



Summons and Agenda for the  
**Council Meeting**

to be held on

**11 September 2012**

at

**6.00pm**

**SELBY**  
  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

---





To: All District Councillors

cc: Chief Officers  
Directors

You are hereby summoned to a meeting of the Selby District Council to be held in the Civic Suite, Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby on **TUESDAY 11 SEPTEMBER 2012** starting at **6.00pm**. The Agenda for the meeting is set out below.

**Chief Executive**  
**3 September 2012**

## Opening Prayers

### **AGENDA**

**1. Apologies for Absence**

To receive apologies for absence.

**2. Disclosures of Interest**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interest in any items set out in the Agenda.

**3. Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 26 June and 24 July 2012 (pages 6 to 18 attached).

**4. Communications**

The Chairman, Leader of the Council or the Chief Executive will deal with any communications which need to be reported to the Council.

**5. Announcements**

To receive any announcements from the Chairman, Leader or Members of the Executive.

**6. Petitions**

To receive any petitions.

**7. Public Questions**

To receive and answer questions notice of which has been given in accordance with rule 10.1 of the Constitution.

**8. Councillors' Questions**

To receive and answer questions submitted by councillors in accordance with rule 11.2 of the Constitution.

**9. Reports from the Executive**

The Leader of the Council, and other members of the Executive, will report on their work since the last meeting of the Council and will respond to questions from Councillors on that work (pages 19 to 24 attached).

## **10. Reports from Committees**

To receive reports from the Council's committees which need to be brought to the attention of Council. To receive questions and provide answers on any of those reports (page 25 attached).

Scrutiny and Audit Committees have not met since the last meeting of Council.

## **11. Motions**

- i) To continue the debate on the Motion considered at meeting of Council on 26 June 2012. The below Motion was moved by Councillor Mrs M Davis:

**The Labour Group wish to ensure that the rights of Scrutiny and the right to proper debate of call-in issues are enshrined within our Constitution to prevent the stifling of debate before an informed vote on the issue can take place.**

- ii) To consider any additional Motions received.

## **12. Access Selby Annual Report**

To receive a presentation from the Chair of the Access Selby Board.

## **13. Selby District Council – Submission on Council Size to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England**

To receive the submission on future Council size. (Pages 26 to 41 attached).

## **14. Urgent Action**

The Chief Executive will report on any instances where he has acted in urgent or emergency situations under the functions delegated to him in the Constitution.

## **15. Sealing of Documents**

To authorise the sealing of any documents necessary to action decisions of this Council meeting, or the Executive or any of its Committees for which delegated authority is not already in existence.

## Council

Venue: Council Chamber  
Date: 26 June 2012

17	Disclosures of Interest
18	Minutes
19	Communications
20	Announcements
21	Petitions
22	Public Questions
23	Councillors' Questions
24	Reports from the Executive
25	Reports from Committees
26	Motions on Notice
27	Olympia Park
28	The Localism Act 2011 – The Amended Standards Regime
29	Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme
30	North Yorkshire Audit Partnership
31	Urgent Action
32	Sealing of Documents

Present: Councillor J Crawford in the Chair

J Cattanach, I Chilvers, Mrs D Davies, Mrs M Davis, J Deans, M Dyson, K Ellis, M Hobson, W Inness, M Jordan, C Lunn, D Mackay, Mrs C Mackman, J Mackman, B Marshall, J McCartney, Mrs K McSherry, C Metcalfe, R Musgrave, Mrs W Nichols, I Nutt, C Pearson, A Pound, I Reynolds, Mrs S Ryder, S Shaw-Wright, R Sweeting and J Thurlow

Apologies for Absence: Councillors D Peart, M Crane, Mrs E Casling, Mrs S Duckett, Mrs G Ivey, Mrs P Mackay, Mrs M McCartney, Mrs E Metcalfe, R Packham, R Price, R Sayner and Mrs A Spetch

Also Present: Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Executive Director S151, Executive Director Communities Selby, Managing Director of Access Selby, Director of Business Services, Democratic Services Manager.

Press: 0  
Public 8

## **17. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **18. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 15 and 29 May 2012, were confirmed as a correct record.

**Resolved:**

**To approve the minutes for signing by the Chairman.**

## **19. Communication**

### Disabled Persons' Parking Badges Private Members' Bill

The Chief Executive reported correspondence received from Simon Kirby MP which requested the Council's support for his Disabled Persons' Parking Badges Private Members' Bill and asked the Council to write to the Local MP expressing support.. The aim of the Bill was to reduce fraudulent use of Disabled Badges whilst protecting those with genuine need. The Council supported the Bill.

**Resolved:**

**To write to Nigel Adams MP offering Selby District Council's support for the Bill.**

## **20. Announcements**

The Chief Executive informed the Council that, due to her husband's ill health, Councillor Mrs G Ivey would be withdrawing from her Council duties for the foreseeable future. Councillor Mrs G Ivey had asked that her Special Responsibility allowance be suspended during this period.

The Council asked that its best wishes be sent to Councillor Mrs G Ivey and her husband.

**Resolved:**

**To send the Council's best wishes to Councillor Mrs G Ivey and her husband.**

**21. Petitions**

None received.

**22. Public Questions**

None received.

**23. Councillor's Questions**

Councillor J McCartney had submitted the following question to the Chair of Planning Committee.

Do you now regret telling the 30th May 2012 Planning Committee that the land to the rear of the old civic centre, that was proposed for new public car parking under the planning application to site a portacabin outside the old walkers bingo hall, was NOT up for sale? And, do you now accept that by telling the Planning Committee you effectively ensured that the planning Committee made a decision based on false information?

As Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor Deans responded by setting out the background to the issue. He highlighted that the land was not currently being marketed for sale.

**24. Reports from the Executive**

The Leader of the Council had submitted a report on the work he had undertaken since the last meeting. Councillor C Metcalfe outlined that during Councillor Mrs G Ivey's absence her portfolio would be split between the Leader and Councillor Lunn. Councillor Metcalfe stated that the Leader would respond in writing to questions on job creation and a meeting he had attended as Chair of the Employers Forum for Yorkshire and the Humber.

Councillor Mrs G Ivey, Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Executive Member for External Relations and Partnerships had reported on the work she had recently undertaken. In her absence, Councillor Metcalfe stated that questions relating to swimming pool provision and the Anti Social Behaviour Strategy would receive written responses.

Councillor C Lunn, Lead Executive Member for Finance, reported on the work he had undertaken within his portfolio. He responded to questions regarding the impact of the Right to Buy scheme on the Housing Revenue Account. He offered to provide written responses to questions raised regarding replacement windows and doors for certain Council properties, the Right to Buy discount purchase scheme and a Culture and Leisure Strategy for the Council.



Councillor J Mackman, Lead Member for Place Shaping, provided a report on his latest work. He updated the Council on the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD. He outlined that the Executive would receive a report on the next stages of the search for a suitable Traveller Site at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

Councillor C Metcalfe, Lead Member for Communities, gave an update on his work. He gave a detailed response to questions raised in respect of the future management of Barlow Common by The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

**Resolved:**

**To receive and note the reports from the Executive.**

**25. Reports from Committees**

The Chair of Policy Review Committee, Councillor M Jordan, reported on work of the Committee since the last Council meeting. He provided the Council with details of the debate at Policy Review Committee on the Olympia Park strategic development site.

Councillor Mrs W Nicholls, the Chair of Scrutiny Committee, outlined the recent work of the Committee. Councillor Nichols responded to questions regarding the presentation to the Committee from Selby Hospital Staff and in particular on the minor injuries unit.

Councillor Mrs C Mackman, the Vice Chair of Audit Committee, gave a verbal update to Council regarding the matters covered at the last meeting. She highlighted that the Committee had received the Annual Internal Audit Report 2011/12 in addition to Risk Registers for Access Selby, the Core and Communities Selby.

**Resolved:**

**To receive and note the reports from the Committees.**

**26. Motions on Notice**

A. Councillor Shaw-Wright moved the following motion.

**In the interests of local democratic accountability we respectfully request that the council looks to amend the constitution of the council to allow for questioning of executive members and Chairs of committees on any item that is within their remit, rather than items contained within the reports presented to council.**

Councillor Shaw-Wright outlined that the motion had been put forward to increase the level of accountability of the Executive and the

Committee Chairs to full Council. He also felt it would ensure improved access to information for all councillors.

Following debate, the Council broadly supported the proposal that each Executive member and Committee Chair could be questioned on any matter within their portfolio and that each executive councillor/chairs' question and answer session would be limited to no longer than ten minutes. Should they wish to do so, each councillor would be able to ask one question of each Executive member and Committee Chair followed by a related supplementary question.

**Resolved:**

- i) To amend, as necessary, the constitution to reflect that each Executive Member and Committee Chair could now be questioned, for a period of ten minutes, on any item within their remit. Furthermore, each Councillor would be able to ask one question of each Executive member and Committee Chair followed by a related supplementary question;**
- ii) To approve an operative date of 24 July 2012 for the amendments to the constitution.**

B. Councillor Mrs M Davis moved the following motion.

**The Labour Group wish to ensure that the rights of Scrutiny and the right to proper debate of call-in issues are enshrined within our Constitution to prevent the stifling of debate before an informed vote on the issue can take place.**

Councillor Mrs M Davis outlined that the motion had been put forward to improve the scrutiny process within the Council.

The Council discussed the perceived benefits and drawbacks of the current call in system. Councillor Mrs W Nichols highlighted some of the issues faced by the Scrutiny Committee. The debate focused on the process of validating a call in.

The Council felt that the motion should be referred to the Executive. The motion would then return to the 11 September 2012 meeting of the Council.

**Resolved:**

- i) To refer the motion to the Executive;**
- ii) To suspend debate on the motion until the meeting of Council on 11 September 2012.**

## **27. Olympia Park**

Councillor J Mackman presented the report which set out an appropriate policy framework to facilitate consideration of a planning application for the Olympia Park strategic development site.

Councillor J Mackman informed the Council that the report asked for approval to submit key documents for public consultation. He highlighted that the developers of the site had recently submitted a planning application which would be considered in due course by the Council's Planning Committee.

### **Resolved:**

- i) To approve the Olympia Park Delivery Framework Document, Masterplan and Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Document for consultation;**
- ii) To approve the timetable set out at paragraph 2.8 in the report;**
- iii) To approve the delegation arrangements set out at paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10 in the report.**

## **28. The Localism Act 2011 – The Amended Standards Regime**

Councillor Lunn presented the report which provided a draft Local Councillor Code of Conduct for consideration and adoption and an update on the appointment of independent persons.

Councillor Lunn highlighted that the Council was also encouraging Town and Parish Councils to adopt the same code of conduct. The code was based upon one recently adopted by the Yorkshire Dales National Parks Authority.

### **Resolved:**

- i) To adopt the draft Local Councillor Code of Conduct attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes;**
- ii) To note the action being taken to appoint two Independent Persons.**

## **29. Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programmes**

The Chief Executive introduced the report which asked Council to approve the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programmes.

The Work Programmes had been considered by each committee and the Executive prior to being received by Council.

**Resolved:**

**To approve the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programmes for the 2012/13 municipal year.**

**30. North Yorkshire Audit Partnership**

The Chief Executive reported that the North Yorkshire Audit Partnership ceased operations on 31 March 2012 and, as a consequence, the Council made no appointment to the Partnership Board for 2012/13. The Council had now been informed that a final meeting of the Board was necessary to effectively wind up the business and approve the final accounts.

**Resolved:**

**To appoint Councillors Crane and Lunn to the North Yorkshire Audit Partnership Board for the purposes of ensuring the proper winding up of the Partnership.**

**31. Urgent Action**

The Chief Executive reported urgent action he had taken in appointing an independent member to the Standards Committee. The appointment would continue for the remaining meetings of the Standards Committee.

**Resolved:**

**To approve the action taken by the Chief Executive.**

**32. Sealing of Documents**

To authorise the sealing of any documents necessary to action decisions of this Council Meeting, or any of its Committees and Boards for which delegated authority is not already in existence.

**Resolved:**

**To grant authority for the signing of, or the Common Seal of the Council being affixed to, any documents necessary to give effect to any resolutions hereby approved.**

The meeting closed at 7:54

## Extraordinary Council

Venue: Council Chamber  
Date: 24 July 2012

16	Apologies for Absence
17	Disclosures of Interest
18	Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE)
19	The State of Area Address
20	The Programme for Growth
21	Localism Act 2011 – Standards Arrangements – Appointment of Independent Person

Present: Councillor J Crawford in the Chair

I Chilvers, M Crane, Mrs D Davies, Mrs M Davis, J Deans, Mrs S Duckett, M Dyson, K Ellis, M Hobson, W Inness, M Jordan, C Lunn, D Mackay, Mrs P Mackay, Mrs C Mackman, J Mackman, B Marshall, J McCartney, Mrs M McCartney, Mrs K McSherry, C Metcalfe, Mrs E Metcalfe, R Musgrave, Mrs W Nichols, I Nutt, R Packham, C Pearson, D Peart, A Pound, R Price, I Reynolds and Mrs S Ryder.

Apologies for Absence: Councillors J Cattanach, Mrs G Ivey, Mrs W Nichols, R Price, S Shaw-Wright, I Reynolds, Miss R Sayner, Mrs A Spetch, R Sweeting, and J Thurlow.

Also Present: Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Executive Directors, Director of Community Services, and Democratic Services Officer.

Press: 0  
Public 2

### **33. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **34. Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE)**

Dr Colin Sinclair and Tim Bowden from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided a presentation on the forthcoming electoral review for Selby. The main points discussed included:

- It was explained that the role of the Boundary Commission included overseeing boundary changes and ensuring electoral equality. Information was also provided on the criteria needed for an electoral review. It was explained that the Commission had received a request from Selby District Council to carry out an electoral review.
- Mr Bowden explained that Selby would not be compared with other local authorities as each authority was viewed as unique by the Commission. Council was informed that the Commission had requested electorate forecasts from the Council for the next five years from the date of the end of the review along with information on likely residential developments in Selby.
- Councillors were informed of the review process. It was explained that the final recommendations would be approved by the Houses of Parliament. It was emphasised that during the consultation, the most effective representations would be based upon strong evidence. Councillors were encouraged to inform as many people and groups as possible during the consultation process.

Councillors raised the following queries:

- It was queried how would a large remote geographical area with a strong community identity be allowed to vary significantly from the elector:councillor ratio. In reply it was said that the Commission always aimed to get everything within +/- 10% variance however this was not always possible. The geographical size of an area would not be considered alone and evidence would need to demonstrate how communities sat together. It was explained that the Commission would consider adding two communities together rather than imposing an arbitrary split.
- It was queried how far ahead the Commission thought in terms of future electoral forecasts. It was explained that forecasts were being requested up to 2019.
- A query was raised concerning timescales and what was being required from Councillors and groups. The Commission were aiming to publish its recommendations by early 2014 and these would be implemented in time for the election in 2015. The Commission were after information outlining what was the right

number of Councillors to run the authority and what would be the correct ward boundaries.

- A query was raised concerning the County Council boundaries and the cost to the authority of this review. Councillors were told that County divisions would not be considered in the review. The Commission was funded by the Speakers Committee and did not charge the Council for the work undertaken. It was explained that the Commission would publish a number of reports for the review and these would be sent to the Council for printing and distribution. It was also acknowledged that there would be a resource implication with officers having to provide the Commission with the information requested.

The Chairman thanked Dr Sinclair and Mr Bowden for their attendance.

**Resolved:**

**To receive and note the presentation from the Boundary Commission.**

**35. The State of Area Address**

Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council, submitted the State of the Area Address for 2012.

**Resolved:**

- To receive and note the State of Area Address from the Leader of the Council;**

**36. The Programme for Growth**

The Leader of the Council introduced a presentation on the Programme for Growth which contained the following 'five big things'.

- Stronger Council
- Changing Places
- Living Well
- Tackling Tough Stuff
- Switched On

Each member of the Executive presented the element of the programme that they were responsible for.

Stronger Council

Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council, explained that due to the pressures on local Government, the Council had to be innovative in its approach to service delivery. Council was informed that there was a

cross party design group reviewing the Council's community engagement process and it was aimed to have direct contact with the Chair of the Leeds and North Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to allow the voice of the Council to be heard. Council was informed that the Programme for Growth would have a focus on jobs including attracting and supporting the creation of high quality jobs within the district.

### Changing Places

Councillor Mackman, Executive Lead Member for Place Shaping explained that it was important to make the most of the district and that a key driver was the Local Development Framework. Councillor Mackman explained that key elements of this initiative were housing and infrastructure. One aim was to improve the quality of housing which included bringing back housing into use that had fallen into disrepair. Council was informed that it was important that quality housing was available to all and developers would be worked with to bring forward key initiatives.

Councillor Mackman explained that the public realm was important and the Council would aim to provide greater flexibility with regard to section 106 agreements. Council was informed that there was a particular issue with regard to infrastructure in the Sherburn area and this would be raised when necessary with North Yorkshire County Council.

In response to a query on involving local Councillors in the process, Councillor Mackman explained that there would be a programme board created to over see the implementation of the 'five big things' and any potential schemes would go in front of the board. It was further explained that there would be a team for each of the five elements and each team would have the capability and opportunity to bring anyone on board.

It was stated that local co-ordinated transport assessments were important. Councillor Mackman stated that it would be useful to get together with North Yorkshire County Council regarding this. It was also suggested that Local Councillors should be invited to any meeting that was arranged.

### Living Well

In the absence of Councillor Mrs Ivey, Executive Lead Member for External Relations, Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council presented this element.

Councillor Crane stated that it was important to work with partners however it was also important that the Council took a lead in the provision of leisure and cultural facilities in the district. It was explained



that due to the fire at Abbey Leisure Centre, the Council had to re-appraise provision of leisure services in the district and improve access to leisure for communities outside Selby.

Council were informed that work would be done to identify the extent of existing provision in the district along with any gaps requiring attention or facilitation. Councillor Crane added that there would also be a project to make sure the Council offered affordable access to leisure to those who would be put off by cost.

Councillor Crane summarised that the Programme for Growth, working alongside partners and the wider community would ensure that the Council maximised everyone's opportunity for living well and enjoying longer and healthier lives.

In response to a query concerning a swimming pool at the proposed new facility, Councillor Crane confirmed that whether the Abbey Leisure Centre was reinstated or replaced it would have a pool and he thanked Sherburn and Barlby high schools for the access to their pools in the current period.

#### Tackling the Tough Stuff

Councillor Metcalfe, Executive Lead Member for Communities presented this element.

Councillor Metcalfe explained that it was important to break down myths and stereotypes with regard to the travelling community. It was stated that a small team had been set up to look at this and meetings had been held with residents. Ideas were currently being formulated to decide a way forward.

Councillor Metcalfe explained that housing was important and it would be necessary to challenge existing thinking and engage with Councillors and developers. A project board had been created and work streams had been scoped for this.

Council was informed that another important aspect was to develop the retail experience.

In response to a query concerning social housing, Councillor Metcalfe stated that discussions needed to be held with developers and it was important that Councillors were also engaged on this issue. The different ways of getting people on the housing ladder needed to be investigated and explored.

Concern was raised over the council house allocations system and that people from outside Selby were being allocated Council housing in the district. Councillor Metcalfe recognised this issue and stated the social

housing element needed to be raised however discussions were being focused on getting people onto the private housing ladder.

Councillors B Inness, J McCartney and Mrs M McCartney left the meeting.

#### Switched On

Councillor Lunn, Executive Lead Member for Finance and Resources presented this element.

Councillor Lunn explained that development would not have been possible without efficiency savings and that the Council was committed to delivering more with less. One of the developments that was mentioned was the introduction of high speed broadband which would assist businesses. It was expected that high quality broadband for the area would be rolled out at the end of this year which would allow people to have access to regular and next generation broadband.

Councillor Crane summed up and explained the work which would be undertaken by the Programme for Growth in the next three years. Councillor Crane recommended to Council that funding be allocated from the Special Projects Reserve for the programme.

#### **Resolved:**

- i) To receive and note the presentation from the Executive.**
- ii) To allocate £1,729m from the earmarked 'Special Projects Reserve – Revenue' to the Programme for Growth.**
- iii) To allocate £493k useable capital receipts, to a 'Special Projects Reserve' – Capital' for the Programme for Growth.**

#### **37. Localism Act 2011 – Standards Arrangements – Appointment of Independent Person**

The Monitoring Officer explained that the Chief Executive had used his emergency powers to approve the appointment of two Independent Persons before the latest deadline of 23 July 2012. It was explained that had an Independent Person been appointed after this date then they could only be appointed for one year.

#### **Resolved:**

- i) To note and endorse the Chief Executive's actions in appointing two Independent Persons.**

The meeting closed at 8:15pm.

## Item 9

Cliff Lunn Executive member for finance Report to Council

Sept 11<sup>th</sup> 2012

On 27<sup>th</sup> June I attended both the North Yorkshire Audit Partnership and procurement boards.

The audit partnership was a formality to dissolve the partnership board as it's functions have now been taken over by Veritau(north Yorkshire). This was agreed by council at a previous meeting.

Procure North Yorkshire presented the annual accounts and governance statement. Ways to implement the involvement of local companies in tendering and supplying were also discussed.

At the executive meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July I presented the annual Final accounts outturn report, details of which can be found on the website.

In the absence of Cllr Gillian Ivey I presented the annual review of the leisure contract with WLCT. It was noted that the coming 12 months presented considerable challenges to both WLCT and SDC but with commitment from both parties we are sure we will provide a commercially viable and sustainable leisure package for the district.

I declared an interest in the item on council tax localisation and this was presented by the leader, Mark Crane.

I have also attended meetings of the programme board which is guiding us to enact the five big things.

On 24<sup>th</sup> July I presented the "switched on" element of the five big things to the special council meeting. I am pleased to report that further to the information known at that time, much of Selby can now access high speed broadband, and that I myself am now connected via fibre optic cable.

On 7<sup>th</sup> Aug I attended a meeting with interested parties about the future of Abbey Leisure centre. I know many are frustrated by the slowness of the decision making process, but we have an opportunity to enhance leisure in Selby District and we must make the right decisions. These will be based on sustainability and affordability. The final decision will be made at full council.

Cllr Cliff Lunn

**Cllr John Mackman**  
**Executive Member for Place Shaping**

**Report to Council on 11 September 2012**

This report covers the period from the Council meeting on 26 June 2012. During this period I have attended scheduled Executive/Executive Briefing meetings, Selby Internal Drainage Board, North Yorkshire Building Control Partnership, North Yorkshire & York Spatial Planning and Transport Board, Parish Council meetings and attended case work as required.

**1) The LDF Core Strategy (CS)**

As Council is aware an Examination in Public (EIP) into the soundness of the Core Strategy was held between the 20 and 30 September 2011 and between 18 and 19 April 2012 in front of an independent inspector appointed by the Government.

The Inspector adjourned the EIP until 5 September for the Council to consider the implications of the NPPF and for the Council to consult on the further changes contained within the 6<sup>th</sup> set of proposed changes.

Consultations have been completed and responses considered with three further changes proposed under delegated authority in order to address valid issues raised by consultees and ensure robust consistency with the NPPF.

All documentation and proposed changes have now been submitted to the independent inspector for his consideration as modifications at the resumed EIP.

At the time of writing we await the inspectors programme for the resumed EIP on 5 September.

**2) The Site Allocation DPD Preferred Options (SADPD)**

Continued liaison with Officers. The Core Strategy continues to be the priority for Officers and as previously mentioned the SADPD will have to eventually take its lead from the Core Strategy and will need to reflect any changes made to the Core Strategy arising from the EIP.

Key issues that the SADPD will need to address when it resumes includes the planning requirements of the NPPF and the requirements of the new Planning Policy for Travellers. Of particular note is the need for all Authorities to have in place a supply of specific deliverable sites for travellers sufficient to provide five years worth of sites against locally set targets. Additionally they need to identify a supply of specific developable sites for years six to ten and when possible, for years eleven to fifteen.

It will be essential to have a robust up to date evidence base (GTAA report) which demonstrates local need and which will stand up to rigorous scrutiny by Inspectors. Achieving these objectives will be an essential requirement of the SADPD which, like the Core Strategy, will be subject to EIP as part of adoption procedures.

### 3) **North Yorkshire Building Control Partnership (NYBCP)**

Attended the NYBCP Board meeting in June and a special partnership meeting in August arranged to decide upon future office accommodation for the partnership.

As previously reported the depressed economy has severely impacted on activity levels in the building and construction industry resulting in significant shortfalls in NYBCP income. In the current operating year 2012/13 despite rationalisation costs of over £100,000 and flat lining income the Board aims to achieve a near break even situation.

Looking to the future and a return to improved business levels steps need to be taken to improve operating efficiency and workload capacity by making improvements to information technology. Accordingly, a spend to save project financed by revenue savings has been approved by the Board which will upgrade the partnerships current information technology. This will facilitate online application submission with payments, consultant access to application information and a document management system which will facilitate on screen plan checking resulting in financial savings and improvements in operating efficiency.

Concerns have been voiced by the Board that should the partnership not market its services to customers effectively it will inevitably reduce its market share in an increasingly competitive market which would impact on budgets and the long term viability of the partnership. These concerns are being addressed by the appointment of a Marketing Officer for a temporary period which will be extended if proven to be beneficial.

Regarding office accommodation the partnership considered all the options available and decided to continue to rent the current offices at least to 2016 the end of the current 9 year lease.

### 4) **North Yorkshire and York Spatial Planning and Transport Board**

This was a kick off meeting of this new Spatial Planning and Transport Board established under local government North Yorkshire and York.

The agenda covered:

- General Governance Arrangements
- Enhanced Broadband Coverage
- Strategic Planning of Infrastructure and duty to co-operate
- Memorandum of Understanding for the A64

### 5) **Programme for Growth**

A schedule of programme board meetings and intensive Executive seminars has been drawn up in order to determine the programme structure, priorities, timescales, resource issues and the overall package for growth.

Key components of the Housing and Infrastructure Programme are likely to include formulating and implementing projects on:

- Master planning
- Strategic site acquisitions
- Policy reviews
- Gateways and public realm
- Housing delivery and affordability mechanisms
- Removing barriers to progress

Clearly achieving the LDF Core Strategy and SADPD will be fundamental to the Housing and Infrastructure growth programme.

Councillor John Mackman  
23 August 2012

## CHRIS METCALFE EXECUTIVE LEAD COMMUNITIES

My work since last council has involved work with the:-

### CEF DESIGN TEAM.

I HAVE PRESENTED THE TEAMS FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS TO THE POLICY COMMITTEE WHERE THEY RECEIVED A POSITIVE HEARING.

WORK CONTINUES AROUND ISSUES OF GEOGRAPHY RAISED BY COUNCILLORS AS PART OF OUR WORK ENGAGING WITH MEMBERS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE. WE ANTICIPATE BRINGING FORWARD OUR PROPOSALS ON THIS ISSUE SHORTLY.

### TACKLING THE TOUGH STUFF TADCASTER

THERE HAS BEEN NO MEETING OF THE BOARD DURING AUGUST. THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR SEPTEMBER. WE WILL BE LOOKING AT REVIEWING OUR "EMPTY HOMES POLICY" AS PART OF OUR WORK PROGRAMME.

### NOTICE OF MOTION RE CALL IN PROCEDURE

AT THE LEADERS REQUEST I'VE TAKEN THE LEAD TO LOOK AT ISSUES AROUND " CALL INS " AND HOW THEY IMPACT ON THE WORK OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, ALSO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, POLICY COMMITTEE AND THE EXECUTIVE, TO EXPLORE HOW A MORE POSITIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIP CAN BE DEVELOPED. I HAVE HELD THREE SEPERATE MEETINGS WITH COUNCILLORS OVER A NUMBER OF NIGHTS TO LISTEN TO THEIR CONCERNS AND TO COLLECT THEIR THOUGHTS ON HOW IMPROVEMENTS CAN BE MADE. MY THANKS TO ALL THE COUNCILLORS WHO ATTENDED AND FOR THEIR CANDID CONTRIBUTIONS, THEY HAVE BEEN A TREMENDOUS HELP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MY REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE, ALONG WITH RECOMMENDATIONS.

WORK IS CONTINUING TO DEVELOP WAYS OF CREATING A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE TRAVELLER COMMUNITY AND THE SETTLED COMMUNITY AS THE COUNCIL MOVES FORWARD ON INDENTIFYING A ROLLING 5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY FOR TRAVELLER SETTLEMENTS.

Chris Metcalfe



## Item 10

### Report from Chair of Policy Review Committee – Councillor M Jordan

Our last meeting took place on July 17th. There were a number of key items to discuss and obtain feedback from officers and the Executive.

Item 1 concerned the Community Engagement Forums (CEFs) and what was planned in terms of reform to get better community engagement. A report on a 'design Team' set up to look at the whole issue came back to the Policy Review Board, and it presented its findings. Clearly there were those on the design team from both 'camps' those supportive and those who saw no actual need for the CEFs. This was a report that looked at the relationship of the CEFs and SDC, issues within the CEFs and how to move forward with them. Ideas have been put forward including how the partnership boards are to be run. It is clear that each area has different needs and it is clear that support mechanisms need to be sorted. Positive WIP is how I would describe it.

Item 2 of very specific interest was the work programme itself and the setting up of a Task and Finish group for developing a sound/robust Renewable Energy Policy for SDC. Funds have been allocated for the group to meet and receive the necessary officer support and the following is an outline of the timescale for that piece of work:

Sept---receiving information and briefing notes

Oct---Invite experts and discussing of issues

Nov---Consider options

Dec---Consider and agree recommendations to Policy Review

Jan---Policy Review Board consider the task groups recommendations and agrees submission to the Executive

I have the draft terms of reference with me if any member wishes to discuss later.

Item 3 was a discussion on the Exec papers with regard to the Localisation of Council Tax. There were a number of concerns raised by members and discussion around the 4 options took place. Option 4 was deemed most appropriate, details of which will appear later as consultation with NYCC and the other District Councils is essential to give a consistent approach. A report will come from the Executive to Full Council on 11Dec 2012 with a recommendation taking into account comments from The Policy Review Committee.

Lastly. During discussions a topic around spending a local pound locally came up and I was asked to do a bit of 'delving'. I have sent a report to the members of the Policy Review Committee and will await comments at the next meeting as to whether we wish to pursue further. Members may wish to 'Google'---' Bristol Pound' into their computer to get some insight into the subject.



## **Public Session**

**Report Reference Number C/12/6**

**Agenda Item No: 13**

---

**To: Council**  
**Date: 11 September 2012**  
**Author: Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive**  
**Lead Officer: Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive**  
**Lead Member: Councillor M Crane**

---

**Title: LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY REVIEW  
COUNCIL SIZE**

### **Summary:**

The Local Government Boundary Commission is undertaking a review of electoral arrangements at Selby District Council in response to an invitation from the Council to consider a reduction in Council size.

The review will commence in October and, in preparation, the Council has been invited to make a submission to the Commission on the appropriate future size of the Council.

This report presents a draft submission for discussion and adoption. The submission argues for a Council of 31 Councillors.

The Council's submission will be considered by the Local Government Boundary Commission in October. The Commission may choose to use the proposals put forward by the Council as the starting point for a wider consultation on Council size that will commence in October and conclude in December. The Commission will consider all representations made to it about Council size and in January 2013 the Commission will issue a "minded to" decision indicating the council size it is minded to adopt.

Following the determination of Council size the commission will embark upon a consultation exercise to establish a warding scheme to deliver electoral equality and proper representation based upon the size of council it is minded to approve. The Commission has indicated that it reserves the right to vary the size +/- 1 from its "minded to" decision to achieve the best warding scheme.

A final decision will be made in January 2014 to come into effect at the elections in May 2015.

### **Recommendations:**

**To consider and adopt Appendix A as the Council's Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission on Council Size.**

### **Reasons for recommendation**

To enable the Council to contribute to the Local Government Boundary Commission review of electoral arrangements at Selby District Council in accordance with the timetable laid down by the Commission.

## **1 Report**

- 1.1 As part of the move from 4<sup>th</sup> option to executive decision-making the Council consulted the public on the proposal to reduce the size of the Council. The result of the consultation showed support for a reduction.
- 1.2 In response, the Council invited the Local Government Boundary Commission to undertake an electoral boundary review. That review starts next month.
- 1.3 In preparation, representatives from the Commission made presentations to Councillors and representatives of the District's Town and Parish Councils in July. In addition the District Council has been invited to make a submission to the Commission outlining the Council's views on an appropriate size for Selby District Council in the future.
- 1.4 Attached at Appendix A is a draft submission for consideration by the Council. The Local Government Boundary Commission will consider the Council's submission in October before launching a period of consultation on the appropriate size of the Council which will last up to the end of the year. The Commission may take the Council's proposals as the basis of that consultation but it is not obliged to.
- 1.5 The Commission will issue a "minded to" decision on Council size in January 2013, reserving the right to depart from its "minded to" decision by +/- 1 when it considers warding patterns during 2013.
- 1.6 The submission argues that the appropriate future size of Selby District Council should be 31 Councillors.
- 1.7 This reflects:
  - 1.7.1 The new decision-making, scrutiny and overview, regulatory and community engagement arrangements now operating at the Council
  - 1.7.2 The evolving role of executive and non-executive councillors
  - 1.7.3 The workloads of the Planning and Licensing Committees and the abolition of the Standards Committee

- 1.7.4 The results of the LGA National census of Local Authority Councillors and the disparity of workloads demands on existing councillors at Selby
- 1.7.5 Current discussions about the most effective means of securing meaningful scrutiny and overview
- 1.7.6 The existing arrangements for community engagement and the proposals emerging from the design group looking at future streamlining of the CEF processes.
- 1.7.7 The number of double and triple hatted councillors and the difficulties believed to be experienced in recruiting candidates at elections
- 1.7.8 The fact that a reduction in the overall number of councillors will increase the opportunities for many more councillors to be actively involved in the widest range of council activities through membership of an overview and scrutiny body and a regulatory body and a community engagement forum or the executive and a community engagement forum.
- 1.7.9 The political view that the recent significant reductions in the Council's staffing establishment should be matched by a willingness to consider an equivalent reduction in the overall number of District Councillors
- 1.7.10 The potential to save £41,150 pa in Councillor Allowances (based upon current rates of allowance)

## **2 Legal/Financial Controls and other Policy matters**

- 2.1 **Legal Issues** – This report forms part of the process conducted by the Local Government Boundary Commission to review electoral arrangements and boundaries affecting Selby District Council. The Commission will consider the issue of Council Size at a meeting in October 2012 and the Council has been invited to make a submission to help inform their considerations. If the Council chose not to make a submission the Commission will proceed to consider the matter and adopt a “minded to” decision in any event.
- 2.2 **Financial Issues** – There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. A reduction in Council size from 41 to 31 offers the potential to save £41,150 pa in basic allowance (at current rates) from May 2015, but this is dependent upon the decisions of future Councils in relation to Councillor allowances.

## **3 Background Documents**

*Local Government Boundary Commission Guidance on Council Size*

**Contact Officer: Jonathan Lund, Monitoring Officer**

**Appendices:** Appendix 1 – SDC Submission on Council Size –  
September 2012

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

**ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SELBY DISTRICT**

**Submission by Selby District Council on Council Size**

**1 Introduction**

In 2010 Selby District Council began a process of consultation on proposals to move its decision-making arrangements away from a “4<sup>th</sup> option” committee structure and adopt the Leader/Executive model. As part of those consultations the Council also sought opinions on a proposal to reduce the overall size of the Council.

The proposal to reduce the size of the Council was based upon a belief that the new decision-making structures would significantly alter councillor roles, streamline decision-making and change the workload and demands placed upon Councillors.

Consultees supported both a move to Leader/Executive and a reduction in Council size and the Council wrote to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) asking to be considered for electoral review on 29 December 2011. The LGBCE wrote to the Council on 19 January 2012 confirming the Council’s inclusion in the review programme.

The issue of Council size is a key factor in establishing the basis for the review to be undertaken by the LGBCE.

The Council’s submission was agreed by the Council at its meeting on 11 September 2012.

**2. The Council’s Submission**

This section sets out the Council’s recommendation and a summary justification for that proposal. The submission which follows contains more detail on specific aspects of the rationale for the proposal.

The justification for the proposal to reduce the Council’s size to 31 elected members is summarised below:

- A smaller Council retains sufficient councillor capacity to run the current executive, scrutiny, regulatory and community engagement arrangements of the Council. Recent experience operating under a 4<sup>th</sup> option system also suggests that a smaller Council would also retain sufficient capacity to support any future governance model that the Council may wish to

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

adopt such as any variation on the cabinet / scrutiny model or a committee model, provided that the new arrangements were efficiently and effectively structured.

- Councillor workloads would remain manageable. Electors will continue to be able to receive comprehensive support from, and have good access to, councillors in all areas of the District.
- It still retains sufficient councillor capacity to provide for the evolution of the roles and responsibilities of councillors to be catered for to reflect local implementation of national policy initiatives in areas such as 'localism', public health, community safety and the recently published Open Services White Paper.
- It provides the basis for a good degree of electoral equality across the District through the 5 year planning period.
- The current national average Councillor / elector ratio for all Councils is 1: 2780. The current ratio for Selby District Council is 1: 1575. Under our proposal for a reduction to 31 Councillors the ratio at Selby would be 1: 2082 rising to 1: 2136 by 2018.
- This effectively moves the average Selby District Councillor / elector ratio significantly closer to the national average over the next five years and would almost match the current North Yorkshire District/Borough/County average of 1: 2178

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

<b>1. Governance and Decision Making</b>		
(a)	<p><b>Leadership:</b></p> <p>Governance Arrangements Decision-making model Portfolios and delegation Partnerships Leadership Roles</p>	<p>Selby District Council operates a strong Leader / Executive model which complies with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Leader/ Executive model was adopted by the Council in May 2011 and has significantly streamlined decision-making and provides clear accountability.</p> <p>There are five Executive Councillors including the Leader and each has cross-cutting portfolio responsibilities allocated by the Leader (External relations/Partnerships; Finance and Resources; Place Shaping and Communities)</p> <p>As part of the new Constitution adopted in May 2011 delegations to officers were substantially recast to ensure that Councillors were able to focus on the key strategic and policy issues, with day-to-day operational matters and policy implementation resting with officers. Executive decisions are made collectively at monthly Executive Meetings. There are no formal arrangements for individual Executive decision-making. Budget and Policy Framework proposals are developed by the Executive, scrutinised by the Policy Review Committee and decided by full council. Other matters requiring executive approval are able to be called-in by the Scrutiny Committee. Non-executive, regulatory functions are determined either by delegation or by the two regulatory committees.</p> <p>This has delivered clearer lines of accountability, permits the Leader/Executive to focus on providing strategic political leadership and ensures opportunities for prior and/or reactive scrutiny and overview whilst making appropriate provision for elected oversight of regulatory matters.</p> <p>Executive Councillors serve on a small number of external decision-making bodies including the joint committees delivering building control and procurement services, a strategic housing partnership and Yorkshire Leaders' and LEP Boards. The Council has been undertaking a comprehensive review of its appointments to outside bodies to reduce the number of appointments and reflect those organisations that are of strategic significance to the Council or where participation plays an important engagement role.</p>



**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>Leadership and portfolio roles are demanding but are not regarded as full-time. The Leader of the Council is in full-time employment and organises his time to enable one day per week to be devoted to Council business.</p> <p>Over the past 12 months there have been 12 executive meetings (including special meetings). The average number of reports per meeting has been 5.3 (min = 1 max = 9 reports) and the average duration of each meeting has been 1 hour 30 minutes.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Regulatory</b></p> <p>Licensing Planning Membership Frequency Attendance Legislative changes</p>	<p>Regulatory matters are dealt with by a Planning Committee and a Licensing Committee (each cover the whole district). The Standards Committee was abolished in June 2012. The new Constitution adopted in May 2011 incorporated substantial delegation to officers for day-to-day operational matters and policy implementation. There is wide functional delegation to officers except for budget and policy framework matters and a clearly expressed set of exceptions and limitations contained with the Scheme of delegation. This enables Councillors to focus on strategic matters and on new policy development.</p> <p>Both the Planning and Licensing committees meet monthly. Membership is fixed but substitutions are allowed and are frequently used, as a result attendance is good and inquaroate meetings are very rare.</p> <p>Greater officer delegation has reduced the number of planning matters being reported to committee (3.8 applications per meeting during 2011/12 with each meeting lasting an average of 1 hour 30 minutes). This has improved application processing times and allowed the Planning Committee to spend more time considering the more significant, major or controversial development applications.</p> <p>The extent of delegation to officers to deal with routine planning and licensing matters provides the capacity to reduce the size of the Planning and Licensing Committees whilst maintaining their effectiveness and frequency. The Standards Committee has been abolished in response to the Localism Act 2011.</p>

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

<p>(c) <b>Demands on Time</b></p> <p>Formal Role Description Training Time spent on council business Attraction and retention Failure to discharge duties Individual or ward budgets</p>	<p>The LGA National Census of Local Authority Councillors 2010 provides the most recent analysis of the time devoted to Council business. The results showed that, on average, Selby District Councillors spend 13.5 hours each week on Council business compared with a national average of 23 hours. Responses varied from less than five hours to over 26 hours per week. There appeared to be some correlation in the findings between respondents who reported a leading role in the Council or their group and the time spent on Council business. If these outliers are excluded it suggests that the average time spent on council business by Councillors in non-leading roles was around 9 hours per week.</p> <p>The Census was taken before Selby District Council adopted a Leader/Executive model and the disparity between councillors at Selby and between Selby councillors and the national average will have grown as a result. Currently 60% of Selby Councillors (25) serve on only one committee (in addition to their area Community Engagement Forum) and 40% of Councillors (16) serve on two committees – none serve regularly on more than two.</p> <p>Our strong Leader and Executive, regulatory, scrutiny and overview and community engagement processes reflect legal requirements and local political choice, but those choices were influenced by the need to try to identify legitimate, engaging and fulfilling roles for 41 Councillors. Some criticism has been made that parts of our current political management structures have been led by the need to “keep councillors occupied”. Since the last boundary review at Selby there have been significant changes to the way decision-making takes place and how the Council engages with its communities. The current council size fails to reflect those changes. The Council believes that a substantial reduction in the size of the Council is a better reflection of the current situation.</p> <p>Since the move to executive structures, finding ways to occupy and engage non – executive members has been a contentious issue with allegations being made, for example, that “Community Engagement Forums have been established with the purpose of finding roles for redundant councillors”. Recently, experience operating policy review and scrutiny arrangements have led councillors to begin to explore the possibility of streamlining that function and a major review of the Council’s five Community Engagement Forums is pointing towards the need to reduce the overall size of each Partnership Board by, amongst other things, reducing the number of District Councillor ex-</p>
--	--

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

officio members. These developments provide the Council with the capacity to accommodate a significant reduction in the overall size of the Council whilst allowing democratic decision-making, scrutiny and community engagement to function more effectively.

The Council now operates with an Executive of five. Excluding these posts and the Chairman, a Council size of 31 would leave 25 non-executive Councillors to fulfil the roles of Planning Committee (9-11 Councillors), Licensing Committee (7) Scrutiny Committee (7) Policy Review Committee (7), Audit Committee (5) and the Board of Access Selby (3) This provides 38-40 non-executive committee places or just under two places per councillor (allowing some spare capacity for substitution to cover illness, holidays and other commitments). In addition all 31 Councillors would each be able to play a full role on one of the district's Community Engagement Partnership Boards (providing an average of 5 or 6 Councillors per Board instead of the current average of 8).

The demands on Councillors would be more evenly spread. All Councillors would be involved in meetings of full council. In addition, an Executive Councillor would be a member of the Executive plus one CEF Board and a non-executive Councillor would be a member of two committees plus one CEF Board. It would also give non-executive Councillors the opportunity to be involved, on average, in one regulatory committee, one overview and scrutiny committee and one community engagement forum, ensuring that they were able to be fully engaged in the affairs of the authority and their community.

The Council provides a comprehensive Induction Programme for new and returning Councillors following the district-wide elections every 4 years. In between elections a regular programme of briefings and training opportunities are provided for all Councillors although attendance tends to be low with fewer than half the Councillors attending most events. Particular attention is paid to regulatory matters, standards and code of conduct issues, finance and new legislation/policy development. A "new councillors" group provides a forum for new councillors to meet with the Chief Executive and discuss issue of concern to them and provides an opportunity for experienced Councillors to act as mentors.

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>Uncontested elections are very rare but each of the local political parties reports difficulties recruiting candidates to fight all of the seats within the District. This has meant that some Councillors have postponed retirement in order to retain a seat for their party because suitable replacement candidates have not been available.</p>
<p><b>2. Scrutiny functions</b></p>		
<p>(a)</p>	<p>Scrutiny arrangements Workload and programmes Activities</p>	<p>The Council currently has three committees carrying out overview and scrutiny roles. The Scrutiny Committee scrutinises decisions and performance and helps hold the Leader and Executive to account. The Policy Review Committee contributes to the development of new policy and reviews the effectiveness of existing policy. The Audit Committee scrutinises and monitors the Council's control procedures, systems, and risk management processes.</p> <p>Each committee works to an annual work programme which they develop after consultation with the Executive. Each work programme is signed-off annually by full Council. These programmes allow for the proper management of business and resources whilst building in some capacity for reactive O&amp;S work in addition to the planned work.</p> <p>Most work programme matters are dealt with in Committee, some work, however, is more appropriately dealt with via small, time limited, task and finish groups. For example in 2011 a T&amp;F Group was tasked with reviewing the potential for Gypsy &amp; Traveller sites in the District to ensure that all reasonable options had been considered. Three councillors participated in a briefing, three meetings and a day-long site visit and reported their findings to Council two months later.</p> <p>Scrutiny and Overview committees are supported by a Chief Officer and Democratic Services Officers. Particular work streams are supported by officers familiar with or specialists in that work stream who will compile data and reports and draft the final report and recommendations for committee consideration.</p> <p>The Audit Committee is chiefly internally focussed, but both the Scrutiny Committee and the</p>

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>Policy Review Committee take evidence from external sources as their work programmes require. In the past year evidence has been received from the District's MP, bus service providers, North Yorkshire Police, the NHS, our Leisure Trust and Environmental Services partners, Governors of the local FE College and representatives of the gypsy and traveller community.</p> <p>Internally, Executive Councillors, senior officers and partner/contractor organisations have been questioned and held to account for the policies they pursue or the services they deliver.</p> <p>Effective management of the work programmes ensures that clear focus is maintained and outcomes are delivered in accordance with the planned timetable. The Council is confident that its proven ability to adopt and maintain a manageable but meaningful workload will enable it to deliver an effective and proactive overview and scrutiny function with a reduced membership.</p> <p>Currently there is an imbalance in workloads between councillors depending upon the degree of engagement with the work of task and finish groups etc. Some Councillors will be actively involved in T&amp;F group work, data gathering and information analysis. Others will be significantly less actively involved between meetings.</p> <p>Following some concerns about the appropriate role for the Scrutiny Committee consideration is being given to further streamlining the structures of the Scrutiny and the Policy Review Committees. Such a development would compliment the arguments for a reduction in Council size.</p>
<p><b>3. Representational Role of Councillors</b></p>		
(a)	<p>Casework Support Engagement Changing roles Hard to reach groups Community Groups and Parish Councils</p>	<p>There are five Community Engagement Forums (CEFs), each covering a distinct geographical part of the district. Forums are public meetings open to everyone. All of the District and County Councillors for the area together with four or five Parish/Town Council representatives, four or five co-opted community representatives, and partner representatives (police, fire, voluntary sector) serve on a CEF Partnership Board for each Forum. Each Board is responsible for</p>

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

developing a Community Development Plan and delivering its outcomes. Each CEF has a devolved budget (£20,000) to fund its work and support local organisations through grants. There are no individual or ward budgets. Non executive Councillors have the opportunity to play a community leadership role through the five Community Engagement Forums. The degree to which Councillors are active in the work of the CEFs varies considerably.

The CEFs meet five times each year and bring together District, County, Police and Fire Services plus the local voluntary sector, town and parish councils.

Each CEF is supported by a small team of Community Support Officers trained to deal with a wide range of local issues related to housing and landlord services, enforcement, environmental health, fly tipping, graffiti and other nuisances and benefits. They work closely with ward councillors to resolve issues in their patch. In addition Councillors respond to direct approaches from members of the public which they may deal with directly or pass on to the Community Support Team.

Following some concerns that CEF Boards were too large to be really effective, there are proposals to reduce membership. We are confident that a reduced number of District Councillors would be better placed than 41 to play an active and effective part in the work of the five CEFs. A Council size of 31 would provide around 5 or 6 District Councillors for each CEF area compared to the existing average of just over 8.

7 of the 41 District Councillors are also County Councillors and 22 are also Parish Councillors. 5 are “triple hatted” County and District and Parish Councillors. Whilst this overlap can bring advantages it may also reflect local political party difficulty in recruiting candidates to fill all of the elected roles which are currently available.

The list of Outside Bodies to which the Council makes appointments was reduced prior to the 2011 change in decision-making structures to reflect those organisations that are of strategic significance to the Council or where participation plays an important engagement role. The Council presently has member representation on 39 outside Bodies (Executive Councillors share 12 of these appointments and non-executive Councillors share the remaining 27).

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>Councillors use a range of routes to fix day to day problems: they signpost constituents to support and advice; raise issues with officers and/or executive councillors; refer matters to the local Community Support Team or seek solutions through the CEF Partnership Board. Councillors present views on policy at meetings of the Council. To further enhance the flow of information to Councillors the Democratic Services Team have begun to provide regular bulletins to members to support their constituency work, providing updates on services and plans affecting local communities.</p> <p>Some Councillors blog from time to time or maintain twitter accounts, most distribute newsletters and leaflets. No Councillors regularly offer ward surgeries.</p>
<b>4. The Future</b>		
(a)	Localism and Policy Development	<p>The Council has sought to anticipate and prepare for the demands created by the Localism Agenda. CEFs were established to help devolve local priority setting and decision-making, to manage and distribute a locally held budget and to harness local volunteer and community effort to implement very local solutions.</p> <p>The next development in the evolution of the CEFs is likely to be a streamlining of the numbers actively involved in CEF Partnership Boards to help ensure a greater focus on delivery. A reduction in the overall number of District Councillors will compliment this development and ensure that existing disparities in Councillor workloads are narrowed rather than widened.</p>
(b)	Service Delivery	<p>Over the past 10 years the Council has implemented an approach to service delivery in which the Council commissions services on behalf of the community.</p> <p>Refuse collection, recycling, street cleaning and grounds maintenance are commissioned from the private sector. Leisure Services are commissioned from a charitable trust. Support for CEFs is currently being commissioned from a mix of private and voluntary sector sources. Audit, procurement and building control services are provided through joint arrangements.</p>

**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>The Council's most ambitious move has been to establish Access Selby a distinct part of the Council tasked with delivering all Council services. A small core of officers, supporting democratic strategic decision-making, commission service delivery by Access Selby and Access Selby is held to account for the services it delivers. Over time both the Council and Access Selby will develop the capacity to operate at arms length and, in due course, the Council may choose to allow Access Selby to become a distinct and separate entity delivering services to a number of clients including Selby District Council.</p> <p>All of these developments have had an impact on the role of elected councillors and have served to move the focus away from day-to-day operations and implementation and much more towards decision-making on strategic issues, outcomes and performance management. Many of these functions are carried out principally by executive councillors under appropriate scrutiny and overview. We believe that these developments not only allow consideration to be given to a significant reduction in Council size, but would be enhanced by a reduction in the number of councillors.</p>
(c)	Finance	<p>The Council has responded decisively to the challenge of reduced central government grant and limits on the scope to increase council tax. An ambitious savings programme and the establishment of Access Selby has addressed the immediate financial pressures and has resulted in new commissioning based approaches to service delivery, new staffing structures – based around generic community support teams – and the greater use of CEFs to harness local effort to implement local solutions.</p> <p>The Council has significantly reduced its budgets, it has reduced staffing levels by 30% whilst striving to maintain performance, it also feels able to propose an equally bold reduction in the overall size of the Council.</p> <p>Although cost savings have not motivated the decision to seek a reduction in Council size, a Council with 31 Councillors would save £41,150 per year in basic councillor allowances (which is equivalent to 1% of Selby's Council Tax) and would contribute towards the Council's ongoing search for savings.</p>



**Selby District Council  
Draft Submission on Council Size  
September 2012**

		<p>We believe that the move to a leader/executive model, greater delegation, our focus on service commissioning, our experience of overview and scrutiny, the streamlining of our CEF arrangements, our community based support to Councillors and our promotion of community effort to solve local problems allow us to propose and gives us the confidence to recommend, a reduction in the number of District Councillors from 41 to 31.</p>
--	--	---