

The Labour Party's East Riding
Local Government Committee

Council Size Submission

East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Introduction

This is a submission by the Labour Party's East Riding Local Government Committee ('the LGC') to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England ('the Commission') concerning the council size (as part of the electoral review process) of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council ('ERYC').

This electoral review offers an opportunity for the ERYC to think carefully about its future governance arrangements – particularly in the context of changing service delivery needs and also councillors' changing roles and expectations over the next decade or more – and how this translates into the appropriate number of elected members.¹ However, the LGC believes that important sections of the ERYC's submission do not engage either in the spirit of the review or with the explicit metrics by which the Commission has stated a 'good submission' can be judged.²

The Commission has made its view clear: a good submission requires the ERYC to engage with the process, to focus on the future needs of the council, and not simply to describe the current governance arrangements. Specifically, the Commission states that submissions should demonstrate "a range of council sizes have been considered, why some have been discounted, and why the council size put forward is considered to be the best one".³

Take the future needs of the council, for example. The ERYC does not properly focus on this because of its failure to acknowledge or address (either in whole or part) the critiques made by Ofsted and the Local Government Association (the 'LGA'), which are discussed later on in this document, in its submission to the Commission. This is the opposite of what the Commission has asked the ERYC to submit.⁴ Even in the *Council Size Submission* document, which the ERYC used to create its proposal, the Commission asks: "Have any governance or capacity issues been raised by any Inspectorate or similar?" The LGC will show how the ERYC's submission fails to answer this vital question with the candour that is required.

The ERYC's submission also fails to demonstrate in a meaningful sense that a full range of council sizes has been considered. The Commission states on numerous occasions in its documentation that different council sizes (be that a reduction, maintenance of the current number, or increase of councillors) should be considered.⁵ If the ERYC's submission was an application for the establishment of a

¹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), pp. 5 & 7.

² Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 3. For the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's submission, see East Riding Yorkshire Council, 'Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024', pp. 117-39.

³ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 3.

⁴ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 3.

⁵ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 6.

new council (a thought experiment which the Commission endorses), the ERYC's submission surely would be found lacking in supporting evidence.⁶ In particular, the ERYC barely engages with the strengths and weaknesses of the case for increasing the council size. When considering an increase in the number of councillors, the ERYC dedicates around 140 words to this proposition in its entire submission – such as one sentence in the section discussing “What impact on the Council’s effectiveness will your council size proposal have” and one paragraph in the “Summary”.⁷

The ERYC states that it has five priorities: ‘Growing the Economy’, ‘Valuing the Environment’, ‘Empowering and Supporting Communities’, ‘Protecting the Vulnerable’, and ‘Helping Children and Young People Achieve’.⁸ Where does the ERYC provide evidence that these priorities will be met by keeping the council size at 67? The LGC will demonstrate in this submission that the ERYC are failing to meet these priorities. The consequences of the ERYC’s lack of engagement with the argument for increasing the council size, so that it is able “to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation”, is a dereliction of duty.⁹ The LGC will remedy this situation in this submission.

The Commission has also given clear guidance that ERYC’s submission should be implemented with a straight-forward and evidence-led approach, which should include robust demographic and electoral data in addition to opinions gathered from councillor surveys.¹⁰ The initial section on the ‘Local Authority Profile’ does indeed contain demographic and electoral data. However, it does not offer additional information, such as opinions gathered from councillor surveys. After the ‘Local Authority Profile’ section, the ERYC’s submission is effectively a descriptive account of current governance arrangements. The ERYC’s submission would appear to pass with flying colours if the following task was being set by the Commission: “Describe with some evidence and justify with assertions the current setup of the ERYC”. However, this is not the case.

The objective of the ERYC’s submission, according to the Commission, should be “to use local evidence to justify thoughts about council size and to articulate the role of councillors and their relationship with the communities they serve”.¹¹ Has this approach been taken in the ERYC’s submission to justify keeping the council size at 67? The LGC finds no trace, for example, of local evidence that properly justifies the ERYC’s council size proposal – much like it finds no evidence of councillor surveys.

⁶ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 5.

⁷ For these references made by the ERYC, see East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 121 & pp. 138-9.

⁸ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 114.

⁹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

¹⁰ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 6.

¹¹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 6.

It would seem that the ERYC does not collect the necessary data to answer the vital questions, with the necessary evidence, asked by the Commission.

To be clear about the trajectory of our submission, the LGC concurs with the ERYC that there should not be reduction in council size. Indeed, the LGC agrees that the current and future pressures identified by the ERYC make a reduction in council size inappropriate. The point of disagreement between the LGC and the ERYC is with regards to whether the council size should remain the same or increase. In their concluding remarks, the ERYC states that the council size should remain at 67 because “[i]t has proven to work well, whilst being reviewed to ensure that it remains effective... Members would be able to continue to serve their residents effectively as they have since the creation of the East Riding”.¹² But what if the ERYC is not, in fact, functioning properly?

If the ERYC’s council size cannot be reduced (or face being unable to meet its current and future pressures) and it is unable to fulfil its obligations at the present council size, what option is left except increase the council size? And is the need for an increase in council size not further compounded if the ERYC and its councillors are expected to undertake new responsibilities?

Below, the LGC will highlight the various failings of the ERYC and its submission in areas such as the environment, Children’s Services, Adult Social Care, the impact of a new mayoralty, planning, accountability, the lack of an Area Committee, and community leadership. The ERYC, according to the LGC, has not proven to work well, nor has it served its residents effectively. Therefore, the LGC holds that maintaining the current council size is untenable.

And this conclusion is compounded by the fact that the ERYC is expected to remedy various failings (which will increase the workload of councillors) in the context of councillors being expected to undertake new responsibilities. As the LGC will show, the LGA has criticised the ERYC for being officer-led, instead of member-led. As the balance of power and commitments shift from officers to members, the ERYC cannot claim that the current council size is sufficient because the executive and scrutiny functions of councillors will increase in the future.

Consequently, the LGC will do two things in this proposal: first, it will redress an imbalance in the ERYC’s submission (so that the Commission has a fuller understanding of the arguments concerning an increase in council size), and, second, it will propose an increase in council size to meet the current and future needs of the council as councillors take on ever more responsibility.

The LGC will make two cases, called ‘Case 1’ and ‘Case 2’, in favour of increasing the council size. *Case 1* will involve the LGC arguing that the ERYC fails to provide strong evidence to support its proposal of a council size, which differs to a significant extent from similar authorities. Based on the Commission’s own guidance, this would lead the Commission to recommend a council size which is nearer to that of other

¹² East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 138.

authorities within the ERYC relevant CIPFA grouping. (This would mean the ERYC would go from a council size of 67 to between 75 and 76.) However, if the Commission does not agree that the council size in the ERYC's proposal differs to a significant extent from similar authorities, the LGC will offer *Case 2*. Here, the LGC will propose that an increase in council size is both vital and necessary in order to enable the council, as requested by the Commission, "to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation".¹³ According to the Commission, this is the basis on which it will always recommend a council size.¹⁴

Throughout *Case 2*, the LGC will reference why there is a need for an increase in council size at interim stages. However, it is in the Summary that the LGC will propose a modest increase in council size for the ERYC to an explicit number: that is, 76. Waiting until the Summary to state why 76 is the best proposal for the ERYC's council size will allow the LGC to make its case after all the evidence has been considered. The LGC wishes to take the current failings of the ERYC in the round before delving into the realm of figures for the best council size.

The LGC will now make its first case.

Case 1 - The ERYC fails to provide strong evidence to support its proposal of a council size, which differs to a significant extent from similar authorities.

This case is split into two parts: first, that the ERYC does not provide strong evidence to support its proposal of a council size of 67, and, second, that the proposal of 67 councillors differs to a significant extent from similar authorities.

Part One - The ERYC does not provide strong evidence to support its proposal of a council size of 67.

What does 'strong evidence' look like? In *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance (Updated June 2023)*, at 4.26, it states that "in cases where the authority's proposal would mean its council size differs to a significant extent from similar authorities, we will require particularly strong evidence, based on the areas set out in 4.20 and in Appendix C".¹⁵

Here, the LGC asks a simple, follow-up question. Where, in the whole of the ERYC's submission, is there any evidence which does not simply describe how the ERYC currently operates? Yes, there is evidence of the ERYC's current profile in the Local Authority Profile section, and there is also evidence of how the ERYC is currently

¹³ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

¹⁴ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 4

¹⁵ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance* (Updated June 2023), p. 22.

governed – all of this describes the current shape of the ERYC. However, if we account for a superficial and cursory reference to a 2021 LGA *Peer Challenge Review*, the ERYC’s submission contains no evidence that supports why the council operates the way it does or how it needs to adapt in the future. Instead, the ERYC’s submission is a litany of assertions. Assertions are not evidence.

Take the issue of allocating allowances for members, for example. The ERYC’s submission states that “[d]ue to the differences in roles and working patterns of Councillors it remains difficult to state how much time is required to carry out the role of a Councillor in the East Riding?”.¹⁶ It goes on to reference the Councils Independent Remuneration Panel and then states that 60 hours a month “remained a reasonable figure to help it calculate allowances”.¹⁷ However, the LGC has been unable to find this report with the reference to this 60-hour figure. (The LGC assumes the 60-hour figure is based on the LGA’s *National Census of Local Authority Councillors* report, which states that “[c]ouncillors spent, on average, 22 hours per week on council business”).¹⁸ But, if the LGC’s assumption is correct, this figure is based on an average of all councillors in England. This figure is not based on the caseload of ERYC councillors. The LGC is frustrated that the ERYC does not collect the necessary data, which would allow it to make decisions based on the particular characteristics and needs of the ERYC.

Moreover, the ERYC fails to give proper referencing when it tries to offer evidence. For example, the ERYC states the following in the “Planning” section of its submission: “In 2023 to date 5% of planning applications are considered by Planning Committee and 95% are delegated to officers”.¹⁹ Where does this figure come from? No reference is given. How can this figure be checked? This is a theme that runs throughout the ERYC’s submission.

Given the lack of necessary evidence, how can the ERYC’s submission satisfy 4.20 or Appendix C of the *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance (Updated June 2023)*?²⁰ The LGC holds that the ERYC’s submission does not satisfy these criteria.

Part Two – *The ERYC proposal of 67 councillors differs to a significant extent from similar authorities.*

With *Part One* in mind, 4.27 of the *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance (Updated June 2023)* states that, where the Commission does “not believe the council has made a sufficiently strong case to adopt a council size which is significantly different from its nearest neighbours, we will seek to recommend a council size which is

¹⁶ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 135.

¹⁷ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 135.

¹⁸ Local Government Association, *National Census of Local Authority Councillors 2022*, p. 3.

¹⁹ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 130.

²⁰ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance (Updated June 2023)*, p. 21 & pp. 40-9 .

nearer to that of other authorities within the relevant CIPFA grouping”.²¹ The LGC will now argue that the ERYC differs to a significant extent from similar authorities.

The ERYC is in the upper quartile of council areas by electoral ratio. According to the LGC, the mean average of the electoral ratio of our Nearest Neighbours is 3575:1. According to the ERYC, the average of the electoral ratio of our Nearest Neighbours is 3621:1. Whichever figure the Commission chooses to adopt, the ERYC currently has one of the largest electoral ratios of 4031:1 – second only to Cornwall, which is 4956:1.

Table 1 - Local Government Nearest Neighbour Group Comparisons.²²

Area	No. Electors	No. Councillors	Electoral ratio
<i>Cornwall</i>	431186	87	4956
<i>East Riding of Yorkshire</i>	270089	67	4031
<i>Wiltshire</i>	382740	98	3906
<i>Cheshire East</i>	310618	82	3788
<i>Northumberland</i>	251575	67	3755
<i>Cheshire West and Chester</i>	262603	70	3751
<i>Dorset</i>	297542	82	3629
<i>Stockport</i>	222842	63	3537
<i>Central Bedfordshire</i>	219869	63	3490
<i>South Gloucestershire</i>	211982	61	3475
<i>Shropshire</i>	250146	74	3380
<i>North Somerset</i>	165519	50	3310
<i>Sefton</i>	211916	66	3211
<i>County Durham</i>	390322	126	3098
<i>North Lincolnshire</i>	130633	43	3038
<i>Isle of Wight</i>	110695	39	2838
Mean Averages	257517	71	3575

Since the LGC argues that the ERYC has not made a sufficiently strong case for its council size proposal, and because the ERYC’s council size proposal is significantly different from its nearest neighbours, the LGC asks the Commission to recommend a council size which is nearer to that of other authorities within the relevant CIPFA grouping.

Based on the LGC’s electoral ratio figure, the ERYC council size should increase from 67 to 76.

²¹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance* (Updated June 2023), p. 22.

²² Please note that the figures in this table are the same as the ERYC, except with regards to the Mean Averages row. The LGC claims the average electoral ratio is the mean average of the electoral ratios column in Table 1: this makes the electoral ratio 3575:1. The ERYC, however, calculate this ratio by dividing the mean average of the number of electors by the mean average of the number of councillors: this would make the electoral ratio 3621:1. The LGC calculation is the best as it requires fewer mathematical abstractions to arrive at the result.

Based on the ERYC’s electoral ratio figure, the ERYC council size should increase from 67 to 75.

However, if the Commission does not agree with Case 1, the LGC will now move on to its second case.

Case 2 – An increase in the number of councillors is both vital and necessary in order to enable the council “to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation”.²³

Here, the LGC’s submission will use the ERYC’s submission as its foundation.²⁴ Where the LGC believes they are able to offer particular insights for the Commission, they will be given. For example, where we wish to dissent from the ERYC’s submission with regards to “The Context for your proposal”, the LGC will offer an alternative analysis. However, there are sections of the ERYC’s submissions to which the LGC has nothing to add – such as the segment concerning the “Reason for Review”. Here, the Commission will find the following statement: “Here, the LGC has nothing to add to the ERYC’s submission”.

About You

This submission is made the by the LGC, which, as mentioned above, is the Labour Party’s East Riding Local Government Committee.

Reason for Review (Request Reviews Only)

Here, the LGC has nothing to add to the ERYC’s submission.

The Context for your proposal

First, the LGC will consider the criticisms made by the LGA. Indeed, the LGA records the uphill struggle that the ERYC faces, if it is to overcome the challenges of today and tomorrow: “Transformational success requires collaboration, a clear long-term vision, big investment, and bold decisions with accompanying transparent governance and accountability arrangements. These are areas where East Riding of Yorkshire needs to do further work”.²⁵ This is a struggle which is compounded by the fact that previous ERYC administrations have relied too heavily on being officer-led, rather than member-led. It is for this reason that the LGA recommends an

²³ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

²⁴ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, pp. 117-39.

²⁵ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

“organisation-wide transformation plan that is member-led and officer-managed”.²⁶ Moreover, the LGA records the following about elected members: “their leadership role within the council and across the region and sub-region needs strengthening. They should be playing a far greater role in policy development, decision-making and performance management, as well as providing leadership of place from the front. Members need to be at the core of decision making in the council”.²⁷ However, this transformation still has a long way to go.

One of the most egregious, recent examples of the ERYC being overly officer-led is with regards to the issue over Nuclear Waste Services plans for a nuclear dump in Holderness. An Environmental Information Request (EIR 1261) records that officers unilaterally began discussions on the subject in April 2023, which was in the middle of the purdah period for the May 2023 full ERYC elections.²⁸ This disclosed material provides no information on when the Council Leader or Cabinet were told about this or gave permission to proceed. According to Councillor Steve Gallant, group leaders on the council were first told informally (outside a formal meeting, so no minutes were taken) on 31 Oct 2023 (i.e. six months into the process); all those present said they didn’t think it should proceed; then, in January 2024, councillors in the wards affected were briefed just one week before a public announcement. Again, no permission appears to have been sought. The fact that a multi-million-pound, major industrial project for a rural ward was allowed to progress for so many months, without (as far as the LGC is aware) having ascertained any democratic input into whether it should even be considered, is of grave concern. It underlines the fact that little has changed in terms of the culture at the ERYC. When councillors were first given a vote on the matter, the project was blocked by 53 votes to 1. This shows just how much significant business, which the ERYC undertakes, is still outside the hands of elected members.

The LGC brings this shift (i.e. from the ERYC being officer-led to member-led) to the attention of the Commission because this will place an ever-greater burden on the pre-existing number of councillors. As more work passes back into the hands of elected members, more pressure will be placed on the current council size as councillors’ workload increases.

The LGC also holds that maintaining the ERYC’s current size of 67 becomes untenable after taking into account the ERYC’s current failings. The LGC will now elucidate the sheer scale of the challenges that the ERYC’s councillors face and, by extension, the knock-on increase on workload.

Here, the LGC dissents from the ERYC’s submission on some significant issues – particularly with regards to the question of whether any governance or capacity

²⁶ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

²⁷ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

²⁸ Appendix 3. Please note that the link in question 2 of the document appears inaccurate.

Presumably, it should be: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-siting-process-for-a-geological-disposal-facility-gdf>

issues have been raised by any Inspectorate or similar. The ERYC offers a cursory reference to the LGA’s *Corporate Peer Challenge* report of 2021, which notes the challenges that the ERYC faces with regards to Children’s Services and Adult Social Care.²⁹ However, the ERYC failed to disclose the source of these concerns for the LGA, which was Ofsted. Specifically, the ERYC have omitted Ofsted’s ‘Inspection of East Riding Local Authority Children’s Services’ (in 2019 and 2023) and Ofsted’s ‘Joint Area SEND Inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (in 2021).

With regards to Ofsted’s ‘Inspection of East Riding Local Authority Children’s Services’, made in 2019, the following grades were given.³⁰

Image 1

Judgement	Grade
The impact of leaders on social work practice with children and families	Inadequate
The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection	Inadequate
The experiences and progress of children in care and care leavers	Good
Overall effectiveness	Inadequate

This report found the following:

- “There has been a marked deterioration in the quality of help and protection support for children in East Riding”.³¹
- “There is a disconnect between strategic planning and the services that children who need help and protection receive”.³²
- “Inspectors found referrals were not looked at for several days, leaving children at unassessed risk and without timely interventions to help them”.³³

²⁹ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

³⁰ Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 1.

³¹ Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 1.

³² Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 12.

³³ Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 3.

- “Inspectors had serious concerns about the response to those highly vulnerable children who were at risk of child sexual exploitation”.³⁴
- “Practice in pre-proceedings work, services for disabled children, and the operational response to children at risk of exploitation are weak. High caseloads in the safeguarding teams and weaknesses in the quality of oversight and decision-making by managers are leading to drift and delay for some children receiving the services they need to protect them and improve their lives”.³⁵

Another ‘Inspection of East Riding Local Authority Children’s Services’ occurred in 2023. While there have been areas of improvement, no areas of the ERYC provision are considered ‘Outstanding’. What is more, part of the third judgement they reached in the above **Image 1** (i.e. the experiences and progress of care leavers) has actually regressed. It is no longer ‘good’, and, instead, ‘requires improvement to be good’.³⁶

In addition, a separate Ofsted inspection was held to look at the ERYC’s provision for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), and Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector (HMCI) determined that a “Written Statement of Action (WSOA) is required because of significant areas of weakness in the area’s practice”.³⁷ Indeed, in the first of the Main Findings section, it is recorded that “there are long-standing and systemic weaknesses in the area’s provision for SEND. These weaknesses predate the pandemic. There is an acute shortage of suitable school places for children and young people who require specialist provision. The system for education, health and care (EHC) plan assessments and annual reviews does not function effectively. Too many children and young people do not get the support they require”.³⁸ With regards to the relationship between the ERYC and their residents, the third Main Finding is that “overwhelmingly, parents and carers who responded to Ofsted’s survey or communicated with the inspection team describe the experience of getting the provision to which their child or young person with SEND is entitled as a fight. Some parents and carers have lost faith in the area’s ability to meet their child’s or young person’s needs. Some parents and carers are in despair”.³⁹ This has led to “a breakdown in trust”.⁴⁰ In short, the Ofsted inspection raised significant concerns about the effectiveness of the ERYC.⁴¹

The lack of any acknowledgment in the ERYC’s proposal to these Ofsted’s reports is of grave concern. These omissions reinforce the view, made separately by the LGA, that the ERYC “must clarify and strengthen its strategic intent and ambition” and “bring more transparency into its decision-making processes”, if it wishes to become

³⁴ Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 4.

³⁵ Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2019), p. 10.

³⁶ For the most recent Ofsted inspection, see Ofsted, ‘East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children’s Social Care Services’ (2023), p. 1.

³⁷ Ofsted, ‘Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (2021), pp. 1-2.

³⁸ Ofsted, ‘Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (2021), pp. 2.

³⁹ Ofsted, ‘Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (2021), pp. 2.

⁴⁰ Ofsted, ‘Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (2021), pp. 3.

⁴¹ Ofsted, ‘Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire’ (2021), pp. 8.

a high performing council.⁴² This lack of transparency (which is mentioned no less than ten times in the LGA report) and ambition is brought into focus all the more given the fact that these challenges, outlined here, are both a statutory obligation and involve some of the most vulnerable people in our society.⁴³

Since the current governance model at the ERYC is clearly failing, an increase in councillor numbers would allow the ERYC to rethink its structures and allocate more councillors for strategic leadership. To reiterate, some crucial points. The ERYC are failing children with no aspect of the Children's Services considered 'Outstanding' by Ofsted. In places, the Children's Services has actually regressed. And all of this has occurred after Ofsted told the ERYC that there was a disconnect between strategic planning and their services and that there were weaknesses in the quality of oversight and decision-making.

An increase in council size would allow the ERYC to allocate more councillors for strategic leadership, thereby allowing the ERYC to better overcome the above-mentioned problems with regards to SEND provision. It would allow the ERYC to give the support that, according to the HMCI, too many children and young people do not get. It would allow the ERYC to address, according to the HMCI, its pre-pandemic, systemic weaknesses. And it would allow the ERYC to work on re-establishing the trust between the ERYC, parents and carers, which, according to the HMCI, is broken. But this is not where future pressures on the current council size ends.

The ERYC's submission refers to an ongoing devolution deal, and the creation of a new Mayoral Cabinet, Scrutiny Committee, and Audit Committee – all of which will require representation from the ERYC. To be specific, based on the *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal* document, the ERYC will need to send two elected members, one of whom will act as the lead member for their constituent council.⁴⁴ Moreover, ERYC must nominate a named substitute for each of their Combined Authority Members.⁴⁵ The ERYC will also need to send six members for the Scrutiny Committee and also four members for the Audit Committee.⁴⁶

The implications of these changes have not been considered fully in the ERYC's proposal. These are significant changes and, likewise, will lead to a significant impact on the ERYC both in terms of the executive and scrutiny functions of the ERYC and also its future budget. The LGC will now elaborate as to why this is the case.

⁴² The need for transparency is mentioned no less than ten times in the LGA report. For these references, see Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

⁴³ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

⁴⁴ *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal*, point 15.

⁴⁵ *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal*, point 15.

⁴⁶ *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal*, points 30 and 32.

TONIC were commissioned to undertake an independent analysis of the response data, generated by the consultation exercise for the devolution deal, in the *Analysis Report*.⁴⁷ The LGC will now refer to the 'Governance Arrangements' section of the devolution deal as outlined in the *Analysis Report*. According to this report, "[a] Mayoral Combined Authority would allow Hull and East Yorkshire to access additional funding and powers, including the £400 million investment fund, which would not currently be available to either council alone".⁴⁸ This is a large sum of money, and the LGC notes that it opens up the possibility for the ERYC to increase its budget significantly if the mayoralty is given the appropriate attention and resources that it requires.

The LGC also notes the many areas of responsibilities of the mayoralty as outlined in the *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal* – such as 'Governance', 'Finance and Investment', 'Skills and Education', 'Housing and Land', 'Transport', 'Net Zero', 'Environment and Climate Change Adaptation', 'Culture and Tourism', 'Digital', 'Innovation', 'Trade and Investment', 'Public Service Reform', and 'Resilience and Public Safety'.⁴⁹ The ERYC must fully engage with all these areas.

It also finds the following responsibilities of the newly created Mayoral Combined Authority in the *Analysis Report*. The mayoralty would:

- "Receive the powers and money from government and provide transparent local leadership.
- Offer decision-making on strategic matters affecting Hull and East Yorkshire.
- Promote Hull and East Yorkshire and give us one, strong voice locally, nationally and internationally.
- Make it easier to work together locally and with central government.
- Seek to secure even more long-term investment, including borrowing.
- Be able to generate revenue locally through a precept or levy, subject to certain conditions being met.
- Make sure things are done for the benefit of the whole of the Hull and East Yorkshire area, representing residents, their communities and their interests".⁵⁰

The LGC finds no evidence offered by the ERYC which demonstrates how these significant changes will be absorbed by the current number of elected members. Indeed, given the various failings of the ERYC, the LGC cannot foresee how this significant change could be absorbed by the current number of elected members, who have to contend with the previously stated issues. Simply put, it is not good enough for the ERYC to assert, without evidence, the following: "It was also felt that any additional roles created by the Mayoral Combined Authority could be absorbed within the existing number of Councillors and if needed changes could be made to

⁴⁷ Matthew Scott, Katie Lund, Daniella Nayyer, and Chloe O'Brien, 'Analysis Report: Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Consultation Analysis Report' (Version 1.8).

⁴⁸ Matthew Scott, Katie Lund, Daniella Nayyer, and Chloe O'Brien, 'Analysis Report: Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Consultation Analysis Report' (Version 1.8), p. 76.

⁴⁹ *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal*.

⁵⁰ Matthew Scott, Katie Lund, Daniella Nayyer, and Chloe O'Brien, 'Analysis Report: Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Consultation Analysis Report' (Version 1.8), p. 76.

the existing Committee Structure without the need for any increase in Councillors”.⁵¹ A feeling is not evidence. The ERYC’s submission, again, relies on assertion, not evidence. This review process gave the ERYC the opportunity to lay out the evidence for how these new responsibilities could be absorbed by the current number of councillors and show how the structure of the council could change to respond to these future pressures: no such evidence has been provided. Therefore, the ERYC has failed to demonstrate that the creation of a new mayoralty will not require an increase in council size, which the LGC legitimately believes to be the case, based on the *Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal* document and TONICS’s *Analysis Report*.

The ERYC wants to maintain the council size at 67, but, given the above-mentioned current and future pressures, the LGC disagrees with the ERYC’s proposal. Even if the ERYC currently functioned properly (which it does not), there is a strong case that an increase in council size is necessary to absorb the additional pressures from the creation of the mayoralty alone. Moreover, since the ERYC is going to take on new responsibilities in some areas while also failing in other areas already within its purview, the LGC holds that the need to increase the council size is a necessity.

Therefore, the LGC does not believe that the current number of elected members provides a strong basis for the sort of strategic leadership that can address the above-mentioned challenges. An increase in council size is vital if the new commitments to a mayoralty (in addition to the ERYC’s current obligations) are to be taken seriously, appropriately undertaken, and met. The ERYC proposal states that (at the current figure) “[a]ll Council services have a portfolio holder with overall strategic responsibility for the function, and with adequate Committee and Scrutiny functions to ensure democratic accountability continues across Council services”.⁵² Moreover, the ERYC believes that an increase in Council Size would decrease effectiveness as there would be elected members “without specific roles or duties assigned to them”.⁵³ As the LGC demonstrates above and below, there are ample roles and duties, which the ERYC could allocate to members of an increased council size, that would allow the ERYC to meet the challenges they are facing both now and in the future.

The LGC dissents in the strongest possible terms from the ERYC’s view that an increase in council size would “decrease effectiveness as there would be more voices to lead or scrutinise”.⁵⁴ This is an argument of desperation by the ERYC (who appear to be clutching at the proverbial straws) in order to try and discredit arguments in favour of increasing the number of councillors. An increase in council size would have a positive and significant impact on the ERYC’s effectiveness for all the reasons outlined above.

What is more, an increase in council size is entirely affordable. The ERYC claims that “[a]n increase in numbers would see additional budget pressures to fund an

⁵¹ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 139.

⁵² East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 121.

⁵³ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 121.

⁵⁴ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 121.

increase in allowances and additional support required”.⁵⁵ However, the ERYC’s annual budget runs into the hundreds of millions of pounds: the cost of a modest increase in the number of elected members to 76 is a drop in the ocean. The rationale behind an increase in council size to 76 will be offered, below, in the Summary.

The current review process is a rare and timely opportunity for the ERYC to think afresh as to how to meet their current challenges (i.e. with regards to SEND, Children’s Services, Adult Social Care, accountability, and strategic leadership) and future challenges (such as the environment and the creation of a functioning majority). However, the opportunities offered by this review process are being squandered by the ERYC in their submission. Moreover, the ERYC’s lack of transparency with the Commission is very concerning. It is hoped that the present submission is remedying the deficiencies in the ERYC’s submission and providing a more realistic picture of the present state of things.

Local Authority Profile

Here, the LGC has nothing to add to the ERYC’s submission.

Council Size

Strategic Leadership

In this section, this Commission asks (amongst other things):

- “If the authority runs a Committee system, we want to understand why the number and size of the committees you propose represents the most appropriate for the authority”.
- “Whichever governance model you currently operate, a simple assertion that you want to keep the current structure does not in itself, provide an explanation of why that structure best meets the needs of the council and your communities”.

Here, the ERYC’s submission fails to answer any of these questions. The ERYC offers no evidence as to why the council should operate in the way that it does. No explanation is given (either with assertions or evidence) as to why the current structure best meets the needs of the council and the community it serves.

The LGC speaks to the theme of ‘Strategic Leadership’ throughout this proposal.

Accountability

This is another disappointing section in the ERYC’s submission. No increase in the council size has been explored. When the ERYC tries to explore an alternative council size in this section, the ERYC simply states: “[w]e also feel that a significant

⁵⁵ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, pp. 138-9.

reduction in the number of Councillors would have a negative impact in the way we can represent the needs of local people”.⁵⁶

The Commission also asks: “What proportion of planning applications will be determined by members?” The ERYC’s submission records that, in 2023, “to date 5% of planning applications are considered by Planning Committee and 95% are delegated to officers”.⁵⁷ The ERYC’s submission then goes on to say: “[w]hilst other authorities have many more Members involved in planning functions, the Council recognise the value in having appropriately trained Members making decisions effectively. There remains a need to have sufficient numbers of Members involved in this function, and 13 is considered an appropriate number”.⁵⁸ The ERYC cites no evidence as to why 13 is considered a sufficient number of members being involved in the planning process. Nor does the ERYC give any evidence as to why the council has not put in place more training for members, so that they could explore increasing the figure from 5%.

In this section, the Commission asks “how the authority and its decision makers and partners will be held to account”. The LGC holds that the current practices at the ERYC’s make this difficult – to put it mildly. A fundamental element in the ERYC’s accountability is for the electorate to vote out councillors who make poor planning decisions. However, this is not possible when only 5% of planning decisions are taken by councillors. The vast majority of planning decisions are made by unelected officers. This is further exacerbated by the fact that the ERYC does not have an Area Committee, which would allow local people to become involved in the decisions made by the ERYC.

The LGC would like to reiterate that the LGC have criticised the ERYC for being officer-led. Changing the ERYC to a member-led and officer-managed organisation will require more than 5% of planning applications being decided upon by councillors. This will place further burdens on the current council size and councillors’ workload. As such, this change to executive and scrutiny functions of councillors (just in terms of planning) buttresses the view that an increase in council size is necessary, since the ERYC’s current proposal depends upon the failing status quo remaining in place.

Community Leadership

The LGC adds the following, supplementary material to the ERYC submission.

All Labour Group Members hold regular surgeries for residents. They also have street surgeries on some weekends. Not all councillors do this. It is left up to councillors to manage their workload regarding ward casework. There is probably more contact with these groups via political party events than via ERYC.

⁵⁶ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 133.

⁵⁷ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 130.

⁵⁸ East Riding Yorkshire Council, ‘Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024’, p. 131.

When issues of importance to many residents occur (concerning, say, telegraph poles or Nuclear Waste), councillors can host public meetings. Councillor Steve Gallant, for example, has organized several of these over the last six months.

All Labour Group members are “double-hatted”. This means they serve on their local parish or town councils, and they attend other local parish meetings. This helps to keep them in touch with local issues, but it also means they have an additional workload from these positions. Councillor Steve Gallant, for example, has been a town councillor for 10 years - 8 of them as Chair of the Finance Committee and other working groups.

The LGC strongly disagrees with the fact that the ERYC does not operate an Area Committee. The LGC also finds it very worrying that the ERYC does not have a performance system for its elected members. The ERYC gives no evidence as to why this should be the case. The LGC also notes with growing concern that the ERYC makes no explicit mention to introducing mechanisms which help councillors to interact with young people, residents who are not on the electoral register, or minority groups.

In this section, the Commission asks: “What is their relationship with locally elected members and Community bodies such as Town and Parish Councils? Looking forward how could they be improved to enhance decision-making?” The ERYC’s submission fails entirely to answer this question. This part of the ERYC’s submission is purely descriptive, and it does not properly engage with the review process.

The LGC contends that the ERYC’s lack of data collection is a fundamental flaw in terms of how it operates. How can the ERYC improve if it does not collect the necessary data, which this section (and other sections) asks to be provided? Without benchmarks with which to compare the efforts of previous ERYC administrations with current and future administrations, the ERYC is hamstringing its ability to improve in a data-driven fashion.

At this stage, the LGC wishes to remind the Commission of these words by the LGA: “Transformational success requires collaboration, a clear long-term vision, big investment, and bold decisions with accompanying transparent governance and accountability arrangements. These are areas where East Riding of Yorkshire needs to do further work”.⁵⁹ The LGC holds that the creation of an Area Committee would have a transformative effect on the ERYC as it would require the ERYC to engage, structurally, with their residents on all manner of issues – such as the ones documented, above, in this submission. It would make the ERYC more accountable to its residents, allow for greater scrutiny, enable the ERYC to take its decisions effectively in light of feedback from the residents it serves, and provide effective community leadership. Light is the best disinfectant, and the ERYC have operated for too long in the shadows.

⁵⁹ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

The creation of an Area Committee would not only make the ERYC more transparent, as requested by the LGA, but it would also add further workload to the executive and scrutiny functions of councillors. Therefore, there will need to be an increase in council size to allow for the creation of an Area Committee.

Casework

Councillors, according to Councillor Steve Gallant, deal with their own casework. Members Services put councillors in touch with the right officer or arrange meetings, but councillors still do the work and give feedback to residents.

All Labour Members use social media to get messages out to residents about many local issues (such as flooding, telegraph poles, and road closures) and countywide policies (like the current devolution debate).

It is at this point that a criticism of the ERYC's engagement with residents by the LGA is instructive: "The maturity level of the council's social media channels is at an early stage and engagement rates are relatively low. It appears that they are used to broadcast timely information about service delivery rather than to engage with residents about priority areas or seek their views".⁶⁰ Nowhere in their submission do the ERYC engage with this criticism or seek to address it.

Finally, the LGC notes (again) that the ERYC's submission fails to "demonstrate that alternative council sizes have been explored" in this section. No council size is considered in this section.

A general theme that emerges in this submission (as it navigates the failings of the ERYC and the ERYC's submission) is the increased workload of councillors that is needed, if the ERYC is to meet the challenges that it faces and remedy the structural issues which have been identified. More elected members are needed if the ERYC's structural problems are to be properly addressed and the challenges that the ERYC faces are to be remedied with regards to SEND, Children's Services, Adult Social Care, planning reform, the creation of a mayoralty, accountability, the creation of an Area Committee, and community leadership (as discussed above). All of this will have a significant impact on councillors' work, and it necessitates the LGC to propose an increase in council size.

Other Issues

Here, the ERYC discusses the implication of the Local Government Nearest Neighbour Group Comparisons. This submission, by the LGC, dealt with this issue at the beginning of this document in *Case 1*.

However, to recap, it is the LGC's view that, in the first instance, the ERYC's submission fails to provide strong evidence to support its proposal of a council size,

⁶⁰ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

which differs to a significant extent from similar authorities. Based on the Commission's own guidance, the LGC asks the Commission to recommend a council size which is nearer to that of other authorities within the ERYC relevant CIPFA grouping. (This would mean the council size for the ERYC would go from 67 to between 75 and 76.)

It is also the LGC's view that, in the second instance, if the Commission does not agree that the council size in the ERYC's proposal differs to a significant extent from similar authorities, an increase in the number of councillors is both vital and necessary in order to enable the council, as required by the Commission, "to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation".⁶¹

Summary

The ERYC's submission is fundamentally flawed, and, according to the LGC, does not fully engage either in the spirit of the review or with the explicit metrics by which the Commission have stated a 'good submission' can be judged.

The ERYC's submission demonstrates a lack of engagement with a litany of vital matters – such as the LGAs *Corporate Peer Challenge* report, the transfer of leadership from officers to elected members, the environment, the Ofsted inspectorate for Children's Services or SEND, Adult Social Care, the creation of a mayoralty, planning reform, accountability, the need for an Area Committee, and community leadership.

A consideration of all these matters will impact upon whether the current council size is fit for purpose. The LGC began this submission by stating why the ERYC believes the council size should remain at 67. To recap, according to the ERYC, this is because "[i]t has proven to work well, whilst being reviewed to ensure that it remains effective... Members would be able to continue to serve their residents effectively as they have since the creation of the East Riding".⁶² The LGC went on to ask: what if the ERYC is not, in fact, functioning properly?

Above, the LGC has highlighted the various failings of the ERYC in areas such as Children's Services, Adult Social Care, the environment, planning reform, accountability, and community leadership. The ERYC, according to the LGC, has not proven to work well, nor has it served its residents effectively. Therefore, the LGC holds that maintaining the current council size is untenable. An increase in the council size is both vital and necessary for the ERYC, as requested by the Commission, "to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation".⁶³

⁶¹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

⁶² East Riding Yorkshire Council, 'Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024', p. 138.

⁶³ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

The failure of the ERYC's submission to consider properly the possibility of increasing the number of councillors, and the absence of evidence to justify keeping the current council size, is a dereliction of duty both to its current and future residents. As mentioned above, the LGA records that the ERYC need an "organisation-wide transformation plan that is member-led and officer-managed".⁶⁴ Moreover, the LGA records the following about elected members at the ERYC: "their leadership role within the council and across the region and sub-region needs strengthening. They should be playing a far greater role in policy development, decision-making and performance management, as well as providing leadership of place from the front. Members need to be at the core of decision making in the council".⁶⁵ This is because, in actuality, the ERYC is not working properly.

Had the ERYC's submission engaged with the electoral review process and thought afresh as to how to meet their current and future challenges (as requested by the Commission), the LGC believes the ERYC would have concluded that increasing the number of councillors is the best proposal. The LGC's proposal highlights the various failings of the council, none of which will be solved by reducing the number of councillors or maintaining the number at their present level.

If the ERYC's council size cannot be reduced (or face being unable to meet its current and future pressures) and it is unable to fulfil its obligations at the present council size, what option is left except to increase the council size? And is the need for an increase in council size not further compounded if the ERYC and its councillors are expected to undertake new responsibilities?

In concluding *Case 2*, the LGC holds that increasing the number of councillors is the best option. But what is the exact figure that the ERYC's council size should increase to?

According to the LGC, 76 is the current electoral ratio of its relevant CIPFA grouping. The LGC contends that an increase from 67 to 76, by hap stance, also corresponds to the best figure to propose for the council size, given the above-mentioned challenges that the ERYC faces. This is a proposed increase of 9 elected members. As things stand, each elected member can sit on multiple committees, with some members sitting on 5 committees and other members sitting on 0 committees. The average number of committees that elected members sit on is 2, and the most common number of committees that elected members sit on is 3.⁶⁶ This means that between 18-27 new positions could be allocated with the LGC's proposed increased in council size. Where could these new positions be allocated?

The creation of a new mayoralty must be accounted for in the council size. The Mayoral Cabinet, Scrutiny Committee, and Audit Committee will all require

⁶⁴ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

⁶⁵ Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*.

⁶⁶ LGC, *Appendix 1*, p. 7.

representation from the ERYC, which the ERYC's submission does not properly account for, and (as mentioned above) accounts for 12 positions which need to be filled (excluding two substitutes). Therefore, 12 of the new positions must be allocated here.

The creation of an Area Committee must also be taken into account. At the ERYC, the number of elected members sitting on committees ranges from 3 to 13. The average number of elected members sitting on a committee is 9.⁶⁷ Therefore, it seems appropriate to propose the creation of an Area Committee with 9 elected members. In addition to the 12 positions allocated above, that means 21 positions have now been allocated.

This leaves 6 more positions available to be allocated, and these should be allocated to the 'Planning Committee', along with the 'Safer and Stronger Communities Sub-Committee', 'Health, Care and Wellbeing Sub-Committee', and 'Children and young people sub-committee'.

Indeed, the ERYC admits that "other authorities have many more Members involved in planning functions".⁶⁸ However, as the LGC has highlighted, the ERYC offers no evidence as to why the current figure of 13 members should be retained – especially since 95% of applications are currently considered by unelected officers, when the ERYC has been criticised for being member-led (as opposed to officer-led). An increase in elected members involvement with the planning process will make the ERYC more accountable, allow for greater scrutiny, enable the ERYC to take its decisions effectively, and provide effective community leadership and representation.⁶⁹

Likewise, an increase in the elected members in the 'Safer and Stronger Communities Sub-Committee', 'Health, Care and Wellbeing Sub-Committee', and 'Children and Young People Sub-Committee' would allow the ERYC to address the challenges it faces now and in the future with regards to the environment, Children's Services, and Adult Social Care. An increase in council size would allow the ERYC to allocate more councillors for the strategic leadership that it desperately needs in these areas. It would allow the ERYC to better overcome the above-mentioned problems with regards to SEND provision. It would allow the ERYC to give the support that, according to the HMCI, too many children and young people do not get. It would allow the ERYC to address, according to the HMCI, its pre-pandemic, systemic weaknesses. And it would allow the ERYC to work on re-establishing the trust between the ERYC, parents and carers, which, according to the HMCI, is broken.

Increasing the council size from 67 to 76 is a modest change, which (as mentioned above) is financially viable. It would also allow the ERYC to move to a sustainable, member-led council (as more power is transferred from officers to members).

⁶⁷ LGC, *Appendix 2*, p. 8.

⁶⁸ East Riding Yorkshire Council, 'Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024', p. 131.

⁶⁹ Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission* (Updated January 2023), p. 2.

A failure to increase the number of councillors will ensure that the failing status quo continues at the ERYC, along with all the failings that the LGC's submission has sought to highlight for the Commission. An increase in council size to 76 is vital. It will have a positive and transformative impact on the ERYC and the lives of its residents, both now and in the future.

Bibliography

East Riding Yorkshire Council, 'Full Council Agenda - 21 February 2024'. Source: <https://downloads.eastriding.org.uk/corporate/committees/full-council/agendas/Full%20Council%20Agenda%20-%202021%20February%202024.pdf>

Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Deal. Source: <https://www.heydevolution.com/deal/>

Local Government Association, *LGA Corporate peer Challenge: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (29 November – 2 December 2021: Feedback report)*. Source: <https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/council-assurance-and-peer-support/peer-challenges-we-offer/corporate-peer-challenge-60#45-capacity-for-improvement>

Local Government Association, *National Census of Local Authority Councillors 2022*. Source: <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Councillors%27%20Census%202022%20-%20report%20FINAL-210622.pdf>

Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Council Size Submission: Guidance - A guide to making a good submission (Updated January 2023)*. Source: https://www.lgbce.org.uk/sites/default/files/2023-03/council_size_guidance_-_jan_2023.pdf

Local Government Boundary Commission for England, *Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance (Updated June 2023)*. Source: https://www.lgbce.org.uk/sites/default/files/2023-06/technical-guidance-june_2023.pdf

Matthew Scott, Katie Lund, Daniella Nayyer, and Chloe O'Brien, 'Analysis Report: Hull and East Yorkshire Devolution Consultation Analysis Report' (Version 1.8). Source: <https://downloads.eastriding.org.uk/heydev/HEY%20Consultation%20Report.pdf>

Ofsted, 'East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children's Social Care Services', (2019). Source: <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50148936>.

Ofsted, 'East Riding of Yorkshire Council Inspection of Children's Social Care Services', (2023). Source: <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50212242>.

Ofsted, 'Joint area SEND inspection in East Riding of Yorkshire' (2021). Source: <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50174035>

Appendix 1

Name	No. of Committees	Committee 1	Committee 2	Committee 3	Committee 4	Committee 5
Councillor Aitken, Victoria	0					
Councillor Arrand, Rick	3	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee		
Councillor Astell, Tom	2	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee			
Councillor Bayram, Linda	3	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee		
Councillor Blakeston, Mark	1	Standards Committee				
Councillor Bovill, John	2	Pensions Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee			
Councillor Bowtell, Maria	0					
Councillor Boynton, David	2	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee			
Councillor Cantrell, Carolyn	3	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Standards Committee		

Councillor Cary, Derek	4	Audit Committee	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Planning Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	
Councillor Casson, Kevin	2	Planning Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee			
Councillor Corless, Margaret	3	Audit Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Planning Committee		
Councillor Coultish, Nick	0					
Councillor Cousins, Andrew	2	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee			
Councillor Dealtry, Liam	0					
Councillor Dennis, John	3	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee	Standards Committee		
Councillor Dewhirst, Charlie	2	Appointments Committee	Authority Wide Joint Consultative Committee			
Councillor Duke, Alex	2	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee			
Councillor Fox, Caroline	4	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Licensing Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	
Councillor Gallant, Steve	3	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Pensions Committee		

Councillor Gill, Coleen	2	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee			
Councillor Gill, Terry	3	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee		
Councillor Hammond, Leo	0					
Councillor Handley, Anne	1	Appointments Committee				
Councillor Harrison, Ross	0					
Councillor Healing, Lyn	3	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee	Standards Committee		
Councillor Healy, Denis	5	Appointments Committee	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Planning Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee
Councillor Henderson, Tony	0					
Councillor Heslop-Mullens, Mike	3	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee		
Councillor Holmes, Claire	2	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee			
Councillor Holtby, John	4	Authority Wide Joint Consultative Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Pensions Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	

Councillor Hopton, Paul	4	Audit Committee	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Pensions Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	
Councillor Howard, David	0					
Councillor Howard, Denise	4	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	
Councillor Jefferson, Barbara	1	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee				
Councillor Jeffreys, Barbara	1	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee				
Councillor Jeffreys, David	3	Authority Wide Joint Consultative Committee	Pensions Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee		
Councillor Johnson, Linda Jane	3	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee		
Councillor Lee, Michael	4	Audit Committee	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	
Councillor McMaster, Gary	0					
Councillor McMaster, Sean	3	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Planning Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee		

Councillor Meredith, Richard	3	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Planning Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee		
Councillor Needham, Dale	3	Authority Wide Joint Consultative Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee		
Councillor Nolan, David	0					
Councillor Norman, Tim	3	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Planning Committee	Standards Committee		
Councillor Owen, Jonathan	1	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee				
Councillor Phoenix, Jayne	3	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Pensions Committee		
Councillor Pickering, Simon	1	Licensing Act 2003 Committee				
Councillor Redshaw, Phillip	3	Audit Committee	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Pensions Committee		
Councillor Robson, Thomas	4	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Planning Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	
Councillor Rogers, Matt	2	Planning Committee	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee			

Councillor Sargeantson, Liz	1	Staff Terms and Conditions Committee				
Councillor Saribal, Zahra	4	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Pensions Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	
Councillor Shephard, Gareth	2	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee			
Councillor Smith, Paul	5	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Planning Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee
Councillor Steel, Sue	3	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Planning Committee		
Councillor Stewart, Diana	3	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Committee	Standards Committee		
Councillor Sutton, Margot	2	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Education Appeals Committee			
Councillor Talbot, Amanda	5	Audit Committee	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	Licensing Act 2003 Committee	Licensing Committee
Councillor Tucker, David	0					

Councillor Walker, Andy	2	Health, Care and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee			
Councillor West, Paul	0					
Councillor Whitaker, Eliza	1	Audit Committee				
Councillor Whittle, John	4	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Education Appeals Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Pensions Committee	Planning Committee
Councillor Whyte, Samantha	5	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee	Overview Management and Scrutiny Committee	Pensions Committee	Planning Committee	Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee
Councillor Wilcock, Jeremy	1	Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee				
Councillor Wilkinson, Nigel	1	Authority Wide Joint Consultative Committee				

The average number of committees that elected members sit on is 2.

The most common number of committees that elected members sit on is 3.

Appendix 2

Committee	No. of Elected Members
Appeals Committee	
· Education	3
· Housing	3
Appointments Committee	4
Assessment Sub-committee	4
Audit Committee	8
Licensing Act 2003 Committee	10
Licensing Act 2003 Sub-committee	3
Licensing Committee	9
Overview and Scrutiny Committees	
· Environment and Regeneration Sub-Committee	12
· Safer and Stronger Communities Sub-Committee	12
· Health, Care and Wellbeing Sub-Committee	12
· Review Panels	6
· Children and young people sub-committee	12
Overview Management Committee	12
Pensions Committee	10
Planning Committees	
· Planning Committee	13
· Eastern Area Planning Sub-Committee	12
· Western Area Planning Sub-Committee	12
Staff Terms and Conditions Committee	7
Standards Committees	

The average number of elected members sitting on a committee is 9.

· Standards Committee	12
· Standards Hearing Committee	4

Appendix 3 (Scans of EIR Below)



Ms L Massey-Davis
Sent by email only:-
lynn_masseydavis@hotmail.co.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: EIR1261
Enquiries to: Jo Bateson
E-Mail: foi@eastriding.gov.uk
Tel. Direct: (01482) 391512
Date: 23 February 2024

Dear Ms Massey-Davis

Environmental Information Regulations - Request for Information

On 31 January 2024 East Riding of Yorkshire Council received your request for information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. The Council's response is set out below.

Response:

1. **Did your group make the invitation to the NWS, The NDA or the DESNZ or did they approach you to consider hosting a GDF in South Holderness. (how did this come about and who was responsible) (please can supporting papers and minutes of meetings be made available to South Holderness GDF action (interim spokesperson Lynn Massey-Davis).**

NWS were exhibiting at a Local Government Association Conference attended by senior Directors of the Council. An introduction was made at this event. From this introduction NWS approached the Council and discussions were held to enable NWS to explain the site investigation process. The project was referred to the Invest East Yorkshire team, the Council's inward investment team who are wholly employed by the Council, to manage the enquiry as they would any other inward investment project.

2. **When did this approach happen (precise dates).**

The meeting to discuss the siting process with NWS and the Council was held on the 18 April 2023. No minutes were taken of this meeting but the information shared can be found on the .gov.uk website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-siting-process-for-a-geological-disposal-facility-gdf>

3. **Why was this considered a "good idea"? (what is the benefit solely focussed on Southern Holderness - the 3 wards in question only and offers of wider help to the ERC area in general).**

The Council's adopted Economic Strategy identifies four main priorities which are Business Growth, Lifelong Learning, Quality Locations, and Sustainable Economy

The Council agreed to talk to Nuclear Waste Services, (NWS), treating their proposed project as an inward investment enquiry. As with other inward investments, the NWS Geological Disposal Facility, (GDF) could potentially bring significant economic benefits for the area, such as construction jobs, supply chain opportunities for local companies, new multi-generational jobs, apprenticeships, the potential to require new purpose built training / education facilities and, in this case, much improved/brand-new infrastructure potentially creating a whole raft of new opportunities for East Riding residents and the local economy.

South Holderness was selected as the initial search area due to the potential economic benefits of the project, particularly around new job creation and improved/new infrastructure which would potentially be game changing for future generations.

4. **Which committee of the local authority (ERYC) has oversight and decisionmaking responsibility for this (please can a copy of the decision record, supporting papers and minutes of the meeting be made available to South Holderness GDF action (interim spokesperson Lynn Massey-Davis).**

The Working Group is not a decision-making body. Its role is to start a conversation with the local community, disseminate information, listen to and answer questions. For that reason, it is not necessary for it to be overseen by a committee.

5. **How was the impact that this would have on the local economy, housing, health, wildlife, transport and infrastructure evaluated? What tools were used? Please can the supporting documentation and the decision records be made available to South Holderness GDF action (interim spokesperson Lynn Massey-Davis).**

The search for a GDF site is a consent-based process. There are two main components to this process: a suitable site and a willing community. The impact of such a facility would be thoroughly scrutinised and ultimately the local community would decide if it was suitable for their area.

6. **Has the East Riding of Yorkshire council received and inducements, financial or otherwise from the above named agencies or central government within the last 12 months, 24 months.**

No

7. **Will the East Riding of Yorkshire council received and inducements, financial or otherwise from the above named agencies or central government in the next 2-5 years in relation to a possible GDF.**

The Council can claim back the cost of officer time spent on specific tasks relating to the siting process. This can only happen once the Working Group is operational.

8. **Have the NWS, The NDA the DESNZ or central government offered to fund any projects in return for cooperation.**

No

9. **Have ward councillors and our local MP Graham Stuart played any part whatsoever in behind the scenes negotiations discussions on the GDF.**

Officers briefed Ward Councillors prior to the official launch of the Working Group and as Energy Minister MP Graham Stuart was briefed by DESNZ on the intention to launch a Working Group in his constituency.

10. **How and when were the community representatives on the board selected?**

There is no board; NWS selected Working Group members.

11. **Can community representatives be substituted for people who have a more local interest and who reflect the emerging views of the people of the area. Would it be possible to elect 2 local representatives living within 3 southern Holderness rather than appointees who live outside the area.**

The Working Group is formed to lead the very first stage of opening the conversation with the local community. It would no longer exist if the project was to move to a Community Partnership. The Community Partnership would be made up of local organisations as well as individuals from the local community .

12. **Are board positions remunerated and what is the remuneration for the chair and the board members?**

This information is available from NWS who manage the GDF siting process.

Addendum: At the Full Council meeting held on 21 February 2024, a motion to immediately withdraw from discussions on the proposed GDF with NWS was carried by 53 votes to 1. The motion was put forward by Councillor McMaster in response to a question from an elector. This means that the council will exercise its right to withdraw from the discussions with immediate effect. To watch the proceedings, visit:

Darren Stevens

Executive Director of Corporate Resources

<https://www.youtube.com/live/lkP5ekaNL0k?si=MblIFAn0Q4hdSd3E>. The agenda item starts from minute 06:54 and runs to minute 23:46.

If you are dissatisfied with the above response or how your request has been handled you can ask for the Council to review this by contacting the Information Governance and Feedback Team by email on foi@eastriding.gov.uk or on the above telephone number within 6 weeks of this letter.

A senior manager will carry out the review and you will receive a response within 40 working days. It will provide a fair and thorough review of the decisions taken and where necessary how your request has been handled.

If you are not content with the outcome of the review you can apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the Council's review procedure. The Information Commissioner can be contacted as follows:

Online: <https://ico.org.uk/make-a-complaint/>

Tel: 0303 123 1113

Yours sincerely

Jo Bateson

Senior Information Governance and Feedback Officer

Darren Stevens
Executive Director of Corporate Resources

www.eastriding.gov.uk

