You are hereby summoned to attend a SPECIAL MEETING of the Rugby Borough Council, which will be held in the TOWN HALL, RUGBY, on Tuesday 23rd September 2014 at 7.00 p.m.

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Apologies for absence.
2. To approve the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 22nd July 2014.
3. Declaration of Interests.

To receive declarations of -

(a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

(c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 - non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

4. To receive and consider reports of officers.

(a) Approval of Accounts 2013/14 - Report of the Head of Resources.

(b) Election of New Leader of the Council - Report of the Executive Director.


(d) Rugby Borough Council Electoral Cycle - Report of the Executive Director in his capacity as Electoral Registration and Returning Officer.

(e) Electoral Review of Rugby Borough Council by The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (Lgbce) - Report of the Executive Director in his capacity as Electoral Registration and Returning Officer.
5. To receive the reports of Cabinet and Committees which have met since the last meeting of the Council and to pass such resolutions and to make such orders thereon as may be necessary.

(a) Cabinet – 15th September 2014


(2) Energy Efficiency Improvements to Council Housing Stock - Non Traditional Construction - Sustainable Inclusive Communities Portfolio Holder.

6. Motion to the Exclude the Public under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972

To consider passing the following resolution: -

“under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of information defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act and that in all of the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.”

PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION

1. To receive the private reports of Cabinet and Committees which have met since the last meeting of the Council and to pass such resolutions and to make such orders thereon as may be necessary:

(a) Cabinet – 15th September 2014

(1) Community Hall – Market Quarter Health Centre – Report of the Resources and Corporate Governance Portfolio Holder.

2. To receive and consider any private reports of officers.

(a) Rugby Town Junior Football Club, Land off Kilsby Lane, Rugby. Report of the Executive Director

DATED THIS 15th day of September 2014

Executive Director

To: The Mayor and Members of Rugby Borough Council
BACKGROUND

Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011, SI 2011 No. 817, which came into force in March 2011, it is a requirement that:

a) By 30th June the Chief Financial Officer (Head of Resources) must sign and date the statement of accounts and certify that it presents a true and fair view of the financial position and income and expenditure of the Council as at the end of 2013/14.

b) By 30th September the Council’s statement of accounts must be considered and approved by Council and signed and dated by the Leader of the Council and then published, including a report/opinion from the Council’s auditor (Grant Thornton).

Prior to approval by Council, the accounts are being presented for consideration by Audit & Ethics Committee.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2013/14

The 2013/14 statement of accounts has been prepared on an IFRS (International Financial Reporting Standards) basis and is more aligned to those of a private sector company. However unlike a private sector company, the Council has statutory limitations on how its expenditure is financed, resulting therefore in a variety of adjustments to the financial statements in order to determine those amounts chargeable to the local taxpayers and our housing tenants.

The statement of accounts, which has been circulated separately, comprises of the following financial statements:

i) Movement in Reserves Statement – This shows the amounts transferred to/from the various reserves held by the Council in order to provide services throughout the year, having taken account of statutory adjustments for financing.

ii) Comprehensive Income & Expenditure Statement – This shows the cost of providing the Council’s services in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Practices (GAAP).

iii) Balance Sheet – shows the value of the assets and liabilities of the Council.
iv) Cash Flow Statement – summarises the cash inflows and outflows in providing the Council’s services during the year.

v) Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Statements – In accordance with the statutory ring-fence, these show the income and expenditure relating to the provision of Council housing and also the overall amount taken from/contributed to HRA balances for the year.

vi) Collection Fund Statement – shows the transactions relating to business rates and council tax and illustrates the way in which they have been distributed between the Council, Central Government, Warwickshire County Council, Warwickshire Police and Parish Councils.

A detailed review of the 2013/14 financial statements and annual governance statement has been undertaken to make them clearer for the reader to understand.

Overall for 2013/14 the Council’s revised General Fund budgets were underspent by £0.561m (details can be found on page 4 of the statement of accounts). As a result of the surplus position and following the return of previously earmarked reserves the Council was able to transfer £0.840m to new earmarked reserves. In addition to the transfer to earmarked reserves, £0.331m was contributed to General Fund balances to leave the general reserve position at 31st March 2014 at £2.060m.

The original budget approved in February 2013 was set to leave HRA balances unchanged. During the year net budget changes of £4.151m were approved to be taken from balances; the majority of this approval related to an amount set aside for the repayment of HRA self-financing debt deferred from 2012/13. Further to this at year-end there was an HRA underspend of £0.843m, resulting in £3.308m being taken from HRA revenue balances to leave a total of £2.863m at 31st March 2014.

The accounts have been audited by Grant Thornton who have issued the attached audit findings report (Appendix 1) which states the financial statements give a true and fair view of the Council’s financial position as at 31st March 2014 and that the auditors anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion by 30th September. In addition they have concluded the Council has in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of its resources.

Appendix 2 is the Management letter of representation, which is to enable the Council to declare in writing that the statement of accounts and other presentations to the auditor are sufficient and appropriate and without omission of material facts to the best of the management’s knowledge.

A copy of the Financial Statements for 2013/14 and a set of summary accounts have also been circulated with this report and will be available on the Council’s website.
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The contents of this report relate only to those matters which came to our attention during the conduct of our normal audit procedures which are designed primarily for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements. Our audit is not designed to test all internal controls or identify all areas of control weakness. However, where, as part of our testing, we identify any control weaknesses, we will report these to you. In consequence, our work cannot be relied upon to disclose defalcations or other irregularities, or to include all possible improvements in internal control that a more extensive special examination might identify.

We do not accept any responsibility for any loss occasioned to any third party acting, or refraining from acting on the basis of the content of this report, as this report was not prepared for, nor intended for, any other purpose.
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**Appendices**

A Audit opinion
Section 1: Executive summary
Executive summary

Purpose of this report
This report highlights the key matters arising from our audit of Rugby Borough Council’s (‘the Council’) financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2014. It is also used to report our audit findings to management and those charged with governance in accordance with the requirements of International Standard on Auditing 260 (ISA).

Under the Audit Commission's Code of Audit Practice we are required to report whether, in our opinion, the Council's financial statements present a true and fair view of the financial position, its expenditure and income for the year and whether they have been properly prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting. We are also required to reach a formal conclusion on whether the Council has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources (the Value for Money conclusion).

Introduction
In the conduct of our audit we have not had to alter or change our planned audit approach, which we communicated to you in our Audit Plan dated 12 March 2014 other than we concluded it was not efficient to test employee remuneration controls in relation to completeness and we undertook additional substantive procedures.

Our audit is substantially complete although we are finalising our work in the following areas:

- reviewing our initial testing of housing benefit expenditure
- obtaining and reviewing the final management letter of representation
- review of final version of the Annual Governance Statement
- updating our post balance sheet events review, to the date of signing the opinion
- update our consideration of VFM, to the date of signing the opinion
- Whole of Government Accounts

We received draft financial statements and accompanying working papers at the start of our audit, in accordance with the agreed timetable.

Key issues arising from our audit
Financial statements opinion
We anticipate providing an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.

We identified one adjustment that affected the Council's reported financial position (details are recorded in section 2 of this report). The draft financial statements recorded net expenditure of £62,480k, the audited financial statements show net expenditure of £61,498k. This change relates to the reclassification of £982k of HRA components derecognised from net cost of services to other operating expenditure. We have also identified a number of adjustments to improve the presentation of the financial statements.
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Key issues arising from our audit (continued)
The key messages arising from our audit of the Council's financial statements are:
• the audit did not identify any material misstatements. Non trivial adjustments have been made to reclassify the £982k HRA component derecognition and reclassify £229k of NNDR credits from short term debtors to short term creditors.
• There are no unadjusted misstatements to report.
• we commend the Council for undertaking a detailed review of the financial statements and the annual governance statement to make them clearer for the readers to understand. We recommend this continues as an on-going review process.
• the restatements of prior year figures has been revisited as a result of the audit. The disclosures in respect of the IAS 19 change in accounting policy have been revised and the non material reclassification of S106 capital grants has been shown as an in year adjustment.
• we are satisfied that the carrying amount of Property, Plant and Equipment, based on the five year rolling programme basis adopted by the Council, does not differ materially from the fair value at 31 March 2014. In our view, however, this rolling programme does not meet the Code’s requirement in paragraph 4.1.2.35 to value items within a class of property, plant and equipment simultaneously. The approach taken by the Council is similar to many other authorities.

Further details are set out in section 2 of this report.

Value for Money conclusion
We are pleased to report that, based on our review of the Council's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources, we propose to give an unqualified VfM conclusion.

Further detail of our work on Value for Money is set out in section 3 of this report.

Whole of Government Accounts (WGA)
We will complete our work in respect of the Whole of Government Accounts in accordance with the national timetable.

Controls
The Council's management is responsible for the identification, assessment, management and monitoring of risk, and for developing, operating and monitoring the system of internal control.

Our audit is not designed to test all internal controls or identify all areas of control weakness. However, where, as part of our testing, we identify any control weaknesses, we report these to the Council.

Our work has not identified any control weaknesses which we wish to highlight for your attention.
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The way forward
Matters arising from the financial statements audit and review of the Council’s arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources have been discussed with the Chief Financial Officer.

Acknowledgment
We would like to take this opportunity to record our appreciation for the assistance provided by the finance team and other staff during our audit.

Grant Thornton UK LLP
22 August 2014
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Audit findings

In this section we present our findings in respect of matters and risks identified at the planning stage of the audit and additional matters that arose during the course of our work. We set out on the following pages the work we have performed and findings arising from our work in respect of the audit risks we identified in our audit plan, presented to the Audit and Ethics Committee on 8 April 2014. We also set out the adjustments to the financial statements arising from our audit work and our findings in respect of internal controls.

Changes to Audit Plan
We have not made any changes to our Audit Plan as previously communicated to you March 2014 other than we concluded it was not efficient to test employee remuneration controls in relation to completeness and we undertook additional substantive procedures.

Audit opinion
We anticipate that we will provide the Council with an unmodified opinion. Our audit opinion is set out in Appendix A.
Audit findings against significant risks

“Significant risks often relate to significant non-routine transactions and judgmental matters. Non-routine transactions are transactions that are unusual, either due to size or nature, and that therefore occur infrequently. Judgmental matters may include the development of accounting estimates for which there is significant measurement uncertainty” (ISA 315).

In this section we detail our response to the significant risks of material misstatement which we identified in the Audit Plan. As we noted in our plan, there are two presumed significant risks which are applicable to all audits under auditing standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks identified in our audit plan</th>
<th>Work completed</th>
<th>Assurance gained and issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Improper revenue recognition   | • review and rebuttal of the presumption of fraud in revenue recognition for all revenue streams other than housing subsidy and housing rents  
• review of Council's controls to ensure that housing benefit and housing rents revenue is correctly recognised  
• substantive testing of significant revenue streams to ensure not materially overstated and confirm recognised in the correct period | Our audit work has not identified any issues in respect of revenue recognition. |

| 2. Management override of controls | • review of accounting estimates, judgements and decisions made by management  
• testing of journal entries  
• review of unusual significant transactions | Our audit work has not identified any evidence of management override of controls. In particular the findings of our review of journal controls and testing of journal entries has not identified any significant issues.  
We set out later in this section of the report our work and findings on key accounting estimates and judgments. |
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Audit findings against other risks

In this section we detail our response to the other risks of material misstatement which we identified in the Audit Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction cycle</th>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>Work completed</th>
<th>Assurance gained &amp; issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>Creditors understated or not recorded in the correct period</td>
<td>We have undertaken the following work in relation to this risk:</td>
<td>Our audit work has not identified any significant issues in relation to the risk identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• documented our understanding of processes and key controls over the transaction cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• undertaken walkthrough of the key controls to assess the whether those controls are designed effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewed and assessed the year end closedown procedures for capturing creditor accruals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantively tested year end creditors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantively tested pre and post year end purchase orders and payments to ensure expenditure is recorded in the correct period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit findings against other risks

In this section we detail our response to the other risks of material misstatement which we identified in the Audit Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction cycle</th>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>Work completed</th>
<th>Assurance gained &amp; issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employee remuneration | Employee remuneration accrual understated | We have undertaken the following work in relation to this risk:  
• documented our understanding of processes and key controls over the transaction cycle  
• undertaken walkthrough of the key controls to assess the whether those controls are designed effectively  
• Reviewed and assessed the year end closedown procedures for capturing payroll accruals.  
• Undertaken a trends analysis of the monthly payroll costs  
• Substantively tested completeness of year end payroll creditors  
• Substantively tested pre and post year end purchase orders and payments to ensure expenditure is recorded in the correct period.  
• Substantive testing of the completeness of IAS19 pension liabilities | Our audit work has not identified any significant issues in relation to the risk identified.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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Audit findings against other risks

In this section we detail our response to the other risks of material misstatement which we identified in the Audit Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction cycle</th>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>Work completed</th>
<th>Assurance gained &amp; issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Welfare expenditure** | Welfare benefit expenditure improperly computed | We have undertaken the following work in relation to this risk:  
• documented our understanding of processes and key controls over the transaction cycle  
• undertaken walkthrough of the key controls to assess the whether those controls are designed effectively  
• Undertaken a predictive analytical review based on DWP statistics  
• Performed the initial testing of benefit expenditure by following the Audit Commission HBCOUNT methodology | Our audit work has not identified any significant issues to date. We are undertaking our evaluation of the initial benefits testing and will provide an update at the 16 September 2014 Audit and Ethics Committee.                                                                 |
| **Housing Rent Revenue Account** | Revenue transactions not recorded | We have undertaken the following work in relation to this risk:  
• documented our understanding of processes and key controls over the transaction cycle  
• undertaken walkthrough of the key controls to assess the whether those controls are designed effectively  
• undertaken a predictive analytical review of rent income  
• undertaken a reconciliation of the council dwellings on the fixed asset register to the rent system | Our audit work has not identified any significant issues in relation to the risk identified.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
## Accounting policies, estimates & judgements

In this section we report on our consideration of accounting policies, in particular revenue recognition policies, and key estimates and judgements made and included with the Council’s financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting area</th>
<th>Summary of policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Revenue recognition**                      | • The Council has a general revenue recognition policy that revenues are recognised on an accruals basis  
• There are specific revenue recognitions policies for grants, council tax and NNDR disclosed alongside the related notes.                                                                                     | • We are satisfied that the policies are appropriate under the Code of Practice on Local Council Accounting in the UK supported by IFRS accounting framework  
• We are satisfied that the policies require limited amount of judgement and have been adequately disclosed.                                                                                                           | green      |
| **Judgements and estimates –Pension fund valuations** | The valuation of pension fund assets and liabilities requires significant estimates and complex judgements. It is disclosed as a major source of estimation uncertainty showing the impact of 1% change in the discount factor.  
• The cost of providing pensions is charged in accordance with IAS19.                                                                                                                                               | • We are satisfied that the policies are appropriate under the Code of Practice on Local Council Accounting in the UK supported by IFRS accounting framework  
• We are satisfied that pension fund estimates and judgments have been appropriately disclosed as a major source of estimation uncertainty and that sensitivities regarding the principal assumptions have been disclosed. | green      |
| **Judgements and estimates –recover of VAT on the jointly controlled crematorium expenditure** | • Debtors include £397k VAT recoverable from Daventry in respect of the jointly purchased crematorium. Daventry have significantly exceed the 5% PEL deminimus but have employed LAVAT consultant who is acting to obtain agreement with HMRC for the recovery. The Council assessment is that this VAT will be recovered and no impairment is required. | • This is a non trivial, non material debtor balance and does not require disclosure as a critical judgement. We are satisfied that management have assessed the recoverability of this debtor and their judgement is that it is probable that the money will be recovered. | green      |

### Assessment

- Marginal accounting policy which could potentially attract attention from regulators
- Accounting policy appropriate and disclosures sufficient
- Accounting policy appropriate but scope for improved disclosure

© 2014 Grant Thornton UK LLP | Rugby Borough Council | 2013/14
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Accounting policies, estimates & judgements

In this section we report on our consideration of accounting policies, in particular revenue recognition policies, and key estimates and judgements made and included with the Council’s financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting area</th>
<th>Summary of policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Judgements and estimates - PPE** | • Note 16 of the accounts sets out the Council’s rolling programme of revaluations. This shows that the date of valuations vary between 1 April 2011 and 1 April 2013. This approach is similar to many other authorities and we are satisfied that the carrying amount of Property, Plant and Equipment (based on these valuations) does not differ materially from the fair value at 31 March 2014. In our view, however, this rolling programme does not meet the Code’s requirement in paragraph 4.1.2.35 to value items within a class of property, plant and equipment simultaneously.  
• This paragraph of the Code, which is based on IAS 16 Property, Plant and Equipment, does permit a class of assets to be revalued on a rolling basis provided that:  
  - the revaluation of the class of assets is completed within a ‘short period’  
  - the revaluations are kept up to date | • In our view, however, we would normally expect this ‘short period’ to be within a single financial year. This is because the purpose of simultaneous valuations is to ‘avoid reporting a mixture of costs and values as at different dates’. This purpose is not met where a revaluation programme for a class of assets straddles more than one financial year.  
• Having discussed this issue with officers the rationale for not carrying out revaluations within a single financial year is that the cost of revaluations does not represent value for money | ☢  Amber |
| **Other accounting policies** | • We have reviewed the Council’s policies against the requirements of the CIPFA Code and accounting standards. | • Our review of accounting policies has not highlighted any issues which we wish to bring to your attention | ☻ |
Adjusted misstatements

A number of adjustments to the draft financial statements have been identified during the audit process. We are required to report all misstatements to those charged with governance, whether or not the financial statements have been adjusted by management. The table below summarises the adjustments arising from the audit which have been processed by management.

**Impact of adjusted misstatements**

All adjusted misstatements are set out below along with the impact on the primary statements and the reported financial position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Account £'000</th>
<th>Balance Sheet £'000</th>
<th>Impact on total net expenditure £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Reclassification of the council dwellings component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>derecognition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- net cost of services</td>
<td>(982)</td>
<td>(982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- other operating expenditure</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Reclassification of NNDR credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- short term debtors</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- short term creditors</td>
<td></td>
<td>(229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall impact</strong></td>
<td>£nil</td>
<td>£nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Misclassifications & disclosure changes

The table below provides details of misclassification and disclosure changes identified during the audit which have been made in the final set of financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment type</th>
<th>Value £'000</th>
<th>Account balance</th>
<th>Impact on the financial statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Disclosure</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>Earmarked GF reserves Capital grants unapplied</td>
<td>MIRS -2012/13 audited figures were re-stated to correct the classification of s106 capital funds. This was not a material error and should not have been shown as a prior period adjustment. It has now been shown as an in year adjustment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 Disclosure    | 982        | Council dwellings component derecognition | Adjustment to primary statements is reflected in related notes:  
- Note 10 Adjustments between accounting basis and funding basis under regulations  
- Note 12 other operating expenditure  
- HRA account statement and notes |
| 3 Disclosure    | 1,695      | Council dwellings reversals of depreciation on revaluation | Note 16 2013/14 PPE movement table. Reclassified as depreciation written out to surplus/deficit on provision of services from other movements in depreciation and impairment |
Other communication requirements

We set out below details of other matters which we are required by auditing standards to communicate to those charged with governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Matters in relation to fraud</td>
<td>• We have previously discussed the risk of fraud with the Audit and Ethics Committee. We have not been made aware of any significant incidents in the period and no other issues have been identified during the course of our audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matters in relation to laws and regulations</td>
<td>• We are not aware of any significant incidences of non-compliance with relevant laws and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Written representations</td>
<td>• A standard letter of representation has been requested from the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Disclosures | • The disclosure of the re-statement of the prior year figures in respect of the IAS19 change in accounting policy has been revised and the non material re-classification of capital s106 balances is now shown as an in year adjustment. New terminology for IAS19 movements updated.  
• Note 6 officers remuneration 2012/13 figures have been corrected and now agree to 2012/13 audited financial statements.  
• Two amendments were made to note 6 officers remuneration 2013/14 figures. Head of Business Transformation benefits in kind has been corrected from £450 to £nil and totals amended accordingly. Head of Resources benefits in kind has been corrected from £2,620 to £2,765 and totals amended accordingly.  
• A number of other minor disclosure and presentational amendments have been made. |
| 5. Matters in relation to related parties | • We are not aware of any related party transactions which have not been disclosed. |
| 6. Going concern | • Our work has not identified any reason to challenge the Council’s decision to prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis. |
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Value for Money conclusion
The Code of Audit Practice 2010 (the Code) describes the Council's responsibilities to put in place proper arrangements to:

- secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources;
- ensure proper stewardship and governance; and
- review regularly the adequacy and effectiveness of these arrangements.

We are required to give our VFM conclusion based on two criteria specified by the Audit Commission which support our reporting responsibilities under the Code. These criteria are:

The Council has proper arrangements in place for securing financial resilience - the Council has robust systems and processes to manage effectively financial risks and opportunities, and to secure a stable financial position that enables it to continue to operate for the foreseeable future.

The Council has proper arrangements for challenging how it secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness - the Council is prioritising its resources within tighter budgets, for example by achieving cost reductions and by improving efficiency and productivity.

Key findings
Securing financial resilience
We have considered the Council's arrangements to secure financial resilience against the following themes:

- Key financial performance indicators
- Financial governance
- Financial planning
- Financial control

Overall our work highlighted that whilst the Council continues to face financial challenges, it has proper arrangements in place for securing financial resilience. The budgeting systems remain robust and at 31 March 2014 the Council contributed £1,072k (taking account of £561k underspend) to the General Fund balances and reserves and £1,411k (taking account of £843k underspend) to HRA balances and reserves.

A balanced budget has been set for 2014/15 and the Council has been able to freeze Council tax for the fifth consecutive year and give a one-off 3 per cent rebate. The medium term financial plan (MTFP) currently shows funding gaps in 2015/16 (£370k) and 2016/17 (£104k) before returning to forecast surplus in 2017/18 (£94k). The 2015/16 gap primarily arises from a step change in waste services as the result of growth in housing. The Council is exploring alternatives to mitigate these gaps, including a review of its fees and charges policy, but does have sufficient general fund balances to address this issue in the short term.

The Council's MTFP is not reliant on making service cuts or compulsory redundancies and sets out a good response to the expected changes to future funding of Councils.
Value for Money

Challenging economy, efficiency and effectiveness
We have considered the Council's arrangements to challenge economy, efficiency and effectiveness against the following themes:

- Prioritising resources
- Improving efficiency & productivity

Overall our work highlighted that the Council is prioritising its resources to take account of the continuing tighter constraints that councils are required to operate within.

The Local Government Association peer review undertaken in 2013/14 found the Council to be good, delivering good services and outcomes for local people within the back drop of a recession.

As part of its work to mitigate funding gaps currently identified in the MTFP the Council is exploring the opportunities for further savings. As part of the West Midlands Improvement and Efficiency Partnership, the Council participated in a recent benchmarking study on fees and charges and is using this to help inform its review of the fees and charges policy. Our detailed risk assessment has not identified any significant VFM issues to follow up or report.

Overall VFM conclusion
On the basis of our work, and having regard to the guidance on the specified criteria published by the Audit Commission, we are satisfied that in all significant respects the Council has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year ending 31 March 2014.
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Fees, non audit services and independence

We confirm below our final fees charged for the audit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Per Audit plan</th>
<th>Actual fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council audit</td>
<td>£72,390</td>
<td>£73,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant certification</td>
<td>£11,218</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total audit fees</td>
<td>£83,608</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There is additional fee of £900 in respect of work on material business rates balances. This additional work was necessary as auditors are no longer required to carry out work to certify NDR3 claims. The additional fee has been estimated by the Audit Commission based on 50% of the average fee previously charged for NDR3 certifications for District Council and is subject to final determination by the Audit Commission.

** Revised indicative fee reflecting 12 per cent reduction for the certification of the housing benefit subsidy claim to reflect the removal of council tax benefit from the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees for other services</th>
<th>Fees £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independence and ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We have complied with the Auditing Practices Board’s Ethical Standards and therefore we confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of the Auditing Practices Board’s Ethical Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Communication of audit matters

Communication of audit matters to those charged with governance

International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 260, as well as other ISAs, prescribe matters which we are required to communicate with those charged with governance, and which we set out in the table opposite.

The Audit Plan outlined our audit strategy and plan to deliver the audit, while this Audit Findings report presents the key issues and other matters arising from the audit, together with an explanation as to how these have been resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respective responsibilities</th>
<th>Audit Plan</th>
<th>Audit Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Audit Findings Report has been prepared in the context of the Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies issued by the Audit Commission (<a href="http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>).</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have been appointed as the Council's independent external auditors by the Audit Commission, the body responsible for appointing external auditors to local public bodies in England. As external auditors, we have a broad remit covering finance and governance matters.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our annual work programme is set in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice ('the Code') issued by the Audit Commission and includes nationally prescribed and locally determined work. Our work considers the Council's key risks when reaching our conclusions under the Code.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for. We have considered how the Council is fulfilling these responsibilities.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our communication plan</th>
<th>Audit Plan</th>
<th>Audit Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respective responsibilities of auditor and management/those charged with governance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the planned scope and timing of the audit. Form, timing and expected general content of communications</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views about the qualitative aspects of the entity's accounting and financial reporting practices, significant matters and issues arising during the audit and written representations that have been sought</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of independence and objectivity</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statement that we have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence, relationships and other matters which might be thought to bear on independence. Details of non-audit work performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP and network firms, together with fees charged Details of safeguards applied to threats to independence</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material weaknesses in internal control identified during the audit</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification or suspicion of fraud involving management and/or others which results in material misstatement of the financial statements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with laws and regulations</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected auditor's report</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected misstatements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant matters arising in connection with related parties</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant matters in relation to going concern</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A: Audit opinion

We anticipate we will provide the Council with an unmodified audit report

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT TO THE MEMBERS OF RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Opinion on the Authority financial statements

We have audited the financial statements of Rugby Borough Council for the year ended 31 March 2014 under the Audit Commission Act 1998. The financial statements comprise the Movement in Reserves Statement, the Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement, the Balance Sheet, the Cash Flow Statement, the Housing Revenue Account Income and Expenditure Statement, the Movement on the Housing Revenue Account Statement and Collection Fund and the related notes. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and the CIPFA/LASAAC Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2013/14.

This report is made solely to the members of Rugby Borough Council in accordance with Part II of the Audit Commission Act 1998 and for no other purpose, as set out in paragraph 48 of the Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies published by the Audit Commission in March 2010. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the Authority and the Authority's Members as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of the Chief Financial Officer and auditor

As explained more fully in the Statement of the Chief Financial Officer's Responsibilities, the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for the preparation of the Statement of Accounts, which includes the financial statements, in accordance with proper practices as set out in the CIPFA/LASAAC Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom, and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view. Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board's Ethical Standards for Auditors.

Scope of the audit of the financial statements

An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes an assessment of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the Authority's circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed; the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the Chief Financial Officer; and the overall presentation of the financial statements. In addition, we read all the financial and non-financial information in the foreword to identify material inconsistencies with the audited financial statements and to identify any information that is apparently materially incorrect based on, or materially inconsistent with, the knowledge acquired by us in the course of performing the audit. If we become aware of any apparent material misstatements or inconsistencies we consider the implications for our report.

Opinion on financial statements

In our opinion the financial statements:

• give a true and fair view of the financial position of Rugby Borough Council as at 31 March 2014 and of its expenditure and income for the year then ended; and
• have been properly prepared in accordance with the CIPFA/LASAAC Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2013/14 and applicable law.

Opinion on other matters

In our opinion, the information given in the foreword for the financial year for which the financial statements are prepared is consistent with the financial statements.

Matters on which we report by exception

We report to you if:

• in our opinion the annual governance statement does not reflect compliance with 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: a Framework' published by CIPFA/SOLACE in June 2007;
• we issue a report in the public interest under section 8 of the Audit Commission Act 1998;
• we designate under section 11 of the Audit Commission Act 1998 any recommendation as one that requires the Authority to consider it at a public meeting and to decide what action to take in response; or
• we exercise any other special powers of the auditor under the Audit Commission Act 1998.

We have nothing to report in these respects.
Conclusion on the Authority's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources

Respective responsibilities of the Authority and the auditor

The Authority is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources, to ensure proper stewardship and governance, and to review regularly the adequacy and effectiveness of these arrangements.

We are required under Section 5 of the Audit Commission Act 1998 to satisfy ourselves that the Authority has made proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. The Code of Audit Practice issued by the Audit Commission requires us to report to you our conclusion relating to proper arrangements, having regard to relevant criteria specified by the Audit Commission.

We report if significant matters have come to our attention which prevent us from concluding that the Authority has put in place proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. We are not required to consider, nor have we considered, whether all aspects of the Authority's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources are operating effectively.

Scope of the review of arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources

We have undertaken our audit in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice, having regard to the guidance on the specified criteria, published by the Audit Commission in October 2013, as to whether the Authority has proper arrangements for:

- securing financial resilience; and
- challenging how it secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

The Audit Commission has determined these two criteria as those necessary for us to consider under the Code of Audit Practice in satisfying ourselves whether the Authority put in place proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year ended 31 March 2014.

We planned our work in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice. Based on our risk assessment, we undertook such work as we considered necessary to form a view on whether, in all significant respects, the Authority had put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

Conclusion

On the basis of our work, having regard to the guidance on the specified criteria published by the Audit Commission in October 2013, we are satisfied that, in all significant respects, Rugby Borough Council put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year ended 31 March 2014.

Certificate

We certify that we have completed the audit of the financial statements of Rugby Borough Council in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Code of Audit Practice issued by the Audit Commission.

John Gregory
Director for and on behalf of Grant Thornton UK LLP, Appointed Auditor

Colmore Plaza
20 Colmore Circus
Birmingham
B4 6AT

xx September 2014
Dear Sirs

Rugby Borough Council

Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2014

This representation letter is provided in connection with the audit of the financial statements of Rugby Borough Council for the year ended 31 March 2014 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards. We confirm that to the best of our knowledge and belief having made such inquiries as we considered necessary for the purpose of appropriately informing ourselves:

Financial Statements

i  We have fulfilled our responsibilities for the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with proper practices as set out in the CIPFA/LASAAC Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in Great Britain ("the Code") as adapted for International Financial Reporting Standards; in particular the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance therewith.

ii  We have complied with the requirements of all statutory directions and these matters have been appropriately reflected and disclosed in the financial statements.

iii  The Council has complied with all aspects of contractual agreements that could have a material effect on the financial statements in the event of non-compliance.

iv  We acknowledge our responsibility for the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control to prevent and detect fraud.

v  Significant assumptions used by us in making accounting estimates, including those measured at fair value, are reasonable.

vi  We are satisfied that the material judgements used by us in the preparation of the financial statements are soundly based, in accordance with the Code, and adequately disclosed in the financial statements. There are no further material
judgements that need to be disclosed.

vii Except as stated in the financial statements:
   a there are no unrecorded liabilities, actual or contingent
   b none of the assets of the Council has been assigned, pledged or mortgaged
   c there are no material prior year charges or credits, nor exceptional or non-recurring items requiring separate disclosure.

viii We confirm that we are satisfied that the actuarial assumptions underlying the valuation of pension scheme liabilities for IAS19 disclosures are consistent with our knowledge. We confirm that all settlements and curtailments have been identified and properly accounted for. We also confirm that all significant retirement benefits have been identified and properly accounted for.

ix Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of International Financial Reporting Standards and the Code.

x All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which International Financial Reporting Standards and the Code require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed.

xi Actual or possible litigation and claims have been accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of International Financial Reporting Standards.

xii We have not adjusted the misstatements brought to our attention in the Audit Findings Report, as they are considered to be immaterial to the results of the Council and its financial position at the year-end. The financial statements are free of material misstatements, including omissions.

xiii We have no plans or intentions that may materially alter the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities reflected in the financial statements.

xiv We believe that the Council’s financial statements should be prepared on a going concern basis on the grounds that current and future sources of funding or support will be more than adequate for the Council’s needs. We believe that no further disclosures relating to the Council’s ability to continue as a going concern need to be made in the financial statements.

Information Provided

xv We have provided you with:
   a access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
   b additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of your audit; and
   c unrestricted access to persons within the Council from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
We have communicated to you all deficiencies in internal control of which management is aware.

All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.

We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.

We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the Council and involves:
   a. management;
   b. employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
   c. others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.

We have disclosed to you all information in relation to allegations of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the Council's financial statements communicated by employees, former employees, regulators or others.

We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing financial statements.

We have disclosed to you the entity of the Council's related parties and all the related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.

We have disclosed to you all known actual or possible litigation and claims whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.

Annual Governance Statement

We are satisfied that the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) fairly reflects the Council's risk assurance and governance framework and we confirm that we are not aware of any significant risks that are not disclosed within the AGS.

Approval

The approval of this letter of representation was minuted by the Audit and Ethics Committee at its meeting on 16 September 2014. It was discussed and agreed by the Authority at the meeting of Full Council on 23rd September 2014.

Signed on behalf of the Board

Name... Adam Norburn
Position...Executive Director.
Date...23rd September 2014....

Name...Mannie Grewal Ketley
Position...Head of Resources..........................
Date...23rd September 2014..........................
AGENDA ITEM 4(b)

SPECIAL COUNCIL – 23rd SEPTEMBER 2014

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ELECTION OF A NEW LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 29th August 2014 Councillor Craig Humphrey resigned as a councillor and Leader of the Council. In accordance with Part 1b Paragraph 7.5.3 of the Council’s Constitution, the Deputy Leader at that time, Councillor Derek Poole, automatically took over as Leader of the Council.

1.2 A further consequence of Councillor Humphrey’s resignation was that the ruling Conservative Group was left without a Group Leader. On 5th September 2014 the Group held a ballot to elect a new Group Leader. The election was won by Councillor Michael Stokes.

1.3 It is convention for the Leader of the Council to be the Leader of the largest political group on the Council. As the duly elected leader of the ruling Group it is appropriate that Councillor Stokes should now be nominated to become the Leader of the Council.

1.4 In accordance with Part 1b Paragraph 4.2d of the Council’s Constitution, only Full Council can appoint a new Leader.

2. EXERCISE OF FUNCTIONS

2.1 In accordance with Part 2a Paragraph 5.1e of the Council’s Constitution, if a new Leader of the Council is appointed, any changes that they choose to make to any of the following will need to be reported to the next available meeting of Council that is not an extraordinary meeting:

i) Deputy Leader
ii) Members of the Cabinet
iii) The number of portfolios and the allocation of responsibilities within portfolios
iv) Portfolio holders
v) The delegation of authority to Cabinet members

RECOMMENDATION

1. Councillor Michael Stokes be elected as the new Leader of Rugby Borough Council.
INTRODUCTION

As required by Section 18 of the Representation of the People Act 1983, Rugby Borough Council is obliged to carry out a review of all the polling districts and polling places within the parliamentary constituency of Rugby.

Between 11 October and 6 December 2013, Rugby Borough Council carried out an initial period of public consultation seeking views on current electoral arrangements.

Draft recommendations were prepared and issued on 10 March 2014 for a further period of public consultation that ended on 20 June 2014.

Final recommendations have been compiled for publication and the full report is provided below within Appendix A.

RECOMMENDATION

The final recommendations of the 2014 review of Polling Districts & Polling Places be approved.
Rugby Borough Council
2014 Review of Polling Districts & Polling Places

Final recommendations - 29 August 2014

Electoral Registration & Administration Act 2013
Representation of the People Act 1983
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1. Introduction
As required by Section 18 of the Representation of the People Act 1983, Rugby Borough Council is obliged to carry out a review of all the polling districts and polling places within the parliamentary constituency of Rugby. The Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013 introduced a change to the timing of compulsory reviews of UK Parliamentary polling districts and polling places and such reviews must be started and completed between 1 October 2013 and 31 January 2015 (inclusive).

Between 11 October and 6 December 2013, Rugby Borough Council carried out an initial period of public consultation seeking views on current electoral arrangements.

Draft recommendations were prepared and issued on 10 March 2014 for a further period of public consultation that ended on 20 June 2014.

This document presents final recommendations to be implemented that recognise feedback received from the consultation periods and consideration of factors identified during the review.
2. What is a review of polling districts and polling places?

A ‘review’ is all the steps set out in Schedule A1 to the Representation of the People Act 1983 (RPA 1983). These are:-

1. The relevant authority must publish notice of the holding of a review
2. The authority must consult the returning officer for every parliamentary election held in a constituency which is wholly or partly in its area
3(1) Every such returning officer must make representations to the authority
3(2) The representations must include information as to the location of polling stations (existing or proposed) within polling places (existing or proposed)
3(3) The representations must be published in such manner as is prescribed
4(1) The authority must seek representations from such persons as it thinks have particular expertise in relation to access to premises or facilities for persons who have different forms of disability
4(2) Such persons must have an opportunity—
   (a) to make representations
   (b) to comment on the returning officer’s representations
5. Any elector in a constituency situated in whole or in part in the authority's area may make representations
6. Representations made by any person in connection with a review of polling places may include proposals for specified alternative polling places
7. On completion of a review the authority must—
   (a) give reasons for its decisions in the review;
   (b) publish such other information as is prescribed

The main components of the review are Polling Districts, Polling Places and Polling Stations.

- **A polling district** is a geographical area created by the sub-division of a UK Parliamentary constituency for the purposes of a UK Parliamentary election. Within Rugby Borough Council administrative area, the UK Parliamentary constituency is divided into Wards, each represented by either 1 or 3 Councillors. These wards are further sub-divided into districts.

The boundaries of wards within the UK Parliamentary constituency were recommended by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England during 2011 and enacted by The Rugby (Electoral Changes) Order 2012. Therefore, this current review seeks to establish districts within those ward boundaries.

- **A polling place** is the building or area in which polling stations will be selected by the (Acting) Returning Officer. A polling place within a polling district must be designated so that polling stations are within easy reach of all electors from across the polling district.

---

1 Source – legislation.gov.uk
A polling station is the room or area within the polling place where voting takes place. All three must be reviewed to ensure that they provide representative and sustainable electoral arrangements, with particular regard to:

- Legislative requirements
  - each parish in England and community in Wales is to be a separate polling district, unless special circumstances apply
  - the council must designate a polling place for each polling district, unless the size or other circumstances of a polling district are such that the situation of the polling stations does not materially affect the convenience of the electors
  - the polling place must be an area in the district, unless special circumstances make it desirable to designate an area wholly or partly outside the district (for example, if no accessible polling place can be identified in the district)
  - the polling place must be small enough to indicate to electors in different parts of the district how they will be able to reach the polling station

- Accessibility
  - seek to ensure that all electors in a constituency in the local authority area have such reasonable facilities for voting as are practicable in the circumstances
  - seek to ensure that so far as is reasonable and practicable every polling place for which it is responsible is accessible to electors who are disabled
  - the council must have regard to the accessibility to disabled persons of potential polling stations in any place which it is considering designating as a polling place or the designation of which as a polling place it is reviewing.

- Electoral process arrangements
  - Security
  - Confidentiality
  - Effective processes

- Health & Safety at polling stations
  - for voters
  - for electoral staff
  - for authorised visitors

Overall, therefore, the review should consider such factors and propose recommendations for approval.
3. **Feedback from consultation**

3.1 **Initial consultation 11 October 2013 – 6 December 2013**
The initial consultation was carried out to seek views on any of the existing electoral arrangements. No new proposals were offered at that time.

The review received one response by the consultation deadline of 6 December 2013:-

**Email from Councillor Leigh Hunt – Clifton, Newton and Churchover**

“As far as I am concerned, having just got the polling station in Clifton moved away from the school to the village hall, I am very happy with things in Clifton, Newton and Churchover as they are and would not want to see any change. “

In addition, documents pertaining to the initial consultation were examined at the Town Hall by one member of the public. No subsequent comments were received.

3.2 **Draft recommendations consultation 10 March 2014 – 20 June 2014**
Feedback was sought on proposals derived after the initial consultation.

The review received the following responses:

**Email from Rugby Borough Council Executive Director (and Electoral Returning Officer)**

“In relation to Recommendations 12 and 13² it could be read as meaning that those electors will only be able to vote by post. I assume that the postal voting arrangements are an offer in addition to the alternative of voting at the district polling station. I think that this could be made clearer. Other than that I am happy with the proposals and the recommendations.”

**Email from Councillor Sue Simpson-Vince – Coton & Boughton** in response for details of proposed community centre. Clr Simpson-Vince obtained the following statement from the developer being consulted by Coton Forward:

“.......it is ‘likely’ to be a suitable venue for a polling station. The reality is that we are probably a couple of years away from completion allowing for funding, planning, design and construction and assuming that we will actually manage to deliver the project.

In terms of the specifics:
Type of building intended – community centre with main hall
Timeframe for construction and opening – late 2015 / 2016 earliest
Size of main room(s) - tbc
Provision of facilities – (heating/toilets/kitchen) – heating yes, toilets yes, kitchen – probably only an area for coffee / heating food, but not a full kitchen
Disabled access provision - yes
Local car parking and provision of bays for vehicles of disabled persons – some, although it is likely to be limited...there is the existing car park with c. 10 spaces (my guess) that we would be looking to utilise. Provision of additional parking would be subject to discussions with planners, etc.”

**Email from Warwick District Council Electoral Services Manager (on behalf of Electoral Returning Officer)**

“WDC don’t have any issues with the polling stations within our Kenilworth & Southam constituency.”

---

² Now Recommendations 16 and 17 in this document
4. **Summarised considerations**

4.1 **Overview**
Section 18 of the Representation of the People Act 1983, requires Rugby Borough Council to carry out a review of all the polling districts and polling places within the UK Parliamentary constituency of Rugby. This must also include those parts of the UK Parliamentary constituency of Kenilworth & Southam that overlap with the administrative area of Rugby Borough Council.

The approach being taken by this review is to focus on all places, districts and polling stations within the Rugby Borough Council administrative area.

A similar review to be carried out during 2014 by Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council for the UK Parliamentary constituency of Nuneaton will provide recommendations for polling places and polling stations within their Bulkington ward. This ward falls within the Rugby UK Parliamentary constituency.

Information pertaining to polling stations from the Rugby BC area that fall within the Kenilworth & Southam constituency will be available to Warwick District Council and Stratford District Council as they carry out their reviews during 2014.

This approach ensures that there is no duplication between local authorities carrying out reviews.

A list of the UK Parliamentary constituencies local to Rugby can found at Appendix A

Maps of the Rugby Borough administration area and of Rugby Borough wards can be found on the Rugby Borough Council website – www.rugby.gov.uk

Overall maps showing the recommended wards and polling districts can be found at Map 1a and Map 1b

A revised list of Polling Districts and Places that includes recommended changes can be found at Appendix B

4.2 **Summarised considerations**

4.2.1 **Population growth within Rugby Borough**
A major influence upon electoral arrangements is the development of housing within the borough and this is expected to continue during the next 20 years. The size, shape and identities of some communities are likely to be affected (or indeed created afresh), whilst infrastructure changes such as roads also need to be considered.

This review has gathered information related to current electorate, population and housing developments (ie. those currently approved, proposed or possible within the Core Strategy\(^3\)) for the next 20 years and calculated the anticipated effects. The main timeframe of considerations within this review is the 10 year period 2014 to 2024.

---

\(^3\) Rugby Borough Council Core Strategy June 2011
Electorate growth is estimated to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual as at February 2014</td>
<td>77,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>83,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>89,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>91,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, estimates made for an ongoing electoral review being carried out by Warwickshire County Council indicate that the electorate for Rugby borough in 2020 will be 81,151. Population increases for that review do not consider housing developments proposed or approved since 2012.

It has been deduced that current ward boundaries are suitable to accommodate known and predicted growth within the next 5-10 years. However, considerations made of the effects of population growth on district boundaries and polling stations have led to some recommendations for change.

4.2.2 Polling Districts
An essential requirement for polling districts is that they should be located wholly within a borough ward. This review has confirmed that this is the case throughout the administrative area of Rugby Borough Council. It has also reviewed alignment (co-terminocity) with proposed Warwickshire County Council divisions.

The review has taken into account final recommendations made by a Corporate Governance Review (CGR) of Cawston parish. It has changed the overall shape of Cawston parish, realigning its boundaries with the neighbouring wards of Dunsmore and Wolston & The Lawfords. Consequential changes have also been made to polling districts AA, AD, KX2 and KP1.

Recommended changes to polling district boundaries and the creation of new polling districts are explained in item 4.3 below. They reflect the need to remove current anomalies and accommodate anticipated changes during the next 5-10 years to the distribution of electorate.

4.2.3 Wards
With the exception of Cawston parish, no other changes are being recommended that would alter ward boundaries established by the LGBCE in 2011-12.

4.2.4 Polling Places and Polling Stations
In reality, the distinction between a polling place and a polling station is influenced by the size or extent of venues used for polling. For instance, a large site such as the Warwickshire College has many rooms and the polling station is located within one of them. Conversely, village halls or community rooms are often self-contained premises with one main room, so the place and the station are effectively the same.

A polling place may host more than one polling station. In such cases, these are known as dual polling stations. They are used to ensure a convenient local venue can be accessed by electors from more than one ward.

---

4 Reference LGBCE 2014 Electoral Review of Warwickshire County Council
Knowledge of polling places and polling stations has been gathered each time an election has been conducted. During the past 3 years in particular, feedback has been gathered by officials attending during each polling day – either at the time or shortly after each election event. Such historic and recent information has been made available from the May 2013, November 2013 and May 2014 elections to this review. The Electoral Services team has an ongoing awareness of occasional issues that may affect polling places and polling stations that has also been included.

Notwithstanding the above information, this review has considered the suitability of each and every polling place and polling station again.

The majority of polling places have been confirmed and recommended for continued use.

4.3 Changes to Polling Districts, Polling Places and Polling Stations
It has been found that the majority of polling districts, places and stations within the administrative area of Rugby Borough Council are suitable to meet ongoing needs.

The following section contains a summary of considerations and conclusions affecting polling districts, places and stations :-

4.3.1 Polling Districts

Clifton, Newton and Churchover ward

District LA – Newton & Biggin parish
A current development at Coton Park east should complete during 2014. Although the local infrastructure links are with the main Coton Park estate, this housing area will remain within the LA district. To change it would require a parish and ward boundary change. The review was aware that a long term development area adjoining the current development may happen in future years but there is no known timescale.

Should applications be made and approved then a boundary review to incorporate further Coton Park extensions may be considered.

In the meantime and in order to promote electoral participation, residents within the Coton Park east development will be contacted and advised of their polling station location and entitlement to register for a postal vote arrangement.

District KJ1 – Churchover parish
The review recognised a potential housing development to the north of Rugby at Coton House. This may increase the electorate by approximately 140. It is considered that polling could be accommodated at the existing polling place in Churchover Community Centre.
Coton & Boughton ward

District KJ2

Major housing development is centred on the Eden Park / Rugby Gateway site to the west of the A426 Leicester Road, from the roundabout junction with Brownsover Lane northwards to the M6 junction 1. The electorate numbers within district KJ2 are anticipated to rise from the current 109\(^5\) to approximately 2,428 within 10 years. The overall development scheme plan includes community facilities and a school. Thus, a local polling place/station will eventually be provided. This would accommodate all the KJ2 electorate and could be used for residents district GB (see Newbold & Brownsover ward below).

However, it has been identified that until such a new local facility is made available, the nearest polling station for KJ2 electors is Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive. This is accessible only by crossing the busy A426 dual carriageway and is an unacceptable long term solution. The limited number of alternative local venues have been investigated but found to be unavailable or unsuitable.

As Phase 1 development at Eden Park involves building near to Brownsover Lane, the current polling station is reasonably local. However once building commences in Phase 2 further north and away from Brownsover Lane, electorate totals are likely to increase significantly before the community facilities and school are available. Investigation of an interim solution such as a temporary building will be considered nearer to the time.

Districts DA and DC – Coton Park  \((\text{see Map 3})\)

The establishment of the Coton Park neighbourhood Forum ("Coton Forward") on 4 February 2013 created a neighbourhood administrative area that overlapped between polling districts DA and DC. It is desirable to bring electoral arrangements into line following this change and the review process permits consideration of changes that may be suitable. In this instance, the Coton & Boughton ward boundaries are unaffected but the polling district boundaries between districts DA and DC should be adjusted.

The recommended change seeks to reflect the new Coton Forward administration area in this locality. The change affects the western section of district DC (bounded by the existing southern boundary of district DA, the A426 Leicester Road, Newton Manor Lane and the footpath between Siskin Close and Mallow Way) which would be transferred to district DA.

District DB – Coton Park

The northern extent of district DB comprises a housing community off Tuthill Furlong, Lancut Hill and Long Hassocks. It is separated from the larger housing area of Coton Park. The review has considered the practicalities involved for the residents to use their designated polling station at Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive. Alternative local venues have been investigated but none are apparent. Until such time that consideration of dual use of the Eden Park polling place is possible, the current polling station remains the only option. However in order to promote local electoral participation, residents in this northern housing area will be contacted and advised of their polling station location and entitlement to register for a postal vote arrangement.

\(^5\) Ref February 2014 Rugby electoral register
Dunsmore ward

District KP1 (see Map 2)

This district features within a long term development area of the Core Strategy. Currently, there are several approved or potential housing developments that together span the next 15-20 years. This review has considered the known possible developments during the next 10 years, as follows:

- **Cawston Grange extension** – approximately 600 dwellings (c.1,076 electors) would utilise the Cawston Grange Primary School as its polling place. The main area of this development has been the subject of a Corporate Governance Review of Cawston Parish and was recommended for inclusion within an extended parish. The existing Cawston parish district should be renamed from AD to AD1 and a new district (AD2) should be created for the extension area. The KP1 district boundary and the ward boundary between Dunsmore Ward and Admirals & Cawston Ward should be changed accordingly.

The polling districts & places review will reflect the outcome of the CGR process as part of its final recommendations later in 2014.

- **Cawston Lane development** – 250 dwellings (c.450 electors). The electors within this new development would be assigned to district KP1 and its existing polling station located at the Dunchurch Sports & Social Club, Rugby Road. There would be no changes to the district boundary.

- **Bilton Grange development off Rugby Road, Dunchurch** – 50 dwellings (approximately 90 electors) can be accommodated at the KP1 polling station at the nearby Dunchurch Sports & Social Club.

Eastlands ward

Districts JA, JB and JC (see Map 4)

An aspect of the review is to resolve anomalous boundary lines. Such a situation exists between districts JA, JB and JC. The northern section of district JC is currently separated from its southern section. By reflecting major infrastructure features within the locality, a simpler district boundary solution can be derived:

- JA - Remove the boundary with JB and replace with new boundary from Bilton Road, along Russelsheim Way to Dunchurch Road. This would transfer the southern half of the current JB district to JA.

- JB and JC - Move the current district boundary between JB and JC to run along the A428 Hillmorton Road until it meets the boundary of JD. Extend the current boundary between JB and JC that is along Dunchurch Road northward to the corner of Warwick St/Rugby School/Lawrence Sheriff St. Rename the whole of the northern district so created to become JB.

- JC - The northern extent would align with the A428 Hillmorton Road. Overall, the current Eastlands ward area is retained and polling stations would continue to be allocated as they have been.

---
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Hillmorton ward

District KK2
Over the next 20 years, the area of district KK2 will be transformed by major housing, infrastructure and community developments. Until that begins and then within at least 5 years, it is anticipated that there will be no new local polling places built to serve the growing population. Continued use of Hillmorton Primary School on Watts Lane will be sufficient to meet anticipated growth during that time and is conveniently located.

In the 2013 Warwickshire County Council elections, district KK2 electors were obliged to vote at Clifton upon Dunsmore, some 2 miles further away from the Watts Lane polling station used for Rugby Borough and UK Parliamentary elections. This is because district KK2 falls within the Fosse division. As the Warwickshire elections are every 4 years, it is unlikely that more than one further repeat will occur but the number of electors is expected to begin increasing by that time. Despite this, the establishment of another polling station just for Warwickshire County Council elections is not warranted. The review recognises that this situation will remain until a polling place within KK2 is available.

Newbold & Brownsover ward

District GB  
(see Map 5)
Currently, district GB uses the polling station at Christ Church, Helvellyn Way. It covers an electorate spread either side of the main A426 Leicester Road dual carriageway. As at November 2013, there were 1,210 registered electors east of the road and 46 to the west. This existing arrangement will be progressively influenced by the Eden Park housing development situated immediately to the north and (significantly) to the west of the A426. As that development grows and includes a school that may be used as a polling place/station, it is reasonable to expect that electors residing to the west of the A426 within district GB would have a safer and more convenient place to vote.

It was decided that the current GB district will be divided along the line of the A426 and the area to the east of the A426 be designated as district GF. Also, when the Eden Park development is able to provide a polling place/station, voters within district GB would be redirected away from Christ Church venue. Until that time, electors within district GB would continue to use Christ Church.

District KN
District KN comprises a small number of electors at Cosford. There were 12 registered electors at February 2014. They are currently assigned to the polling station at Christ Church, Helvellyn Way, located on the other side of the major A426 dual carriageway.
The review has reconsidered the practicality of this arrangement and concluded that a safer, slightly closer arrangement would be to assign KN electors to the polling station at Newbold Methodist Church within district GA.

It is not anticipated that any direct footpath, cycleway or road will be built from the nearby Eden Park to Cosford but should that happen in future, shared use of the Eden Park polling place for KN electors will be considered. This is unlikely to be for at least 5 years.
Rokeby & Overslade ward  
Districts KO and KP1  
In January 2014, developers announced potential plans for a 1000 home development to the north of Ashlawn Road. This would adjoin the IG district. Whilst at the time of writing no formal plans have been submitted to Rugby Borough Council for approval, the review has recognised the potential of such a development being carried out within the next 5-15 years, as it is within an area identified within the Core Strategy7.  
The developer’s proposals indicate that a school would be included for the local community. It is therefore anticipated that this would act as a polling place for an electorate of approximately 1800. It is also assumed that a development of this size would require the creation of a new district (IH) and that it would be located within the Rokeby & Overslade Ward.  
In order to fully embrace the extent of the proposed development area, a small district boundary change within Dunsmore Ward involving districts KO and KP1 would be necessary. Although the development is currently speculative and not yet certain to start within 5 years, it is sensible to make this minor adjustment that follows existing geographical features. It does not adversely affect any residents in either district and it does not cause a change to ward or county division boundaries.

4.3.2 Polling Places / Polling Stations  
Abbotts Farm Junior School – ref Paddox Ward – districts HA and HE  
The suitability of the room provided at Abbotts Farm Junior School was questioned during the May 2014 election. It was deemed to be too small for use as a dual polling station. An additional room was identified that would be suitable. The use of two adjoining rooms should be investigated and agreed with the school management.  
Bilton Infant School, Magnet Lane, Rugby – ref Bilton Ward – districts CE and CF  
The review noted and acted upon concerns raised by the chair of school governors about the continued use of the school as a polling station. An alternative venue was sought that would be suitable for districts CE and CF. Approval was sought from ward councillors to the use of Bilton Bowling Club off Bawnmore Road. This venue would remove the need to close Bilton Infants School, avoid a similar issue for either of other two local schools and provide suitable off-street car parking. The bowling club venue met the necessary standards of accessibility.  
After further investigation, it was identified that Bilton Infant School was dependent upon Bawnmore Infant School for its provision of school dinners. The latter is also a polling place venue. An alternative polling place to Bawnmore Infant School was investigated but none was found.  
Therefore, so long as the school meals arrangement is in place and Bawnmore Infant School is used as a polling place, Bilton Infant School would have to close on polling day as it would be unable to provide school dinners. Although Bilton Bowling Club would be a suitable polling place, in recognition of the disruption that would otherwise be caused to Bilton Infant School, no changes should be made to polling places within districts CE and CF.  

7 Rugby Borough Council Core Strategy June 2011
Oakfield Primary School – ref New Bilton Ward – district FH
Although a sizeable polling place, the school hall provided for the May 2014 elections was deemed unsuitable in two respects –
   a) Poor disabled access over a curb and through a gap in a hedge
   b) No lighting provided along the driveway leading to the venue
The school site has other buildings that are closer to the main entrance and offer improved disabled access. Such an alternative should be investigated and agreed with the school management.

Warwickshire College, Technology Drive – ref Newbold & Brownsover Ward – district GE
Anticipated population growth within district GE will necessitate the creation of another polling station. This polling place is capable of use as a dual polling station.

Willoughby Village Hall – ref Leam Valley Ward – district LL
The polling place at Willoughby has no landline telephone within the premises. Mobile phone coverage is limited within the village and only possible from outside the venue. This compromises the ability to communicate with polling station staff. In all other respects the venue is excellent. There is no local alternative to the current venue.

Until mobile phone coverage is improved, the issue must be managed by careful briefing of polling staff. Local working arrangements should be established that will deal with the safety and management of polling station staff.
5. **Final recommendations**

5.1 **Changes affecting Polling Districts**

Please note that Recommendations 1 to 6 reflect outcomes from the 2014 Community Governance Review of Cawston Parish.

**Dunsmore Ward – district KP1** (see Map 2)

**Recommendation 1**
That a new district AD2 is created from a part of district KP1 in accordance with changes to Cawston parish.

**Recommendation 2**
That the new parished area and new district is transferred from Dunsmore Ward to Admirals & Cawston Ward

**Recommendation 3**
That the boundaries of Dunsmore Ward and district KP1 are altered to reflect the extended parish and new district

**Recommendation 4**
That current district AD is renumbered to AD1

**Wolston & The Lawfords Ward – district KX2** (see Map 2)

**Recommendation 5**
That district KX2 is enlarged to include part of district AD1.

**Admirals & Cawston Ward – district AA** (see Map 2)

**Recommendation 6**
That part of district AA is transferred to district AD1.

**Coton & Boughton Ward – districts DA and DC** (see Map 3)

**Recommendation 7**
That the western section of district DC (bounded by the existing southern boundary of district DA, the A426 Leicester Road, Newton Manor Lane and the footpath between Siskin Close and Mallow Way) is transferred to district DA.

**Eastlands Ward – districts JA, JB and JC** (see Map 4)

**Recommendation 8**
That the district boundary lines between districts JA, JB and JC are realigned along Russelsheim Way, Dunchurch Road (between Sow Brook and Warwick Street) and Hillmorton Road (between Warwick Street and Bruce Williams Way).

No changes to the allocation of polling places and polling stations are necessary.

**Newbold & Brownsover ward – district GB** (see Map 5)

**Recommendation 9**
That current district GB is split along the line of the A426 so that the area to the west retains the GB designation and the area to the east is designated GF.

Electors in both districts would continue to be assigned to the polling station at Christ Church, Helvellyn Way.

---

8 Ref. The Rugby Borough Council (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order 2014
5.2 Changes affecting Polling Places and Polling Stations

**Recommendation 10**
That the polling station at Churchover Community Centre is used to accommodate potential electorate growth at the proposed Coton House development – ref Clifton, Newton and Churchover ward – district KJ1

**Recommendation 11**
That electors within Coton & Boughton Ward district KJ2 continue to use the polling station at Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive until a new local facility is made available within the Eden Park housing development

**Recommendation 12**
That future electors residing at housing developments off Cawston Lane and at Bilton Grange are assigned to the polling station at Dunchurch Sports & Social Club – ref Dunsmore Ward – district KP1

**Recommendation 13**
That electors within Newbold & Brownsover Ward district KN are reassigned to the polling station at Newbold Methodist Church

**Recommendation 14**
That the polling stations at Cawston Grange Primary School and Warwickshire College are used as dual stations in order to accommodate electorate growth caused by future local housing developments

**Recommendation 15**
That the use of two adjoining rooms at Abbotts Farm Junior School should be investigated and agreed with the school management so that the polling place can operate effectively as a dual polling station site.

**Recommendation 16**
That an alternative room within the overall Oakfield Primary School site is identified and agreed with the school management.

5.3 Electoral support

**Recommendation 17**
That residents within the Coton Park east development are contacted and advised of their polling station location and entitlement to register for a postal vote arrangement – ref. Clifton, Newton and Churchover ward - district LA

**Recommendation 18**
That residents in the housing community off Tuthill Furlong, Lancut Hill and Long Hassocks are contacted and advised of their polling station location and entitlement to register for a postal vote arrangement - ref Coton & Boughton ward – district DB
5.4 Co-terminocity with Warwickshire County Council electoral divisions

Recommendation 19
That Warwickshire County Council is specifically advised of the recommended district boundary changes within this report and requested to make adjustments to their proposed county divisions as appropriate.

5.5 General

Recommendation 20
That polling places, districts and stations within the administrative area of Rugby Borough Council not highlighted for change by final recommendations are confirmed as being suitable for future ongoing use.

Recommendation 21
That recommendations pertaining to polling places, districts and stations representing Bulkington ward emanating from the 2014 review by Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council are accepted.

6. Further information

Details of
- Submissions received during the consultation periods
- Related maps
- Ward and district lists
- Polling places and polling station lists
- Polling station details
- Planning applications

can be found on the Rugby Borough Council website – [www.rugby.gov.uk](http://www.rugby.gov.uk)

Printed copies of the final recommendations, maps and details of polling stations will be available for viewing at the Town Hall.

---
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APPENDIX A UK PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN WARWICKSHIRE THAT OVERLAP WITH RUGBY

Constituency    Electoral wards

**Rugby**
- **Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council**: Bulkington.

**Kenilworth and Southam**
- **Rugby Borough Council**: Dunchurch and Knightlow, Leam Valley, Ryton-on-Dunsmore.
- **Warwick District Council**: Abbey, Cubbington, Lapworth, Leek Wootton, Park Hill, Radford Semele, St John’s, Stoneleigh.

**Nuneaton**
- **Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council**: Abbey, Arbury, Attleborough, Bar Pool, Camp Hill, Galley Common, Kingswood, St Nicolas, Weddington, Wem Brook, Whitestone.

Source – Wikipedia  
[Click here](#) to return to Section 4.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polling District</th>
<th>Polling Place</th>
<th>Polling Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA - Rugby</td>
<td>Henry Hinde Infant School, Grenville Close, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB - Rugby</td>
<td>Henry Hinde Infant School, Grenville Close, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC - Rugby</td>
<td>Henry Hinde Infant School, Grenville Close, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD - Rugby</td>
<td>Cawston Grange Primary School, Scholars Drive, Cawston</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA - Rugby</td>
<td>Benn Hall, Newbold Road, Rugby</td>
<td>Caldecott Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB - Rugby</td>
<td>Benn Hall, Newbold Road, Rugby</td>
<td>Caldecott Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC - Rugby</td>
<td>Benn Partnership Centre, Railway Terrace, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD - Rugby</td>
<td>Benn Partnership Centre, Railway Terrace, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE - Rugby</td>
<td>Claremont Children’s Centre, Benn Education Centre, Claremont Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF - Rugby</td>
<td>Benn Partnership Centre, Railway Terrace, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG - Rugby</td>
<td>Claremont Children’s Centre, Benn Education Centre, Claremont Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH - Rugby</td>
<td>Claremont Children’s Centre, Benn Education Centre, Claremont Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI – Rugby</td>
<td>Pakistani Community Centre, 85 Cambridge Street, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Infant School, Magnet Lane, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Infant School, Magnet Lane, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Polling Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG - Rugby</td>
<td>Bilton Methodist Church Hall, Lawford Lane, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH - Rugby</td>
<td>Bawnmore Infant School, Bawnmore Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI - Rugby</td>
<td>Bawnmore Infant School, Bawnmore Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ - Rugby</td>
<td>Bawnmore Infant School, Bawnmore Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK - Rugby</td>
<td>Rugby International Fellowship Church, Cymbeline Way, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA - Rugby</td>
<td>Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB - Rugby</td>
<td>Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC - Rugby</td>
<td>Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD - Rugby</td>
<td>Christ Church, Helvellyn Way</td>
<td>Main Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE - Rugby</td>
<td>Christ Church, Helvellyn Way</td>
<td>Main Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA - Rugby</td>
<td>Rogers Hall, Deerings Road, Hillmorton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB - Rugby</td>
<td>Hillmorton Primary School, Watts Lane, Hillmorton</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC - Rugby</td>
<td>Hillmorton Primary School, Watts Lane, Hillmorton</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA - Rugby</td>
<td>New Bilton Community Centre, 1 Gladstone Street, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB - Rugby</td>
<td>Indian Community Centre, Edward Street, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC - Rugby</td>
<td>Indian Community Centre, Edward Street, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD - Rugby</td>
<td>Salvation Army Citadel, Bennfield Road, Rugby</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE - Rugby</td>
<td>Sheltered Housing Accommodation, Dryden Place</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF - Rugby</td>
<td>St Matthew and St Oswald Church, Lawford Road, Rugby</td>
<td>Church Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG - Rugby</td>
<td>St Matthew’s Bloxam C of E Primary School, Webb Ellis Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH - Rugby</td>
<td>Oakfield Primary School, Oakfield Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA - Rugby</td>
<td>Newbold Methodist Church Hall, Main Street, Newbold</td>
<td>The Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Polling Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB – Rugby</td>
<td>Christ Church, Helvellyn Way</td>
<td>Main Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC - Rugby</td>
<td>Christ Church, Helvellyn Way</td>
<td>Main Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD – Rugby</td>
<td>Sheltered Housing Accommodation, Robotham Close</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE – Rugby</td>
<td>Warwickshire College, Rugby Centre</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA – Rugby</td>
<td>Abbots Farm Junior School, Abbotts Way, Rugby</td>
<td>2x Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB - Rugby</td>
<td>Oak Site, Paddock Primary School, Fareham Avenue, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC – Rugby</td>
<td>Oak Site, Paddock Primary School, Fareham Avenue, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD – Rugby</td>
<td>St George<code>s Church Hall, St John</code>s Avenue, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE - Rugby</td>
<td>Abbots Farm Junior School, Abbotts Way, Rugby</td>
<td>2x Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF - Rugby</td>
<td>St George<code>s Church Hall, St John</code>s Avenue, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG - Rugby</td>
<td>St George<code>s Church Hall, St John</code>s Avenue, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA - Rugby</td>
<td>Overslade Community Centre, Buchanan Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB - Rugby</td>
<td>Overslade Community Centre, Buchanan Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC - Rugby</td>
<td>Overslade Community Centre, Buchanan Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID - Rugby</td>
<td>Bawnmore Infant School, Bawnmore Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE - Rugby</td>
<td>Bawnmore Infant School, Bawnmore Road, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF - Rugby</td>
<td>Rokeby Primary School, Anderson Avenue</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG - Rugby</td>
<td>Rokeby Primary School, Anderson Avenue</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA - Rugby</td>
<td>The Arnold House, End of Elsee Road</td>
<td>The Ball Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB - Rugby</td>
<td>The Arnold House, End of Elsee Road</td>
<td>The Ball Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC - Rugby</td>
<td>The Arnold House, End of Elsee Road</td>
<td>The Ball Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Polling Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD - Rugby</td>
<td>Rugby United Reformed Church, 40 Hillmorton Road</td>
<td>St Margaret's Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE - Rugby</td>
<td>St Peter<code>s and St John</code>s Church Hall, Clifton Road, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF – Rugby</td>
<td>Eastlands Primary School, Lansdowne Place</td>
<td>Pre-school Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG - Rugby</td>
<td>St Peter<code>s and St John</code>s Church Hall, Clifton Road, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH - Rugby</td>
<td>St Peter<code>s and St John</code>s Church Hall, Clifton Road, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI - Rugby</td>
<td>Rugby United Reformed Church, 40 Hillmorton Road</td>
<td>St Margaret's Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ - Rugby</td>
<td>Eastlands Primary School, Lansdowne Place</td>
<td>Pre-school Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA - Ansty</td>
<td>Ansty Social Club, Grove Road, Ansty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB1 - Binley Woods (District 1)</td>
<td>Binley Woods Village Hall, Rugby Road, Binley Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB2 - Binley Woods (District 2)</td>
<td>Binley Woods Village Hall, Rugby Road, Binley Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC - Birdingbury</td>
<td>Birdingbury Community Room, Main Street, Birdingbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD - Bourton</td>
<td>Bourton, Draycote and Frankton Village Hall, Bourton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE1 - Brandon (District 1)</td>
<td>Brandon &amp; Wolston Village Hall, Main Street, Wolston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE2 - Brandon (District 2)</td>
<td>Brandon &amp; Wolston Village Hall, Main Street, Wolston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF - Brinklow</td>
<td>Brinklow Community Hall, Broad Street, Brinklow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - Burton Hastings</td>
<td>Church of St Botolph, Burton Hastings</td>
<td>The Vestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH - Church Lawford</td>
<td>Church Lawford Village Hall, School Street, Church Lawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJ1 - Churchover</td>
<td>Churchover Community Centre, Churchover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJ2 - Churchover</td>
<td>Brownsover Community School, Webb Drive, Rugby</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK1 - Clifton-Upon-Dunsmore</td>
<td>Townsend Memorial Hall, Lilbourne Road, Clifton upon Dunsmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK2 – Clifton upon Dunsmore</td>
<td>Townsend Memorial Hall, Lilbourne Road, Clifton upon Dunsmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL - Combe Fields</td>
<td>Dunsmore Brinklow Community Hall, Broad Street, Brinklow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Polling Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM - Copston Magna</td>
<td>Wolvey Village Hall, The Square, Wolvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN - Cosford</td>
<td>Christ Church, Helvellyn Way</td>
<td>Main Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KO - Rugby</td>
<td>Dunchurch Sportsfield and Village Hall, Rugby Road</td>
<td>Sports Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP1 - Dunchurch (District 1)</td>
<td>Dunchurch Sportsfield and Village Hall, Rugby Road</td>
<td>Sports Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP2 - Dunchurch (District 2)</td>
<td>Dunchurch Community Library, The Green, Dunchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP3 - Dunchurch (District 3)</td>
<td>Dunchurch Sportsfield and Village Hall, Rugby Road</td>
<td>Sports Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQ - Easenhall</td>
<td>Early Birds Nursery, Main Street, Harborough Magna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR - Frankton</td>
<td>Bourton, Draycote and Frankton Village Hall, Bourton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS - Grandborough</td>
<td>Grandborough Village Hall, Grandborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Harborough Magna</td>
<td>Early Birds Nursery, Main Street, Harborough Magna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU - Kings Newnham</td>
<td>Church Lawford Village Hall, School Street, Church Lawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KV - Leamington Hastings</td>
<td>Leamington Hastings Parish Hall, Hill, Leamington Hastings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW - Little Lawford</td>
<td>Long Lawford Primary School, Holbrook Road, Long Lawford</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KX1 - Long Lawford (District 1)</td>
<td>Long Lawford Primary School, Holbrook Road, Long Lawford</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KX2 - Long Lawford (District 2)</td>
<td>Long Lawford Primary School, Holbrook Road, Long Lawford</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY - Marton</td>
<td>Marton Village Hall, Marton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZ - Monks Kirby</td>
<td>Monks Kirby Village Hall, Brockhurst Lane, Monks Kirby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA - Newton &amp; Biggin</td>
<td>Newton Village Hall, Newton, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB - Pailton</td>
<td>Pailton Village Hall, Lutterworth Road, Pailton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC - Princethorpe</td>
<td>Our Lady`s Catholic Primary School, Leamington Road, Princethorpe</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Polling Place</td>
<td>Polling Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD - Ryton-on-Dunsmore</td>
<td>Ryton on Dunsmore Village Hall, High Street, Ryton on Dunsmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE1 - Shilton (District 1)</td>
<td>Shilton Village Hall, Wood Lane, Shilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE2 - Shilton (District 2)</td>
<td>Barnacle Village Hall, Barnacle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF - Stretton Baskerville</td>
<td>Church of St Botolph, Burton Hastings</td>
<td>The Vestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG - Stretton-on-Dunsmore</td>
<td>Stretton on Dunsmore Village Hall, Church Hill, Stretton on Dunsmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH - Stretton Under Fosse</td>
<td>Stretton Under Fosse Village Hall, Main Street, Stretton under Fosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI - Thurlaston</td>
<td>Thurlaston Village Hall, Thurlaston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ - Wibtoft</td>
<td>Monks Kirby Village Hall, Brockhurst Lane, Monks Kirby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK – Willey</td>
<td>Monks Kirby Village Hall, Brockhurst Lane, Monks Kirby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL - Willoughby</td>
<td>Willoughby Village Hall, Willoughby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM - Withybrook</td>
<td>Withybrook Village Hall, Withybrook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN – Wolfhampcote</td>
<td>Flecknoe Parish Hall, School Hill, Flecknoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO1 - Wolston (District 1)</td>
<td>Wolston Leisure and Community Centre, Old School Field, Manor Estate</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO2 - Wolston (District 2)</td>
<td>Brandon &amp; Wolston Village Hall, Main Street, Wolston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP - Wolvey</td>
<td>Wolvey Village Hall, The Square, Wolvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Click here](#) to return to Section 4
1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011), local authorities can resolve to change their electoral cycle at any time (see Appendix 1).

1.2 Such a resolution must specify the year for the first ordinary elections of the council at which all councillors are to be elected. In the case of a district council within a county for which there is a county council, the year specified may not be a county council elections year (2017) and every fourth year afterwards (Section 33 (3) A and B).

1.3 On 25 February 2014, Council approved the budget resolution that stated “the Council investigates with the Electoral Commission further opportunities to reduce the cost of politics by reviewing the frequency of elections and the number of councillors”.

1.4 On 31 March 2014, an Extraordinary meeting of Council resolved that an application be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for a possible reduction in Council size. As part of this work consideration was also given to change the frequency of elections from elections by thirds to all-out elections every 4 years.

1.5 A cross-party and officer working group was established to consider both election frequency and council size. This report is informed by the findings of the working group.

1.6 This report seeks to highlight the reasons for change and to provide a recommendation to consider change to the electoral cycle.
2. The Electoral Commission view

2.1 In January 2004, the Electoral Commission published its report “The Cycle of Local Government elections in England” following a request for a review in 2003 from The Deputy Prime Minister. Items indicating potential benefits of the all-out electoral system stated:

“Local authorities in England derive democratic legitimacy from the regular election of their members by the communities that they serve. Once elected, local representatives are held to account for the decisions they have made on behalf of their communities through re-election.”

“Whole council elections …. ensure that all eligible electors in the authority area have the opportunity to influence the political composition and control of the authority at the same time.”

“Supporters of whole council elections also note that, particularly in the case of elections by thirds, when fewer than half the seats are up for election, overall political control of the authority may not change, even if the ruling party loses all the seats contested at a particular election.”

“…. elections of the whole council can give the ruling group the opportunity of a clear four-year period within which it can fulfil its manifesto promises before being judged on its policies and performance, including the setting of council tax.”

2.2 The recommendation in item 3.27 of the report stated “The Commission recommends that the cycle of local and sub-national government elections in England should follow a clear and consistent pattern, within and across local authorities. Individual authorities should not be permitted to ‘opt out’ of this pattern, and any newly created authorities should also follow the same pattern.”

Recommendation 4.33 stated “The Commission recommends that each local authority in England should hold whole council elections, with all councillors elected simultaneously, once every four years.”

2.3 As Rugby Borough Council is the principal council within its administrative area, its electoral cycle affects those of its local parish councils. The Electoral Commission review identified that all 8,700 English parish and town councils carried out whole elections. They observed that “parish council elections are normally held in the same year as those of the principal authority” and “those parish councils should continue to be elected at the same time as the district or unitary council.”
3. **Potential Reasons for change**

3.1 The 2004 Electoral Commission recommendations (above) have informed the preferred electoral system in England. A 2013 assessment of local authorities by Central Government\(^1\) showed that 63.5% of English district councils use the all-out elections system. In seeking to carry out a review to meet the needs of Rugby borough, we should be aware of national trends and Government priorities for modernising local government.

3.2 The Government’s programme of reducing local government funding means that we should review all aspects of our services, including electoral arrangements.

3.3 The Electoral Commission found that “The balance of evidence suggests that local government electors are less likely to participate in the democratic process in areas that hold elections by thirds.”

3.4 The all-out elections system provides a more flexible basis for council size options by removing the need for one that is divisible by three and the associated preference for wards to be represented by at least 3 councillors\(^2\).

3.5 When taken alongside the changes to national elections from 2015, switching to all out elections every 4 years could assist in bringing greater consistency and certainty to the overall elections timetable.


4 Electoral cycle cost savings

Reducing costs of local government is not only good practice but accords with central Government policy. Conducting borough elections once rather than three times within a 4 year electoral cycle offers the potential to bring about a reduction in costs.

Table 1 shows a comparison with the current system and how costs may be removed. The table uses an assessment of election costs incurred by Rugby Borough Council during election events 2012-2014. It illustrates the profile of elections and anticipated costs for the 4 year period starting with 2016.

Although costs can be shared when our local election coincides with other national election events, holding all-out elections every 4 years would reduce the frequency of elections to be funded by Rugby Borough Council and thus when they occur differently to national elections.

**TABLE 1**

**RUGBY BOROUGH ELECTIONS COST PROFILE**

| Election costs baseline based upon assessment of costs incurred 2012-2014 = £120k per election |
| Assumption made that costs incurred by Rugby are shared with coincidental national election events. WCC, RBC and Police & Crime Commissioner electoral cycles = 4 years |
| UK Parliamentary and EU Parliamentary electoral cycles = 5 years |
| Established electoral cycle (assumed to be in May of each year) | PCC | County | EU | Totals over 4 years* |
| 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |  |
| Retain current thirds profile | £60,000 | £108,000 | £54,000 | £222,000 |
| All-out elections from 2016 | £60,000 | £0 | £0 | £60,000 |

Savings during 4 year cycle £162,000

All-out elections are not permitted during the year of County elections

*It should be noted that because of the mix of 4-year and 5-year electoral cycles, some four year periods will have 3 years where events coincide and others with 2 years when they coincide. During the latter periods, costs to Rugby Borough Council for retention of the election by thirds system would be £54,000 higher.
5 Potential benefits of changing to the all-out elections system from 2016

5.1 It could provide greater certainty in planning ahead over four years.

5.2 Compared to a continuation of the current system of elections by thirds the costs of running elections could be reduced.

5.3 Voters could consider local issues and choose their councillors at the same time.

5.4 It would align the frequency of borough and parish elections and provide a consistent basis for planning and resourcing of electoral events.

5.5 It would bring the Rugby Borough Council electoral cycle into line with Electoral Commission best practice and accord with the Government’s policy to reduce the cost of local government, as proposed by the Council budget resolution for 2014/15.

6 Some potential drawbacks of changing to the all-out election system from 2016

6.1 The 2004 Electoral Commission report “The Cycle of Local Government elections in England” identified various pros and cons for all-out elections, including the following items that indicate potential drawbacks:

“Supporters of partial elections argue that electing half or a third of an authority’s members in rotation can help to ensure that the composition of the council better reflects the political complexion of the electorate, and that more frequent elections can provide sharper accountability by keeping representatives ‘on their toes’.”

“Opponents of whole council elections express concern that important but controversial decisions may be postponed for political reasons until after an election, giving electors no opportunity for democratic protest for three years.”

6.2 A move to all out elections will affect the parish councils within Rugby. At present parish councils elect every 4 years and elections are generally combined with the Borough Elections in that year.

If Council resolve to move to whole council elections in 2016 and every fourth year thereafter, any parishes with elections that fall in the years when there will no longer be borough elections would have to meet the whole of the cost of their individual elections in the same way they would at a by-election.

The 2007 Act enables the Council to make an Order to alter the years of the ordinary election of parishes so that they coincide with a move by the Council
to all out elections. The order can make transitional provision for the retirement of parish councillors at different times than would otherwise apply during the transitional period.

7 Conclusions

Legislative changes made in recent years encourage authorities to move towards whole council elections.

Any decision on the part of Council would require the electoral arrangements of the parishes in Rugby to change to bring their individual year of election in line with that of the Borough.

There is a financial need to ensure that the costs of Borough elections are as low as possible, whilst ensuring that legal obligations are met.

A cost reduction could be made by the adoption of a system of all-out elections every 4 years, beginning in 2016.

8 Recommendation

Council consider a move to whole Council elections every four years.

Please note that Special Council requires a two-thirds majority of those voting to pass the resolution.
32 Resolution for whole-council elections

(1) A district council in England that is subject to a scheme for elections by halves or by thirds may resolve that it is to be subject instead to the scheme for whole-council elections under section 34.

(2) A resolution under this section is referred to in this Chapter as a “resolution for whole-council elections”.

33 Resolution for whole-council elections: requirements

(1) A council must comply with this section in passing a resolution for whole-council elections.

(2) The council must not pass the resolution unless it has taken reasonable steps to consult such persons as it thinks appropriate on the proposed change.

(3) The resolution must be passed—

(a) at a meeting which is specially convened for the purpose of deciding the resolution with notice of the object, and

(b) by a majority of at least two thirds of the members voting on it.
AGENDA ITEM 4(e)

Council – 23 September 2014

Electoral Review of Rugby Borough Council
by
The Local Government Boundary Commission For England (Lgbce)

Report of the Executive Director
in his capacity as
The Electoral Registration and Returning Officer

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 31 March 2014, an Extraordinary meeting of Council resolved that an application be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for a possible reduction in Council size. This was based upon consideration being given to change the current elections by thirds system to all-out elections every 4 years and to reduce the number of councillors. The LGBCE agreed to the review taking place and incorporated it within their 2014 programme.

1.2 The “Rugby Borough Council submission on Council size” document included as Appendix A explains the basis for the review.

1.3 Under a schedule of deadlines for the review issued by the LGBCE, an initial submission will be made by 7 October 2014.

1.4 Council is requested to decide upon a change to the number of councillors so that it can be included within the LGBCE review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Council consider resolving to move to an alternative council size.

3. OPTIONS

1) Keep the number of councillors at 42

2) Reduce the number of councillors representing Rugby Borough Council from 42 to an alternative number (to be specified by Council)

Please note that Special Council requires a simple majority of those voting to pass the resolution.
Rugby Borough Council submission on Council size

Purpose of Report
To outline a submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) on council size.

Summary

On 31 March 2014, an Extraordinary meeting of Council resolved that an application be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for a possible reduction in Council size. This was based upon a proposal to change the current elections by thirds system to all-out elections every 4 years and to reduce the number of councillors. The LGBCE agreed to the review taking place and incorporated it within their 2014 programme.

A cross-party and officer working group comprising:

- Adam Norburn - Executive Director
- Doug Jones - Head of Business Transformation
- Steve Garrison - Democratic services Manager
- Peter Aughton - Improvement & Elections Project Officer
- Cllr Sally Bragg - Conservative
- Cllr Steve Birkett - Labour
- Cllr Jerry Roodhouse - Liberal Democrats
- Cllr Howard Roberts - Independent

has overseen the production of this report.

The working group considered at length whether and why the electoral cycle could be changed from the current elections by thirds system to all-out elections from 2016.

The working group reached overall agreement that the council could reduce the number of councillors from 42 but could not agree on what lower number would be appropriate. However, it was noted that a lower level could potentially enable an effective level of governance, representation and reasonable alignment with the 8 Warwickshire County Council divisions for the Rugby area. It could also ensure a continued recognition of the main urban settlement of Rugby town and of rural communities.

---

1 WCC proposal for 8 Divisions represented by 10 councillors (2 Divisions to have 2 councillors each)
Considerations for change

On the basis that a reduced council size could be achieved the following key points were identified for consideration:

- All-out elections every 4 years from 2016
- A reduction in the number of councillors
- Achieving a reduction in council costs
- Representation by 2 councillors for rural wards comprising groups of small villages
- Representation by 1 councillor for rural wards where the electorate of a single parish is mostly located within a single community
- Representation by 2 councillors for urban wards where applicable
- An average of 2,459 electors per councillor\(^2\)
- Cotermoincy where possible with Warwickshire County Council divisions
- Streamlining of the council committee structure and appropriate reduction in councillor membership of committees
- Further use of technology and social media to support councillors and to enhance access to information by the public

Cost savings based upon current councillor basic allowances\(^3\) and current frequency of national elections could potentially be made. These are identified at Table 2 and Appendix 3.

This report reflects the work carried out by the cross-party working group to understand the issues and allow considerations to take place that would allow council to determine the basis for a response to the LGBCE.

---

\(^2\) Average is based upon predicted 2020 electorate of 81,151 as contained within the Warwickshire County Council electoral review submission to LGBCE

\(^3\) See Appendix 3
Background

Within Rugby Borough Council’s Corporate Strategy 2012-2016, it aims to achieve the following strategic outcomes when delivering services:-

- Residents able to easily access local services
- Delivery of high-quality services built around the real demands of our customers
- Innovative approaches to service delivery

It therefore makes good business sense to align the number of councillors to the way it has chosen to run its operations, taking account of advances in technology and changes in legislation.

Since the conclusion of the 2011 LGBCE review of electoral arrangements and the subsequent enactment of The Rugby (Electoral Changes) Order 2012, Rugby Borough Council has been represented by 42 councillors, elected by thirds.

On 25 February 2014, Council approved recommendation 6 of the Conservative budget resolution that stated “the Council investigates with the Electoral Commission further opportunities to reduce the cost of politics by reviewing the frequency of elections and the number of councillors”

On 31 March 2014, at an extraordinary meeting of the Council, it was resolved that: “An application be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for a possible reduction in Council size”.

The work that has followed since to produce this report has aimed to clarify the requirements of Rugby Borough Council and thereby to offer guidance to the LGBCE prior to its review commencing in October 2014.

On 22 April 2014, the LGBCE notified the council that an electoral review would take place within its programme for 2014/15 and that it had scheduled a preliminary work period to be carried out between April and October 2014 – see Appendix 1.

The first stage of the electoral review is for the LGBCE to make a proposal regarding the future size of the council i.e. the number of councillors. To that end, the LGBCE invited us to make a submission setting out our proposal before it publishes its own for consultation.

The LGBCE has further indicated that the electoral review of Rugby could be carried out, at least in part, in tandem with a corresponding review of Warwickshire County Council. Although the justification of councillors representing each organisation will remain separate affairs, the purpose of this alignment is to allow options for coterminocity between county divisions and district wards to be considered simultaneously and simplify overall electoral administrative arrangements.
Potential reasons for change

Since the completion of the 2011 LGBCE Electoral Review of Rugby Borough Council, a number of factors have emerged that affect current electoral arrangements:

- Rugby is currently undergoing considerable change as the fastest-growing borough in the West Midlands and the latest expectations of further growth are different to those envisaged in 2011/12 at the time of the last review. It is essential that council services and councillor representation are suitable through to 2020 and able to accommodate change after that period.

- The Government’s programme of reducing local government funding provides an imperative for us to review all aspects of our services, including electoral arrangements and council size.

- There have been rapid changes in the use of social media and the availability of online information nationally and locally that affect how the public deal with services and information provided by local authorities.

- Warwickshire County Council is reviewing its electoral arrangements, including the number of councillors and its divisions.

- During the past 3 years, Rugby Borough Council has delivered services using an executive structure based upon the Leader of the Council and two Executive Directors. Consideration could be given to deploying this model across applicable areas of the Authority, enabling greater involvement by Councillors working closely with Council Officers.

- We wish to reinforce our compliance with provisions within the Local Government Act 2000 regarding effective and transparent decision-making.

- The current assessment by Central Government⁴ shows that 63.5% of English district councils use the all-out elections system. In seeking to carry out a review to meet the needs of Rugby borough, we should be aware of national trends and Government priorities for modernising local government.

Council business – Executive and committee arrangements

Since the 2010/11 review, the executive management structure of Rugby Borough Council has changed and we no longer have a Chief Executive. The Council’s two non-departmental directors have taken over the Chief Executive’s statutory and management roles. The Chief Executive’s representational, ambassadorial and policy duties particularly at a national, regional and sub-regional level are now undertaken within the role of the Leader of the Council.

In October 2013, a Peer Review report was overwhelmingly positive about the range of achievements the Council has delivered. In relation to Leadership and Senior Management it said the following:

“You have excellent working relationships internally and externally. The strength of your internal political management and officer working has served you well. You have a model of leadership that has suited you and has delivered. The Leader of the Council provides you with a strong and progressive focal point. The Executive Directors reflect that Leadership and across the board we found positive politicians and officers who have Rugby’s best interests at heart”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader of the Council</th>
<th>Executive Directors (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councillors

Heads of Service (6)
- Business Transformation
- Customer & Information Services
- Environmental Services
- Housing Services
- Planning & Cultural Services
- Resources
Executive process

The Council has chosen to streamline decision making with extensive delegation to individual councillors and officers.

Full Council takes only decisions on those matters that it is required to do by law. During 2013/14, Council met on 9 occasions, with an average councillor attendance of 88%.

Full Council agrees a corporate plan every four years and a budget annually. Cabinet, working with the management team, is empowered to deliver it.

Cabinet currently comprises six councillors and has scheduled meetings once every three to eight weeks. There were 8 meetings during 2013/14.

Average councillor attendance for Cabinet during 2013/14 was 87.5%.

There is a process in place for urgent decisions to be made by Executive Directors with delegated authority in consultation with the Leader, Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Opposition.

Day-to day business of the council is conducted without the requirement to engage the majority of councillors.

In assessing how to move forward, members of Cabinet have confirmed their desire to continue to build services around our customers’ real demands; and the continuing need to promote the growth of the borough (not only in terms of population and the built environment but also its community, economic, environmental, leisure and cultural strengths). They have had regard to the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan and the likely continued pressures on Local Government finance.

All councillors receive a quarterly report on finance and key performance indicators.

The Corporate Performance scrutiny committee considers performance bi-monthly to hold the Cabinet to account.

From a political and managerial viewpoint the Council has put very streamlined decision-making processes in place.
Quasi-judicial processes

Planning Committee - consists of 12 councillors.
It meets every three weeks to consider those applications that the Head of Planning does not determine using delegated powers.

Planning Committee met a total of 17 times in 2013/14. The average councillor attendance was 96%.

During 2013/14, the Planning Committee considered 97 planning applications and carried out 13 site visits. A further 1,047 planning decisions were taken by officers under delegated powers, highlighting that Planning Committee considered 8.5% of the total number of planning applications determined.

The number of applications considered by Planning Committee during meetings varied between 1 and 13.

The number of planning applications determined by delegated powers and noted at Planning Committee meetings varied between 44 and 97.

Planning applications considered by councillors on the Planning Committee can vary greatly in complexity. They can amount to 6-8 hours of work per application especially if they involve a site visit, pre-committee research and time during meetings.

We do not anticipate a significant change in this level of workload over the next few years.

Licencing & Safety Committee - consists of 15 councillors.
The full Licencing & Safety Committee met 4 times in 2013/14. The average councillor attendance was 88%.

There are 2 sub-committees:-
Licensing and Safety Sub Committee (Alcohol and Regulated Entertainment)
Licensing and Safety Sub Committee (Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing)
Each Licensing sub-committee consists of 3 councillors and deals with the majority of licensing applications.
During 2013/14, the sub-committees met on a total of 9 occasions. Five were for Alcohol and Regulated Entertainment and four were for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing.
Scrutiny Process

What is Overview and Scrutiny?
The Local Government Act 2000 introduced the overview and scrutiny function to local government. The legislation requires every council to have a scrutiny process in place and each council has developed its own process. Overview and Scrutiny is central to the effective running of local services.

Members from all political parties work together to get to the heart of issues and problems, and to investigate the most effective ways to resolve them. They collect as much information as they can about the issues so they can make informed recommendations to the Cabinet and other organisations on how services can be improved.

Our Mission Statement
Overview and scrutiny at Rugby Borough Council aims to enhance the quality of life of all who live and work in the Borough by ensuring services are delivered effectively and supporting improvement in the Council's services, policies and performance. Scrutiny aims to be objective, evidence-based, transparent and constructive, and to reflect the interests and concerns of local communities.

The roles of Overview and Scrutiny
All of the councillors who are not Cabinet members can have a role on overview and scrutiny committees or task groups. Their key roles are to:

- Act as a check-and-balance on the decision making power of the Cabinet.
- Review and develop Council policies to make sure they have a positive impact on the lives of people in Rugby.
- Review and scrutinise the performance of the Council and help drive improvements in services.
- Review and scrutinise the work and impact of external organisations on the community.

The Council aims to deliver effective overview and scrutiny that is:

- Cross-party and non-partisan.
- Clearly independent from the Executive.
- A critical friend of the Executive and other partners, and not the 'official opposition'.
- Evidence-based and evaluative.
- Member-led and supported, but not driven, by officers.
- Engaging the public and reflecting the interests and concerns of local people.
- Making an impact by offering robust recommendations that lead to action by Cabinet, Council and external agencies.
**How Overview and Scrutiny works in Rugby**

The structure of Overview and Scrutiny in Rugby consists of an Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and two overview and scrutiny committees.

These two committees are the Corporate Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the Customer and Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

---

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB)** – has 9 members appointed by the Council. These in turn report to Corporate Performance Committee and Customer and Partnership Committee.

There were 5 OSMB meetings during 2013/14. Average councillor attendance for OSMB during 2013/14 was 84.4%.

Individual Task Groups are set up to carry out all scrutiny reviews (called work programmes) and report to the relevant committee.

OSMB draws up the overview and scrutiny work programme. It is allocated a budget to support this work and manages the work programme within the available resources.

In addition, OSMB:

- holds the leader and executive officer to account
- acts as gatekeepers for councillor call for action
- co-ordinates Notices on Motion from council
Corporate Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee – is primarily concerned with the council's organisation and resources (people, finance and property) and how these are used and managed to deliver the council's obligations and services.

This will include, for example, corporate strategy, organisational health, performance management, financial monitoring and budget-setting, and support services.

This committee currently comprises 9 councillors. There were 5 meetings during 2013/14. Average councillor attendance during 2013/14 was 73.3%.

Customer and Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee – is primarily concerned with the impact of the council's services and actions on customers and partners.

It is also concerned with outward facing services, matters which have a direct impact on the council's customers, communities and the local area and partnership working in this regard.

This committee exercises the council's statutory power to scrutinise the decisions and actions of the responsible authorities within the Community Safety Partnership in relation to their crime and disorder functions.

This committee currently comprises 9 councillors. There were 5 meetings during 2013/14. Average councillor attendance during 2013/14 was 91.1%.

Audit and Ethics Committee - consists of an independent chairman and vice chairman and 4 councillors. The committee audits the councillor’s financial processes but also has a range of other responsibilities such as maintaining a standards function which reviews any complaint received against councillors.

The committee met 5 times during 2013/14. Average councillor attendance was 85%.

Appeals Committee
The Council also has an Appeals Committee consisting of 5 councillors. Although it met on four occasions between May 2010 and June 2014, they were only to formally appoint chair and vice-chair for the committee. There have been no meetings to discuss other substantive items.
Changes to committees since 2011/12
The Crime and Disorder Committee was dissolved in 2014 and its business is now dealt with by Customer & Partnerships Committee and by reports to Cabinet / Council.

The Standards Committee was dissolved in 2012 and its business is now carried out by the Audit & Ethics Committee. This includes oversight and direction of two sub-committees (Hearings and Political Restriction) that meet occasionally as needed and comprise 3 members of the full committee.

Councillors

Representation

The overall area comprising the borough of Rugby is primarily rural and covers 87,949 acres.
The Office of national Statistics estimates that the 2014 population of the administration area of Rugby Borough Council is 102,328\(^5\).

The town of Rugby is the single largest urban area with approximately 71% of residents\(^6\) and is mostly composed of un-parished wards. Rural communities are located within parishes.

The rural areas are currently divided into 6 wards containing a total of 36 parishes. Two parishes are included within 2 Rugby Town wards.

There are currently 42 councillors:-

- 12 councillors represent the 6 rural wards -
  - 1 councillor represents a ward containing 3 parishes
  - 1 councillor represents a ward containing 5 parishes
  - 1 councillor represents a ward containing 6 parishes
  - 9 councillors represent 3 wards containing 25 parishes
  - 6 councillors represent 2 mixed rural/urban wards
  - 24 councillors represent 8 urban wards

As at February 2014, the electorate total within the administrative area of Rugby Borough Council was 77,355. The average electorate per Rugby Borough councillor was 1,842.

Councils undergoing electoral reviews are required to use 6 year predictions for their electorate. Thus by 2020 the electorate for Rugby is predicted to be 81,151.
Retaining 42 councillors would provide an average electorate per councillor of 1,932. This compares with other councils with electorate sizes of 75-90,000\(^7\).

\(^5\) Source – ONS 29 May 2014 - Table Z1: 2012-based Subnational Population Projections. Local Authorities in England, mid-2012 to mid-2037 - All Persons totals for Local Authority areas

\(^6\) Calculation based upon percentage of electorate within un-parished wards

\(^7\) Source – LGBCE electoral review reports 2012-2013
Erewash - 1,893 (47 councillors)
Gedling - 2,205 (41 councillors)
Newark & Sherwood - 2,419 (39 councillors)
Wyre Forest - 2,482 (33 councillors)
Bromsgrove - 2,519 (31 councillors)

Two other district councils in Warwickshire who have completed similar reviews (Warwick District Council in 2012 and Stratford District Council in 2013) have predicted councillor/electorate averages of 2,313 (46 councillors) and 2,891 (36 councillors) respectively.

Unlike Rugby, both Stratford upon Avon and Warwick District Council have several Town Councils in addition to parish councils and their District Council.

In Rugby, the Borough Council covers the duties for both town and borough.

Appendix 2 provides further details of comparable councils and their structure.

Role and responsibilities

Processes are in place for all councillors to be provided with a monthly emailed newsletter that updates them on key developments within the council as well as issues of wider interest. They also receive a monthly update of the Forward Plan that gives notification of issues and meetings within the forthcoming 3 months. Access to the Rugby Borough Council website ensures availability of all published documents such as agendas and minutes. Most communication is via email. Simple processes are in place to cover things like the call-in of planning applications.

Papers for Council, Cabinet and committees remain predominantly in printed form. There is considerable scope to review and change this in the future by continuing to exploit advanced presentational methods, reducing the need for lengthy reports and emphasising the use of laptops and tablets.

Some councillors have found that the camera feature within mobile phones has become useful when residents approach them personally about complaints or issues, by enabling photographs to be taken. Simple technology such as this enhances what councillors can do and the speed with which issues can be investigated.

In addition to the 12 Rugby Borough councillors representing rural areas of the borough there are also parish councils that represent local communities. Whilst parish and borough council roles are different, rural constituents have ready access to a local parish councillor who can help individuals resolve local problems.

Councillors attend a variety of mayoral and civic events (typically 4-5 during a year), as well as annual community events and one-off special events such as the 2012 Olympic torch relay and Godiva procession.
There are many differences affecting the workload and obligations of councillors, not least when comparing representation of rural and urban wards:

- Rural wards typically cover relatively large areas containing multiple parishes
- Urban wards are typically smaller in geographical area but with a higher population density
- Whilst the presence of parish councillors for rural communities can be supplementary to the workload of a rural borough councillor, the need to attend the meetings of multiple parish councils within a rural ward is an additional commitment
- Levels of economic affluence and deprivation
- Provision of and access to high-speed broadband – for individuals and businesses in rural and urban areas
- Cultural diversity
- Infrastructure
- Provision of and access to health, welfare and social amenities
- Representation on community forums and voluntary groups

Such differences are key factors when considering councillor allocations that maintain equality of representation across the whole borough.

Borough councillors may provide contributions to matters that are primarily of County concern, such as health, education, transport, the Police and Safer Neighbourhoods Team.

A survey of councillors has been carried out\(^8\) to identify types of public interaction, workload, and the extent of meetings undertaken. It was accepted that occasional major issues can exaggerate the amount of work.

Analysis from those that responded showed some variations between councillors but it was determined that they each spend a monthly average of 51.2 hours on council work that included:
- a monthly average of 159 emails, phone calls and text messages
- a monthly average of 11 hours spent promoting issues within their wards
- a monthly average of 7 borough council meetings
- a monthly average of 6 hours researching ward issues

The production and distribution of newsletters/leaflets involves time for councillors. In turn, the leaflets generate interest requiring responses to enquiries and issues.

---

\(^8\) Survey carried out 11-26 August 2014. Response rate was 43%
Public interaction with Rugby Borough Council and access to information

Through our programme of Service reviews we have redesigned many aspects of service delivery around the needs of our customers, giving them direct access to the officers working on the issues of interest to them. Alongside this, a progressive review of our web content and digital service provision means that it is now much easier for residents and businesses to report matters of concern and find relevant information in a timely manner.

Responsive and proactive e-communications, utilising social media and a mobile web app for smartphones allow us to deliver up-to-the-minute information upon demand. Residents who use such technology are able to respond directly to the Council on issues that affect them, via email or some other electronic means.

Such changes to service delivery, access to information and online forms allows residents who may previously have contacted their councillor to find out how to do something, or to find information of interest, are now contacting the Council directly. The traditional importance and need for public meetings and meetings with councillors has thereby been diminished as the primary method for communicating with the Council. Nevertheless, many residents do not use or have access to PCs, email and other forms of social media. In such cases, the need for traditional methods of contact with councillors remains and capability to provide such services should be maintained.

Website contact with the Council – 2011 to 2014
In order to better understand what technology is being used and how it is being used, we have carried out a study using website volumetric.

Since the last electoral review of Rugby borough in 2011, there have been significant changes in the ways that the Council can be contacted, the volume of contacts and the type of information sought.

At the start of 2011, there were two PC-based devices used by customers accessing the Rugby Borough Council website – Desktop and Mobile Phone. Since then, the use of tablet PCs has been added.

The volume of use via these three device types has grown year on year since 2011:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2011-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(projected)</td>
<td>(overall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+52%</td>
<td>+65%</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2,918%</td>
<td>+107%</td>
<td>+8,253%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, we expect to see website use totalling 404,000 sessions during 2014 – a volume increase of 20% compared to 2011.

We also expect users in 2014 to view approximately 1.8 million web pages.
The use of Twitter and Facebook comprise by far the largest social media tools used for referrals to the website. Like-for-like comparison between similar months in 2011 and 2014 show an overall increase of 228%.

**Uses**
Between January and May 2014, 77% of the subject enquiries made of the website were:

Council services
Bin collections
Reporting problems
News
Councillor information
Events
Find parks
Meetings and agendas
Council tax

Taken together, the two aspects outlined above amply demonstrate that there is a growing and broad demand for information that is being met via access to the Rugby Borough Council website.
Growth and change within the borough

Rugby is currently undergoing considerable change as the fastest-growing borough in the West Midlands and the latest expectations of further growth are different to those envisaged in 2011/12 at the time of the last review. The latest data from the Office of National Statistics\(^9\) indicates that the population of Rugby will increase from the 2012 figure of 100,800 to 106,800 by 2020.

Several housing and employment development schemes are underway, with more to follow within the next 10 years. Our ability to provide effective and sustainable electoral arrangements must therefore reflect the revised housing growth pattern within the Borough and provide a sustainable basis for adapting to future population growth.

Within the context of such rapid change, it is understood that information technology can offer benefits to councillors as they deal with their workload and as an enabler for effective interaction between them and their residents. However, it is recognised that the provision, costs and training associated with the use of such technology should not become a barrier to existing councillors or those interested in becoming a councillor. To this end, Rugby Borough Council will continue to develop its provision of supportive information technology and appropriate training.

This review acknowledges the requirement to respect the boundaries of parishes and polling districts. They are the building blocks upon which borough wards and county divisions are based.

A primary consideration is the need to ensure recognition of defined community identities and that community links, particularly between urban wards, are supported.

It is possible to maximise alignment with proposed Warwickshire County Council divisions that are currently under LGBCE review. However, it is essential that the Rugby Borough Council electoral review reflects its communities effectively and fairly – and this may not necessarily be done by a simple mirroring of the WCC divisions (see Table 1). We need to avoid single-member wards in rural areas comprising several small village communities and where there are additional commitments to multiple parish councils. Travel between communities in such wards should be easy and practical.

Therefore, consideration could be given to coterminosity with proposed county division boundaries where possible but should not be imposed where the benefits and fairness of local borough representation would be compromised.

---

\(^9\) Source – 2012-based Subnational Population Projections issued by ONS 29 May 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WCC DIVISION</strong></th>
<th><strong>POLLING DISTRICTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ELECTORATE</strong></th>
<th>(+/-) 10% of average</th>
<th><strong>Number of Cllrs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rural Area North/East</td>
<td>LF, KG, LP, KM, LI, LM, LX, KZ, LB, KT, KN, KJ, KJ2, LA, DB, KK1, KK2</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rural Area West</td>
<td>LE1, LE2, KA, KL, LH, KF, KB1, KB2, KE1, KE2, KU, KO, KW, KH, LO1, LO2</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rural Area South</td>
<td>LC, LD, LG, KR, KD, LI, KP1, KP2, KO, KY, KC, KV, KS, LL, LN</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Coton Park / Brownsover</td>
<td>GA, GB, GC, GD, GE, DA, DC, DD, DE, BA, BB, BC, BD, BE, BF, BG, BH, BI</td>
<td>16,052</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Long Lawford / New Bilton</td>
<td>FA, FB, FC, FD, FE, FF, FG, FH, KX1, KX2</td>
<td>8,490</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cawston / Bilton</td>
<td>AA, AD, KP3, CD, CE, CF, CG, CH, CI, CJ, CK, IE</td>
<td>8,232</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Admirals / Overslade</td>
<td>AB, AC, AE, CA, CB, CC, IA, IB, IC, ID, IF, IG</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electorate</td>
<td>81,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** – Division names shown in table 1 are illustrative to describe the overall area containing the polling districts. No official names have been established at the time of this report.

Whilst it is recognised that there are reasons to reduce the number of councillors representing Rugby Borough Council, an essential feature of the review is to ensure that accommodation is made which reflects future growth and reshaping of communities within wards. To this end, it is noted that Section 56(2) of the Local Democracy Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 states:

“The Local Government Boundary Commission for England may at any time-
(a) Conduct a review of all or any part of the area of a principal council, and
(b) Recommend whether a change should be made to the electoral arrangements for the area of the principal council.”

It is therefore proposed that agreement is sought with the LGBCE that would allow a small increase in councillor numbers affecting a ward without the need to conduct another full overall review - should that be necessary after 2020.
**Indicative cost saving benefits**
Two main aspects can be used to illustrate savings that could be made:
- changing to all-out elections every 4 years
- reducing the number of councillors

**Electoral cycle cost savings**
Table 2 shows a comparison with the current system and how costs may be removed. The table uses an assessment of election costs incurred by Rugby Borough Council during election events 2012-2014. It illustrates the profile of elections and costs for the 4 year period starting with 2016.

Although costs can be shared when our local election coincides with other national election events, holding all-out elections every 4 years would reduce the frequency of elections to be funded by Rugby Borough Council.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUGBY BOROUGH ELECTIONS COST PROFILE</th>
<th>Compiled 2 September 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election costs baseline based upon assessment of costs incurred 2012-2014 = £120k per election</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption made that costs incurred by Rugby are shared with coincidental national election events. WCC, RBC and Police &amp; Crime Commissioner electoral cycles = 4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Parliamentary and EU Parliamentary electoral cycles = 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established electoral cycle (assumed to be in May of each year)</th>
<th>PCC</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Totals over 4 years*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain current thirds profile</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-out elections from 2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings during 4 year cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All-out elections are not permitted during the year of County elections

*It should be noted that because of the mix of 4-year and 5-year electoral cycles, some four year periods will have 3 years where events coincide and others with 2 years when they coincide. During the latter periods, costs to Rugby Borough Council for retention of the election by thirds system would be £54,000 higher.*
Councillor number cost savings
Savings accrued by reducing the number of councillors can be simply illustrated using calculations based upon the payment of basic allowances.

Each councillor is entitled to £6,290
For example, savings reflecting a reduction to 33 councillors would be £56,610 per annum. Total basic allowance savings for a 4 year electoral cycle would be £226,440

Appendix 3 contains the December 2013 statement of councillor allowances.
Conclusions

Although the current level of 42 councillors is not fully aligned with structures in comparable district councils across England any reduction in number, whilst possible, could place strains on their ability to meet representative and governance commitments.

A greater number of councillors than 30 would not provide 100% coterminicity with proposed Warwickshire County Council divisions. Parish and polling district boundaries would be respected, thereby achieving a high level of coterminicity across the borough.

A Council comprising fewer borough councillors could be appropriate, sustainable and sufficient to manage the business of the Council and it could:-

- provide fair representation for electors across the borough
- allow councillors to fulfil their representational roles
- offer better aligned representation of the borough’s diverse communities, both urban and rural
- accommodate population growth within the borough through to 2020
- provide a basis for additional councillors within specific wards with expected growth beyond 2020

New technologies offer more convenient access for those seeking to interact with the council. They have changed the way councillors work within their wards and changed the traditional position whereby councillors would be the first point of contact for council and community matters. However, ease of communication has brought an increase in the variety of contact with councillors, notably via email.

It is recognised that many residents do not use or have no access to new technologies and traditional ways of interacting with their councillors must remain in order to ensure full representation and support.

Rural wards should be represented by at least 2 councillors where such wards embrace a group of small village communities and multiple parish councils. A single councillor could represent a single parish where the electorate is mostly located within a single community.

Changes to the structure and membership of committees have been made since 2011 and consideration could be given to reviewing the current levels of membership. The size of committees including the executive should reflect the number of councillors.

Overall, savings could be achieved by the reduction in councillor numbers and by a change to all-out elections every 4 years.
### Rugby Borough Council – provisional LGBCE timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Review timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary period</td>
<td>Date start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary meetings with Group Leaders, full Council, parish and town councils and officers</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of draft council size submission</td>
<td>22 July 2014 (Council meeting date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of full electorate data and forecasts</td>
<td>7 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of final Council size submission</td>
<td>By 29 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of decision on Council’s electoral cycle</td>
<td>By 29 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council size LGBCE mtg</td>
<td>18 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to propose warding arrangements</td>
<td>25 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBCE analysis and deliberation</td>
<td>14 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBCE analysis and deliberation</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final recommendations published</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Order Laid In Parliament</td>
<td>Late October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2

### COMPARISON OF COUNCILS

Compiled by Peter Aughton  Improvement & Elections Project Officer  20 August 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council name</th>
<th>All-out elections</th>
<th>Electorate No.</th>
<th>Electorate year</th>
<th>Data baseline year</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>No. of Wards</th>
<th>Electorate per Cllr</th>
<th>Cabinet members</th>
<th>meeting frequency</th>
<th>Cllr Exec proportion</th>
<th>Planning Committee members</th>
<th>meeting frequency</th>
<th>Licencing Committee members</th>
<th>meeting frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>81,151</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford upon Avon</td>
<td>104,082</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick District Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106,385</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52,717</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttoxeter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69,196</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78,077</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre Forest *</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>81,908</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewash</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88,954</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90,409</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ribble</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93,910</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark &amp; Sherwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94,358</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97,123</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of the White Horse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98,802</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>sub-comms</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103,638</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ad hoc**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106,694</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108,643</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kesteven</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115,167</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116,844</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162,061</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>(see note 2)</td>
<td>82,003</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>(see note 2)</td>
<td>86,055</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - Not all councils have groups named Cabinet, Planning or Licencing. In such cases, close equivalents have been used to illustrate councillor involvement.

* Wyre Forest review is currently underway and data shown is contained within draft recommendations. Cabinet and committee representation is that proposed but not yet adopted.
** Suffolk Coast operates 2 regional planning committees that meet monthly, involving a total of up to 33 councillors

### Note 2 - Included for comparison as councils with projected 2020 population closest to Rugby. Data sourced from council websites

Sources:
- LGBCE reviews 2010-2014 [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)
- Council websites [www.gov.uk/government](http://www.gov.uk/government)
### Schedule 1

**Members’ Allowances Scheme**  
Basic, Special Responsibility and Standard Allowances

The rates in this schedule have been determined by the Remuneration Panel and apply to the municipal year 2013/14, following an increase of 1% on the 2012/13 allowances.

#### Basic Allowance

A basic allowance of £6,290 shall be paid to each councillor.

#### Special Responsibility Allowance

The following are specified as the special responsibilities for which special responsibility allowances are payable in addition to the basic allowance from the date of the Annual Council Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Allowance (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet:</td>
<td>17,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Cabinet (Deputy Leader)</td>
<td>6,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member – Economy, Development and Culture Portfolio Holder</td>
<td>5,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member – Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder</td>
<td>5,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member – Sustainable Inclusive Communities Portfolio Holder</td>
<td>5,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member – Resources &amp; Corporate Governance Portfolio Holder</td>
<td>5,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Planning Committee</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Licensing and Safety Committee</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Appeals Committee</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Corporate Performance Committee</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Customer and Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of major minority groups</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Audit and Ethics Committee</td>
<td>3,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Audit and Ethics Committee</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The chairman and vice-chairman of the Audit and Ethics Committee are independent and are not councillors.

No councillor is entitled to more than one special responsibility allowance – the higher allowance is to be assumed.

---

Note – Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee has been disbanded

Note – Standards Committee was disbanded in 2012/13
AGENDA ITEM 5

REPORT OF CABINET

15th September 2014

PRESENT:

Councillor Poole (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), Mrs Bragg, Leigh Hunt, Mrs Timms and Dr M Williams.

Councillors Buckley, Ms Edwards, Ellis, Miss Lawrence, Lewis, Roodhouse, Sandison and Stokes were also in attendance.

1. CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT REGIME

Cabinet considered the following report.

Background

Rugby Borough Council owns and operates a number of off street car parks in and around the town centre. This is done to support the economic vitality of the town centre and has in the past represented a significant revenue source for the Council, which has allowed investment in other services, many of which directly support local businesses or stimulate visitors to the town and borough.

On-street parking is parking on public highways. Charges, restrictions and enforcement are the responsibility for the highways authority. Off-street is the traditional surface car parks and multi-storey car parks and are controlled by their private owners, including local authorities.

Currently there are 11 Council owned off-street car parks for the public (including one which provides free parking in Bilton). The 10 car parks where charges apply are the John Barford, Railway Terrace, Old Market Square, Gas Street, Little Church Street, North Street, Chestnut Fields, Evreux Way, Newbold Road and Westway car parks.

The Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) was introduced to tackle congestion and disruption on the road network. The TMA places a duty on local traffic authorities to make sure that traffic can move freely and quickly on their roads and on the roads of nearby authorities. As part of this, on-street parking enforcement was decriminalised, and passed from the police to the highways authority, in this area Warwickshire County Council (WCC). This is commonly known as Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE).

Since 2006 Rugby Borough Council has been working in partnership with WCC as agents to provide their on-street parking enforcement service in Rugby Borough and since 2011 has also provided this service in Nuneaton and Bedworth. Stratford on Avon District Council and Warwick District Council also act as agents for WCC.
Currently the Council has a team of Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) and Appeals Officers (AOs) employed by Rugby Borough Council and who deal with on-street parking (as agents from WCC) and off-street parking in Rugby Borough Council owned car parks. Currently around 10 to 15% of resources are for Rugby Borough Council owned car parks. The balance is for on-street and is funded by WCC.

In 2012 WCC reviewed this arrangement and elected to go out to the market for a private contractor for their parking services, this has now been awarded to NSL Limited. The contract with Rugby Borough Council is being terminated and will end on 31st October 2014. From 1st November 2014 Rugby Borough Council will only be responsible for its own off-street car parks. As a consequence of this we need to consider the most appropriate system for managing our own off street parking activities.

**Options**

Officers have identified 6 potential options (see Appendix 1 for more details of these options):

1. In-House Parking Team
2. In-House Enforcement Warden Team
3. Shared service with other local authorities in Warwickshire or further afield
4. Utilise Warwickshire County Council Framework
5. Invite Tenders for Off Street Service from Private Sector
6. Convert all Car Parks to Pay on Exit

Some of the relative merits or otherwise of these options are detailed in the appendix. On balance, officers are of the view that Option 2 is the most effective and flexible solution.

**Service Outline**

While most users of car parks comply with car park rules, a small majority through deliberate acts or neglect do not comply. In addition, the number that do not comply increases if motorists become aware that there is no enforcement. To ensure fairness, and protect revenue that supports key community projects, there is a need to undertake enforcement to ensure the element of doubt and compliance is placed in the drivers mind.

If notices are issued it is important that there is an effective means of considering any appeal or processing the offence through to prosecution if the fine is not paid. Within that has to be discretion as each case has to be considered on its own merits. The guidance for the TMA recommends these decisions should be made locally, and officers agree as it allows local knowledge, experience and policies to be considered. It also allows the officer to have simple access to the officer who has issued the notice.

It is also clear from feedback that the majority of local residents and businesses have concern about environmental crimes (e.g. dog fouling, littering, fly-tipping). All political groups have indicated they are keen to see more of this type of enforcement as a deterrent and drive improvements in local environmental quality.
In response to this a new post was created as part of the 14/15 budget to provide a proactive patrolling service throughout the borough, in order put more emphasis into addressing environmental crimes. The new appointee to this post started in July.

Currently, the CEOs and AOs only regulate parking legislation. While their services are vital to the Council’s integrated regulatory services, they are in contrast to the other functions within Regulatory Services where the officers generally have more flexibility in their roles, allowing the Council to adapt quickly to changing situations.

The proposal in Option 2, which will create a total of 3 FTE Community Enforcement Wardens and 1 FTE appeal/administration officer would allow:

- Improved flexibility of deployment of the officers depending on short-term or long-term priorities for the Council
- 7 day service opportunity in new contracts
- Compliment the Council’s Community Safety Wardens who currently provide a key out-of-hours uniformed service (e.g. noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour, dog warden services)
- Ability to integrate into the current and any potential review of the strategy for the town centre.
- Improved utilisation of technology to streamline how enforcement notices are dealt with.

**Staffing Implications**

As a consequence of the decision by WCC to transfer the service to NSL, all existing staff will be eligible for transfer under TUPE. It appears likely that the existing AOs will be made redundant at some point as there will be no local base for these operations. This would occur after they have transferred to NSL/WCC and at no cost to ourselves. The CEOs will be retained but are likely to operate from a base outside Rugby. Since WCC gave notice of termination for our service we have supported the existing staff in widening their work experience opportunities, development of transferrable skills and applications for internal vacancies.

If option 2 is approved then we would be able to potentially retain 2 FTE CEOs and 1 FTE AO post, which will be selected through a “ring fenced” internal recruitment process. The new job profiles have been evaluated and match the existing grading for CEOs and AOs.

The retention of existing staff is considered important for 4 main reasons:

1. Retention of knowledge and experience. The cancellation of the partnership agreement between RBC and WCC means that the supervisors and team leader are likely to be lost. While plans are in place for management and key skills to be transferred internally to other managers, the practical skills and necessary statutory training are better to be retained.
2. Staff are the Council’s key assets and as experienced RBC employees officers have been trying to retain their skills and experience in-house where vacancies or potential vacancies have occurred.
3. AOs are likely to be made redundant as NSL have announced the service centre is in Oldham and there are limited opportunities for other posts in WCC or NSL locally.

4. The CEOs have been advised they will be based at offices in the north of the county, probably Nuneaton. They will be required to commute and several have indicated the additional time and costs may mean they have to resign.

The Trade Unions and the parking services team have been consulted regarding these proposals. No specific responses have been made regarding the proposals, although the majority of the staff have expressed interest in the new posts. As such a selection process is being arranged.

Technically this is a change to the Council’s staffing establishment that requires Council approval. Normally this would be referred to the Council meeting scheduled for 28th October 2014, however it is considered that this is too close to the scheduled transfer of staff and as such it is recommended that this be referred to the special Council meeting scheduled for 23rd September 2014.

The internal ring fenced recruitment process has been initiated due to the desire to provide certainty for the existing employees at the earliest possible opportunity; however no formal appointments will be made prior to the formal decision by Council.

**Financial Implications**

Appendix 2 provides the estimated financial implications for the 6 potential options. This shows there is very little financial difference between option 1, 2 and 3. The cost of options 4 and 5 cannot be estimated at this time. Option 6 is not as financially beneficial to the Council.

Therefore the preference for the potential service delivery model is really focussed on the achievement of corporate priorities, which is why option 2 (In-house enforcement warden team) has been recommended and the costs detailed further in Appendix 3.

Column 1 in Appendix 3 provides the existing 2014/15 budget for the off-street function which was based on salary costs up to 31st October 2014, as costs beyond this point were not known at the time of budget setting.

On the basis Option 2 is approved, column 2 in Appendix 3 shows the impact for the remainder of 2014/15, which results in an additional cost of £11,790. It is proposed to meet this from corporate savings already identified to date.

Column 3 in Appendix 3 shows the additional cost to the Council in 2015/16, which is £72,340. This is mainly due to Council overheads (internal recharges) that were previously charged to WCC and which will no longer be recoverable. These charges will not fall entirely upon this service in 2015/16, but instead will be redistributed across other services as part of the budget setting process. However the impact overall to the Council as mentioned is £72,340.

These overheads were analysed and the majority of the costs related to the service provided by Customer & Information Services to Car Parking.
Ordinarily, these staffing implications would also be considered in the context of this service change. However, due to the increase in customer contact as a result of growth in the Borough, it is considered appropriate to not reduce resources in this area.

For the purpose of comparison, income for this service is as per original 2014/15 budgets, as estimating with any degree of accuracy car parking revenue can be very challenging as there are many external factors which contribute to drivers behavioural changes.

Whilst we have not increased car parking charges for 5 years, current budget monitoring is showing evidence of increased (approximately £20,000) income as a result of greater use of council operated car parks, possibly due to a greater awareness that our parking tariffs are the lowest in the town. This will be incorporated into 2015/16 budgets and therefore offset the additional costs previously mentioned. Income from penalty charge notices (parking tickets) accounts for approximately 5% of total parking revenues.

There is an on-going scrutiny review of fees and charges and it would therefore be inappropriate and premature to include within this report and discussion on potential parking charge strategy review. Any recommendations from that review will be considered at a later date and would not necessarily change the overall service delivery requirement.

**Conclusion**

The termination of the WCC parking agreement has created an opportunity for a fundamental review of exactly what style of service would be appropriate for the future. It is evident that in order to maintain an effective management regime to support the economic prosperity of the town centre that some form of on-going enforcement presence across our car parking estate is required.

However as the vast majority of users are compliant we can look to optimise resources to enable a broader enforcement service that reflects and contributes to the Council’s overall ambitions and strategy. Therefore including within this redesigned activity an element of multi-skilled enforcement of environmental crimes appears to be appropriate.

**Recommendation of Cabinet**

Cabinet decided to recommend to Council that -

(1) Option 2 be approved; In-House Enforcement Warden Team which allows the reconfiguration of the existing resources to create a multi-skilled enforcement warden resource covering car parking and environmental issues; and

(2) the financial implications of Option 2 from 2015/16 onwards be included in the budget setting process.

**Recommended that** – the recommendation of Cabinet be approved.
2. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS TO COUNCIL HOUSING STOCK - NON-TRADITIONAL CONSTRUCTION

Cabinet considered the following report.

**Background**

The government introduced the Green Deal scheme in 2013, and in June 2014 opened the Green Deal Home Improvement Fund, with £120m funding pot.

A project to improve all 387 of the Council’s non-traditional dwellings was being prepared to take advantage of the Green Deal incentives. Analysis of our housing stock indicated that our Non-traditional stock would significantly benefit from external wall insulation.

This scheme was very popular due to the high cashback incentives and was subsequently closed on 25th July 2014 with very little notice.

Whilst there was general disappointment that this funding was withdrawn at such short notice, officers wished to continue with a reduced initial scheme. Should government funding become available in the future the Council would then be in a better position to make a quick application to fund additional phases at Long Lawford and other areas.

**Opportunity for Rugby**

Officers have identified the Long Lawford area as the initial project in a potential programme of external wall insulation works across the borough.

The insulation work would be synchronised with other planned capital works on new doors and windows to achieve a comprehensive improvement. Budget approval has already been obtained for the doors and windows. By incorporating external wall insulation this will prevent duplication of site costs such as scaffolding, security and welfare etc.

**Issues Considered When Selecting Properties for the Proposed Project**

Across the borough, the council has 387 non-traditionally constructed properties which would benefit from external wall insulation (see Table 1). It should be noted that HRA stock in any one area can be dispersed as a direct consequence of Right to Buy sales.
Table 1: Location of Council Non-traditional Construction Housing Stock:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ansty</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdingbury</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinklow</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Hastings</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchover</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton upon Dunsmore</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosford</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunchurch</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankton</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough Magna</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lawford</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marton</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbold</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princethorpe</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rokeby</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretton-on-Dunsmore</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withybrook</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolston</td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolvey</td>
<td>Trusteel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To maximise the project’s efficiency, locations with fewer than 25 properties were discounted for now. This approach identified five potential sites (see Table 1).

To help identify the most suitable area additional criteria were applied using Fuel Poverty data and benefit levels. This analysis showed Long Lawford as being the
most appropriate area for a focused project and Appendix 2 details and summarises the data.

**Developing a Pilot Project for Long Lawford**

Long Lawford was selected as the area for the initial project due to the overall combination of factors, including the numbers of properties with low EPC ratings and high levels of benefit claimants. Additionally, competition from new affordable housing in the village may make existing RBC stock less attractive, creating a risk in terms of future rental income.

The housing stock was then subdivided into 2 potential phases as detailed in Appendix 3.

The Elizabeth Way properties were discounted as they already have benefitted from a previous envelope cladding scheme.

**Table 2: Numbers and Types of Properties in Selected Areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>House Nos</th>
<th>Flat Nos</th>
<th>Bungalow Nos</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there are flats in Area B Planning Permission would be required and would add additional costs and time, so it could be approached in two phases. The costings for these works are shown in Table 3 and a 15% contingency would be added.

**Table 3: Cost of Works in Selected Areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Costs £</th>
<th>Nos of properties</th>
<th>Budget required per property £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>364,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Phase 1(Houses)</td>
<td>282,720</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311,345</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>594,065</td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation of Cabinet

Cabinet decided to recommend to Council that -

(1) Option A at Long Lawford be approved as the initial phase for an external wall insulation project to be carried out by the chosen contractor;

(2) a supplementary HRA capital budget of £400,000 be approved for 2014/15 for external wall insulation to be met from HRA Capital; and

(3) Option B be held in abeyance pending the availability of Government funding.

Recommended that – the recommendation of Cabinet be approved.

COUNCILLOR D POOLE
VICE-CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR
## Off-Street Parking Options for the Future

### In-House Options

#### Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>In-House Parking Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Operate an off street Service in house with a reduced number of patrolling, management and appeals staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Safe option, some exiting staff who have experience in the area could be retained and an effective service could be provided with minimal disturbance. Operations remain entirely within RBC control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Small operation would not achieve economies of scale. May not maximise use of resources. Results in two separately-run parking operations, on and off-street, which could confuse the public. Not a joined-up approach to parking enforcement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Resource Required | 3 x Patrolling staff  
1 x Appeals / Admin staff for season ticket issue, concessionary permits  
Parking Machinery, maintenance and supplies  
Cash Collection Contractor  
ICT infrastructure and equipment  
Uniforms, stationery and equipment.  
Office space |
| Costs             | Could expand service by managing contracts for other car parks or local authorities |
| Comment           | Achievable but not the most beneficial solution. |
## Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>In-House Enforcement Warden Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Builds on Option 1, operate an in-house enforcement service that covers an expanded range of enforcement activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Safe option, some exiting staff who have experience in the area could be retained and an effective service could be provided with minimal disturbance. Operations remain entirely within RBC control. Resource could be used more widely to address wider Council agendas, e.g. litter, dog fouling, graffiti etc. Wider range of duties allow resources to be fully utilised and deployed according to need. Ability to refocus activities to meet new and emerging priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems</strong></td>
<td>Small operation with some risk of ensuring cover. Results in two separately run parking operations, on and off street, which could confuse the public. Not a joined up approach to parking enforcement. The Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 places restrictions on CEO activities and these would need to be managed. Additional staff training and infrastructure to enforce Environmental legislation would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Required</strong></td>
<td>3 x Patrolling staff 1 x Appeals / Admin staff for season ticket issue, concessionary permits and FPN processing Parking Machinery, maintenance and Supplies Cash Collection Contractor ICT infrastructure and equipment Uniforms, stationery and equipment. Office space One Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Most effective and flexible in house solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Shared Service Options

#### Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared service with other local authorities in Warwickshire or</td>
<td>A number of Warwickshire District Councils would combine their off street management and back office functions under a shared arrangement and each Council would appoint their own patrolling staff in accordance with their local requirements.</td>
<td>Increased purchasing power. &lt;br&gt; Reduced management and appeal costs. &lt;br&gt; Retains the ability to determine levels of patrolling staff required and the duties they should perform.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Problems                                                                                                               | Management could be remote from RBC. <br> The TMA places some restrictions on the formal appeals procedure but should be workable within Warwickshire. <br> Results in two separately run parking operations, on and off street, which could confuse the public. <br> Not a joined-up approach to parking enforcement. <br> Not aware of any shared services acting across Highway Authority Boundaries. |                                                                                               |

| Resource Required                                                      | **RBC**<br>3 x Patrolling                                                                                                                  | **Shared**<br>0.25 Manager & 0.75 Appeals / Admin staff for season ticket issue, concessionary permits <br> Parking Machinery, maintenance and Supplies <br> Cash Collection Contractor <br> ICT infrastructure and equipment <br> Uniforms, stationery and equipment <br> Parking Machinery, maintenance and Supplies <br> Office space |

| Costs                                                                   | Initial investigation by shared service team found that there was little appetite at this time for a shared service arrangement and that the uncertainty around expectations increased the risk to this approach |                                                                                               |

| Comment                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                               |
**Option 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Utilise Warwickshire County Council Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Under the On-street tender, WCC are asking for providers to include a rate for patrolling car parks and back office activity. RBC will have the option to call off services from this contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Control of the Off Street Parking places Order would be retained. Could vary enforcement hours as required allowing for seasonal, event variations etc which may not be as flexible with directly employed staff. Will be on a deployed per hour basis so you will get what you need and pay for. Flexibility could assist with seasonal variations, events etc. RBC will be able to direct and ‘order’ resources where it specifically requires them, or not, as the case may be. Allows for directed enforcement, with no capacity waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems</strong></td>
<td>RBC has expressed concerns to this approach as part of the WCC consultation process. Not clear what will be available. Staff could not be relied upon to be ambassadors for RBC or to undertake wider roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Resource Required** | There would be a need to retain expertise in house to cover:-  
- Understanding the enforcement requirements;  
- Assessing and planning deployment required;  
- Undertaking changes to the OSPPO;  
- Managing price changes, consultations etc.;  
- Co-ordinating event management;  
- Managing any infrastructure changes to machinery;  
- Maintaining and auditing the car parks, signage etc.;  
- Monitoring the contract and possibly auditing cancellations.  
Parking Machinery, maintenance and supplies  
Cash Collection Contractor |
| **Costs** | Unable to establish at this time |
| **Comment** | WCC have appointed NSL as their contractor. At this time we have no details of what service(s) would be available and at what cost. This may be something to reconsider in 18-24 months when the WCC contract is embedded |
**Option 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Invite Tenders for Off Street Service from Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A specification and tender could be drawn up and put to the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Market testing could ensure best value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Would require development of specification and tender process which will not be achievable by November 2014. Has limited benefits over other options but more work is required for undertaking the tender exercise. Most private sector off-street service providers only work to civil legislation as the Traffic Management Act 2004 does not apply to private land, so tender is only likely to interest large market providers. Would need to retain staff to manage the contract and deal with a number of administrative matters that cannot be externalised. Results in two separately-run parking operations, on and off-street, which could confuse the public. Not a joined-up approach to parking enforcement. The service will only be as good as the specification that is produced and changes to specification / requirements may be costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Required</td>
<td>Contract Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments</td>
<td>If we are to outsource is likely to be a better option as the WCC contract should achieve better economies of scale and would have the benefit of a single enforcement agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Convert all Car Parks to Pay on Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>All car parks could be converted to pay on exit so that patrolling was not required. Exit controls could be linked to CCTV to prevent people becoming trapped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Reduction in costs of patrolling, issuing notices and appeals. Visitors can stay as long as necessary with no risk of committing an over-staying contravention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems</strong></td>
<td>Would require significant capital investment to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of penalty charge income Requires 24/7 robust coverage of CCTV Not all car parks can be safely and easily secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Required</strong></td>
<td>0.5 x staff resource for machine maintenance season ticket issue, concessionary permits Cash Collection Contractor ICT infrastructure and equipment Stationery and equipment Parking Machinery, maintenance and Supplies Office space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td>High Capital investment, potentially circa £500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>There are a number of practical implications to implementing this solution including the need to secure boundaries and create off road waiting areas before the barriers in some car parks these would be very difficult to achieve. Also, in practice, experience suggests that this solution is likely to require staffing to deal with issues with the machinery and users who require assistance, lose tickets, or become trapped in the car parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Implications

### Proposed Staffing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Enforcement Officer - Grade C</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Enforcement Officer - Grade C</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Technician - Grade C</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals Officer - Grade C</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Manager 0.25 FTE/Appeals Officer 0.75 FTE*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained staff resource 0.50 FTE - Grade C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86,520</td>
<td>86,520</td>
<td>91,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed New Running Expenses

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Wall Security</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Consultancy</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Running Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Machinery - capital charges**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Machinery - maintenance costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
| **Existing running expenses (detailed on Appendix 3)** | 102,400  | 102,400  | 102,400  | 0        | 0        | 102,400  |

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>197,920</td>
<td>201,520</td>
<td>198,420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
| **Income**                     |          |          |          |          |          |
| Car Parking Charges            | -473,000 | -473,000 | -473,000 | -        | -        | -473,000 |
| Car Park Season Tickets        | -61,500  | -61,500  | -61,500  | -        | -        | -61,500  |
| Car Park Excess Charges        | -65,940  | -65,940  | -65,940  | -        | -        | -65,940  |
| **Total Income**               | -600,440 | -600,440 | -600,440 | 0        | 0        | -534,500 |

|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
| **Net Expenditure (before accounting adjustments)** | -402,520 | -398,920 | -402,020 | 0        | 0        | -332,980 |

|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
| **Accounting Adjustments (detailed on Appendix 3)** | 224,230  | 224,230  | 224,230  | 0        | 0        | 224,230  |

|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
|                                |          |          |          |          |          |
| **Net Expenditure**            | -178,290 | -174,690 | -177,790 | 0        | 0        | -108,750 |

* Option 3

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager - Grade G7</td>
<td>£39,625</td>
<td>x 0.25 FTE</td>
<td>9,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals Officer - Grade C</td>
<td>£21,631</td>
<td>x 0.75 FTE</td>
<td>16,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 6

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Purchase £500,000 / 10 year useful life</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on borrowing @ 3.66% p.a. (PWLB fixed rate)</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Capital Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Existing running expenses would continue to be incurred as per Appendix 3.
## Financial Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014/15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014/15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015/16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>85,390</td>
<td>114,490</td>
<td>86,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011</td>
<td>QUAL QUALIFICATION TRAINING</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,720</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0101</td>
<td>ACCOMMODATION</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td>GENR CAR PARK MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0141</td>
<td>RATES</td>
<td>52,340</td>
<td>52,340</td>
<td>52,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0145</td>
<td>BIDS LEVY</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0151</td>
<td>VMS SIGNAGE</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROPERTY EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,950</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>NEW EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0340</td>
<td>UNIFORMS</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0350</td>
<td>STATIONERY</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0351</td>
<td>TICKET/RECEIPT SUPPLIES</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0370</td>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0371</td>
<td>MOBILE TELEPHONES</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0374</td>
<td>SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0376</td>
<td>HARDWARE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0440</td>
<td>PRM INSURANCE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0441</td>
<td>INSURANCE EXCESSES</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0444</td>
<td>OTHER MISC. EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>18,790</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GENERAL RUNNING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,690</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0734</td>
<td>TEC TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT COURTS</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0734</td>
<td>PAT PCN PATROL COSTS</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0734</td>
<td>CHIP CHIPSIDE ENQUIRY SERVICES</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0744</td>
<td>CASH COLLECTION</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>12,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OTHER RUNNING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,560</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEW VEHICLE RUNNING COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEW STONE WALL SECURITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEW NEIGHBOUR CONSULTANCY</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEW RUNNING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>220,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,520</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LESS INCOME:-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>CAR PARKING CHARGES</td>
<td>-473,000</td>
<td>-473,000</td>
<td>-473,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>CAR PARK SEASON TICKETS</td>
<td>-61,500</td>
<td>-61,500</td>
<td>-61,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>PENALTY CHARGES (OFF STREET)</td>
<td>-65,940</td>
<td>-65,940</td>
<td>-65,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>-600,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>-600,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>-600,440</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NET EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>-391,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>-379,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>-398,920</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(before accounting adjustments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTING ADJUSTMENTS:-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>IAS 19 ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0780</td>
<td>INTERNAL RECHARGES</td>
<td>106,870</td>
<td>106,870</td>
<td>186,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>CAPITAL RECHARGES</td>
<td>36,550</td>
<td>36,550</td>
<td>36,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NET EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>-247,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>-235,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>-174,690</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on the existing arrangement to 31.10.14 and Option 2 in place from 01.11.14.