

Subject:	Changes to the Democratic Processes and Mayoral Review	Status:	For Publication
Report to:	Cabinet Governance Working Group Policy Overview and Scrutiny Civic Matters Working Group Council	Date:	27 th June 2012 27 th June 2012 10 th September 2012 26 th November 2012 27 th February 2013
Report of:	Director of Business	Portfolio Holder:	Customers, Legal and Licensing
Key Decision:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forward Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Exception	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Urgency <input type="checkbox"/>
Equality Impact Assessment:	Required:	Yes	Attached: Yes
Biodiversity Impact Assessment	Required:	No	Attached: No
Contact Officer:	Stuart Sugarman	Telephone:	01706 252447
Email:	stUARTSUGARMAN@rossendalebc.gov.uk		

1.	RECOMMENDATION(S)
1.1	To request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review on the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries, and that Council consider (during the review period in 2014) moving to one election every four years.
1.2	To reduce to three Licensing Committees per year and to deal with Taxi Licence applications through sub-committees.
1.3	To change to two overview and scrutiny committees: one to deal with policy and performance (Corporate Scrutiny) and one to deal with the scrutiny of partner organisations (Partner Scrutiny) and to retain these as evening meetings.
1.4	To merge Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group (4 meetings a year) and keep Civic Matters Working Group as it is (to meet as and when required).
1.5	That the changes to committees detailed at 1.2 – 1.4 commence from May 2013.
1.6	That the Council delegates any further changes to the Mayoralty to the Civic Matters Working Group, and that the terms of reference for the Civic Matters Working Group be amended to reflect this change.
1.7	To update the Council's Constitution with the agreed changes.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 To review proposed changes to the democratic processes within the Council relating to the number of members, cycle of committees, Council's election cycle and Mayoral review.
- 2.2 In June 2012 the Cabinet recommended that Governance Working Group and Overview and Scrutiny review proposed changes to the number of councillors and changes to the committee structure, and that Civic Matters Working Group review changes to the Mayoralty.
- 2.3 Members are asked to consider the consultation responses in section 12 and questionnaire responses from elected members and members of the public.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:
- **Responsive and value for money local services** – responding to and meeting the different needs of customers and improving the cost effectiveness of services.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:
- Any changes to the number of Councillors per ward would require the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review.

5. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

5.1 ELECTORAL REVIEW OF COUNCILLOR NUMBERS

Electoral reviews are undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which is an independent body set up by Parliament in April 2010 under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

- 5.2 Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act sets out the 'statutory criteria' to which the Commission is required to have regard in conducting electoral reviews. In broad terms: These are:-

- the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities
- the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and
- the need to secure equality of representation

- 5.3 The Commission can make the following recommendations for local authority electoral arrangements:-

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council (known as 'council size')
- the number and boundaries of wards or divisions
- the number of councillors to be elected for each ward or division, and
- the name of any ward or division

- 5.4 It is important to note that in reality any recommendations made by the Commission following a review would be binding on this Council.

- 5.5 Council size is the starting point in any electoral review since it determines the average number of electors per councillor to be achieved across all wards or divisions of that authority. Discussions with the Commission have indicated they are content with the current arrangements here and have no plans conduct a review in the foreseeable future.

- 5.6 The Commission is of the view that each local authority should be considered individually and not compared with other authorities of similar geographic or population size, or those facing similar issues and concerns. In the Commission's opinion, local government is as diverse as the communities it serves, providing services, leadership and representation tailored to the characteristics and needs of individual areas. In addition, the demographic make-up and dispersal of communities in England are such that to aim for equality in the number of electors each councillor represents as an average across the whole country would be impractical, if not unachievable. The Commission therefore will not base its decisions on council size on comparisons between local authorities.

- 5.7 Proposals for council size are most easily, and regularly, argued in terms of effective and convenient local government (in terms of choosing the appropriate number of members to allow the council and individual councillors to perform most effectively). Arguments can also be made on the basis of reflecting communities and allowing for fairness of representation.
- 5.8 When making recommendations, the Commission has to ensure that it can justify its proposals for council size on the basis of the statutory criteria, and the evidence it receives from stakeholders based on these criteria.
- 5.9 Should Council be minded to support the recommendation, the first step would be for officers to contact the Commission to establish whether the Commission would be willing to undertake a review and how this would fit with the Commission's current workload, and to establish what information and detail of proposals the Commission would require. Initial discussion with the Commission indicate the earliest they would be able to undertake a review would be 2013/14.
- 5.10 In advance of a review, it is likely that the Council would be required to submit to the Commission various information including electoral data, maps, information about governance arrangements, information about the Council, parish councils, community groups, partners and stakeholders. There would be Officer resource implications for providing such information and for liaising with the Commission throughout the review process.
- 5.11 The Commission advises that a starting point should be to consider the model of local governance used by the local authority, or intended to be used by any authority. These models have 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 by that council. The existence of parish and town councils in an area may also have a bearing, although it is unproven as to whether this factor necessitates more or fewer councillors. The functions of the scrutiny, planning and licensing committees of the council may also have an effect, as might the representational aspect of councillors' roles.
- 5.12 The Commission's approach to conducting electoral reviews is one of consultation, openness and transparency, aiming to build as much of its recommendations as possible on locally-generated proposals and, to that end, conduct as much consultation as is practicable in any review. The Commission publicises the review as widely as possible, and asks that the local councils, political parties, parish and town councils, community groups, residents' associations and other main stakeholders do the same.
- 5.13 Timescales for electoral reviews vary depending on complexity, interest, cooperation from interested parties, and the Commission's workload. They are also dependant on the amount of consultation undertaken by the Commission. Their starting point is usually to conduct at least two rounds of consultation – one at the very start of the review and one following the publication of draft recommendations. However, there are occasions when the Commission will wish to conduct further consultation on specific areas or issues, particularly if they are proving controversial.
- 5.14 A public consultation was undertaken in 2010 to review the numbers of councillors per ward.
- 5.15 The consultation period was set up in for August/October 2010 and feedback could be returned via the web site or using paper based methods and forms were available at the One Stop Shop. Posters were added to the Neighbourhood Notice Boards, community groups were sent information and an advert was placed on the Council website to inform of the consultation and allow an online response to be given. Whitworth Town Council were also

informed and Town Councillors were encouraged to respond individually.

5.16 More recently a consultation was undertaken with members in July/August 2012 and a public consultation in August/September 2012. Members are asked to consider the feedback from the consultations as well as the recommendations from Governance Working Group and Policy Overview and Scrutiny, detailed in section 12 of the report.

5.17 To make changes to the number of members per ward would require the Council to have an all out election, the earliest this could be implemented if the Local Government Boundary Commission for England agreed the changes would be 2015, after which, the next dates for implementation would be in an ordinary year of election (e.g. 2016/2018/2019/2020/2022). However, the Council has received notification from the Department for Communities and Local Government that there are proposals to alter the timescales for when changes can be implemented. The new proposals would mean that changes could be implemented at a May election (regardless of whether the Council had an election in that particular year).

6. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE CHANGES

6.1 As part of the budget savings consultation, suggestions have been received through the thrifty thread suggestion scheme, where staff were able to make suggestions to departments on how costs could be reduced. These suggestions have been detailed in this report for consideration. The suggestion for a reduction in committees was also made at a previous Governance Working Group.

6.2 To create savings, members are asked to consider reducing the number, frequency and format of the existing committees. This will result in a reduction in the number of evening meetings attended by officers and councillors and reduce the number of chairs of committees with additional financial savings.

6.3 Possible options to consider:

Licensing

Licensing Committee current meets four times a year in the evening, with Licensing sub-committees called as required during the daytime. Suggestions have been made through the budget saving consultations to reduce to three evening committees per year with Licensing Hearings to be called as required during the daytime (as per the usual arrangements).

An additional option would be to agree further delegation to officers in respect of appeals. This works successfully within other Council's and applicants can continue to appeal any decision in the Magistrates Court.

6.4 Overview and Scrutiny

There are currently 3 Overview and Scrutiny Committees (O&S) which meet in the evening (Management, Policy and Performance). Task and Finish Groups and Consultation Response Groups are set up as required and meet during the daytime.

- **Performance Scrutiny** currently meets 8 times a year, looking primarily at Performance Monitoring quarterly report, Leisure Development plus partnership performance (CAPITA, GVH) and also any relevant reports as and when need reporting (BEaRs, Environmental Health, etc).
- **Policy Scrutiny** currently meets 6 times a year, with an average of 4 or 5 policies being presented to each meeting.

- **Overview and Scrutiny Management currently meets 4 times a year.** Legislation states the O&S must monitor the Community Safety Partnership at least once a year. This is tabled for December of each year. Other presentations are from health, fire, education, ambulance, etc.
- **Overview and Scrutiny Option:**
An option might be that Policy Scrutiny and Performance Scrutiny be combined into a Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee and having 6 meetings a year. These meetings could be held during the daytime (since the committee will be making recommendations to other committees as there is no decision making authority). The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee could become Partner Overview and Scrutiny Committee and reduce to meeting 3 times a year to continue the requirement to scrutinise partner organisations.

If necessary specific work of Performance and Policy could be incorporated into Task and Finish Groups. The Localism Act has now extended the power of scrutiny of partners and this may create an increased work load for Scrutiny.

The change to 3 Partner Overview and Scrutiny Committees and 6 Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committees would require changes to the constitution. There are also implications for committee membership as only 7 members would be required for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the another 7 members being on the Partner Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This change would impact on the Council's Political balance as there would no longer be the over-arching Management Committee of 14 members. Group Leaders would need to agree the amended political balance.

At present there are 18 evening meeting associated with Overview and Scrutiny. By changing to 9 meetings a year current costs would be reduced by half, and if it was agreed that these meeting would be held during the daytime there would be a saving for 18 meetings.

On average meetings usually last around 2.5 hours and are attended by approximately 4 officers and the Scrutiny Support Officer. A reduction in meetings would mean a potential saving of a total of 12½ hours per meeting in officer flexi-time/toil claimed or overtime if below scale 5.

6.5 **Member Development Working Group, Governance Working Group and Civic Matters Working Group**

The Member Development Working Group currently meets four times a year during the daytime. Members could consider meeting three times a year, however to meet the re-assessment for the North West Charter at Level 1 we have to evidence that the “all party member training group meet at least four times a year.” Although there are no staffing cost savings with holding three daytime meetings instead of four, there will be savings in preparation and distribution as well as the Chamber being free for other usage e.g. hiring out.

The Governance Working Group currently meets four times a year during the daytime. Members could consider meeting three times a year. Although there are no staffing cost savings with holding three daytime meetings instead of four, there will be savings in preparation and distribution as well as the Chamber being free for other usage e.g. hiring out.

The Civic Matters Working group currently meets in June and December, and also meets as

required.

Another option would be to combine the Member Development Working Group, Governance Working Group and Civic Matters Working Group which would then meet four times a year and would be planned into the committee schedule.

Alternatively the Member Development Working Group and Governance Working Group could be combined to meet four times as year and would be planned into the committee schedule and the Civic Matters Working Group could continue to meet as and when required.

7. FREQUENCY OF ELECTIONS

7.1 The Council has the option to remain with the current system or change to whole council elections (it can only consider elections by halves or elections by thirds if this was the previous arrangement). As the Council currently has elections in thirds it can only decide whether to stay with the current arrangement or change to whole council elections. If the Council decides to make changes to the frequency of election it must pass a resolution after the Annual Council meeting in 2014 but before 31st December 2014, and implement the changes by May 2015 (as the frequency of elections cannot be reviewed again until 2014 as per the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007).

7.2 The public consultation questionnaire asked members of the public whether they would like to stay with elections in thirds or change to all out elections (once every 4 years). The responses are detailed within the consultation section of this report.

8. MAYORAL REVIEW

8.1 Cabinet recommended Civic Matters Working Group to consider changes to the Mayoralty.

8.2 Civic Matters Working Group met on 25th June 2012 to consider changes that were within their remit (i.e. changes to the Civic Protocol). As a result of this meeting Civic Matters Working Group has already made the following changes:

Annual Meeting – will be held in the Council Chamber and will be followed by a buffet. Councillors and guests will pay £10 to attend the buffet to cover the costs.

Civic Service – the budget for the Civic Service would be halved and capped at £500.

Mayor's Ball – all guests (including Civic guests) attending the Mayor's Ball will be required to pay for tickets (with the exception of the Deputy Mayor and guest and Mayor's Chaplain and guest). In addition, attendants accompanying Civic guests will be expected to pay £5 to cover the cost of refreshments provided to them.

Civic events outside the borough – it was agreed that during a Mayoral year, the Mayor would be limited to attending no more than 15 Civic events outside the borough.

In addition, Civic Matters Working Group agreed to review the following at a later date:

Civic Parade – the Civic Service includes a parade, members will consider whether to move to just having a church service but no parade, and therefore removing the cost of hiring a band.

Festival of Remembrance Concert – the Remembrance Sunday events are followed by a Festival of Remembrance Concert in the evening, members will consider whether to continue with the evening concert.

8.3 In addition to the above, a consultation was undertaken with elected members, who were asked to provide feedback on changes to the Mayoralty, these comments have been included

at Appendix 2.

- 8.4 A public consultation was also undertaken and members of the public were asked to consider changes to the Mayoralty. Feedback from the public consultation can be found at Appendix 3 (questions 6 and 7).
- 8.5 Civic Matters Working Group met on 26th November to discuss feedback and changes to the Mayoralty, their recommendations are included at 12.6.
- 8.6 The change recommended is for the Civic Matters Working Group to make future decisions on changes to the Mayoralty.

COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:

9. SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 9.1 A reduction in the number of committee meetings will as a consequence reduce current resource requirements (staff time, use of building and associated expenses, etc.). The reduction required in support resources will therefore have a positive financial benefit (albeit this has not been quantified in the report).

Reducing the number of members per ward to two per ward, based on Members current basic allowance of £3.3k pa and assuming no variation to the special allowances budget would save £26k pa.

10. MONITORING OFFICER

- 10.1 There would be no costs to the Council if the Commission agreed to undertake a review although a considerable amount of Officer time would be required. A number of Councils are currently looking at the feasibility of cutting the number of its councillors. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England would need to recommend any changes in wards or boundaries and even if this proposal was agreed the effects would not take effect until 2015, although the new Localism Act does contain a provision for Council's to make changes to their electoral cycle at any time.

Two member wards - this would mean that there would be 28 councillors, two in each ward. This option would only be available if the Council moved to whole council elections (as elections in thirds can only be done if the total number of councillors is divisible by 3). Whole Council Elections cannot be revisited until after the Annual Council meeting in 2014, with a resolution required by December 2014.

Alternative option – if the Council remains with elections in thirds the total number of councillors has to be divisible by 3 this would mean having thirteen wards with two councillors and one ward with one councillor

11. HEAD OF PEOPLE AND POLICY (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)

- 11.1 The human resources implications of the possible options are detailed in the report. . The consideration has been given to the impact of changes on protected equality groups. Based on the information available and the recommendations proposed, no impact has been identified for protected equality groups as there will be no significant changes to the public.

12. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

- 12.1 Cabinet, Governance Working Group, Policy Overview and Scrutiny, Committee and Member Services, Legal and Management Team. In addition, all members have been consulted through the questionnaire, results of which are attached at Appendix 1 and 2.

- 12.2 Governance Working Group recommend Council to:
- Explore sub-committees to deal with driver applications.
 - Change Overview and Scrutiny to 2 committees but keep meetings in the evening.
 - Merge Member Development Working Group and Governance Working Group.
 - Review whether to retain the North West Charter and the need for 4 meetings a year.
- 12.3 Feedback from the consultation questionnaires to members at Appendix 1 indicate that that the following are the preferred options:
- To request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review on the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries.
 - To deal with Taxi License applications through sub-committees.
 - To change to two overview and scrutiny committees: one to deal with policy and performance (Corporate Scrutiny - 6 meetings a year) and one to deal with the scrutiny of partner organisations and external scrutiny (3 meetings a year).
 - To continue to have Overview and Scrutiny Committees in the evening.
 - To merge Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group (4 meetings a year) and keep Civic Matters Working Group as it is (to meet as and when required).
- 12.4 Consultation with Policy Overview and Scrutiny recommended:
- That a review be undertaken on the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries.
 - That the Licensing Committee reduces to 3 meetings per year, with sub committees set up as required, in consultation with the Chair of Licensing and the Licensing Enforcement Manager.
 - To change to two overview and scrutiny committees, as detailed above and all meetings to continue to be held in the evening.
 - To merge Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group and keep Civic Matters Working Group as is.
 - That the changes to committees commence from May 2013.
- 12.5 Feedback from the public consultation has indicated that:
- The Local Government Boundary Commission should be asked to undertake a review of the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries.
 - Elections should be held once every 4 years.
 - Rossendale should continue to have a Mayor.
 - Rossendale should move to having a Modern Mayor.
- 12.6 Consultation with the Civic Matters Working Group recommends Council to:
- Delegate any further changes in relation to the Mayoralty to the Civic Matters Working Group.
 - Amend the Civic Matters Working Group terms of reference in the Constitution to reflect this change.

13. CONCLUSION

- 13.1 The Council is again facing a significant financial challenge over the medium term. The review and rationalisation of its democratic processes will assist the Council in realising some of its financial savings target. These issues identified in this report have been considered by the Cabinet, Governance Working Group, Policy Overview and Scrutiny, Civic Matters Working Group, a consultation questionnaire was sent to all members for their views and a public consultation has been undertaken.

Background Papers	
-------------------	--

Document	Place of Inspection
Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007: boundary reviews and changes to electoral arrangements	http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2007/ukpga_20070028_en_6#pt3

FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of Policy, Decision, Strategy, Service or Function, Other: (please indicate)	Changes to the Democratic Process and Mayoral Review	
Lead Officer Name(s):	Stuart Sugarman	
Job Title & Location:	Director of Business, Futures Park	
Department/Service Area:	Business	
Telephone & E-mail Contact:	01706 252447 / stUARTSUGARMAN@rossendalebc.gov.uk	
Date Assessment:	Commenced: 28/11/2012	Completed: 18/12/2012

We carry out Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) to analyse the effects of our decisions, policies or practices. The EIA should be undertaken/started at the beginning of the policy development process – before any decisions are made.

1. OVERVIEW

<p>The main aims/objectives of this policy¹ are:</p> <p>The Council is facing a significant financial challenge over the medium term. The review and rationalisation of its democratic processes will assist the Council in realising some of its financial savings target. The review is focussed on the following democratic processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of members. • Cycle of committees. • Council's election cycle. • Mayoralty. <p>This impact assessment has been undertaken with the information available and considers the feedback from the following consultations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire to councillors. • Public consultation on the number of councillors and elections, and the Mayoralty. • Report to Cabinet and their recommendations. • Report to Governance Working Group and their recommendations. • Report to Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee and their recommendations. • Report to Civic Matters Working Group and their recommendations.

Is the policy or decision under review (please tick)

New/proposed

Modified/adapted

Existing

¹ Policy refers to any policy, strategy, project, procedure, function, decision or delivery of service.

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 1 of 6	

The main intended people or groups that will be most affected by this policy are:

- Elected members of the Council.
- Customers of Committee and Member Services e.g. general public who attend committee meetings.
- Community and charity groups and organisation who book the Mayor for their events.

2. FINDINGS / EVIDENCE

FINDINGS/EVIDENCE: The following information/data has been considered in developing this policy/decision (including any consultation or engagement):

Information/data obtained and/or Consultation/engagement carried out (please state who with)	What does this tell us? / What does it say?
Rossendale Borough Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)	The Council's MTFS sets out the imperative to make significant financial savings.
Consultation feedback:	
Feedback from the consultation process is detailed at section 12 of the main report and included in the appendices. The majority view from the consultations has been identified as follows:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review on the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries and for Council to consider the cycle of elections in 2014. 	Both Councillors and members of the public predominantly indicated that a review should be undertaken. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England will consider all equality and community impact during a review and before making a decision. Full Council will also be able to consider the cycle of elections when the next review is due in 2014.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To deal with Taxi Licence applications through sub-committees. 	Councillors indicated a preference for sub-committee meetings to deal with taxi licence applications as they would be dealt with in a more timely and effective manner. This would improve the current provision to taxi licence applicants needing to come before the committee as they currently have to wait until the next scheduled committee meeting. This would mean a meeting would be called as and when required. Applicants would still receive their meeting notification in line with current procedures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To change to two overview and scrutiny committees: one to deal with policy and performance and one to deal with the scrutiny of partner organisations and external scrutiny. 	Councillors indicated a preference for two overview and scrutiny committees to be held in the evening. The two committees would deal with the workload currently undertaken by the three committees. This would mean slightly longer meetings to deal with the workload. Since the same workload would be split between the two committees there would be no impact to members of the public as the meetings for the two committees would remain public meetings and would be advertised on the meeting schedule.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue to have Overview and Scrutiny 	Councillors indicated a preference for evening Overview

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 2 of 6	

Committees in the evening.

- To merge Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group (4 meetings a year) and keep Civic Matters Working Group as it is (to meet as and when required).
- To delegate any further changes in relation to the Mayoralty to the Civic Matters Working Group.

and Scrutiny Committees as they would be more accessible for both Councillors and members of the public. As there is no change recommended, there has been no impact identified.

Councillors indicated a preference for merging Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group and keeping the Civic Matters Working Group as it was. This would mean a slightly longer agenda for Councillors on the merged group, however Councillors identified this as their preference. There would be no impact on members of the public as these were internal working groups only.

Both Councillors and members of the public indicated a preference for modernising the Mayoralty. As this work had already commenced through the Civic Matters Working Group, it was recommended that decisions on future changes were delegated to the Civic Matters Working Group.

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 3 of 6	

3. EQUALITY IMPACT

Using the table below please indicate whether the policy/strategy/decision has a positive, negative or no impact from an equalities perspective on any of the protected equality groups listed below. **Please also give consideration to wider equality of opportunity and community cohesion impacts within and between the groups identified.** See EIA Guidance

Equality		Positive Impact (It could benefit)	Negative Impact (It could disadvantage)	Reason and any mitigating actions already in place (to reduce any adverse /negative impacts <u>or</u> reasons why it will be of positive benefit or contribution)	No Impact
Age	Older people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any Council decisions will be undertaken in line with its equality duty and equality policy. Based on the information available, no negative impact identified any protected groups. See Section 2 of EIA.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Younger people and children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Disability	Physical/learning/mental health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gender Reassignment	Transsexual people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and Maternity		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Race (Ethnicity or Nationality)	Asian or Asian British people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Black or black British people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Irish people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	White British	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Chinese people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gypsies & Travellers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Other minority communities not listed above (please state)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Belief or Religion		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gender	Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Men	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sexual Orientation	Lesbian women , gay men and bisexual people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and Civil Partnership (employment only)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to equality of opportunity		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Contribution to fostering good relations between different groups (people getting on well together – valuing one another, respect and understanding)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 4 of 6	

Equality	Positive Impact (It could benefit)	Negative Impact (It could disadvantage)	Reason and any mitigating actions already in place (to reduce any adverse /negative impacts <u>or</u> reasons why it will be of positive benefit or contribution)	No Impact
Human Rights http://intranet/site/scripts/documents_info.php?categoryID=86&documentID=251	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any Council decisions will be undertaken in line with the Human Rights Act 1998.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. OUTCOME OF EIA – COURSE OF ACTION TO BE TAKEN

What course of action does this EIA suggest you take? More than one of the following may apply	Please indicate
Outcome 1: No major change required. The EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome 2: Adjust the policy to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better promote equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified? If there is a negative impact identified, you must consider (and evidence/record) what mitigating actions you have or will put in place to reduce the negative impact where/if possible, and to enhance the positive impact. This might include any partnership discussions/working that needs to be undertaken. Complete EIA Action Plan as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outcome 3: Continue the policy despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to promote equality identified. You will need to ensure that the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact. This might include any partnership discussions/working that needs to be undertaken. Complete EIA Action Plan as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outcome 4: Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination or significant negative impact that can not be justified or mitigated against. <u>You must speak to Liz Sandiford (2452) or Emma Hussain (2451) immediately.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 5 of 6	

5 . EIA ACTION PLAN & REVIEW

Based on the impact assessment, findings/evidence and outcomes identified above, please complete the Action Plan below – these should be actions arising as a result of undertaking the EIA.

The Action Plan should address (not exhaustively):-

- Any gaps in findings/evidence research including any consultation or engagement regarding the policy and its actual/potential affects.
- How you will address any gaps.
- What practical changes/action will help reduce any negative impacts that you have identified.
- What practical changes/action will help enhance any positive contributions to equality.

Further Actions Required: Yes No

EIA Action Plan

Issue	Action required	Lead officer	Timescale
N/A			

Please add more rows if required.

Actions arising from the Impact assessment should form part of the business planning process for service areas.

Monitoring & Reviewing the Effect of the Policy

Please state how you will monitor the impact and effect of this policy and where this will be reported:

- The Local Government Boundary Commission is responsible for reviewing the number of elected members in the Borough. They will consider all impact to all equality groups as part of their review.
- The cycle of elections can be reviewed on a 4 year basis by full Council in line with government legislation on when changes to the electoral cycle can be considered. The next date changes can be considered by full Council is 2014 for implementation in 2015.
- To monitor the number and cycle of committees through Management Team when drafting the Committee Schedule for future years. This will subsequently be agreed annually by full Council.
- To monitor changes to the Mayoralty through the Civic Matters Working Group which is a cross party working group.

Responsible Section/Team	Business	Version	1
Responsible Author	Stuart Sugarman	Due for review	
Date last amended	10/12/2012	Page 6 of 6	

Consultation on changes to the democratic process in light of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (26 responses received)

Options in relation to Electoral Review of Councillor Numbers

16	To request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review of the number of councillors, wards and ward boundaries.
0	To make no changes to the current number of councillors or wards.
10	Not indicated a preference.
<p>Additional comments made:</p> <p>I believe there should only be a need for no more than two elected members per ward for each ward in Rossendale as a whole.</p> <p>Suggest 15 wards with 2 members per ward of roughly equal numbers of electors. In favour of four yearly elections.</p> <p>I think there are too many councillors and that the wards need to be redefined into more logical areas.</p> <p>I would support a review of councillor numbers in order to ensure that we continue to provide value for money.</p> <p>None of the above – we would like to see the existing Ward structure retained but Councillor numbers reduced to a maximum of two per Ward (x 9).</p> <p>In my opinion twelve wards with two councillors in each is ample. I believe that we need two members per ward in order to cover for holidays, sickness etc.</p> <p>I feel the current number of Councillors is currently excessive for the size of the borough and should be reviewed a.s.a.p. In line with this review I feel we also need to consider going to whole council elections which would also have a cost saving effect.</p>	

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Committee Changes – Licensing

2	To agree further delegations to officers in respect of Licensing appeals.
16	To deal with Taxi License applications through sub-committees (As recommended by the Governance Working Group).
12	To reduce to 3 Licensing Committees a year.
3	To make no changes to the current 4 Licensing Committees a year.
<p>Additional comments:</p> <p>[One response above had the first three options ticked, indicating a combined approach to dealing with licensing matters].</p> <p>[One response had the second and fourth options ticked with the following explanation- I have limited experience of Licensing Committee but for at least a trail period I'd keep to 4 meetings a year lasting a maximum of 2 hours each, plus a sub-committee for license applications].</p> <p>[One response had the second and fourth options ticked with the following explanation - three meetings per year may result in very long meetings depending on the number of cases to be heard].</p> <p>[One response had the first and second options ticked].</p> <p>[Two responses had the second and third options ticked].</p> <p>We feel this option (reduce to 3 committees a year) allows for maximum participation for all committee members.</p> <p>I understand that the licensing workload is heavy therefore it would seem essential to maintain an active group which meets frequently.</p> <p>To consider re-visiting the policy with a view to stricter criteria thus leading to delegating more decisions to officers.</p> <p>A sub-committee structure I feel is the best option.</p> <p>I feel that all elected members who sit on this committee should be fully involved with the day to day workings of all licensing matters, I'm also of the view that members input should not be reduced in any way what so ever, as I feel this could be a retrograde step, for both the council and also anything that may required to be licenses.</p>	

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Committee Changes – Overview and Scrutiny

25	To change to 2 overview and scrutiny committees: one to deal with policy and performance (Corporate Scrutiny - 6 meetings a year) and one to deal with the scrutiny of partner organisations and external scrutiny (3 meetings a year). <i>(As recommended by the Governance Working Group).</i>
1	To continue with the 3 existing overview and scrutiny committees: Policy, Performance and O&S Management.
<p>Additional comments:</p> <p><i>I would tend to broadly agree with these proposal's (first option).</i></p> <p><i>The one dealing with partner organisations may need to meet more frequently depending upon the organisation.</i></p> <p><i>As current O&S Chair (Management and Performance) I support the streamlining of our O&S procedures.</i></p> <p><i>I think that the present system works well. There is plenty of slack to scrutinise more areas – some meetings have been cancelled due to a lack of agenda items, yet there are many areas which need looking at which are being ignored.</i></p>	

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Also consider the following - would you prefer Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meetings to be daytime or evening?

	Daytime
26	Evening (As recommended by the Governance Working Group).
Additional comments:	
<p>I feel that if an elected member is in full time employment then it is important that wherever possible all meetings should take [place in an evening to accommodate elected members.</p> <p>As a retired person I would prefer daytime meetings but I want to encourage councillors of all ages to be elected so will prefer evening so everyone can attend.</p> <p>Changing to daytime meetings would tend to exclude members who work inflexible hours.</p> <p>Daytime will cause problems for members and the public who work during the day.</p> <p>It's important we have evening meetings so people who work during the day (Paid or unpaid, ie carers) can be councillors).</p> <p>Meetings must be held in the evening in order to ensure that working people and working Councillors are not excluded.</p> <p>Retention of evening meetings is essential to ensure being a councillor is available to all sectors of the community regardless of age, work commitments etc. (x 9)</p> <p>Most councillors are available in the evening whilst many are not (including me).</p> <p>All meetings should be in the evening to allow members who work to attend.</p>	

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Committee Changes – Member Development Working Group, Governance Working Group and Civic Matters Working Group

1	To merge the three working groups into one (4 meetings a year).
24	To merge Member Development Working Group with Governance Working Group (4 meetings a year) and keep Civic Matters Working Group as it is (to meet as and when required) (As recommended by the Governance Working Group).
	To continue with the 3 existing working groups in their current form.
*1	Not indicated a preference.
<p>Additional comments:</p> <p>*I don't have a problem with this (option1) but this committee would need to be made up of a member from all political parties, with the Mayor being given any casting vote. I don't have a problem with any amendments providing members can give them their full support in agreement. Only members of the full council should approve any such proposals.</p> <p>Too much for one group.</p> <p>I agree with this proposal (second option) provided it does not undermine the vital importance of member development.</p>	

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Feedback on a Modern Mayoralty:

I believe that this is an item that should only be debated by all elected members of full council, yes there is a need to modernise the Mayoralty, however not just for the sake of saving the odd pound here and there, this is why we need a full debate by all elected members of full council. If we are quite serious with regards to making cost effective savings then why do we need a deputy leader of the council, there is a very strong case for the leader giving up some of their **“Special Responsibility Allowance”** to fund the role of a deputy if required or needed, it is the same with anyone who wishes to serve has a member of the cabinet then I firmly believe that no elected member should receive anything other than a basic allowance, which be in line with the basic minimum wage, which at this moment in time is not the case, given that the basic minimum pay is **£7.08 pence per hour** which most elected members are receiving far less than this agreed rate of pay has set out in the **2010 Equalities Act.** I’m only too aware that not all elected members share my views or concerns, but given we are seeking elected members views on this matter I feel it only right and proper to share both my view and also my concerns if only in the interest of fairness and balance, having now served and been an elected member of Rossendale Borough Council Since 1988.

We should to preserve the dignity of the Mayoral role, however expenditure must be brought into line with current fiscal reality.

Consider putting the regalia & chains on display at the museum -so people can see them. Not have a special mayor’s car & attendant – too expensive – can use own car or taxi. Not very happy with the mini mayor – why do we have one? Would prefer someone from the Youth Council if necessary.

No taxpayer funded travel outside Rossendale. Discussion around putting chains in a museum and paying travel expenses to the Mayor to save money on car and attendant.

Have the Mayor car as a car for members & officers when not being used by Mayor.

I feel strongly that the history and traditions of the Mayoralty should be maintained. The position means a lot to the people of Rossendale and as the first citizen, the Mayor is seen as the 'face' of the Council. Therefore if Rossendale has a Mayor then we should give the Mayor the tools to do the job properly. However, over the years 'the chain gang' appears to have become a group that pays more attention to getting together to enjoy the social side than representing the Councils they serve. A high percentage of events in the weekly lists that are circulated appear to be outside the Borough attending social or charity events that are organised by other Mayors.

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

For the Civic Matters Working Group to continue to look at the Mayoralty as an ongoing process.

I don't agree with having a Mayor who is part of the political setup. The Borough's First Citizen (open to nominations) or something similar, could be voted in at the same time as council elections (period of office to be debated!) and if the elected person happens to be a serving councillor, then I think they should stand down for the term of office.

1. Not sure of need for a consort for the Mayor
 2. Not sure how many functions outside of the area are attended by the Mayor – but as it is largely a ceremonial role do not see the point – business issues should be dealt with by the leader and the cabinet
-

We have a magnificent opportunity here to create a mayor for the 21st C and for austere times. We can distinguish ourselves with some creative and fresh thinking. I think the requirements of this role are as follows:

1. To chair full council meetings. In this role, the mayor not only chairs these meetings effectively and objectively, but also needs to provide a shining example of excellence in chairing and generally to other members. The mayor is the member development champion ("job description" to be agreed so there's clarity over what this involves)
 2. To be the official "face" of the council in Rossendale at relevant events across the Valley, eg, official launches, armistice day, and some community events (and at many of these the aim will also be about increasing engagement).
 3. To be the champion for increasing democratic engagement in Rossendale. Again, "job description" needs to be written. As far as I'm concerned, this does NOT mean school and other visits in mayoral robes - this, more than anything, emphasises "otherness" and deters engagement. I would suggest that in this role, the regalia (apart from a simple chain) will always be counter-productive.
 4. An EXTREMELY limited role for attendance at events outside the borough, each one needing a strong case for attendance which needs to connect with one or more of points 1-3 above. Loose phrases such as "promoting Rossendale" need to be substantiated for each event
 5. As with any role, I'd suggest a regular supportive appraisal during the year and at year end to review progress on the above. This could be from chair of O&S and chair of Civic Matters. This would feed into ways in which we might want to amend the role in future
 6. As part of this we need to agree the appropriate support structure.
-

I may be old fashioned but I would like to keep the present form of mayoralty as I think it is dignified and does bring good press to Rossendale.

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Cut out the pomp and ceremony, have a small inexpensive chain made (if we don't already have one) which can be worn for civic and public occasions and does not necessitate the presence of an attendant. Similarly for Deputy Mayor.

Put the mayoral chains and robes on secure display at Futures Park where they can be viewed by visitors.

Get rid of the mayoral car when the lease comes up for renewal. The Mayor and Deputy should travel to their public duties by taxi, own vehicle or public transport.

Review all Mayoral visits made and the expense incurred. Consider cutting down on the more costly occasions.

Continue with the Mayor making at the Riverside but charge Councillors and their partners the true cost of the meal and entertainment. This ensures that CLAW will still get the business and would be the only time the mayoral robes are used each year.

(x 9 Group response)

We are not sure what the definition of a Modern Mayor actually is?

The Mayor is the first citizen of the Borough and as such there can be no half way house with the position as it would de-value it too much.

There is definitely a role for a Mayor within Rossendale and for the tradition to be kept alive.

We would like to see the emphasis of the Mayoral role focussed more on attending events within Rossendale and not as much on attending other Mayoral events outside the Borough.

I believe that at a time where the councils finances are under intense pressure we should put all our resources into front line services.

The Mayoralty is certainly not a front line service and the money should be deployed in other directions.

I would advocate scrapping the Mayoralty completely until the council can sensibly afford this luxury.

In addition I would question whether RBC need to keep three very valuable Mayors chains – surely one will do the job? I realise that this would cause a big debate over which one was to be retained but surely we can rise above such petty issues? I suggest that the general public wouldn't give two hoots about this issue. Selling off two chains would provide a valuable (one off) financial boost to our coffers.

A combined response was received on behalf of the Conservative Group. This has been reflected above by adding 9 to the relevant response section.

Allow the Civic Matters Working Group to look into all available options.

Maintain civic role of Mayoralty but try to reduce costs.

I believe the current mayoralty is outdated and relies too much on sentimentality and tradition. In a modern world there should be no need for all the pomp and ceremony attached to this out-dated office and a more modern approach needs to be found.

The cost of the mayoralty is also excessive. When we are considering savings in excess of £1m, officers are being asked to consider cuts to front-line services and even having to consider further job cuts, to pay for someone to be driven around in a chauffeured car to attend functions is criminal!

The need for a mayor is often over-stated – I am sure school children love to have the mayor attend their prize giving but if there was no mayor would they miss it - I doubt it.

I understand the mayor raises money for charity throughout their year of office which is very commendable but what is the cost of that fundraising, in officers time and council resources? I wouldn't be surprised if the actual costs are more than the funds raised and as such it is a waste of time and resources.

I feel that the 'first citizen' should be the leader of the council but obviously he/she would find it difficult to carry out all the current duties of the mayor. The duties should be split amongst all councillors so if a school or group wishes someone to attend their function then it should be one of their ward councillors who attends. The council should make this clear from the outset and if a councillor is not available then we should make it clear that a representative from the council will not be able to attend.

As we are facing huge cuts in our financial budgets I feel sure that given the choice between front line services such as bin collections or a mayor the residents of Rossendale would vote for the removal of the mayor. It is an unnecessary post which if it continues will potentially take money from vital front line services and so it is morally wrong to continue with this role.

Making ends meet

Following a 39% reduction in funding from Central Government over the 4 years to 2015/16, we are seeking the views of Rossendale residents about Council proposals for making the cuts we need to balance our budget. We have already saved £1.5m over that past 2 years, but still need to cut a further £1.3m from our annual budget. At their meeting of 27th June 2012, Cabinet gave approval for us to begin consultation on a range of areas where we could make the cuts needed.

Please do spare 10 minutes to give us your views. Many thanks in advance for your contribution.

Q1 So that we do not send you an unnecessary reminder, could you please provide your Panel ID number below (e.g. R420)? This number will be contained within the e mail invitation to take part in this survey or at the top of the letter you received through the post. Please note that this is NOT used to identify any individual responses (if you are not a member of the Citizens' Panel, just leave this question blank and skip to Q2).

100.0%

Refuse and Street Cleansing

We are looking to review the way that we run our refuse and recycling collections and the way we deliver our street cleansing services, to allow us to utilise our staff in a more flexible way, so we can save money. Residents would still experience the same level of service, but we may need to collect your bins on a different day to the one you have at the moment.

We think that we may be able to save around £80,000 a year from this change.

Q2 Do you agree or disagree that the Council should consider making this change? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

87.8% Agree	7.9% Disagree	4.3% Don't know
-------------	---------------	-----------------

Collection of Garden Waste in Winter

Currently we collect on average 300 tonnes of garden waste per month from April - September (based on fortnightly collections, this is approximately 8.5kg per household per collection). In March and October, this reduces to an average of 175 tonnes per month (approx. 5kg per household per collection), and from November to January, this reduces further still, to only 43 tonnes per month on average (approximately only 1kg per household per collection). Many people do not put their garden bins out at all over the autumn and winter period.

In order to save on the cost of visiting all of the same households every week, and potentially having very few bins to empty, we are proposing to offer an 'on demand' service over the winter months, where householders could pick from allocated days, and let us know if they had any garden waste for us to collect on those days.

This change would allow us to utilise our staff more effectively on other tasks in the winter months.

Q3	Do you agree or disagree that the Council should move to an 'on demand' garden waste collection service over the winter months? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY	
	52.0% <i>Agree - from October to March</i>	5.0% <i>Disagree</i>
	41.5% <i>Agree - from November to January</i>	1.5% <i>Don't know</i>

Review of Democratic Processes

Number of Elections

Rossendale Borough Council consists of 36 elected Councillors. Each Councillor is elected for a term of 4 years, but our elections take place in 'thirds'. This means that there are 3 elections in every 4 years, and at every election, one third of the number of Councillors are elected (ie 12 Councillors at each election).

We are considering moving to holding only one election every 4 years, which would be similar to Parliamentary elections for MPs. This would mean that all Councillors would be elected at that time, and then they would be in office for 4 years.

We think that we may be able to save £25,000 a year from this change.

Q4	Do you agree or disagree that the Council should consider making this change? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY		
	73.3% <i>Agree</i>	21.0% <i>Disagree</i>	5.6% <i>Don't know</i>

Number of Councillors

Currently we have 36 elected Councillors in Rossendale Borough Council. This equates to an average of one Councillor for every 1861 people who live in Rossendale (this is similar to the level of representation in Burnley and Pendle). There are 14 wards in the Borough, and every ward has either 2 or 3 Councillors. If we changed to 2 Councillors per ward, this would equate to an average of one Councillor for every 2,393 people (this would be similar to Bury, Rochdale and Hyndburn).

We would need to consult with the Local Government Boundary Commission if we were to propose this change, and they would take the ultimate decision on the number of Councillors in The Borough.

We think that we may be able to save £26,000 a year from this change.

Q5	Do you agree or disagree that the Council should consider making this change? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY		
	84.2% <i>Agree</i>	10.4% <i>Disagree</i>	5.4% <i>Don't know</i>

The Mayor

The Mayor is a Councillor who has been nominated by other Councillors to be the Mayor of the Borough for a term of one year. We have a traditional Mayor in Rossendale, known as the 'First Citizen of The Borough' who wears the Council robes and gold chains and, along with their Consort (partner), they carry out civic duties such as attending a wide range of community, charity and school events both within and outside Rossendale. It is a non-political role and is supported by attendants who drive the Mayor and their Consort to events in a civic car.

Some other areas have modern Mayors. This role is different to a traditional Mayor in that they may not necessarily wear the robes and chains to events and may not have attendants to accompany them. Some modern Mayors drive their own cars to events and may attend a more limited number of events outside the area, which are about promoting the Borough.

We are proposing that in Rossendale we move towards having a modern Mayor.

We think that we may be able to save up to £50,000 a year from this change.

Q6 Do you agree or disagree that Rossendale should have a Mayor? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY
 77.6% Agree 19.2% Disagree 3.2% Don't know

Q7 If you agree that Rossendale should have a Mayor, do you think we should have a traditional Mayor (as we currently do), or a Modern Mayor? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY
 27.1% Traditional 72.9% Modern

One Stop Shop

The Council has a One Stop Shop in Rawtenstall, where customers can speak to members of staff face to face about a range of issues. In the last Citizens' Panel questionnaire, 18% of respondents told us that they prefer to contact the Council face to face.

82% of respondents said they would prefer to use other methods such as the telephone or internet. The Council can be contacted on 01706 217777 in office hours, 0845 300 6478 out of office hours, or via email at generalenquiries@rossendalebc.gov.uk.

Respondents told us that, if they were to contact us face to face:

- 1) 15% would do so to talk through a licensing application;
- 2) 13% would do so to find out about a planning application;
- 3) 12% would do so to enquire about a claim for benefits (such as housing or council tax benefit);
- 4) 7% would do so to submit a Freedom of Information request; and
- 5) 7% would do so to advise us of a change of address.

As part of our savings plans, we are proposing to reduce the number of buildings that we have, and deliver most of our services from one place. For example, we have identified that it is likely to cost around £400,000 to bring the One Stop Shop building in Rawtenstall up to modern building standards. One option may therefore be to move services to one of our buildings in Bacup which may cost around £150,000.

We think that we can save around £35,000 a year (plus future capital costs) from this change.

Q8 On average, how often do you visit the One Stop Shop in Rawtenstall? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

0.3% Weekly	8.7% Annually
2.8% Monthly	22.3% Less than annually
2.9% Quarterly	56.6% Never
6.4% Once every 6 months	

Q9 If we did move the One Stop Shop to Bacup, what impact would this have on your usage of the service? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

7.8% Increase	15.5% Decrease	30.2% Stay the same	46.6% I don't use it
---------------	----------------	---------------------	----------------------

Q10 Please tell us why your usage would increase, decrease or stay the same.
 100.0%

Q11 Do you think that the Council needs to have a One Stop Shop? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

62.2% Yes	19.7% No	18.1% Don't know
-----------	----------	------------------

Your local Museum

Currently, Rossendale Museum, at Whitaker Park in Rawtenstall, is open 17.5 hours, over 5 days per week (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday and Sunday) throughout the year.

Q12	Have you ever visited Rossendale Museum? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY	
	3.9% Yes, more than once a month	8.3% Yes, less than once a year
	19.0% Yes, more than once a year	31.9% Yes, once in the last few years
	10.6% Yes, once a year	26.4% No, I have never visited Rossendale Museum

Q13	If you have visited the Museum, what was the nature of your visit? PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY		
	87.8% Personal visit out of interest	7.9% Visit as part of an organised group	14.2% Visit for an organised event

The Museum is managed by Lancashire County Council (LCC) but Rossendale Council pays for the service. LCC have confirmed that in order to reduce costs, they would need to reduce the opening times of the Museum. We think that we can save between £10,000 and £50,000 by doing this.

Q14	Do you agree or disagree that we should consider options for reducing the opening times of the Museum in order to save money? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY		
	59.9% Agree	28.6% Disagree	11.5% Don't know

Q15	We are also considering the option of inviting any other interested parties to run the Museum, at their expense. Do you agree or disagree that we should consider this option? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY		
	71.6% Agree	17.1% Disagree	11.3% Don't know

Your local Swimming Pools

Currently, there are three swimming pools in Rossendale, at Whitworth, Marl Pits and Haslingden. Rossendale Borough Council currently pays money towards the running costs of swimming pools in the Borough.

Q16	Have you ever been swimming in one of the three swimming pools in Rossendale, and if so, how often? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY	
	36.7% Yes, more than once a month	4.8% Yes, less than once a year
	17.1% Yes, more than once a year	16.5% Yes, once in the last few years
	3.6% Yes, once a year	21.4% No, I have never been swimming in a pool in Rossendale

Q17	If you answered 'Yes' to the above question, which swimming pool did you visit most often? PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY		
	16.1% Whitworth	49.3% Marl Pits	34.6% Haslingden

Rossendale Council is currently working with Rossendale Leisure Trust and users of the pools to look at options to reduce the running costs of one or more of the swimming pools in Rossendale. It is focusing its work on Haslingden Pool as this pool alone currently requires around £137,000 each year of council money to keep it running and will need approximately £1.5m to be spent on it in the next few years to bring it up to an acceptable building standard.

Q18 Do you agree or disagree that we should consider options to reduce the running costs of Haslingden Swimming Pool? *PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY*

56.4% <i>Agree</i>	33.4% <i>Disagree</i>	10.1% <i>Don't know</i>
--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

Q19 We are also considering the option of inviting any other interested parties to run one or more of the swimming pools in Rossendale, at their expense. Do you agree or disagree that we should consider this option? *PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY*

67.9% <i>Agree</i>	23.0% <i>Disagree</i>	9.1% <i>Don't know</i>
--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Q20 If no other option can be found to reduce the costs, the Council may need to consider closing Haslingden Pool. Do you agree or disagree that we should consider this option as a last resort? *PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY*

38.9% <i>Agree</i>	53.2% <i>Disagree</i>	7.8% <i>Don't know</i>
--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Changes to Other Services

In the last Citizens' Panel questionnaire, we asked you what you thought the Council priorities should be. The top three priorities were:

1. Ensuring rubbish is collected regularly (88%);
2. Ensuring streets and open spaces are clean (86%); and
3. Value for money council services (80%)

In addition, respondents also told us that good customer services were important (62.4%) and improving The Borough's town centres (59.3%) and improving the health of people locally (59.1%) should also be priorities.

Here we have outlined the range of services that we deliver and the amount of money that we spend on these services per year.

Q21

What other services, if any, do you think that we should look at to make the £1.3m savings?
Please note the spend per annum is listed in brackets. PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY

- 29.3% *Community Management and Partnerships (£165,000)*
- 6.7% *Community Safety (£50,000)*
- 14.5% *Voluntary Sector Support, Grants and Events (£152,000)*
- 20.3% *Area Management Teams, including Markets, Town Centre Caretakers, Street Cleansing, Enforcement (£404,000)*
- 6.1% *Bereavement Services, including Cemeteries (£168,000)*
- 14.8% *Open Spaces, including Parks and Playgrounds (£811,000)*
- 7.4% *Emergency Planning (£8,000)*
- 31.6% *Housing and Council Tax Benefits (£132,000)*
- 28.5% *Collecting Council Tax and Business Rates (£423,000)*
- 49.2% *Information Technology (IT) and Electronic-Government (£632,000)*
- 17.4% *Concessionary Travel (£40,000)*
- 10.8% *Dog Warden and Pest Control (£41,000)*
- 25.3% *Leisure Services Grants (£715,000)*
- 8.2% *Environmental Health (£477,000)*
- 12.9% *Economic Regeneration, including tourism and business support (£261,000)*
- 12.6% *Housing Regeneration and Homelessness (£198,000)*
- 25.2% *Museum at Whittaker Park (£91,000)*
- 15.3% *Refuse and Recycling (£909,000)*
- 14.0% *Street Sweeping (£690,000)*
- 14.8% *Planning Services and Land Charges (£179,000)*
- 8.0% *Building Control Services, including Safety Standards (£128,000)*
- 10.8% *Public Protection (Licensing and Enforcement - taxis, entertainment venues) (£152,000)*
- 15.8% *Legal Services (£205,000)*
- 71.5% *Democracy, including Elections, Member Allowances and The Mayor (£587,000)*
- 47.6% *Corporate Management and Support Services (£375,000)*
- 45.0% *People and Policy (Human Resources, Payroll, Performance Management, Communications) (£402,000)*
- 39.8% *Finance, Treasury Management, Audit and Insurance (£599,000)*
- 50.0% *Corporate Estates (Land and Property Management and Depreciation) (£872,000)*
- 3.8% *None of the above*

About you

So that we can analyse the results of this survey by different groups of residents, answering the following questions will be really helpful in enabling us to understand local differences and to ensure that we take any necessary action to address this. All responses are completely confidential and will be used for no other purpose.

Q22	Are you...	45.3% <i>Male</i>	54.7% <i>Female</i>	0.0% <i>Prefer not to disclose</i>
------------	-------------------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------

Q23	What is your age group?	1.1% <i>Under 20</i>	22.1% <i>30-39</i>	18.0% <i>50-59</i>	14.0% <i>70+</i>
		6.8% <i>20-29</i>	22.0% <i>40-49</i>	16.0% <i>60-69</i>	0.0% <i>Prefer not to disclose</i>

The Equality Act 2010 defines disability as 'a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'.

Q24	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12.5% <i>Yes</i>	85.8% <i>No</i>	1.8% <i>Prefer not to disclose</i>
------------	---	------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

Q25	How would you best describe your ethnic origin?	94.4% <i>White or White British</i>	0.0% <i>Black or Black British</i>	0.7% <i>Other</i>
		2.4% <i>Asian or Asian British</i>	0.7% <i>Mixed or multiple ethnicity</i>	1.8% <i>Prefer not to disclose</i>

Q26	Finally, to help us analyse responses from different sections of the borough, please provide your postcode below.	100.0%
------------	--	--------

Thanks for taking the time to share your views. Simply click the 'submit' button below to send us your completed response.

Results of this and other consultations will be presented to Cabinet on 28th November 2012 to inform decision making on cuts. Papers will be available on the Council's website (www.rossendale.gov.uk) one week in advance of the meeting.

WE ALSO NEED YOUR VIEWS ON CHANGES TO COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT

We would also very much value your opinion on our other consultation which is ongoing at the moment, in relation to changes to Council Tax Benefit. Further to the cuts set out previously, from 1 April 2013, the Government will give us around 10% less than we currently need in Rossendale to pay for Council Tax Benefit. This means that there will be a further shortfall in local funding of around £600,000 per year. We would also very much value your opinion on how we can make up the £600,000 shortfall in relation to Council Tax Benefit.

There is a different questionnaire for this and it can be found online at www.rossendale.gov.uk/ctsupportscheme, or you can email us for a copy of the questionnaire, at counciltaxsupport@rossendale.gov.uk.

Please ask in the One Stop Shop or telephone us on 01706 217777 to request a copy of any of the questionnaires if you would like them to be posted to you.