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- The reports with this agenda are available at www.dorsetareacouncils.co.uk
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- **Public Participation**
  Guidance on public participation at the Dorset Area Joint Committee is available on request from DorsetAreaJC@dorsetcc.gov.uk.

Members of the public can ask questions and make statements at the meeting. The closing date for questions is 10.00am on 15 January 2018, and statements by midday the day before the meeting.
1. **Apologies for Absence**
   To receive any apologies for absence.

2. **Code of Conduct**
   Councillors are required to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 regarding disclosable pecuniary interests.

3. **Minutes**
   To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017.

4. **Public Participation**
   To receive any public questions or statements on the business of the Joint Committee.

5. **Local Government Reorganisation - Update**
   To consider a verbal update from the Chief Executive Sponsor of the Central Programme Team on the current status of the Future Dorset proposal submitted to Government in February 2017.

6. **Structural Change Order**
   To receive a report (to follow) by the Dorset Councils' Monitoring Officers on the options open to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for inclusion in a Structural Change Order. The purpose of the Structural Change Order is to underpin the transition from existing councils to a new authority for the Dorset area.

7. **Disaggregation**
   To consider a report by the Dorset Councils’ Chief Executives.

8. **Programme Management Budget**
   To consider a report by the Dorset Councils’ Chief Executives.

9. **Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports**
   To consider the following:
   
   a) **Progress of Task and Finish Groups**
      To receive a verbal update on the progress of Task and Finish Groups.
   
   b) **Task and Finish Group on Boundary Review - Recommendation**
      To consider a recommendation from the Task and Finish Group on Boundary Review meeting held on 3 January 2018 on the initial evidence stage submission to the DCLG. A further meeting of the Group will be held on 17 January 2018 at 5:30pm and any updated information will be circulated at the meeting.
To consider the work programme and forward plan for the Joint Committee.
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Dorset Area Joint Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester DT1 1UZ on Wednesday, 13 December 2017

**Present:**
Rebecca Knox (Chairman)
Anthony Alford, Shane Bartlett, Jeff Cant, Graham Carr-Jones, Spencer Flower, Matt Hall, Jill Haynes, Sherry Jespersen, Ros Kayes, Byron Quayle, Barry Quinn, Gary Suttle and Simon Tong

**Officer Attending:** Stuart Caundle (Monitoring Officer - Dorset Councils Partnership), Steve Mackenzie (Chief Executive - Purbeck District Council), David McIntosh (Chief Executive - East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Council), Matt Prosser (Chief Executive - West Dorset District, Weymouth & Portland Borough and North Dorset District Council), Debbie Ward (Chief Executive - Dorset County Council), Lee Gallagher (Democratic Services Manager - Dorset County Council) and Fiona Napier (Communications & Customer Experience Manager - Dorset Councils Partnership).

**Apologies for Absence**
30 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Colin Huckle (Weymouth and Portland Borough Council) and Cllr Bill Pipe (Dorset County Council).

**Code of Conduct**
31 There were no declarations by members of disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

**Minutes**
32 The minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2017 were confirmed and signed.

**Public Participation**
33 **Public Speaking**
There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1).

There were no public statements received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2).

**Local Government Reorganisation - Update**
34 The Chief Executive Sponsor of the Central Programme Team provided a verbal update on the current status of the Future Dorset proposal. Work continued between the Central Team and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), together with continued work to develop programme workstreams on disaggregation, Council Tax harmonisation, legal and democratic (including boundary review), strategic human resources and organisational development, communications and finance.

Due process would be followed until a final decision was made by the Secretary of State, which if positive, could be announced by early February 2018, with a Structural Change Order being approved and in place by June 2018.

Cllr Gary Suttle, as Leader of Purbeck District Council, was pleased to confirm that the Council had withdrawn its objection to the Future Dorset proposal, and had informed the Secretary of State.
Cllr Spencer Flower also announced as Leader of East Dorset District Council that the Council had reconsidered its position and had now accepted the Secretary of State’s ‘minded to’ decision.

There were now eight out of nine of Dorset’s Councils that were in common support of the drive towards unitary authorities across Dorset.

Noted

Programme Update – including formation of Task & Finish Groups

The Joint Committee received an update on workstreams and further work areas that required the creation of Task and Finish Groups in order to maintain the pace of the programme.

An overview of the workstreams included progress in relation to shared services; communications and engagement; service disaggregation; Council Tax harmonisation; boundary review; wider member engagement; Structural Change Order. In addition, the arrangements for an LGA session on the process for appointment of Chief Executive, and a Risk Management Workshop were summarised.

The Programme Management governance would see appointments made to the Programme Director, Programme Manager, Communications and Engagement Manager and two Workstream Coordinators in December 2017 and early January 2018. When appointments had been completed the new team would be responsible for supporting the workstreams and ongoing programme.

Staff engagement was highlighted as critical to the success of the workstreams and overall programme, especially in relation to what staff could do to contribute to the programme. This would be addressed through the Shared Services Task and Finish Group. An important part of the staff engagement work would also rely on a focused communication approach.

A further point was raised about the ability of staff across organisations to be in scope for positions, and to enable the formation of the new organisation as an opportunity for staff to progress or change direction in their careers. David McIntosh, as the HR workstream lead Chief Executive, confirmed that both staffing issues had already been identified and were being considered as part of the Programme.

Where workstreams overlapped with the role of an existing body, such as the Strategic Planning Forum (SPF), it was noted that a link would be made with these bodies to ensure direction and prevent duplication. Cllr Barry Quinn suggested that the SPF was not working particularly well and attendance was low. He also stated that this covered the pan-Dorset area as the SPF included Bournemouth and Poole representatives.

Wider member engagement was seen as a particular area where members of all councils would be interested in the Task and Finish Group as many would be very keen to be involved in the work so there needed to be an appropriate way for them to take part. It was felt that all 211 members should be involved, but the Group should be of a manageable size in order to drive the workstreams. The size of the Group did not prevent members from being involved in its work, and communications would be imperative to a successful workstream.

Lead members and officers would be identified for each Task and Finish Group. It was also identified that a further group on Area Based Decision Making needed to be established alongside the others. A specific request was made for the budgetary implications of an area based decision making structure to be considered carefully.
Each group would comprise a small number of members and cover the broad geography of Dorset. In addition they would receive input from the Communications and Engagement Manager and a Workstream Coordinator, and work topics would continually assess the need to consider engagement with members and other stakeholders. Additional Task and Finish Groups could also be established under each workstream to carry out further work.

Resolved
1. That the updates on the established workstreams and Task and Finish Groups be noted.
2. That the Task and Finish Groups detailed in the annexure to these minutes be created and memberships agreed, subject to outstanding appointments and lead members being confirmed by Council Leaders through delegated authority.

Programme Management Budget
36 The Joint Committee made decisions at previous meetings in October and November 2017 to recruit a Programme Director, Programme Manager, Communications and Engagement Manager and two Workstream Co-ordinators as the central resource to create a new unitary council. The Joint Committee considered the commissioning arrangements needed to enable additional appointments for specific work to deliver the programme.

The remaining funding available to the Programme after appointments that had been agreed was £700k. To ensure the fast-moving Programme, the Joint Committee was supportive of the need for the Programme Board to manage the spend to avoid delays. Progress would then be reported back to the Joint Committee regularly.

Current support offered by existing officers across each council was highlighted as this was cost neutral at the moment, but at the point where more intensive dedicated work was required there would be a need for backfill arrangements to be put in place. Particular areas of significant support were highlighted as finance and human resources.

Resolved
1. That the remaining budget of £700k, to be spent on programme management up to 31 March 2019, be approved.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Programme Board of Chief Executives in relation to detailed spending decisions.
3. That regular updates on the Programme Management Budget be considered by the Joint Committee.

Consolidated Medium Term Financial Plan
37 A report on the cooperation between partner Councils in respect of financial decisions and combined financial position was considered by the Joint Committee. The monitoring of the budget position was imperative as the programme progressed towards the new unitary council, taking account of budget gaps and savings moving forward over the next 15 months.

An overview of the budget setting process through the Implementation Executive in 2018/19 and 19/20, and for the new Council after the elections in May 2019, was provided.

Attention was drawn to existing asset management and budget gaps of each council, and how anticipated assets and liabilities would be transferred to the new authority. The purpose of bringing the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to the Joint Committee on a regular basis would be to monitor budget planning and spending across all councils and for decisions that would have a significant impact on the
financial position of the proposed new unitary Council to be reported. Collective monitoring by finance officers would also take place to support the Joint Committee. It was also clarified that the Capital Programmes would continue for each council and capital spend commitments would be included in the MTFP process.

The asset management strategies of each council would also be expected to continue to spend and release assets, but for this to move the respective councils towards the new organisation. A suggestion was made that early progress on the Area Based Decision Making Task and Finish Group could help to identify the asset spend in localities, but caution was expressed as this could lead to an inequitable approach to assets.

**Noted**

**Work Programme and Forward Plan**

The Joint Committee considered its Work Programme and Forward Plan and added the following items for future meetings throughout the meeting:

- Task and Finish Group Regular Updates (Minute 35)
- Programme Management Budget Regular Updates (Minute 36)

Additional reserve dates for the Joint Committee would also be added to the work programme to provide flexibility to enable decisions to be made at pace.

The need for an up to date and appropriate central resource was needed for Joint Committee members to access information and dependencies as the programme progressed. The use of SharePoint sites was cited as a possible solution and would be investigated outside of the meeting.

**Resolved**

1. That the Work Programme and Forward Plan be updated.
2. That additional reserve meeting dates be arranged.
3. That a central information source for members be developed.

Meeting Duration: 11.30 am - 12.45 pm
# Dorset Area Joint Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject of Report</strong></td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Summary</strong></td>
<td>The detailed planning and preparation for the service analysis has completed and the series of service reviews has started. The work is due to complete on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Implications</strong></td>
<td>It may be necessary to provide supplementary resource by means of backfilling key staff. This will be reported through update reports to the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>The Joint Committee is asked to note the progress of the disaggregation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendices</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Report Originator and Contact** | Sarah Longdon  
01202 633018  
s.longdon@poole.gov.uk |
Background detail

1. Since the last Joint Committee meeting further detailed planning and preparation for the disaggregation work has taken place. Service review meetings are being scheduled and service data is being prepared for these reviews. Some early reviews are already in progress, the majority will start in the next few weeks.

2. The Oversight group held its first meeting on 19th December 2017 where it agreed the approach to the service analysis and reviews, approved the preparation documents and provided input into the schedule. It also reviewed the outcome and learning from the Libraries Service pilot. This learning has been incorporated into the process.

3. A briefing meeting for all directors and service leads involved in the work is planned for mid-January to ensure they are fully aware of the process and their responsibilities for this work.

4. The Libraries service pilot data analysis was reviewed on 13th December 2017. Those involved felt it went well, the process achieved its objective and some useful, constructive feedback was provided to improve the process for further reviews.

5. A joint meeting of the two Task and Finish Groups will take place at the end of January or early February 2018, to share details of the process and the outcome of the early reviews.
## Executive Summary

At its meeting in December the Joint Committee was informed that the programme management budget for the Dorset Area Joint Committee totals £1,213k, of which £83k is committed to the central team. The central team is responsible for the research and coordination work required by both Joint Committees in Dorset. The central team is also meeting the costs associated with the disaggregation of the County Council's services in Christchurch.

The Joint Committee has previously approved the use of the programme management budget to finance the costs associated with the Programme Director, Programme Manager, Communications and Engagement Manager and two Workstream Coordinators. The Programme Director has been appointed by the Leaders of the Dorset Area Councils and has started work on the programme, on a part-time basis from 10 January and full-time from 5 February. The other posts have been advertised and interviews are due to be held at the end of January and early February.

In December the Joint Committee agreed to delegate the allocation of the remaining budget of £700k to the Programme Board of the four Chief Executives of Dorset Area Councils. The purpose of this report is to provide the Joint Committee with an update on the budget.

Provided there are sufficient suitable candidates interviewed, the Programme Board is minded to appoint three Workstream Coordinators, rather than two. This is because there are now a large number of workstreams and Task and Finish Groups.
which need to make progress quickly, to meet the deadline of 1 April 2019 to form the new unitary council.

**Budget Implications**

The programme management budget of the Joint Committee is expected to be £1,130k, after £83k has been spent by the central team. The commitments against this budget, up to 31 March 2019 are shown in the table below, assuming three Workstream Coordinators are appointed, including employee related oncosts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Director</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>193,600</td>
<td>217,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>68,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>67,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstream Coordinators x 3</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>148,300</td>
<td>164,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>463,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>517,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The balance of the budget remaining uncommitted is therefore £612,300.

**Recommendation**

The Joint Committee supports the appointment of a third Workstream Coordinator, provided there are suitable candidates.

**Appendices**

None

**Background Papers**

None

**Report Originator and Contact**

Steve Mackenzie  
Chief Executive, Purbeck District Council  
Telephone: 01929 557235  
E-mail: stevemackenzie@purbeck-dc.gov.uk
Recommendation from the Task and Finish Group meeting held on 3 January 2018

Local Government Reorganisation Boundary Review - Initial Evidence Stage Submission

5. The Task and Finish Group considered a report by Dorset Councils’ Monitoring Officers on the Boundary Review for the Dorset Area which was a key part of work to establish electoral boundaries for a new council from 1 April 2019. The Group was established by the Dorset Area Joint Committee on 15 November 2017.

The background and context to the Boundary Review was considered, noting that there was a short timeline to compile a first submission for the new Dorset Area council regarding council size and electoral forecast information to 2023 by 31 January 2018. Consideration therefore had to be given to electoral equality, ward boundaries, community identity and governance arrangements.

After the initial submission the review would follow a timetable which included a public consultation in July 2018, and completion in November 2018 to provide time to prepare for elections in May 2019. The submission of council size would be used in as a fall-back position and in the Structural Change Order, but it was clarified that DCLG expected both council size numbers to be consistent. The review was being led by DCLG in advance of the Structural Change Order being made, and the Boundary Commission would then play an active role.

It was recognised that work undertaken at an early stage on accountability and leadership in the Case for Change: Local Government Reorganisation in Dorset (section 6) provided a starting point based on assumptions and provided direction regarding the formation of boundaries in the fall-back position. However, more detailed work showed that a higher number of members would be required than 72 as stated in the report.

For clarity, it was suggested that the new council should refer to ‘Wards’ and not ‘Divisions’ for each electoral area.

Initial ward profiling used recent electoral forecast information to 2020 as a basis to develop the fall-back position. It showed that a doubling up of county divisions provided for 82 members, but in urban county areas of Bridport, Dorchester, Ferndown, Gillingham, Moors and Verwood there would be the need to create two dual member divisions for each area. Although it was possible to create triple member wards it was not possible to have quadruple member wards so maps would be developed to illustrate how these wards would look. Further updated electoral forecast information would also be reported back to the Group as the team was currently working through the forecast model for 2023, and there was some outstanding information required from councils and the Office for National Statistics. Both sources of information would be developed to support the recommendation of the Group to the Dorset Area Joint Committee on 18 January 2018.

A further point was supported by the Group that the final warding in the next stage of the process should be based on single member wards where possible and in the urban areas it was possible to have dual or triple member wards if needed as this was an established practice in Dorset, and worked better for areas of higher population.

The average number of electors for each ward was discussed by the Group, with reference to other similar authorities. An average of 3900 would be at the higher end
of the comparators in the report, but it was felt that this was an appropriate average borne by a council size of 82.

The governance model information in the report outlined a broad approach to executive arrangements with area planning and area boards, and as such comparisons were drawn with other multi-purpose authorities which had similar electorate profiles and numbers of members which managed similar governance. In addition, some of the authorities which had been larger when they were established were now reducing to a number broadly in line with the assessment of 82 members. It was therefore felt that the governance of the new council would be adequately served by a council of 82.

Links with other Task and Finish Groups such as the Area Based Decision making Task and Finish Group were highlighted and the importance of starting the other groups was supported by all members.

A question about whether Community Governance Reviews could be undertaken alongside the Boundary Review was asked, to which it was clarified that DCLG was not supportive of multiple reviews taking place at the same time.

The final ward mapping would be undertaken as part of the next stage of the review, but the Group discussed the need to ensure that there was appropriate local member engagement. It was suggested that there should be a series of five roadshow events across Dorset to liaise with local members. This information would also be considered at the next meeting.

On considering all of the information available, it was agreed that a council size of 82 was appropriate and would be recommended to the Dorset Area Joint Committee, subject to the consideration of further evidence at a meeting on 17 January 2018. It was also noted that depending on whether any information was outstanding at this stage it may be appropriate for delegated authority to be used to finalise the figures prior to submission to DCLG on 31 January 2018.

Resolved
1. That the timetable in section 4 of the Monitoring Officers’ report be noted.
2. That the methodologies for electoral forecasting and council size set out in the report and appendix 1 be supported.

RECOMMENDED
1. That a council size of 82 members be recommended to the Dorset Area Joint Committee for approval as part of a submission to the DCLG by 31 January 2018, subject to any further clarification of detail arising from the next meeting being held on 17 January 2018; and,
2. That this council size be used in the Structural Change Order as the fall-back electoral arrangements.
3. That electoral areas should be referred to as Electoral Wards.
**Executive Summary**

As part of Local Government Reorganisation preparations and the work to establish a new council for the Dorset area the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is working with us on a boundary review with the aim of achieving new electoral boundaries from 1 April 2019.

The Task and Finish Group was established by the Dorset Area Joint Committee on 15 November 2017 to oversee and co-ordinate the review. The membership of the Task and Finish Group is drawn from the existing Dorset area councils. The review work is supported by district and county officers.

This report outlines the arrangements and a timetable for the review, together with the key considerations in the first stage of the review. It is anticipated that the Task and Finish Group will continue to meet throughout the review process and future update reports will be provided as the review progresses.

In the light of forecasting of the electorate across the Dorset area for the five years to 2023 the Task and Finish Group will need to arrive at a proposal for the number of councillors who will form the new council. This work needs to be completed urgently so that a recommendation can be made to the Dorset Area Joint Committee in time for its meeting on 18 January 2018. The Joint Committee will then make representations to DCLG about council size.

A firm decision about council size will enable detailed work to be undertaken in the second stage of the review to divide the new council area into new wards/divisions. This work must take account of the need both to ensure (within certain tolerances) that councillors represent equal numbers of electors and that wards/divisions reflect a sense of community identity.

The Task and Finish Group will also need to make recommendations about fall-back boundary arrangements to enable elections to still go
ahead in the event that a full electoral review cannot be completed in time for elections to be held in May 2019.

| Budget Implications | There are no immediate budget implications associated with this report but it is likely that significant councillor and officer time will need to be committed to the review. Decisions made about council size and governance model will have some direct budget implications at a later stage when an independent remuneration panel makes recommendations about basic and special responsibility allowances for councillors. |

| Recommendation | That the Task and Finish Group: 
1. Approves the timetable in section 4 of the report  
2. Considers and support the methodologies for electoral forecasting and council size set out in this report and appendix 1  
3. Makes a council size recommendation to the Dorset Area Joint Committee so that it is in a position to make a submission to the DCLG by 31 January 2018 and  
4. Recommends fall-back electoral arrangements to the Joint Committee. |

| Appendices | 1. Electorate forecasts methodology briefing note.  
2. “Improving accountability” extract from the Local Government Reorganisation in Dorset case for change document  
3. Briefing note on council size  
4. Electoral divisions |

| Report Originator and Contact | Name: Jonathan Mair, Head of Organisational Development, Dorset County Council  
Tel: 01305 224181  
Email: j.e.mair@dorsetcc.gov.uk |
1. **Background**

1.1 As part of Local Government Reorganisation preparations, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is progressing a Boundary Review across Dorset with the aim of achieving new electoral boundaries for the new organisation for the Dorset area from 1 April 2019.

1.2 Electoral reviews usually take place within the context of an existing council and look at whether the number of councillors should be changed and whether the boundaries of wards/divisions need to be altered. Such reviews can be triggered either by the need to ensure fairer representation at local government elections after any significant changes in the distribution of electors, or at the request of a council for other reasons.

1.3 The preliminary phase of the review requires the submission of evidence in relation to:

- Five year electoral forecasting - to ensure that decisions made in the present are future proofed and protected from predictable changes in the distribution of electors.
- Council size – before any boundaries are redrawn, a view must be reached about the total number of councillors to be elected to the council. A recommendation on council size will be made by the Task and Finish Group to the Dorset Area Joint Committee and it will in turn make representations to DCLG.

1.4 The next phase of the review, from March 2018 will consider:

- The number, boundaries and names of wards/divisions; and,
- The number of councillors to be elected from each ward/division.

2. **The Local Government Reorganisation Context**

2.1 In the context of local government reorganisation it might be considered incorrect to describe the work of the Task and Finish Group as an “electoral review”. The work of the Task and Finish Group is not to review and update existing council divisional/warding patterns, but to arrive at proposals for the size and warding/divisional pattern of a completely new council.

2.2 The new Dorset council will be a large multi-purpose local authority combining district and county functions. This combination of responsibility for delivering local and strategic council functions across a large area and to a significant population is important in determining how many councillors are needed to govern the new council, work effectively with partners and to represent local communities.

2.3 The responsibility for overseeing the preparations to form a new Dorset council currently sits with the Dorset Area Joint Committee. Following any final decision to proceed with local government reorganisation in Dorset the Secretary of State will make a structural change order. That order will make
provision about the council size as well as including a fall-back position in the event that a boundary review cannot be completed.

3. **Fall-back arrangements**

3.1 Creating a completely new council, determining its membership size and creating a new warding/divisional pattern from scratch is complex and will be difficult to achieve in time to enable elections to take place safely in May 2019. Working with the existing local authorities, DCLG and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) have developed a plan which would enable a legally compliant boundary review to take place within a significantly shorter timescale than would ordinarily by the case.

3.2 The key legal ingredients of a public consultation by the LGBCE on the proposed new arrangements and leading to a parliamentary order will still be present, but much of the work that might ordinarily be undertaken or supported by LGBCE will have to be undertaken locally by the Task and Finish Group and your officers. This is in part because LGBCE are unable to engage formally with us until the Secretary of State has made a final decision to proceed with local government reorganisation in Dorset.

3.3 DCLG has recognised that local government reorganisation in Dorset is a one in 20 years opportunity and that if we are creating a new council then we really do need to start as we mean to go on, with new membership arrangements specifically designed to meet the needs of a new organisation and the communities it serves, in place from the outset.

3.4 DCLG will do all that it can to help us deliver new membership arrangements for the new council but recognising the short timeframe they will also provide a fall-back position in the structural change order. This fall-back position will enable elections to take place even if time constraints prevent completely new arrangements from being put in place in time to prepare for elections in May 2019.

3.5 Any fall-back position for a new council, based upon the warding/divisional patterns of an outgoing county council, would be less than satisfactory and so this underlines the importance of meeting DCLG and LGBCE deadlines and the timetable set out below to establish completely new arrangements.
4. Proposed timetable to achieve new council size and divisional/warding pattern

**Boundary Review Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2017</td>
<td>Formation of the Task and Finish Group for Boundary Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2017</td>
<td>DCLG meeting with the Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 January 2018</td>
<td>Report to Task and Finish Group on Methodology and recommendation of council size proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 January 2018</td>
<td>Report to Dorset Area Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 31 January 2018</td>
<td>Submission of initial evidence in relation to electoral forecasts and Council Size to DCLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>DCLG Analysis and deliberations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – June 2018</td>
<td>(concurrent with DCLG analysis and therefore at risk) development by the Task and Finish Group of proposed divisional/warding pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - June 2018</td>
<td>Task and Finish Group Consultation with existing Dorset Area councillors on proposed divisional/warding pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Analysis and deliberations, and proposals referred to LGBCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 2018</td>
<td>Consideration of proposals at meeting of LGBCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start July 2018</td>
<td>Publication of proposals by LGBCE – start of 12 week statutory consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Consideration by LGBCE of consultation responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>LGBCE lay Order in Parliament for 40 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November and December 2018</td>
<td>Work undertaken at risk by the Dorset Area Councils to prepare registers during 40 day Parliamentary period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Order takes full effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May 2019</td>
<td>Elections to a new Dorset Council based upon newly approved council size and divisional/warding pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Dorset’s area and population context

5.1 The proposed area of the new Dorset Council comprises the existing district and borough areas of East Dorset, North Dorset, Purbeck, West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland – the area of the existing county council but without Christchurch Borough.

5.2 Population: Dorset’s population grew by 5.7% over the decade to 2013. The total population grew faster than had previously been expected, rising by approximately 22,000 to 412,900 in 2011 and rising to 414,900 in 2012. Dorset has an above average proportion of residents aged 65 years or more. In-migration continues to drive population growth, with the greatest gains
among 45-64 year old migrants. However, there is a net migration loss of those aged 16-24 years.

5.3 The total population is expected to increase by 4.6% by 2020. During this period an additional 9,300 dwellings are expected to be completed which will result in the total population increasing by almost 20,000. By 2020 the total population is forecast to reach 434,400 and the electorate (those aged 17+ years) will reach 358,900.

5.4 Environment: Dorset includes part of England’s only natural World Heritage Site and two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, covering 53% of the County. The ‘environmental economy’ of the South West (agriculture, forestry, fishing, energy and tourism) has been estimated to contribute 15% to regional GDP. Over 12% of the regional economy is estimated to rely directly on the land and landscape. These same environmental benefits are relevant when we forecast electoral growth because they serve as limiting factors on development and housing growth.

5.5 Housing: 59% of Dorset's population live in urban areas and 41% in rural areas. In 2011, Dorset had about 180,200 households and this is expected to grow to around 195,000 by 2021. However over the last ten years, build rates have declined. Between 2001 and 2011 in Dorset, 70% of new and converted dwellings were built on previously developed land.

5.6 Access: Almost half of those living in rural areas live in rural towns or fringe areas. Only 15.5% of households in Dorset do not have access to a car, and over 41% have access to more than one car.

6. Key Considerations in recommending council size and divisional/warding pattern

6.1 Electoral Forecast: Detailed five-year forecasts of the electorate are vital at polling district, parish and ward level if these are to form reliable building blocks for the proposed new electoral divisions/wards.

6.2 Proposed new divisions/wards must meet the following criteria, as set out by LGBCE:

**Electoral Equality**
Each of the new wards/divisions must have an electorate which is within 10% of the average for all of the Dorset area divisions/wards as a whole, based on the forecast for 2023.

The formula to be applied is:

\[
\text{Total forecast electorate/Council size} = \text{average number of electors per division}
\]
For instance, following the recent review in the current county council area, a county electorate of 359,000 divided by 46 county councillors means that each county councillor should represent some 7,800 electors (figures are rounded).

Applying the +/- 10 per cent tolerance, the current county divisions should have an electorate of between 7,020 and 8,580.

**Division/Ward Boundaries**
Where possible, the new wards/divisions must be coterminous with parish boundaries. Only in exceptional circumstances will new boundaries be created, in these instances, supporting evidence is required to demonstrate why this is being proposed. However, in the context of forming a new council, it is also important to bear in mind that existing district council boundaries will no longer exist, and there may be instances where it makes sense for new divisions/wards to cross former district boundaries.

**Community Identity**
Divisional/ward boundaries cannot simply be lines on a map which are meaningless on the ground. In exceptional circumstances, a new division may be created with an electorate outside of the 10% tolerance, if the alternatives would result in the splitting of a community or distinct settlement.

6.3 LGBCE state that electorate forecasts must take us to 2023 and take account of proposed house building at a local level. The forecasts will be produced at polling district level.

6.4 A basic cohort component model has been used:

\[
\text{Base population} + \text{births} - \text{deaths} +/\text{- migration} = \text{new population}
\]

6.5 Migration is constrained to the number of dwellings available, which includes those we expect to be completed by 2023, as set out in local plans.

6.6 **Governance arrangements:** The new council’s governance arrangements, both internal and external, are also a factor in identifying an appropriate council size. At this stage, we do not know the precise detail of the intended governance structure of a new Dorset council. However, a new council would be likely to operate the executive leader model so provision would need to be made for:

- A leader and cabinet (a total of up to 10 members)
- Overview and scrutiny arrangements
- Area board arrangements
- Regulatory functions
- Engagement with external partners

Other multi-function councils operate with a membership size ranging between 40 and 126 councillors. As set out below, the proposed Dorset...
council size will be within this range and it is not necessary that at this stage the Joint Committee should define the new council’s governance structure in any greater detail than suggested above.

6.7 **Council Size Methodology** - Based on the council size proposed to the DCLG an average electorate size will be set, as described below. Given the 10 per cent tolerance allowed, wards/divisions must therefore have an operating range of electors. Where former electoral arrangements were constrained by district boundaries, this will not be a constraint in this review and will allow for imagination to be used to form new wards/divisions for the new council.

7 **Consideration of Council size options**

7.1 DCLG has suggested that in proposing a council size we might take as our starting point the information on accountability and leadership which was contained in section 6 of the case for change submitted as part of the Future Dorset proposal to the Secretary of State. The relevant extract from the case of change is appendix 2 to this report – *The case for change: Local Government Reorganisation in Dorset – section 6 stronger and more accountable leadership.*

7.2 The case for change extract describes the current electoral representation arrangements in the Dorset area which are provided by 211 councillors each representing an electorate ranging between 1,332 and 6,937 electors.

7.3 In the table at figure 34 the case for change goes on to compare the position in multi-purpose councils established in 2009 where the electorate per councillor ranges between 3,017 and 3,579. Whilst this range can be seen as typical for a new multi-purpose council there is much greater variation in the numbers of councillors on each council. Bedford council has 40 councillors whilst County Durham has 126.

7.4 The extract from the case for change reaches high level conclusions about a possible appropriate number of councillors for a new Dorset council – 72 councillors. On the electoral figures available for PWC at the time this would result in each councillor representing some 3,900 electors.

7.5 Further work has now been undertaken in detail based upon more up to date figures. This is set out in the briefing note on council size at appendix 3. The data illustrates a range of electors per councillor of between 2,900 (Herefordshire) and 5,100 (Cornwall). For the reasons set out in the briefing note we need to move on from the initial PWC work and base recommendations upon more detailed work carried out by officers, based upon more up to date figures and analysis.

7.6 The information in table 4 provides figures for the electorate per councillor based upon alternative council sizes ranging from 70 to 82 councillors. At a council size of 72, each councillor on the new Dorset council would represent an electorate of some 4,400. At a council size of 82, each councillor would represent an electorate of some 3,900.

7.7 As set out earlier in this report in addition to work to identify a new council size and divisional/warding pattern DCLG also requires us to identify fall-back
electoral arrangements. The fall-back arrangements will be prescribed in a schedule to the structural change order which forms the new council.

7.8 DCLG has advised that the fall-back council size and the council size arrived at through the review must be the same (it is the divisional/warding pattern which will be different). They have also advised that the only practical fall-back position is one that takes as its starting point a doubling of the councillors returned by the existing county council electoral divisions.

7.9 The Dorset County Council area, excluding Christchurch, has 35 electoral divisions returning in total 41 county councillors. This reflects that six of the county council divisions each return two councillors.

7.10 At its most straightforward a doubling of the county council divisions would result in a fall-back council of 82 councillors. The detailed table 3 included in appendix 3 sets out the electorate per existing county council division alongside calculations for the electorate per councillor in each division if the number of councillors was doubled to 82.

7.11 This is illustrated for instance in what is currently a single number division like Cranborne Chase where a county councillor representing an electorate of 7,210 would be replaced in a fall-back situation by two Dorset councillors sharing representation of the same 7,210 electorate. The unsatisfactory nature of this as a fall-back position is in part that the two councillors would not each be representing a separate electorate of 3,605. Both would be equally responsible for representing all 7,210 electors.

7.12 The unsatisfactory nature of the fall-back becomes starker when we look at the existing county two councillor divisions which if doubled would become four councillor divisions. For instance, four councillors would represent the Dorchester division and all four councillors would each have their own responsibility towards the 16,730 Dorchester electors. In contrast councillors in single councillor divisions would each be accountable to some 3,900 electors.

7.13 The LGBCE do not approve of four councillor divisions and in new divisional/warding arrangements would not approve any more than a three councillor division/ward. This presents the Task and Finish Panel with a choice, either:

- To make the existing two councillor divisions into three councillor divisions; or,
- To divide each of the existing two councillor divisions into two separate two councillor divisions.

The first option would result in an overall council size of 76. It would remedy the problem of four councillor divisions but electors in three councillor divisions would be under represented in comparison to electors in single councillor divisions.

The second option would result in a council size of 82 but would require the splitting of existing divisions. Some divisions will be easier to split than others and officers will illustrate at the meeting how this might be done.
7.14 A fall-back position is essential for inclusion in the structural change order and the practicalities mean that it must be based upon existing county council divisions. A doubling of existing single councillor divisions works in providing an arrangement where only one division (Swanage) deviates more than 10% from the average electorate but increasing existing two councillor divisions to become three councillor divisions would increase to seven the number of divisions with a greater than 10% deviation from the average.

7.15 Although this would involve additional work the preference is to illustrate to the Task and Finish Group on 3 January how the existing two councillor divisions could be split.

7.16 If the Task and Finish Group accept that the fall-back position should be based upon doubling existing county divisions, with the splitting and then doubling of existing two councillor divisions then this would provide a council size of 82 for inclusion in the structural change order.

8 Next steps

8.1 Putting on one side the fall-back position, if we base the next phase of detailed review work on a council size of 82 then work can begin on a completely new divisional/warding pattern in which (plus or minus 10%) each councillor would represent some 3,900 electors. Decreasing council size to 76 would result in each councillor representing 4,200 electors.

8.2 The Task and Finish Group is invited to support a council size of either 76 or 82 for recommendation to the Joint Committee.

Report author - Jonathan Mair,
Monitoring Officer, Dorset County Council

December 2017
Introduction:

As part of the electoral boundary review first stage electorate forecasts are required for all the Dorset districts, DCC, Bournemouth and Poole.

The output required is 5-year population forecasts in line with anticipated housing growth by polling districts.

It is critical that all authorities use the same methodology and projections to ensure a consistent approach and population assumption. To ensure this, DCC officers are working alongside officers at Bournemouth and Poole to complete a single set of population forecasts to inform the electorate review.

Methodology:

Projections will be produced using software from PopGroup. This uses a standard cohort component methodology for projecting a population. This is the same method as used by the ONS which begins with a base population and assumptions of births, deaths and migration, adding in births, subtracting deaths and allowing for in and out migration into the area.

Population base is the 2016 mid-year population estimates from ONS with assumptions for fertility, mortality and migration based upon data from the last 5 years, assuming that those trends will remain the same.

To ensure population growth is in line with anticipated housing growth in the local area they will be constrained with anticipated dwelling completions. This approach assumes that the population will grow to meet with housing development.

The resulting projections will then be disaggregated to meet with polling districts and the 18+ electorate population, through a proportional assumption of population distribution based upon on electorate data.

The work will be completed in stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Dependency</th>
<th>Estimated completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trend population projections at ward level</td>
<td>Awaiting migration data from ONS</td>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dwelling led projections at ward level</td>
<td>Dwelling completions from districts</td>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disaggregation of population forecasts to polling districts</td>
<td>Need agreed methodology from DCC, Bmth &amp; Ple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forecast of 18+ population by polling district</td>
<td>Last 3 year electorate population from districts</td>
<td>31/01/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This approach of projection assumes that population change is guided by the levels of births, deaths and migration input in the model, with growth led by estimated dwelling completions. These assumptions are disaggregated to polling districts to provide the output to guide a boundary review.

Nicola Dench  
Policy & Research team  
Dorset County Council
surgeries could be conducted by councillors, reducing travel time and allowing residents with limited mobility to have their views considered.

The proposed move to a unitary structure would allow the new organisations to consider how technology can be used to share and promote what is happening and facilitate greater engagement in the democratic process.

6.3. Improving accountability

In many senses, the issues highlighted above would also serve to strengthen accountability. However, there are two specific factors that warrant further attention.

6.3.1 A consistent governance model

Delivering a more accountable system of local government will be critical to the Dorset councils achieving their future ambitions. The democratic structures operated by the nine current authorities vary. Many have opted for an executive arrangement, where a cabinet is responsible for much of the overall business of the council. Others have retained the committee system. Similarly, the current authorities operate different approaches to scrutiny. This situation could be made more straightforward.

At a local level, it may be effective to have varying structures in place, reflecting the needs of the area and the resources available. However, it also presents an inconsistent and confusing picture to residents. It can also result in decision making being unnecessarily time consuming and costly and impede effective partnership working.

For example, a project undertaken across multiple councils could involve reporting to multiple scrutiny committees. In most instances, each scrutiny committee could require different information to be submitted, or information to be provided in multiple formats. This would lead to effort being duplicated and delays in decision making.

Reorganisation presents an opportunity to establish a more consistent and streamlined approach to governance and accountability. While the future authorities may wish to consider different options, the fact that most councils in the UK have adopted the cabinet system would suggest that many are convinced by the advantages it offers.

The cabinet system tends to offer stability, particularly in the initial years of an electoral cycle, clarity and consistency of strategic direction, quick and straightforward decision making and it is relatively cost effective. Though critics have argued that the concentration of power under a cabinet model disenfranchises much of the electorate and means that councils run the risk of missing out on the advice and expertise of non-cabinet members on some issues, the established checks and balances provided by scrutiny and audit committees mitigate this, to some extent.

6.3.2 Electoral equality

In terms of democratic representation, Dorset currently has 172 electoral areas (divisions and wards). These are served by 189 district council members, 96 unitary authority council members and 46 county council members. Excluding town and parish councillors, this amounts to 331 elected members across Dorset.

The table below indicates that the ratio of members to the electorate currently varies significantly across the nine authorities.
During the last round of local government reorganisation in 2009, many new unitary authorities reduced the number of council members per division in comparison to more established local authorities. Among the unitary authorities created in 2009, Cornwall, Northumberland and Wiltshire unitary authorities have the lowest council members per electoral area ratio (one member per division), while the other seven new authorities have a range between 1.17 and 2.7.

The Local Partnerships report, commissioned by the Dorset councils, anticipates that the number of elected members across Dorset could reduce to between 151 and 216, following reorganisation. Assuming that Dorset would seek to achieve a reduction in members towards the lower end of this scale, there would be a requirement equivalent to approximately two members per current unitary or county electoral division following reorganisation, based upon the 74 electoral areas which exist.

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{74}}\text{County Council divisions traditionally represent a larger electorate than district wards.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{75}}\text{https://www.lgbce.org.uk/records-and-resources/local-authorities-in-england}\]
across the current county council and unitary division boundaries (though it is likely this would be subject to future review by the Boundary Commission).

Assuming that a ratio of two members per electoral area was pursued across Dorset, this would suggest that the total number of members required could be reduced to 148. Comparing this reduction to the reductions made under the 2009 reorganisations, the new councils would be well placed to continue to provide strong political representation for communities, with an average of two members per current unitary or county electoral division.

In terms of equality of representation, we have carried out a high level analysis based on the following assumptions:

- There would be 74 electoral areas across the two new unitary authorities.
- There would be 148 members across the two new unitary authorities, equal to an average of two members per electoral area across the entire region.
- The apportionment of the district electoral areas required to calculate the projected number of members for options 2a and 2b is based on the current distribution of district wards across the area covered by Dorset County Council.

Based on these assumptions, option 2b would appear, in indicative terms, to provide the greatest equality in terms of political representation across the whole of Dorset. However, a boundary review would be likely to address this issue, whichever option was pursued.

**Figure 35: Members and representation in Dorset (proposed two unitary model options)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Electoral areas</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Electorate per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Conurbation</td>
<td>359,435</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Dorset</td>
<td>210,768</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Conurbation</td>
<td>289,305</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Dorset</td>
<td>280,898</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2c</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Conurbation</td>
<td>251,098</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Dorset</td>
<td>319,105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4. Conclusions

Reorganisation would offer an opportunity to strengthen leadership and accountability of the Dorset councils. Though leadership at present is strong, and has been responsible for many notable successes, the fact that there are so many different leadership voices in the county is resulting in a level of compromise and negotiation that may be impeding further progress. Reorganisation offers an opportunity to address this on a range of levels.
The proposal to reduce the overall number of councils would result in leadership being less fragmented in the future. The fact that the Dorset councils are considering establishing two authorities, which more closely reflect the distinctive geographies of the conurbation and the predominantly rural part of Dorset, would enable its leaders to focus on the issues that matter in their areas. The scale of the new organisations will ensure the Dorset councils have a stronger leadership presence within its region, as well as on the national stage. Finally, the establishment of two entirely new councils will offer an opportunity to build new cultures, empower the workforce, encourage leadership at all levels and model the sorts of behaviours that will enable the Dorset councils to respond more effectively to future opportunities and challenges.

At a local level, reorganisation should be used to enhance the role of the elected member, giving them the tools and capabilities to engage with their communities more effectively and more directly. This is not to suggest that members of the current councils are not delivering in this regard, but our analysis has suggested that they could be given more support to carry out their roles effectively. Finally, the new councils will have the chance to design their decision making arrangements in such a way that accountability, transparency and efficiency of decision making are enhanced.
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## Appendix 1 – Forward Plan

### 18 January 2018 10.00am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Change Order</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Section 151 Officers &amp; Monitoring Officers</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21 February 2018 2.00pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of Chief Executive</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline for next phases of collaborative work priorities</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Workshop (to be facilitated by the County Council’s Governance and Assurance Team)</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Mark Eyre – Risk Manager, DCC</td>
<td>Workshop to develop understanding of LGR related risks</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Senior Officer(s) supporting</td>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Prior consultees</td>
<td>To be submitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Senior Officer(s) supporting</td>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Prior consultees</td>
<td>To be submitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Senior Officer(s) supporting</td>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Prior consultees</td>
<td>To be submitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20 September 2018  2.30pm**

Publication of agenda and reports – 12 September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**06 October 2018  2.30pm**

Publication of agenda and reports – 8 October 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Senior Officer(s) supporting</td>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Prior consultees</td>
<td>To be submitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Senior Officer(s) supporting</td>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>Prior consultees</td>
<td>To be submitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20 February 2019 2.30pm**
Publication of agenda and reports – 12 February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Budget update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Plan update</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20 March 2019 2.30pm**
Publication of agenda and reports – 12 March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Decision maker</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Cllr Rebecca Knox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Cllr Anthony Alford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officers</td>
<td>Matt Prosser, Debbie Ward, Steve Mackenzie, David McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Officer</td>
<td>Lee Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>