

## **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 Entertainment 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

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Members Present</b>	<b>Length of Meeting</b>	<b>Number of Items considered</b>
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**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Action</b>
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