

Submission on Council size by the Mayor of Copeland, Mike Starkie

Council Size Submission

Summary

This submission proposes a reduction in Council size from 51 Councillors to 33 Councillors.

Section 1

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Borough of Copeland spans an area of 73,174 hectares situated in western Cumbria. The Borough shares boundaries with Allerdale Borough to the north, Barrow Borough to the South and South Lakeland District to the east.
- 1.2 The Borough has unusual topographical characteristics, being bounded by the Irish Sea to the west and the Cumbrian Fells mountain range to the east, including Scafell Pike, the highest mountain in England. East-west travel routes within the Borough are almost non-existent, being confined to the tortuous and steep Hard Knott and Wrynose Passes.
- 1.3 The partly detrunked A595 runs north-south through most of the Borough, joining the A590 north of Millom for connections to Kendal, and to the A66 to the north, connecting to the M6 at Penrith in east Cumbria. The Cumbrian Coast rail line runs the length of the Borough providing passenger connections to main lines at Barrow and Carlisle together with freight traffic to and from the nuclear sites at Sellafield and Drigg.
- 1.4 The sub-regional centre is Whitehaven, with a population of some 27,000, which also serves as the Council's administrative centre. Other centres are at Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom, each with a population of 8,000-10,000.
- 1.5 The ONS mid-2012 estimate of the population of the Copeland Borough is 70,329.
- 1.6 The registered electorate was 53,206 in May 2017.
- 1.7 The whole of the Borough of Copeland is parished, following a Community Governance Review of Whitehaven in 2014-15, which resulted in the creation of a

new parish council in the only previously unparished area. There are 27 parish/town councils and two parish meetings.

- 1.8 Two thirds of the geographical area of the Borough lies within the Lake District National Park and the local planning authority for this area is the Lake District National Park Authority, not the Council.
- 1.9 The last electoral review of the Borough was completed by the Local Government Commission for England in 1998. The review set council size at 51 (no change) and reduced the number of wards from 26 to 25. Other than these changes, the electoral arrangements of the Council have remained unchanged since it came into existence on 1 April 1974.

Section 2

2. The Decision-Making Process

- 2.1 The Local Government Act 2000 (LGA 2000) fundamentally altered the political management of local authorities by separating executive from non-executive functions. Previously the Council had been managed, like all local authorities in England, by a range of Committees each with its own remit and responsibility for overseeing, and taking decisions on, a function of the Council.
- 2.2 The LGA 2000 was significant as, whilst Full Council now sets the broad policy and budgetary framework, much of the executive decision-making was placed within the Executive. There was no requirement that the Executive had to have political proportionality and thus could be completely made up of the majority political group.
- 2.3 From 2001 to 2015 the Council operated the Leader and Cabinet model of executive governance, with a Leader appointed by the Council and a single-party Executive of Councillors chosen by the Leader. In 2014/15, the last year of the Leader and Cabinet model, there were six members of the Executive including the Leader.
- 2.4 Following a petition and referendum in 2013, the Council changed its executive governance model from Leader and Cabinet to directly elected Mayor and Cabinet, with the first Mayor elected in May 2015. Legislation provides that a change in executive governance model brought about by a referendum cannot be changed by a further referendum for a minimum of 10 years from the date of the first referendum.
- 2.5 The Executive in an elected Mayor model can comprise between two and nine Councillors chosen by the Mayor in addition to the Mayor. The current Mayor has appointed a multi-party Executive of three Councillors in addition to himself. It is not expected that this configuration will change in the near future, though an Executive of up to nine Councillors plus the Mayor can be appointed if the Mayor wishes.

Full Council

- 2.6 The Council currently has 51 Councillors, elected every four years at a single set of elections, the last in May 2015. Full Council is responsible for appointing the Committees of the Council and for setting its Budget and Policy Framework on the recommendation of the Executive. The Full Council meets on average 6 times per year. Occasionally the Council has found there is a need for additional ad hoc meetings to conduct its business but these are largely avoided.

Executive

- 2.7 The Borough Council operates a Directly Elected Mayor model with an Executive appointed by the Mayor from Councillors. The Executive is responsible for most day-to-day decisions on local government functions specified as executive functions in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended. Responsibility for groups of Executive functions (portfolios) are allocated to Executive members by the Mayor. The use of Portfolios enables Executive Members to establish a close working relationship with Officers.
- 2.8 Legislation provides that executive functions in the Directly Elected Mayor model can be delegated to individual Executive members by the Mayor but the current Mayor has not adopted this option.
- 2.9 Executive meetings take place monthly where Executive business is discharged by collective decision-making. Meetings are not long (typically 45-90 minutes) but it should be remembered that Executive reports are discussed in more detail at informal planning meetings attended by Executive members and Corporate Leadership Team (senior management) held some two weeks before each Executive meeting.

Other Committees

- 2.10 In respect of other Committees, the following Committees are scheduled to meet on a regular basis and each has a substantial workload:
- Planning Panel
 - Audit and Governance
 - Overview and Scrutiny

Committees/Panels meeting on an intermittent basis:-

- Overview and Scrutiny Performance Sub Committee
- Overview and Scrutiny Housing Panel
- Licensing Committee
- Taxi & General Licensing Panel
- Strategic Nuclear and Energy Board
- Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects Panel (NSIP)
- Personnel Panel
- Local Development Framework Working Party

- Electoral Review Working Party
- Member Training and Development Panel
- Council Tax Setting Committee

Details of current Committee arrangements including attendances are set out in Appendix 'A'

Quasi-Judicial Processes

- 2.11 The Planning Panel currently meets 13 times a year to determine planning applications and consider other planning issues. The Planning Committee has 12 Members with places allocated according to proportionality rules and there is a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Planning Committee meetings currently last around three hours. Some 90% of planning applications are determined by officers using delegated powers (see also 5.20 below).

Section 3

3. The Scrutiny Process

- 3.1 The Local Government Act 2000 requires each principal local authority to appoint at least one overview and scrutiny committee with powers to call-in decisions of the Executive for review by the overview and scrutiny committee. The call-in power has been little used since the introduction of overview and scrutiny at Copeland and has been used only once in the past 12 months.
- 3.2 When the overview and scrutiny function was introduced to local government in the early 2000's the Council appointed four overview and scrutiny committees to reflect its then corporate priorities. This was subsequently reduced to two (Internal and External) and later still in 2013 to a single committee. Other recent legislation have placed additional obligations on local authorities in respect of overview and scrutiny functions including the Police and Justice Act 2006 which requires all Councils to have a Scrutiny Committee that has the power to consider crime and disorder issues; and the Local Government and Public Involvement Act 2007 which provides for Councillors to raise issues of local concern as a Call for Action and requiring certain partners to provide information to Overview and Scrutiny and have regard to its recommendations.
- 3.3 Little use has also been made of the Councillor Call for Action since its introduction.
- 3.4 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has a full work plan and a number of activities have been completed in the current year. A copy of the work plan is attached at Appendix 'B' showing completed activities.

Section 4

4. Representational Role

- 4.1 Information has been sought from Members on their current duties. The response to a questionnaire is summarised in Appendix 'C'
- 4.2 There are currently 20 places on Outside Bodies for the Mayor and Executive Members and 42 for non-Executive Members. These Details of current Outside Bodies are included in Appendix 'D'
- 4.3 There are 29 Parishes in the Borough represented by a mixture of Parish Councils and Parish Meetings. There are 27 Parish Councils and 2 parish meetings. The involvement of Borough Members with Parish Representatives varies. Some Members (28 of the current 51) are also Parish Councillors and some attend Parish Council meetings and Parish Meetings.
- 4.4 The Council has a number of channels of communication with Parishes. There is a quarterly 3 tier meeting between representatives of the three tiers of local government in the Borough, which is well attended by parishes. Parishes also receive weekly lists of planning applications received and planning decisions made in the previous week. Although Borough Councillors may be copied into these communications, they are not expected to deliver information, seek feedback or report back to the Borough Council. There is no requirement for Borough Members to attend parish council meetings or parish meetings, but clearly, a good relationship between Borough Members and parish representatives is a positive thing. Most Parish Councils meet every month or six weeks. Parish Meetings tend to be convened as and when required, but should meet on at least two occasions during a year (the annual meeting and at least one other occasion). The current workload is variable depending on how many Parish Councils are covered by a Borough Ward. The Member Survey indicated that 36% of councillors attended parish meetings on average more than once per month, with 44% attending on average one parish meeting per month and 5% of respondents indicating that they seldom or never attend parish meetings.
- 4.5 The effect of a reduction in Borough Council Members on parish interaction may depend on the warding arrangements. In the rural areas the number of parishes in a Borough Member's Ward may increase. How it specifically affects a Member will depend on his/her approach to parish liaison and how the spread of Parish Councils actually falls once warding arrangements are finalised.
- 4.6 The Council has in place a Community Asset Transfer policy which facilitates the transfer of assets to parish councils and third sector organisations. Since 2013 the

following services have been subject to CAT's, a trend that we expect to continue into the future:

- Hensingham Skate Park – local community group
- St Bees Toilets & Play Area – parish council
- Bootle toilets – parish council
- Gosforth toilets & par park – parish council
- Pica play area – parish council
- Silecroft toilets – parish council
- Lowes Court Gallery, Egremont – local association
- Kells playing field – amateur rugby league club
- Whitehaven Allotments – parish council

4.7 Furthermore, it should be noted that parish councils in the Borough have taken on responsibility for such functions as hanging baskets, lengthsman schemes, grass-cutting, extra litter bins, and street-cleansing. This represents a shift in service delivery from the Council into communities, resulting, as far as the Council is concerned, in less activity and expenditure and therefore fewer decisions, fewer complaints and less risk. We expect this trend to continue in the future. Whilst the devolution of services referred to in this paragraph may appear minor in terms of their impact on Councillors' workload, we believe that, taken cumulatively with other changes referred to in this submission, they are not without significance.

4.8 Member interaction with the public is clearly an important part of the role. The Survey indicated that 29% of councillors are contacted less than 5 times a week by constituents with only 18% being contacted more than 10 times per week. Most respondents are contacted between 6 and 20 times per week. The level of contact with the public will vary from area to area and may depend on local issues. For example, because planning can be a controversial subject and most development takes place in the towns there may be greater contact by the public with Members in those areas.

4.9 The Council operates a 3 stage complaints process. A review of the Council's formal comments, compliments and complaints procedure was undertaken in 2012, at which time the council had a 4 stage process, the final stage being an Appeal before Members although this Stage had only been progressed 3 times in the previous 6 years.

4.10 It was decided that in accordance with Ombudsman guidance the procedure should be 3 stages, the first an investigation by the Customer Relations Officer aiming for a response within 10 working days (roughly 90% of complaints are resolved at this first Stage) . The second is an investigation by the Service Manager and if the customer remains dissatisfied, finally a Stage3 investigation by a Director.

- 4.11 Surgeries are not a recurring feature in Copeland with 24 % of respondents indicating that surgeries were seldom held and a further 44 % stating that they never held surgeries. Most communication from the public will be ad hoc via 'phone call or e-mail. E-mails in particular can be easily forwarded to Officers if required. However from time to time there is a requirement for Councillors to be present for site visits and an expectation from members of the public that they will be available for this. Clearly, a reduction in the overall number of Councillors would increase the potential for time spent dealing with members of the public because the electorate per Member would increase.
- 4.12 It is envisaged that new communication channels available to the public (particularly though the internet) will continue to reduce the need for residents to contact their ward councillor directly, as they will be able to 'self-serve' through the Council's online services. Transactional services available to residents directly on the Council's website include applying for planning permission, paying planning application fees, applying for jobs, electoral registration and Council Tax account management. **There is therefore the potential for residents to contact the Council directly concerning provision of services rather than needing to contact their ward councillor.**
- 4.13 **In terms of remote working, all Councillors are supplied with smart phones and tablets and a monthly broadband allowance is paid to all Members as part of the Members' Allowances Scheme. Council and committee papers are distributed electronically through ModGov, one of the democratic services applications commonly used in local government. All these applications are used by almost all Councillors with a very small number of exceptions and should have an advantageous impact on their workload in the medium and long term and facilitate interactions with constituents.**
- 4.14 **Fibre and superfast broadband are currently being rolled out across Cumbria. It is expected that by September 2018, 93.41% of properties in Copeland will be in receipt of 8MBs fibre broadband and 90.03% superfast 24MBs broadband. These percentages are expected to increase to 98.64% and 95.15% respectively by the conclusion of the current commercial roll-out some 12 months later. Roll out of broadband to the majority of the Borough will further facilitate remote working by members.**
- 4.15 **It should be noted at this point that we do not feel that matters of technology and geography can be a severe impediment to effective working by Councillors since 22 of the existing 51 live outside the wards they represent.**

Section 5

5. Proposals

- 5.1 It is acknowledged that the existing ratio of Councillors to electors at Copeland of 1:1035 is the lowest of the Cumbria districts and the lowest by some margin in our CIPFA nearest neighbour family using the default indicators in the CIPfastats model. Both sets of comparative data are shown at Appendix 'E'.
- 5.2 It is further acknowledged that the Council as an organisation has significantly reduced in size in the last few years. In 2006 the Council undertook a voluntary transfer of its housing stock of some 3,800 properties to Home Group Ltd together with 165 employees under a TUPE transfer, comprising almost the whole of our housing service and a significant number of Direct Labour Organisation employees. For example our revenue budget has reduced from £9.622m in 2014/15 to £9.150m in 2015/16 to £8.799m in 2016/17 to £8.433m and in 2017/18. Looked at over a longer period, the Council's revenue budget was £7.383m in 1995/6. Taking inflation into account using the Bank of England's inflation calculator, this sum would be worth £13.025m in 2015/16, compared to an actual revenue budget for that year of £8.799m, representing **a reduction of a third in real terms**. We employ 266 people (full-time equivalents) in 2017 compared with 321 in 2014.
- 5.3 An analysis of our Executive and Committee structure ten years ago in 2007/8 shows a total of 167 places including an Executive of 8, a shadow Executive of 8, 4 overview and scrutiny committees (1 at present) and a Standards Committee overseeing arrangements for regulation of the conduct of members, whose duties have now been subsumed into those of the Audit and Governance Committee. The existing structure shows 97 places, (not including the Council Tax Setting Committee which only meets once a year, and the NSIP Panel which is ex-officio), **a reduction of more than a third**.
- 5.4 By way of contrast with these trends of reductions over time, our electoral arrangements in terms of Council size have remained unchanged since the Council came into existence on 1 April 1974. **We are contending in this submission that the reductions in the size of the Council as an organisation evidenced in paras 5.2 and 5.3 above on a number of indicators over both the short and long term should be reflected in the Council's electoral arrangements, and in particular in Council size.**
- 5.5 **We are of the view that reductions in budgets do indeed result in lesser workloads for Councillors, particularly those involved in preparation, setting and scrutiny of budgets. This is evidenced by the relatively short Executive meetings throughout the year, referred to in paragraph 2.9 above, and by the significant reduction in governance places for Councillors over a 10 year period referred to in 5.3 above. Furthermore it should be noted that since the onset of large scale cuts in local government funding in 2010/11, the majority of Council budget decisions have been**

taken on a cross-party basis, and the days of “alternative budgets” have become a thing of the past. Local political parties have been forced by financial circumstances to put forward their most financially competent Councillors to work co-operatively to ensure the Council’s survival as a viable organisation. Simultaneously, the massive reduction in spending on discretionary services (referred to elsewhere in this submission) has been accompanied by a strong emphasis on efficiency in delivering statutory services. This is a significant shift in emphasis in the way the Council is governed which should not be under-estimated.

- 5.6 There have been very significant changes in the Council’s governance arrangements since 2000: the first in 2001 when the post 1974 committee system was replaced by the Leader and Cabinet executive model, resulting in a substantial reduction in the number of Members involved in decision-making on mainstream Council functions.
- 5.7 The second significant change was the replacement of the Leader and Cabinet model by the Directly Elected Mayor model in 2015. Such changes of models of Executive governance do not impact on the split of local authority functions into executive and non-executive (these are specified in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended) but do indicate a significant change in the leadership style of the Council, since the Mayor enjoys a direct mandate from the electorate of the Borough and as such is in a position to legitimately influence the direction of travel of the organisation. The current Mayor strongly supports a significant reduction in the number of Councillors as proposed in this submission. When the current Mayor stood as the independent candidate in the first Copeland mayoral election in 2015, his manifesto (see Appendix “H”) included a commitment to reducing the number of Councillors to one per ward – a Council size of 25. In addition a piece of desktop work has been done which looks at reducing Councillor numbers by simply amalgamating existing wards – resulting in a Council size of 24 (Appendix “I”).
- 5.8 When the Mayor considered the independent research report commissioned by the Managing Director he was therefore initially disappointed that the proposed Council size was as high as 33 given his previous manifesto commitment referred to above. The Mayor has since come to realise that the independent report (which now forms part of this submission) considers the relevant evidence and leads to the conclusion that 33 is the appropriate Council size, for the reasons set out in the following paragraphs, and he is now happy to support that proposal. As explained elsewhere in this submission, it contains resilience which either of the lower figures would not.
- 5.9 We need to be very clear that we have **not** considered a Council size of higher than 33 because we believe it would be fundamentally wrong, and contrary to the approach we believe the Commission has advocated from the outset, to take an arbitrary Council size figure and then look for evidence to support that figure. We are proposing 33 because that is the figure we believe is supported by the evidence.

- 5.10 It should also be noted that there are a significant number of discretionary district council functions which the Council has in the last three years, as a direct result of budget pressures, chosen to discontinue. These are listed at Appendix F
- 5.11 Some work has been done on an indicative governance model using numbers of Councillors similar to, though not identical to, those applying at present. These are:

Executive – 3 Councillors plus the Mayor

Group A Committees/Panels

Audit and Governance Committee – 7 Councillors plus independent Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 12 Councillors

Planning Panel – 11 Members

Group B Committees/Panels

Licensing Committee – 11 Councillors (statutory minimum is 10)

Electoral Review WP – 7 Councillors

Local Development Framework WP – 7 Councillors

Strategic Nuclear & Energy Board – 7 Councillors

Taxi & General Licensing Committee – 7 Councillors

Personnel Panel – 7 Councillors

Housing Panel – 7 Councillors

Member Training & Development Panel – 7 Councillors

(NSIP Panel is not included as its membership is ex officio. OSC Performance Sub Committee is not included as it is a subcommittee of OSC. Council Tax Setting Committee is not included as it only meets once a year.)

- 5.12 Group A Committees/Panels are those, which have a substantial workload and/or meet regularly in accordance with a pre-determined programme. Group B Committees are those that do not have a substantial workload and/or meet only on an ad hoc basis as and when required.
- 5.13 It is suggested that it would be a reasonable expectation, firstly, that all non-Executive Councillors should hold one seat on either the Executive or one Group A Committee/Panel. There is no reason why a Councillor could not sit on more than one, other than the statutory requirement that a Councillor cannot sit on both the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny; and the guidance (CIPFA Practical Guidance for Local Authorities and Police on Audit Committees, 2013) that membership of the Executive and Audit and Governance Committee.
- 5.14 It is suggested that it would be reasonable, secondly, to expect all non- Executive Councillors sit on two Group B Committees/Panels.

- 5.15 Looking at the committee and panel numbers set out in 5.11 above, it will be seen that there are 30 seats on group A committees, and 60 seats on Group B Committees. Based on the assumptions in 5.13 and 5.14 that all non-Executive Councillors would hold one Group A seat and 2 Group B seats, it therefore follows that there is a requirement for **30 non-Executive Councillors**. Adding the current contingent of 3 Executive Councillors leads to a proposed Council size of **33**.
- 5.16 It should be emphasised that there is a considerable measure of resilience in the governance model described in the preceding paragraphs, for four reasons: firstly, the model treats Executive and non-Executive Councillors as separate groups; however as noted in 5.13, there are Executive Councillors sitting on some of the Group B Committees and Panels, thus reducing the requirement for places for non-Executive Councillors. Secondly it should be noted that some of the Group B Committees and Panels meet very infrequently, as can be seen in Appendix "A". **Six** of them met **three times or less** in 2016/17; and of those six taken together, there have only been a **total** of only **three** meetings so far in the current year. This suggests that membership of many Group B Committees and Panels is not onerous in terms of workload for Councillors. Thirdly, there is an opportunity for the Council to consider whether all the Committees and Panels described in 5.11 are strictly needed. Indeed one (Strategic Housing Panel) has been abolished whilst this submission has been in preparation, and there are plans to abolish another (Personnel Panel) in the near future. Further opportunities should and will be explored to further abolition and/or merging of committees and panels to reduce the potential workload of all Councillors. Fourthly, in terms of the grouping of committees and panels into Group A and Group B in 5.11 above, there must be a question over whether the Planning Panel should continue to be regarded as a Group A committee.
- 5.17 Resilience in addition will afford the Mayor an opportunity to increase the size of the Executive from the current four though the current Mayor sees no need to do so in the remainder of this term of office.
- 5.18 We are contending in this submission that the resilience in this model is also sufficient to compensate for the fact that much (though not all) of the Borough of Copeland is rural and sparsely populated and that for some Councillors travelling to the administrative centre of Whitehaven is more time-consuming than in more densely populated areas.
- 5.19 A Council size of **33 Councillors** results in a Councillor: elector ratio of 1:1599, which is comparable to, **and does not look out of place in the context of**, other local authorities, both in Cumbria and in our CIPFA nearest neighbour family, using the default combination of indicators in the CIPFA model.

5.20 There have been significant changes in delegation of functions from member level to officers in the last 10 years. For example, in development management, in 2009 some 70% of planning applications were determined by officers and the balance of 30% at Member level by Planning Panel. This was against a national target of 90%. In the last four months of 2008, for example, Planning Panel determined 50 planning applications; the equivalent figure for the last four months of 2014 was 31 and for 2015 (the last year currently available due to our recent cyber-attack), 20. There is scope to increase delegation to officers further to 97-98% so that the role of Planning Panel in development management would be limited to determination only of very significant applications or those which have attracted substantial public interest.

5.21 Within a mayoral authority a number of key financial functions, which would ordinarily be reserved to the Full Council, are either the responsibility of the Mayor and Executive or in large measure carried out by them, such that the burden on the Full Council is reduced.

Examples include:

- The annual revenue financial outturn reports, both provisional and final, are approved by the Executive.
- Also the provisional and final financial outturn reports for capital.
- Approval of virements within both the revenue and capital budget.
- Amendments to and deletions from the approved Capital Programme.
- Management of the implementation of the annual Treasury Management Strategy and its associated borrowing and investment policies, including receiving and approving the annual report (Note: approval of the Treasury Management Strategy itself remains reserved to Full Council).
- Consideration and determination of the Council's budgetary process including the identification of priorities or provision of services.
- Production of a draft budget and its review and revision based on scrutiny input, followed by the recommendation of a resulting final draft to Full Council which has undergone comprehensive appraisal and challenge.
- Establishment and review/revision of policies and procedures in respect of financial administration.
- Approval of the Council Tax Base for each coming financial year is delegated directly to the Council's Section 151 Officer.
- The resulting reduction in the direct involvement of Full Council in these matters is offset to an extent by overview and scrutiny arrangements which form an important part of the checks and balances within the governance framework as a whole, but there is nevertheless a substantive impact on the overall burdens placed upon the wider group of elected members.

Whilst the changes in delegation arrangements referred to in the preceding two paragraphs may appear minor, we believe that taken cumulatively, and in the context also of the overall reduction in governance positions for Councillors in the

last 10 years referred to in paragraph 5.3, they do represent a significant reduction in the workload of Councillors, especially non-Executive Councillors.

- 5.22 In terms of the representational role, 31 of our 51 Councillors returned questionnaires about this aspect of their work. It should be noted that not all Councillors who returned questionnaires answered all the questions on the questionnaire. 57% of respondees expressed the view that the current number of Councillors is too high with 36% expressing the view that the existing number is about right. In terms of the role of Councillors in interacting with parish councils, the majority of existing Councillors (40 out of 51) represent predominantly urban areas where Parishes tend to include a number of geographically small but relatively densely populated Borough wards. It is contended that in these areas a reduction in the number of Councillors we are proposing would not have a significant impact on Councillor workload since the same parishing arrangements would exist as at present, albeit covering a smaller number of new Borough wards. There would not therefore be a major impact on Councillor workloads. In more rural areas the position might be somewhat different as larger new Borough wards might take in several different parishes. By way of example, the existing Seascale ward includes parts of five different parishes (Seascale, Drigg and Carlton, Irton with Santon, Wasdale and Eskdale). It is reasonable to suppose that a larger ward for that part of the Borough under a Council size of 33 might well contain parts of more than five parishes, which might in theory impact adversely on the workload of a small number of Councillors. However, we know from research carried out as part of this submission – staying with the Seascale example – that neither of the two current Seascale councillors attend meetings of all five parish councils parts of whose areas are covered by the Seascale ward, so in practice there will be little impact.
- 5.23 In terms of the representational role of Councillors looking after the interests of constituents, we are aware that a reduction from 51 to 33 is a significant change, but we are also acutely aware, as highlighted elsewhere in this submission, that our current Councillor: elector ratio of 1:1035 is the second lowest in the country. To move from this position to a more mainstream one requires a larger statistical shift than for a local authority already nearer to the mainstream. Furthermore, as also stated elsewhere in this submission we do not consider that the new ratio of 1:1599 under a Council size of 33 is at all out of place when considered in the context of our Cipfa nearest neighbour authorities. There are authorities in that group which comprise a similar mixture of populated urban areas with more rural hinterlands: North Warwickshire and Wyre Forest are examples.
- 5.24 On outside bodies, there are currently 20 places where the representative is the Mayor or other Executive member and 42 on which the named representative is a non-Executive Councillor, including champion appointments, but not including Locality Partnership meetings which are open to all Councillors in the Locality. It is notable that these 42 places are occupied by only 26 non-Executive Councillors. Some sit on more than one outside body and a small number on more than two. It is

contended that with a more equitable distribution of outside body appointments among all Councillors, all outside body places could be filled with a total Council size of 33, **without placing an undue burden of work on Councillors.**

- 5.25 As noted in para 1.7 above, the whole of Copeland is now parished following completion of the Community Governance Review of Whitehaven in 2015 which introduced a parish tier into the previously only unparished area of the Borough. There are thus now three tiers of local government in the whole of Copeland, where residents are also represented by an MP and several MEP's – a multi-layered picture of democratic representation. **There is therefore in our view a strong argument that Copeland is over-governed.** Looked at from this perspective it is arguable that the principle of subsidiarity should apply, in that in any hierarchy of organisations or organisational elements, decisions should always be taken at the lowest possible level consistent with them being made in an efficient and timely manner. This approach has its constraints of course, not least the legal one whereby different local government functions are allocated by statute to different local government tiers. **Nevertheless there are compelling reasons for suggesting that in multi-tier areas of local government reducing the number of district representatives when the opportunity arises, so as to go some way towards reversing the trend towards over-government.**

Section 6

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 This submission on Council size brings together evidence from a number of sources in support of a new Council size of 33, which we believe is appropriate and sustainable in the future.

Appendices

Appendix A – Committees and Panels

Appendix B – Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan

Appendix C – Members' Questionnaire Results

Appendix D – Outside Bodies

Appendix E – Comparative Data – Councillor/Elector Ratios

Appendix F - Discretionary Services Discontinued

Appendix G – Workshop Attendances

Appendix H – Mayoral Manifesto

Appendix I - Council Size of 24 Proposal

2016-17 Meetings and Meeting Attendances

Meeting	No. of Cllrs On Committee	Average Attendance	No of Meetings Held in Year
Council	51	72.5%	8
Executive	3	96.3%	9
Overview & Scrutiny Committee	13	66.0%	10
OSC Performance Sub Committee	6	66.7%	4
Planning Panel	11	75.1%	13
Licensing Committee	12	41.7%	1
Taxi & General Licensing Panel	7	71.0%	2
Member Training & Development Panel	7	60.0%	5 (1 not quorate)
Strategic Housing Panel	7	66.6%	3
Strategic Nuclear & Energy Board	7	64.0%	4
Local Development Framework Working Party	9	63.3%	3
Electoral Review Working Party	7	74.2%	5
Audit & Governance Committee	7	73.8%	6
Nationally Significant Infrastructures Project Panel	*4	83.3%	3
Personnel Panel	7	93.0%	2

Overall Average = 71.2%

Range = 41.7% (Licensing) – 96.3% (Executive)

*Nationally Significant Infrastructures Project Panel is chaired by The Elected Mayor and consists of the two leaders of the Main Political Parties, Chair of Planning Panel and the Chair of Local Development Framework Working Party (Not subject to political balance).

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2016-17

Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Senior Responsible Officer	Portfolio Holder
24 May 2016	Council Plan Performance Report (Q4 2015/16)	Standing Item	Fiona Rooney	Mike Starkie
(OSC Performance Sub-Committee)	Financial Monitoring Reports (Q4 2015/16 – Revenue/Budget/Treasury Monitoring)	Standing Item	Fiona Rooney	Mike Starkie
<p>Re-arranged to 14 June 2016 4:00pm St John's Church Hall, Hensingham</p> <p>POSTPONED</p>				

Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Date Completed & Minute No
24 May 2016 (Full OSC)	Executive Forward Plan	Standing Item	
	Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	Standing Item	
	Update from Task & Finish Group (where applicable)		
	Agree Work Programme	Standing Item	
	OSC Annual Report	Standing Item	24/5/16 OSC13
	Outside Bodies Annual Member Report Back and Outside Bodies Reporting		24/5/16 OSC14
	Adult and Children Safeguarding Policy Updates		24/5/16 OSC11
	Strategic Housing Panel (Creation and Appointments)		24/5/16 OSC12
	Recycling Service Overview		24/5/16 OSC9
	CBC Trading Account		24/5/16 OSC10

Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Date Completed & Minute No
12 July 2016	Council Plan Performance Report (Q1 2016/17)	Standing Item	
(OSC Performance Sub-Committee)	Financial Monitoring Reports (Q1 2016/17 – Revenue/Budget/Treasury Monitoring)	Standing Item	
9 August 2016	Executive Forward Plan	Standing Item	
(Full OSC)	Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	Standing Item	
	Update from Task & Finish Group (where applicable)	Standing Item	
	Work Programme Update	Standing Item	
	Report of Health & Wellbeing in South Copeland Task and Finish Group		9/8/16 OSC22b
	Harassment and Illegal Eviction Policy		9/8/16 OSC24
	Disabled Facilities Grants Policy		9/8/16 OSC22a
	Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy		9/8/16 OSC26

Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Date Completed & Minute No
4 October 2016 (OSC Performance Sub-Committee) POSTPONED	Council Plan Performance Report (Q2 2016/17) Financial Monitoring Reports (Q2 2016/17 – Revenue/Budget/Treasury Monitoring)	Standing Item Standing Item	
4 October 2016 (Full OSC)	Executive Forward Plan Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Update from Task & Finish Groups (where applicable) Work Programme Update Support Services Service Review	Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item	
11 October 2016 (OSC Performance Sub-Committee)	Council Plan Performance Report (Q1&2 2016/17) Financial Monitoring Reports (Q1&2 2016/17 – Revenue/Budget/Treasury Monitoring) Procurement Strategy	Standing Item Standing Item	

Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Date Completed & Minute No
10 January 2017 <i>(Full OSC)</i>	Special OSC - Budget		10/1/17 & 17/1/17 OSC45
21 February 2017 <i>(Full OSC)</i>	Special OSC - Budget Executive Forward Plan Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Update from Task & Finish Groups (where applicable) Work Programme Update	Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item	
21 February 2017 <i>(OSC Performance Sub-Committee)</i>	Council Plan Performance Report (Q3 2016/17) Financial Monitoring Reports (Q3 2016/17 – Revenue/Budget/Treasury Monitoring)	Standing Item Standing Item	



Meeting Date	Agenda Items	Status	Date Completed & Minute No
7 March 2017 (Full OSC)	Executive Forward Plan Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Update from Task & Finish Groups (where applicable) Work Programme Update	Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item	
11 April 2017 (Full OSC)	Executive Forward Plan Report of the Representative to the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Update from Task & Finish Group (where applicable) Work Programme Update	Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item Standing Item	

Other Work Items undertaken by Task & Finish Groups:-

- Success Regime
Request from Council 28 June 2016 – started August 2016, Completed 06/12/2016 – minute OSC 52c
- Review of Social Media Policy
Request from Council 28 June 2016 – started 13/10/2016, Completed 21/2/2017 – minute OSC 74b
- Review of Accommodation Project -
 - Phase I (Market Hall)
Request from Equalities Group - started 10/10/2016, Completed 06/12/2016 – minute OSC 52b
 - Phase II (Copeland Centre and Moresby) – to be started six months after move to ground floor of Copeland Centre.
- Waste / Recycling – Started June 2017, scheduled for completion

APPENDIX C – Members Questionnaire

Please state your ward:

Note: 28 out of 51 Councillors returned questionnaires. Of the 28 respondees, not all Councillors answered all questions on the questionnaire.

Electoral Review – Member Questionnaire

Q1 the Council currently has 51 Elected Members. Do you feel this number is?

Too Many	About Right	Too Few	No View
57%	36%	3.5%	3.5%

Q2 the average ratio of Elected Members to electors in Copeland is 1:1035. Do you think this is?

Too High (not enough Cllrs)	About Right	Could be Increased (fewer Cllrs)	No View
	44%	56%	

Q3 the District currently has a mixture of one, two and three member wards. Do you think that the District should consist of?

Single	Mixture	No View
16%	80%	4%

Q4 what do you consider to be a fair ratio of electors to every Elected Member?

<1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	>1800	No View
7%	25%	3%	14%	11%	7%		11%	11%	

Q5 With regard to your constituency work, how many times do constituents contact you (in person, by post, fax, e-mail or telephone) each week?

0 to 5	6 to 10	10 to 20	20 plus

29%	53%	14%	4%
-----	-----	-----	----

Q6 (a) With regard to your constituency work, what is the main way constituents contact you?

email	In person	phone	social media
Total number 8	16	14	3

Q6 (b) what are the main issues they raise?

Main issues: Housing; Anti-Social Behaviour; Refuse/Bins; Health

Q6 (c) how do you raise their issues to Council?

Main methods: Through CBC Officers or Members
Through Home Group

Q7 (a) how frequently do you hold surgeries within your ward?

Weekly	fortnightly	monthly	Less frequently	Seldom	Never
12%		8%	12%	24%	44%

Q7 (b) if you hold them how many attend your surgeries?

Main response: Very Few or 2/3

Q8 approximately how much time do you spend on 'ward' business on average each week (dealings with constituents, local groups etc.)?

<7 hours	7 to 14 hours	15 to 21 hours	>21 hours
----------	---------------	----------------	-----------

17%	70%	13%	
-----	-----	-----	--

Q9 (a) do you feel that advances in technology in the last 10 years (e.g. access to e-mail, services available on web direct to customers) have led to a smaller workload for Councillors in dealing with issues on behalf of constituents or a larger one?

Much smaller	Smaller	No change	Larger	Much larger
14%	14%	14%	58%	

Q9 (b) do you think this trend will continue in future. If so, please give details.

Main response – yes likely to continue
--

Q10 approximately how much time do you spend on 'Council' business on average each week (attending CBC meetings/briefings, panels, reading committee reports etc.?)

<7 hours	Approximately 7 hours	7 to 14 hours	15 to 21 hours	>21 hours
5%	33%	38%	5%	19%

Q11 do you feel that the amount of 'Council' business you undertake is.

Very Reasonable	Reasonable	No View	Unreasonable	Very Unreasonable	Not Answered
18%	77%		5%		

Q12 do you have an active relationship with the parish/town council in your area? Do you regularly attend meetings of the parish/town council? If so, how often?

Per week	1 per fortnight	1 per month	Seldom	Never
28%	8%	44%	8%	12%

OUTSIDE BODIES 2017/18 Proposals

Appendix D

	Outside Body / Partnership	Attending Officer	Member representative	Corporate Strategy Alignment	Comments / Links
1	Copeland Community Fund	Director of Customer and Community Services	Mayor, Mike Starkie and Portfolio Holder for Nuclear and Corporate Services, Councillor David Moore. Reserves: Councillor Lena Hogg for Mike Starkie Councillor Keith Hitchen for Councillor David Moore	All Ambitions	
2	Greenwich Leisure Limited Board - Copeland	Director of Customer and Community Services	Councillors David Riley and John Dirom	Ambition 3	
3	Copeland Partnership	Director of Customer and Community Services	Mayor, Mike Starkie, and open to all Members	All Ambitions	
4	Howgate and Distington Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		
5	NE Copeland - NE Locality Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		
6	West Locality Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		
7	Mid Copeland Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		

8	Whitehaven Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		
9	South Copeland Partnership	Community Regeneration Officer	All in Partnership area		
10	3 Tier Quarterly Meetings	Director of Customer and Community Services	Open to all members to attend	All Ambitions	3 Tier meeting serviced by CALC - meetings move around the borough
11	Energy Coast West Cumbria Board (ECWC) BEC	Managing Director	Mayor, Mike Starkie	All Ambitions	
12	West Cumbria Community Safety Partnership	Director of Customer and Community Services	Councillor Linda Jones-Bulman	Ambition 1, 3 and 4	
13	West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group (WCSSG)	Managing Director	Mayor, Councillors Lena Hogg and Fee Wilson	Ambition 1 and 3	
14	WCSSG LLWR	None	Councillors Jackie Bowman; Alan Jacob and Graham Sunderland	Ambition 1 and 3	
15	WCSSG Spent Fuel Management and Nuclear Materials	None	Councillors John Kane; Alistair Norwood and Charles Maudling	Ambition 1 and 3	
16	WCSSG Risk and Hazard Reduction and Waste Management Working Group	None	Councillors Lena Hogg; David Banks; Felicity Wilson and Andy Pratt	Ambition 1 and 3	

17.	WCSSG Environmental Health	None	Councillors John Bowman and Alistair Norwood	Ambition 1 and 3	
18.	WCSSG Emergency Planning	None	Councillors Lena Hogg and Felicity Wilson	Ambition 1 and 3	
19	BEC Properties Committee	Managing Director	Linked to ECWC ie Mayor – representation by senior officer at meetings	Ambition 1, 2 and 4	
20	Cumbria Community Foundation – West Cumbria Grants Panel	None	Councillor John Kane Councillor Keith Hitchen	Ambition 1 and 3	
21	West Cumbria Cycleway Partnership	Strategic Planning Manager	Councillor Graham Sunderland	Ambition 1 and 3	
Cumbria					
22	Cumbria LEP	None	Mayor, Mark Starkie, West Cumbria representative – shared on 2 year cycle with Allerdale Borough Council	All Ambitions	
23	Cumbria Leadership Board	None	Mayor, Mike Starkie	All Ambitions	
24	Joint District Leaders Board	Managing Director	Mayor, Mike Starkie	All Ambitions	
25	Cumbria Housing Group	Director of Customer and Community Services / Strategic Housing Manager	Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, Councillor Lena Hogg	All Ambitions	

26	West Cumberland Hospital Stakeholder Group	None	Mayor, Mike Starkie	Ambition 1 and 3	
27	Cumbria Public Health Alliance	Director of Customer and Community Services	Portfolio Holder	All Ambitions	
28	Cumbria Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	None	Chair of CBC OSC Councillor Ray Gill	All Ambitions	
29	Cumbria Waste Partnership	Waste and Enforcement Manager	Portfolio Holder	All Ambitions	
30	Lake District National Parks Authority	None	Councillor Hugh Branney	Ambition 3 and 4	
31	LDNP Partnership	Economic Development Manager	Councillor Keith Hitchen	Ambition 1, 3 and 4	
32	PCC Forum	None	Councillor Graham Sunderland	Ambition 1, 3 and 4	
33	Connecting Cumbria	None	Councillor John Bowman	All ambitions	
34	Pensions Committee	Chief Finance Officer	Councillor Gillian Troughton	Ambition 4	
35	Cumbria Nature Partnership	None	Councillor Hugh Branney	Ambition 1 and 3	Feeds into the Cumbria LEP
36	Cumbria Community Foundation Board	None	Mayor, Mike Starkie	Ambition 1 and 3	
Regional					

37	North West Employers Organisations	None	Councillor John Bowman	Ambition 3 and 4	
National					
38	Nuleaf	As requested	Portfolio Holder for Nuclear and Corporate Services, Councillor David Moore	All ambitions	
39	The Alliance	As requested	Councillor Ray Gill	Ambition 1, 2 and 3	
Champions					
40	Armed Forces Champion		Councillor Allan Forster	Ambition 3	
41	Conservation Champion		Councillor Mike McVeigh	All ambitions	
42	Equalities Champion		Councillor Anne Bradshaw	All Ambitions	
43	Safeguarding Champion		Councillor Anne Bradshaw	All ambitions	
44	Homeless Champion		Councillor Sam Pollen	Ambition 1, 3 and 4	
45	Voluntary and Community Sector liaison Champion		Portfolio Holder	All ambitions	
46	ASB Champion		Councillor Jeanette Forster	Ambition 1, 3 and 4	
47	Young Peoples Champion		Councillor Hugh Branney	All ambitions	
48	Older Persons Champion		Vacancy Councillor David Moore advising.	All Ambitions	

49	SME Champion		Councillors Doug Wilson and Gillian Troughton to share North and South	Ambition 1, 2 and 4	
50	Democracy and Engagement Champion		Councilor Andy Pratt	Ambition 3 and 4	
51	Health and Wellbeing Champion		Portfolio Holder	All ambitions	
Local Trusts managed by the Council					
52	Whitehaven Maternity Trust	Julie Betteridge	Jeanette Forster, Mark Holliday & Carla Arrighi	Ambition 3	Endorses Previous Appointment
53	Pipers Educational Trust	Julie Betteridge	Brian O’Kane	Ambition 3	Endorses Previous Appointment

Appendix E

Comparative Data

District	Electorate 05/17	Members	Ratio	Stat Distance
Allerdale	72738	56	1299	
Barrow	53306	36	1481	
Carlisle	77356	52	1488	
Copeland	52769	51	1035	
Eden	41549	37	1122	
S Lakes	81696	51	1602	
Bassetlaw	86586	48	1804	0.0426
North Warks BC	48979	35	1399	0.0633
Bolsover	59251	37	1609	0.0635
Carlisle	77356	52	1488	0.0766
NW Leics	75717	38	1993	0.0801
Newark & Sherwood	87815	39	2236	0.1007
Wyre Forest	78140	33	2368	0.1037
West Lancs	84937	54	1573	0.1079
Newcastle u Lyme	89874	60	1498	0.1118
Mansfield	79937	36	2220	0.1135
Amber Valley	94641	45	2103	0.1153
Allerdale	72738	56	1299	0.1161
Selby	66095	31	2132	0.1181
East Staffs	84690	39	2172	0.1206
Cannock Chase	74146	41	1808	0.1224
Coventry	221389	54	4100	

Appendix F

Cessation of Service or Post

- Business Support
- Sports Development Team (non Greenwich Leisure Limited)
- Arts & Culture – lost Arts Development Team
- Sustainability – lost officer & role
- Youth Engagement
- Public Toilets
- Pest Control
- Economic Development – loss of Economic Development capacity
- Closure of Whitehaven Civic Hall as CBC facility
- Whitehaven Allotments – (Community Asset Transfer to Parish Council)
- Play Areas – (Community Asset Transfer to parishes)
- Reduction in grass cutting frequency some stopped altogether
- Public realm activities – planting, removal of bins, tips
- Closed nursery and Distington Walled garden transferred on short term lease
- In Bloom awards scheme participation stopped
- Home Improvement grants & loans
- Leisure contract now provided through Socio Economic Grant
- Commercialised operation of Beacon visitor centre and museum
- Asset transfer of community focused Council assets e.g. toilets, car parks
- Lane Ends – reduction in refuse collection service in certain areas by asking residents to bring bins to lane end

Appendix G

Local Government Boundary Commission Review 2017 Member & Parish Workshop Timetable

Questionnaire sent to all Members	
7 th July 2017	
Millom Network Centre	No. Attended
Mon, July 10 – 2pm to 4pm – members	0
Mon, July 10 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes (cancelled due to no uptake)	0
Copeland Centre	
Tues, July 11 – 11am to 1pm – members	18
Tues, July 11 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes	3
Copeland Centre	
Weds, July 19 – 2pm to 4pm – members (mop up)	8
Weds, July 19 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes (mop up)	4
Deadline for Completed Questionnaires	
31 st July 2017	
Millom Network Centre	
Weds, Aug 9 - 2pm to 4pm – members	4 (1 member 3 Parish/Town)
<i>Weds, Aug 9 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes (cancelled due to no uptake)</i>	
Copeland Centre	
Thurs, Aug 10 – 2pm to 4pm – members	16
Thurs, Aug 10 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes	3
Copeland Centre	
Weds, Aug 16 – 2pm to 4pm – members (mop up)	8
Weds, Aug 16 – 5pm to 7pm – parishes (mop up)	3
All workshops supplemented with 1-2-1's on request	
Number of Questionnaires returned after 3 weeks	31 of 51
Average readership of Member Bulletin in July	20.4%
Make up of LGBCR Officer Group	
Managing Director	Communications Manager
Independent Advisor	Elections Officer
Strategic Planning Manager	GIS Officer
Democratic Services Officer	Project Support Officer

VOTE MIKE STARKIE – PUT PEOPLE BEFORE POLITICS

BIOGRAPHY – MIKE STARKIE

MIKE was born in Whitehaven at the West Cumberland Hospital and raised in Egremont. Mike is married to Louise, also from Egremont, for 26 years. They have two grown-up children aged 23 and 22.

For the last 25 years, Mike has worked in Financial Services, having first joined AMP/Pearl as a District Agent in 1990. In 11 years, Mike progressed through the ranks to become the Regional Sales Director East of England.

There were many highlights in AMP/Pearl – most significantly leading local branches to the most successful ever, breaking all company records. Mike was the only employee who had climbed up through the ranks of the company. In the role of Regional Sales Director Mike managed a staff of over 600 employees.

Mike joined Zurich Advice Network as Group Sales Manager based in Carlisle, and raised the Branch to first place in the country. In the summer of 2002, he was head-hunted to join Axa as National Sales Manager based out of Bristol, where Mike oversaw significant growth in productivity.

Mike joined the independently owned Network Personal Touch Financial Services based in Solihull as National Sales Manager working directly for the Company owner and Executive Chairman Martin Wilson in 2005. Over the next 5 years, the company underwent exceptional growth – three times appearing in the *Sunday Times* list of the UK's fastest growing companies.

Mike joined Openwork in February 2011 as Executive Director of Business Acquisition, and made significant increases in Distribution before resigning in August 2013 to set up own Financial Services Company, and partnered with True Potential. In 18 months, Mike has built up a significant client base and has millions of pounds of client assets under management.

Mike has had a lifelong interest in Politics, and locally was very much in support of the campaign for a Directly Elected Mayor believing strongly that it represents the most democratic form of local governance.

ON May 7th Copeland gets the opportunity to vote for a first ever elected mayor, almost 12 months on from the referendum that decided to shake up local government in our borough.

When you cast your vote it is a simple choice to make: If you are happy with how our council has been run then vote for a political party candidate; If you think things need to change then please cast your vote for me, an independent candidate who will put the needs and ambitions of Copeland and its residents before those of a political party.

I am not suggesting anybody should cast aside years of loyalty to a political belief, I just believe that local government is best served free of party political interest and cross party bickering. Everyone will have, and should take the opportunity to vote politically in the General Election held on the same day.

There will also be a number of councillors standing for election under political colours and I have no argument against voting for them, if they have served their ward well as many have, of all political persuasion.

Irrespective of who wins the General Election the cuts in funding to local authorities won't stop, and won't be reversed. We face a choice between managed decline, or we look for a radical solution. I know what I prefer and I think people expect to hear more from their elected representatives than comments like "there will be more hard choices". The public want innovative and workable solutions.

I want the council to become more business like in its thinking and I would if elected look at commercialising the council. I want to set-up trading companies, wholly owned by the council, or in partnership

with entrepreneurs that will deliver profits that councillors can utilise. There are examples all over the country where more enlightened councils are already doing this very successfully – these councils are adopting a flowering of diverse approaches to problems.

I would immediately commission an independent audit of all spending, budgets and activities the council is involved with, that will establish a starting point. I will then set clear goals and objectives and then set out the detail. If you know where your journey starts and ends you can then plan the route. It is an established framework to manage a successful business.

I would look to put together an executive of the most appropriate talent irrespective of political leaning. I would endeavour to make the council completely transparent and hold full council and executive meetings around the borough and throw them open to the public, allowing 30 minutes of non staged questions. I would hold these meetings in the evening to make them accessible to working people.

I would look at the structure of the council and look to make it leaner and more effective and will aim to reduce the number of councillors to one per ward at the earliest opportunity.

I am a supporter of the nuclear industry and will work with government agencies to ensure Copeland remains a leader in Nuclear matters and the local supply chain optimizes the opportunities that are heading our way with large scale inward investment and our communities maximise socio economic benefits. I would look to build strong relationships with bordering councils; all the town and parish councils; the harbour commission; festival committees, and embrace community groups rather than battle with them. I would also look to work with our local



Mike Starkie: Independent candidate for Copeland's elected

sports clubs who already do so much in our communities.

I would like to make sure that our geography does not become an obstacle for our youth that excel in sports or the arts, and they are given the platform upon which their potential is developed to the full. I would also like to see the Police, Pub Watch and the Council working in partnership to enable a prosperous, safe and thriving social scene across West Cumbria for people of all ages and tastes.

I do not believe, as many have commented, that this is a poisoned chalice. Copeland in the top 10%

nationally for average earnings, we have relatively low house prices, we are in the top 5% for economic growth and low crime rates, but none of that is reflected walking around our towns and villages. I think it could and should be.

Copeland: we have a choice - Make the change the referendum indicated you wanted, with a radical and innovative approach to turning a problem into an opportunity, or carry on as we were before, where it seemed the only plan on a sinking ship was to rearrange the deckchairs.

Mike STARKIE

Mike Starkie Recommendations:

Andy Halstead Former Sales Director AMP/Pearl

Highly motivated and results driven. During Mike's tenure at Pearl / AMP he delivered outstanding sales results across a difficult geographic region, consistently outperforming more affluent regions of the UK. A good team builder who developed his people and managed performance in the most positive manner. Mike had a strong following and developed loyalty from all who worked closely with him

Rob Wyld CEO Manulife Chinabank

Mike is a highly effective leader who possesses strong team building skills underpinned by a real determination to succeed. He had an enviable track record at AMP UK where he was a consistent high achiever.

Martin Wilson Founder and Former Exec Chairman PTFS

I have known Mike 10 years plus. I always found him to be hardworking honest and completely trustworthy. He is very well respected both by work colleagues and people who have come in to contact with him. He has always shown an empathy and understanding towards other peoples problems and well being .I think a position in the public domain will suit his personality and he will be an asset to the people he will represent

Kevin Boyle Providing specialist financial advice for Education Professionals in Scotland & NI | Area Sales Manager at Wesleyan

Mike is a very hands on and supportive manager. He maintains focus and bags of energy in good times and also during challenging periods. I very much enjoyed my time working with him he is a very good motivator and brings out the best in his team

More recommendations can be found on linkedin profile

Current Wards (Total 25)	No of Electorate	Current No of Councillors	No of Electors per Councillor	Suggested Wards (Total 13)	No of Electorate	Proposed No of Councillors	No of Electors per Councillor
Arlecdon	1174	1	1174	Arlecdon & Frizington	3199	2	1599
Beckermet	2263	2	1131	Distington & Moresby	4105	2	2052
Bootle	1018	1	1018				
Bransty	3753	3	1251	(Cleator Moor Nth & Sth)			
Cleator Moor North	3102	3	1034	Cleator Moor	5077	2	2538
Cleator Moor South	1975	2	987				
Distington	3016	3	1005	(Egremont Nth & Sth + St Bees)			
Egremont North	3223	3	1074	Egremont & St Bees	7348	3	2449
Egremont South	2801	3	933				
Ennerdale	808	1	808	Holborn Hill & Haverigg	2955	1	2955
Frizington	2025	2	1012	Bootle & Millom Without	2111	1	2111
Gosforth	1084	1	1084	Seascale & Gosforth	3290	2	1645
Harbour	3115	3	1038	Beckermet & Ennerdale	3071	2	1535
Haverigg	1040	1	1040	Newtown	2569	1	2569
Hensingham	3025	3	1008	(
Hillcrest	2018	2	1009	Mirehouse & Sandwith)			
Holborn Hill	1915	2	957	Whitehaven South	5130	2	2565
Kells	2003	2	1001				
Millom Without	1093	1	1093	(Kells & Harbour)			
Mirehouse	3117	3	1039	Whitehaven Central	5118	2	2559
Moresby	1089	1	1089				
Newtown	2569	3	856	(Hillcrest & Hensingham)			
Sandwith	2013	2	1006	Whitehaven East	5043	2	2521
Seascale	2206	2	1103				
St Bees	1324	1	1324	(Bransty)			
				Whitehaven North	3753	2	1876
TOTAL	52769	51	1034		52769	24	2198