) At the direction of the Chief Executive to act as lead sponsor for specific service areas and projects which contribute to the development and implementation of strategic policy.

### **12.3 Functions of the head of paid service**

#### **(a) Discharge of functions by the Council**

The head of paid service will report to full Council on the manner in which the discharge of the Council's functions is co-ordinated, the number and grade of officers required for the discharge of functions and the organisation of officers.

#### **(b) Restrictions on functions**

The head of paid service may not be the Monitoring officer but may hold the post of chief finance officer if a qualified accountant.

### **12.4 Functions of the Monitoring officer**

#### **(a) Maintaining the Constitution**

Maintain an up-to-date version of the Constitution and will ensure that it is widely available for consultation by members, staff and the public.

#### **(b) Ensuring lawfulness and fairness of decision making**

After consulting with the head of paid service and chief finance officer, the Monitoring officer will report to the full Council or to the Cabinet in relation to any Cabinet function if he or she considers that any proposal, decision or omission would give rise to unlawfulness or if any decision or omission has given rise to maladministration. Such a report will have the effect of stopping the proposal or decision being implemented until the report has been considered.

#### **(c) Supporting the Standards Committee**

Contribute to the promotion and maintenance of high standards of conduct through provision of support to the Standards Committee.

(d) **Receiving reports**

Receive and act on reports made by ethical standards officers and decisions of the case tribunals.

(e) **Conducting investigations**

Conduct investigations into matters referred by ethical standards officers and make reports or recommendations in respect of them to the Standards Committee.

(f) **Proper Officer for access to information**

Ensure that Cabinet decisions, together with the reasons for those decisions and relevant officer reports and background papers are made publicly available as soon as possible.

(g) **Advising whether Cabinet decisions are within the budget and policy framework**

Advise whether decisions of the Cabinet are in accordance with the budget and policy framework.

(h) **Providing advice**

Provide advice on the scope of powers and authority to take decisions, maladministration, financial impropriety, probity and budget and policy framework issues to all Councillors.

(i) **Complaints**

Co-ordinating the response to complaints referred to the Local Ombudsman.

(j) **Restrictions on posts**

The Monitoring officer cannot be the chief finance officer or the head of paid service.

## 12.5 **Functions of the S151 Officer**

*The S151 Officer will –*

(a) **Ensuring lawfulness and financial prudence of decision making**

After consulting with the head of paid service and the monitoring officer, the chief finance officer will report to the full Council or to the Cabinet in relation to any Cabinet function and the Council's external auditor if he or she considers that any proposal, decision or course of action will involve incurring unlawful expenditure, or is unlawful and is likely to cause a loss or deficiency or if the Council is about to enter an item of account unlawfully.

(b) **Administration of financial affairs**

Have responsibility for the administration of the financial affairs of the Council.

(c) **Contributing to corporate management**

Contribute to the corporate management of the Council, in particular through the provision of professional financial advice.

(d) **Providing advice**

Provide advice on the scope of powers and authority to take decisions, maladministration, financial impropriety, probity and budget and policy framework issues to all Councillors and will support and advise Councillors and officers in their respective roles.

(e) **Give financial information**

Provide financial information to the media, members of the public and the community.

**12.6 Duty to provide sufficient resources to the Monitoring officer and chief finance officer**

The Council will provide the monitoring officer and chief finance officer with such officers, accommodation and other resources as are in the opinion of the monitoring officer and chief finance officer sufficient to allow their duties to be performed.

**12.7 Conduct**

Officers will comply with the Officers' Code of Conduct set out in Part 5 of this Constitution.

**12.8 Employment**

The recruitment, selection and dismissal of officers will comply with the Officer Employment Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.