

Agenda No 5

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Committee | Rugby Area Committee |
| Date of Committee | 12th July 2007 |
| Report Title | Responsive Services and Empowered Communities –the development of a locality approach |
| Summary | This report follows on from the decision of the Cabinet on 10 th May 2007 authorising consultation with elected members through the Area Committees on the principles and issues relating to the development of a Locality approach by the Council. |
| For further information please contact: | Nick Gower Johnson County Partnerships Manager Tel: 01926 412053 nickgower-johnson@warwickshire.gov.uk Nick Darwen Rugby Area Manager Tel: 01788 568418 nickdarwen@warwickshire.gov.uk |
| Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework? [please identify relevant plan/budget provision] Background papers | No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report to Cabinet dated 10th May 2007 'Locality proposals' • Warwickshire Local Area Agreement 2007-2009 (final version dated 20/3/2007) • Quality of Life in Life in Warwickshire – key trends 2000-2007- Warwickshire Observatory • Local Government White Paper – 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' – October 2006 • Report to Council dated 23 January 2007 'Enhanced 2 tier working' • Closer to People and Places – Local Government Association Campaign • 'The Politics of Place' – Leadership Centre for Local Government – October 2006 • The Lyons Enquiry into Local Government – March 2007 • Changing Neighbourhoods – Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2007 |

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-

Details to be specified

- | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Other Committees | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Local Member(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other Elected Members | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Cabinet Members | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cllr Peter Fowler |
| Chief Executive | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jim Graham, Chief Executive |
| Legal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Greta Needham, Sarah Duxbury, Sian Stroud |
| Finance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Clarke |
| Other Strategic Directors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | William Brown – Community Protection Marion Davis – Children Young People & Families John Deegan – Environment & Economy Graeme Betts - Adult Health & Community Services |
| District Councils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rugby Borough Council's has been drawn to both the Cabinet Paper dated 10 th May 2007 and this Paper. A meeting has been arranged with the Chief Executive of the Borough Council in order to take matters further |
| Health Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A meeting has been arranged with the Chief Executive of NHS Warwickshire as part of the consultation and engagement arrangements |
| Police | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A meeting has been arranged with the Chief Constable as part of the consultation and engagement arrangements |
| Other Bodies/Individuals | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Further consultation with partner agencies on the implementation of the localities approach will take place in due course, in all probability through the district- based Local Strategic Partnerships |

FINAL DECISION**No****SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:**

Details to be specified

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Further consideration by the Cabinet | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | On 18 th October 2007 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|

- To Council 30th October 2007
- To Cabinet
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee
- Further Consultation

Agenda No 5

Rugby Area Committee – 12th July 2007

Responsive Services and Empowered Communities –the development of a locality approach in Rugby Area

Report of the Strategic Director for Performance & Development

Recommendations:

1. That members consider the contents of this Report and express their views on the principles set out, including the boundary and governance options, and how they relate to this area
2. That views expressed by the Area Committee are relayed to the Cabinet when it next considers the proposals at its meeting on 18th October 2007.

1 Introduction and Strategic Context for the Proposals

- 1.1 The Lyons Inquiry, the Local Government White Paper 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' and the Local Government Association all see local authorities as 'place shapers' of their localities – determining the outcomes needed from public services and ensuring that they are set up to deliver them.
- 1.2 A quick glance through some of the Warwickshire Quality of Life publications and similar reports produced by other local authorities shows, in a nutshell, some of the key aspirations of local people are that :
 - Their environment is clean and well maintained
 - When they are out and about they feel safe from traffic and street crime
 - There are safe play areas for young children and good levels of activities and facilities for teenagers
 - The essential character of the community is preserved through appropriate decisions about development
 - Refuse collection happens appropriately and the service responds to community issues
- 1.3 These and other more complex local issues (such as community cohesion) show themselves differently from community to community – are more pronounced in some places than in others, and the solutions that local people need from service providers can also be markedly different. However,

traditionally, the public sector has tended to provide single and often uncoordinated uniform solutions without taking sufficiently into account either local community differences or the activities of other agencies.

- 1.4 The Local Government Association has consistently argued for local differentiation of service provision and greater connection with local people to enable them to engage with service providers:

‘Councils and their partners such as police and health must respond to the needs of the town, city or village they serve, not be constrained by a plethora of targets set in London (which can be up to 1000 per council); We want to achieve high-quality services everywhere, but with **'post-code choice'**, depending on what is important to the city, town or village’

- 1.5 Over recent times, a raft of publications, reports and programmes (most notably the White Paper ‘Strong and Prosperous Communities’) has reinforced this approach and made clear the key role of local government as strategic leader, place shaper, and as the convenor of public sector services.

- 1.6 Information available from public perception surveys, including those conducted by the County Council, has indicated that a number of satisfaction indicators are moving in the wrong direction. These are indicative of a growing level of ‘disconnection’ between the Council and its communities. For example, satisfaction with the way the Council runs things has fallen from 63% in 2000 to 55% in 2006, and fewer people feel that they get good value for money from the County Council.

- 1.7 The Local Area Agreement has a number of Outcomes and Targets that are relevant to this issue – most notably found in the Stronger Communities Block of the LAA. For example there are Outcomes relating to:

➤ ‘Empowering local people to have a greater choice and influence over local decision making and a greater role in public service delivery’(St1)

and

➤ ‘Vibrant communities where people are likely to access facilities, services and amenities locally and participate in community life through shared activities’ (St2)

and

➤ ‘Creating fair, tolerant and cohesive communities’ (St3)

All efforts made by the Council and its partners to deliver these outcomes are at least to an extent contingent on the establishment of shared arrangements to ‘get closer to the people’.

- 1.8 There is increased recognition of the fact that no single agency can produce a suitable response to many of the most complex issues on the ground in local communities and that, in order to address these matters, there is a need for

much closer joint working between agencies on the ground. This is made clear in the introduction to the Warwickshire Local Area Agreement:

‘These complex issues cannot be addressed by one agency working in isolation and joined up and focused delivery through partnership... these are typically problems which extend beyond the remit of one agency and require a multi agency response in order to achieve significant and sustained improvement’.

- 1.9 Against this background, the Council should consider the best ways in which it can get closer to local communities, encouraging their engagement with the Council and its key partners, in order to identify priority local issues, the solutions to local problems and what services should be commissioned in response.
- 1.10 The remainder of this Paper explores further the potential for locality working in Rugby and focuses on the following matters:
- The general issues raised in the Cabinet Paper dated 10th May 2007 (Paragraph 2)
 - The various options for the designation of locality boundaries in each of the five areas of the County (Paragraph 3)
 - The options available in respect of local forums and structures (Paragraph 4)
 - The relationship between localities and existing democratic and governance structures and the options which exist in this respect. (Paragraph 5)
 - A Conclusion (Paragraph 6)
- 1.11 It is hoped that this Paper will inform and guide the discussions of the Area Committee. In turn, these and other discussions will be summarised and incorporated in a comprehensive further paper to be considered by the Council’s Cabinet on 18th October 2007.
- 1.12 These proposals seek to build on the current Locality Panel arrangements currently operated successfully by elected members in Rugby with the support of the Rugby Area Team.

2. The Cabinet Paper of 10th May 2007

- 2.1 On 10th May, Cabinet considered a short report on Locality Working coupled with a more detailed discussion paper entitled ‘Locality Proposals for Warwickshire’. Cabinet resolved:

That the Cabinet approve the attached paper as the basis for:

- Consultation with members of the County Council
- Discussion with District and Borough Councils and other partners
- Approve the development of a locality working pathfinder project in the Stratford area, subject to agreement with Stratford on Avon District Council

- 2.2 The following matters were raised during the discussion at Cabinet:

- There would be benefits in individual presentations being made to each area committee before they considered the issues rather than one presentation being made to all members of the Council.
- The views of the area committees would be submitted to the Cabinet when considering the issues.
- Consideration should be given to the preparation of a business case.
- The proposals would enhance members roles as community leaders
- The benefits in the pilot being undertaken with the Stratford on Avon District Council were acknowledged.

2.3 The Discussion Paper considered by the Cabinet is attached as Appendix One. This is in its original form apart from the fact that it has been edited to ensure an exclusive focus on the proposed locality arrangements affecting this area alone.

Members will note that the Discussion paper sets out:

a) A Vision for Locality Working:

To deliver responsive services, extending choice and control, giving individuals and groups a real say over services and strengthening the role that councillors, citizens and communities play in shaping the places they live.

b) The principles underpinning Locality Working:

*Responsive Service Delivery
Effective Governance
Community Development
Enhancing Local Strategic Partnerships and the delivery of local priorities through the LAA
Rationalisation of local service delivery and access points*

c) A proposed definition of Localities

Members are reminded that in order to ensure the best possible balance between 'community identity' and 'Manageability' that we have been working, wherever possible, to the population in each Locality being within the range of 15,000 – 30,000 people.

d) Options for Locality Boundaries in the Area

3. Options for Locality Boundaries in this Area

3.1 Option 1

The first set of proposals for Rugby comprises 6 locality areas, 3 rural and 3 urban, and a small, Town Centre sub-area. These proposed localities are:
Rugby - Rural North(1) (7,500 population)

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rugby - Rural Central(1) | (12,200 population) |
| Rugby - Rural South(1) | (7,500 population) |
| Rugby - Town North(1) | (20,400 population) |
| Rugby - Town East(1) | (19,500 population) |
| Rugby - Town West(1) | (22,500 population) |
| Rugby -Town Centre sub-area(1) | (700 population) |

The proposed localities are aligned with the Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas in Rugby.

Several discrepancies exist between locality proposals and WCC Divisions. In the rural areas the Rural North and Rural South localities are coterminous with WCC divisions, whilst the Rural Central area comprises the Earl Craven division and the western part of Lawford and New Bilton division. In Rugby itself, the Town North locality is coterminous with the Brownsover division. The Town East locality comprises the Eastlands and Hillmorton division and the eastern part of Caldecott and the Town West locality comprises the western part of Caldecott, Admirals division and the eastern part of Lawford and New Bilton.

To summarise, WCC divisions that are split between localities are:

Lawford and New Bilton, split between Rugby Rural central and Rugby Town West

Caldecott, split between Rugby Town West and East.

The Town Centre sub-area is effectively a sub-division of Rugby Town North locality.

The fit between locality proposals and draft schools extended services proposals is good.

3.2 Option 2

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rugby – Rural(2) | (24,400 population) |
| Rugby - Town North(2) | (20,800 population) |
| Rugby - Town South(2) | (30,200 population) |
| Rugby - Town West and Long Lawford(2) | (14,800 population) |

This option involves the creation of a single Rugby rural locality and 3 town based localities. The option is based on WCC electoral divisions. The proposal is coterminous with Borough Council wards, but not with existing Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas. Under existing Electoral Divisional Panel arrangements, the Long Lawford division is split, with the Long Lawford area being part of the adjacent rural electoral division, with the New Bilton part of the division relating to the urban area. No separate Town Centre locality is proposed in this option

4. The role of Locality Fora

- 4.1 At the heart of Locality Working will be the establishment of Locality Fora structures. These could either be established as Advisory Fora or as decision-making bodies – see Paragraph 5 below.

4.2 In **all options**, the broad purposes of a Locality Forum would be to:

- Provide an opportunity for elected members of the County, District and (where applicable) Town and Parish Councils and other stakeholders to debate and lead on important local matters.
- Improve local coordination between services – for example – housing and social care or youth services and the police
- Provide a means for Councillors and local people to greater influence the development of local services
- Provide a single and agreed local forum for consultation with local people – to be used by all local services
- Enable local stakeholders – for example businesses, the voluntary and community sector to become more engaged with local people and shaping local public services
- Strengthen local governance and the role of the front line elected member, providing a single visible forum for local discussions and consultation where the public attend and contribute their views
- Establish a single local point of focus for local people to know:
 - ✓ Where to sort out any local problems swiftly and efficiently
 - ✓ When local issues are being discussed, and how they can input
 - ✓ Who makes local decisions
 - ✓ Why those decisions have been made
 - ✓ How they can influence the future provision of their services
- Make better use of time and effort through the creation of a simpler system of locality governance with fewer partnerships and meetings
- Support work on a range of issues – most notably the enhancement of community cohesion and the vibrancy of communities at a very local level.
- Enhance links between local people, elected members, and Local Strategic Partnerships and their Theme Groups
- Give a positive and higher profile for elected members in local community activity

4.3 Again, in all cases, the Locality Fora would be responsible for:

- Co-ordinating local consultation
- Deciding on how issues raised by residents will be resolved and by whom
- Developing local actions and targets associated with the countywide LAA and the area Sustainable Community Strategy
- Better engagement with those who don't often speak up or get involved
- Managing local expectations about what can and cannot be delivered

- Supporting service providers to deliver local priorities

4.4 Membership of the Locality Forum would be shaped by the locality's remit and powers, as well as local interest, although it would be expected that membership should include:

- The County Council elected member(s) for the Locality
- The Borough/District Council representative(s) for Locality
- The Police
- Representation from Town and Parish Councils
- Representation from the Health Sector
- Education/Learning representatives (School and FE College)
- Business Sector representation
- Representation from local voluntary sector and community groups

Service provider engagement would depend on the agenda /issues being discussed and developed.

4.5 The following includes a summary of the types of issues that might appear on the agenda from which it can be seen that the Fora should focus on those issues and services that most interest local people. Evidence from a range of sources provides a broadly consistent view of what local communities collectively are interested in:

- Cleaning up streets, parks and open spaces – litter, dog fouling, graffiti, refuse collection, abandoned vehicles, fly tipping and grass cutting
- Traffic and road safety issues
- Facilities and activities for children and teenagers
- Road and pavement maintenance
- Crime & Community Safety
- Public Transport
- Health services – especially the reconfiguration of services affecting local communities
- Affordable housing
- Sports, leisure and cultural facilities
- Range and types of shops available locally
- Planning
- Local employment and volunteering opportunities

5. Governance Options

5.1 The options for the structure and powers of Locality Fora are set out below for members to consider.

5.2 Option 1

Locality Fora sit alongside existing member/ partnership bodies (e.g. Cabinet, Area Committees (at County and District level), LSPs)

(i) General Information

This option would involve using existing local arrangements as the 'locality forum' for the area wherever possible. In other words, with the support of

Warwickshire Police, PACT Panels and/or other local agencies, area panels would fulfil the function of the locality forum with a brief which extends beyond community safety issues.

Area Committees of the County Council and also any local area committees operating at Borough / District Council level would continue to operate.

(ii) Membership

It is anticipated that membership would follow a similar pattern to membership of the LSPs with a range of agencies represented (as set out in paragraph 4.5). Where locality fora are fulfilled by PACT Panels, the Home Office guidance on membership of such panels would need to be taken into consideration.

(iii) Role and Powers

This option tends towards locality fora more as being advisory forums. There may be occasions when Council officers are in attendance and can take operational decisions (similarly with Senior Police Officers who could take operational decisions at such meetings). However, generally speaking, in respect of Council functions these fora would not have decision making powers and all local authority decisions relating to locality and area issues would continue to vest with the relevant Area Committee(s) or other local authority executive body. This position may well change with the advent of individual decision making powers for councillors contained in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill which is making its way through Parliament.

The fora would have a key role in providing local intelligence and feedback to relevant decision makers (e.g. the Area Committee of the County Council, the Area Committee of the District/Borough Council). They could be an appropriate forum for consultation on local issues and in such a role, the locality forums could report to the LSPs, as well as to the consultation proposers, in view of the LSP's multi-agency composition and partnership focus.

Some linkage would be required between the Area Committee and the LSP to ensure that all locality issues were being picked up and appropriately addressed. A locality action plan could address this and a number of practical steps could reinforce this: reciprocal circulation of minutes and standing agenda items for locality issues, an agreed "call for action" procedure; attendance of the Chair of the locality as a non-voting invitee (if not already represented) at the LSP and Area Committee.

In such a model it would be necessary to manage the expectations of those attending and participating at meetings in respect of decision-making and actions arising. The powers of, and political support for, localities must be such that local people perceive a real benefit in their existence and that another layer of governance is justified.

(iv) Servicing arrangements

The responsibility for servicing arrangements for locality forums could be shared between the statutory and non-statutory partners within a local area,

although it would probably be necessary for either the County or District/Borough Council to retain overall responsibility for the management of locality forums to ensure the consistency and frequency of meetings, attendance and agenda management and to take forward any actions arising.

- 5.2 **Option 2:** This would be Option 1 but with a commitment to review after 12 months to consider the effectiveness of the arrangements that had been put into place and whether they may be enhanced by the addition of more formal decision making arrangements.
- 5.3 **Option 3:** Locality Fora would replace existing member bodies (eg Area Committees at County and District level).

(i) Structures

Under current legislation, in order for locality fora to be decision making in respect of Council functions, they would need to be established as a joint committee comprising County and District Council members. Other agencies could be represented but would not have the power to vote. In due course, when the law allows for individual decision making powers for councillors this position will alter.

Giving locality fora decision making powers would call into question the continued role of Area Committees. The future role for Area Committees is also compounded by the prominence given to multi-agency LSPs (rather than single authority Area Committees) by national policy and the imperative of delivering the Warwickshire LAA. .

Under this model therefore, Area Committees of the County Council and any local area committees operating at Borough / District Council level would cease to operate and any residual powers would be transferred down to locality level, or to individual councillors or officers, or up to the local authorities' executive bodies..

(ii) Membership

Until such time as individual decision making powers are in place for councillors, this arrangement would involve a joint committee comprising county and district councillors. Other agencies would be able to attend and participate but in respect of any issues which require a Council decision, they would not be able to vote.

(iii) Role and Powers

This option would give locality fora decision making powers. This might give a stronger local authority identity to meetings and give local people a real sense that decisions which affect their community and address their needs can be taken at a local level in a responsive way.

In this sort of arrangement, there might still be a number of local authority-specific decisions that should not be made at a locality level - because of the impact on a wider area- for example, where a school's priority area or a traffic

calming scheme crosses several localities. In the absence of Area Committee these issues would have to be decided elsewhere, ultimately by the local authorities' executive bodies.

Under this model, the role of the LSP would become enhanced, as the body with primacy for area-wide strategy. The LSP already reports into the Public Service Board on county-wide issues and LAA implementation, but the local authorities would also need to link into the LSP to pick up any locality issues that require specific action by one or both of the local authorities rather than the LSP or the Public Service Board.

(iv) Servicing arrangements

Any formal decision-making arrangements between the local authorities, at locality level, would require servicing in accordance with local government committee legislation. The additional impact of servicing would need to be outweighed by the benefits of the new local decision-making powers.

6. Summary and Conclusion

- 6.1 This Paper has set out the national and local strategic context to enable elected members to offer their views on the establishment of a Locality Approach. It suggests that the establishment of such an approach should be seen as being key to the achievement of better, more responsive and more coherent services for the public and the development of more engaged communities through the establishment of Locality Groups.
- 6.2 The paper offers a number of options for consideration by elected members and the outcomes of the Area Committee discussions will be summarised and reported to Cabinet on 18th October 2007 and thereafter to the County Council on 30th October 2007.

David Carter
Strategic Director for Performance & Development
25th June 2007

Appendix One

Discussion Paper on Locality Proposals for Warwickshire - Responsive Services and Empowered Communities

1. Background

- 1.1 One of the key themes of the County Council's new ways of working involves the concept of locality working.
- 1.2 The proposed vision for locality working is:
To deliver responsive services, extending choice and control, giving individuals and groups a real say over services and strengthening the role that councillors, citizens and communities play in shaping the places they live.
- 1.3 The approach has real potential for transforming the way that public services are delivered and is clearly echoed in the Government White Paper, Strong and Prosperous Communities. To deliver this vision, the approach needs to be agreed by all public service providers, working to common definitions of localities and with common structures and processes. A unified approach to localities will provide one of the building blocks of enhanced two-tier working in Warwickshire.

2 Principles

The principles behind this approach to locality working are:

2.1 Responsive Service Delivery

- All public sector service providers working together to address local needs – able to address cross cutting issues
- Common structures for engaging / consulting local communities
- Common locally defined priorities arrived at through a process that enables local communities to shape and influence the delivery of services
- Mechanisms to hold service providers to account

2.2 Effective Governance

- Councillors supported in their role as community champions, leading the process of shaping services for local communities
- Councillors playing a pivotal role in linking community priorities with those of the councils on which they serve
- All tiers of local government working effectively together

2.3 Community Development

- Building the capacity of local communities to influence and shape services
- Rationalised approach to supporting the voluntary and community sector at a local level
- Rationalisation of the approach to financial support for local groups and local initiatives

2.4 Local Strategic Partnerships

- Local delivery of Local Strategic Partnership and LAA priorities
- Ensuring local priorities are addressed through strategic partnership working

2.5 Rationalisation of local service delivery and access points

- Establish models of local service delivery and access to services and information appropriate to individual communities

3.0 Definition of Localities

- 3.1** For locality working to be effective, there needs to be a balance between creating localities that are small enough for people to identify with, yet large enough to be manageable within the resources available to partner agencies.
- 3.2** An officer working group involving staff from the County Council and Warwickshire Police has produced an initial set of locality proposals which have sought to achieve the balance set out above. The proposals have been built upon the need wherever possible to align locality proposals with:
- County Council electoral divisions
 - Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas
 - Schools extended services clusters (draft proposals shown on attached maps).
- 3.3** In seeking to achieve a balance between localities that are small enough for people to relate to and large enough to be manageable, there has been an attempt to arrive at a fairly uniform population size. However, a clear pattern of differences between urban and rural areas emerged in the first set of proposals for each area, with rural areas being geographically larger, but less populous than the smaller urban areas.
- 3.4** These locality proposals should be seen as the starting point for discussions with partners, particularly Warwickshire's District and Borough Councils. To deliver our vision for localities we need the agreement of key partners to work to common structures and processes and critically to work to agreed geographic areas.

4 Options for Locality Working

- 4.1** Options for locality working are set out in this paper for each of the 5 areas of Warwickshire. The first option in North Warwickshire, Nuneaton and Bedworth, Rugby and Warwick are the initial options from the locality working group. In all areas (except Rugby where there is an anomaly), these proposals are coterminous with District / Borough Council wards and with Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas. In relation to these first options, in some instances, there are anomalies between the boundaries of proposed localities and County Council electoral divisions. These anomalies are principally due to the Safer Neighbourhood areas being aligned with District and Borough Council ward boundaries. The implication of these anomalies is that in those instances, the County Councillor representing the divisions concerned will relate to more than one locality.
- 4.2** The second option for each area generally seeks to increase the size and consequently the population level of the more rural localities and provides an option based on WCC electoral divisions rather than District / Borough wards. These options do not fit as closely with Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas.

4.3 Whilst a limited number of options per area are set out here, there are numerous possible variations that can be developed depending on the weighting attached to the criteria used to define localities. **Appendix 1** to this paper comprises a map of WCC electoral divisions for reference purposes.

5. Locality Proposals - Rugby

Option 1

The first set of proposals for Rugby comprises 6 locality areas, 3 rural and 3 urban, and a small, Town Centre sub-area. These proposed localities are:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rugby - Rural North(1) | (7,500 population) |
| Rugby - Rural Central(1) | (12,200 population) |
| Rugby - Rural South(1) | (7,500 population) |
| Rugby - Town North(1) | (20,400 population) |
| Rugby - Town East(1) | (19,500 population) |
| Rugby - Town West(1) | (22,500 population) |
| Rugby -Town Centre sub-area(1) | (700 population) |

The proposed localities are aligned with the Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas in Rugby.

Several discrepancies exist between locality proposals and WCC Divisions. In the rural areas the Rural North and Rural South localities are coterminous with WCC divisions, whilst the Rural Central area comprises the Earl Craven division and the western part of Lawford and New Bilton division. In Rugby itself, the Town North locality is coterminous with the Brownsover division. The Town East locality comprises the Eastlands and Hillmorton division and the eastern part of Caldecott and the Town West locality comprises the western part of Caldecott, Admirals division and the eastern part of Lawford and New Bilton.

To summarise, WCC divisions that are split between localities are:

Lawford and New Bilton, split between Rugby Rural central and Rugby Town West
Caldecott, split between Rugby Town West and East.

The Town Centre sub-area is effectively a sub-division of Rugby Town North locality.

The fit between locality proposals and draft schools extended services proposals is good.

Option 2

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rugby – Rural(2) | (24,400 population) |
| Rugby - Town North(2) | (20,800 population) |
| Rugby - Town South(2) | (30,200 population) |
| Rugby - Town West and Long Lawford(2) | (14,800 population) |

This option involves the creation of a single Rugby rural locality and 3 town based localities. The option is based on WCC electoral divisions. The proposal is coterminous with Borough Council wards, but not with existing Safer Neighbourhoods Policing areas. Under existing Electoral Divisional Panel arrangements, the Long Lawford division is split, with the Long Lawford area being part of the adjacent rural

electoral division, with the New Bilton part of the division relating to the urban area. No separate Town Centre locality is proposed in this option.

**Localities Option 1
Rugby Borough**

Checklist


| | |
|--|-----------|
| Coterminus with Electoral Divisions? | No |
| Coterminus with Borough Wards? | No |
| Coterminus with Safer Neighbourhood Areas? | No |
| Coterminus with Extended Services Clusters? | No |
| Populations within range of 15,000 - 30,000? | No |

- ☆ Customer Access Points
- County Council Electoral Divisions

Extended Services Clusters

Cluster

- East 1A
- East 1B
- East 1C
- East 2
- East 3
- East 4



N.B. A yellow line highlights where an Electoral Division is split by a proposed locality area.

Locality population estimates calculated using 2004 Super-Output Area estimates.

Based on the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Warwickshire County Council, 100018285, 2006.

**Localities Option 2
Rugby Borough**

Checklist


| | |
|--|------------|
| Coterminus with Electoral Divisions? | Yes |
| Coterminus with Borough Wards? | Yes |
| Coterminus with Safer Neighbourhood Areas? | No |
| Coterminus with Extended Services Clusters? | No |
| Populations within range of 15,000 - 30,000? | No |

- ☆ Customer Access Points
- County Council Electoral Divisions

Extended Services Clusters

Cluster

- East 1A
- East 1B
- East 1C
- East 2
- East 3
- East 4



Locality population estimates calculated using 2004 Super-Output Area estimates.

Based on the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Warwickshire County Council, 100018285, 2006.

Electoral Divisions 2005

North Warwickshire

- 1 Arley
- 2 Atherstone
- 3 Baddesley
- 4 Coleshill
- 5 Hartshill
- 6 Kingsbury
- 7 Polesworth
- 8 Water Orton

Rugby

- 22 Admirals
- 23 Brownsover
- 24 Caldecott
- 25 Dunchurch
- 26 Earl Craven
- 27 Eastlands & Hillmorton
- 28 Fosse
- 29 Long Lawford & New Bilton

Nuneaton & Bedworth

- 9 Arbury & Stockingford
- 10 Bede
- 11 Bedworth North
- 12 Bedworth West
- 13 Bulkington
- 14 Nuneaton Abbey
- 15 Nuneaton Camp Hill
- 16 Nuneaton Galley Common
- 17 Nuneaton St. Nicolas
- 18 Nuneaton Weddington
- 19 Nuneaton Wem Brook
- 20 Nuneaton Whitestone
- 21 Poplar

Stratford-on-Avon

- 30 Alcester
- 31 Aston Cantlow
- 32 Bidford-on-Avon
- 33 Feldon
- 34 Henley-in-Arden
- 35 Kineton
- 36 Shipston-on-Stour
- 37 Southam
- 38 Stour & The Vale
- 39 Stratford Avenue & New Town
- 40 Stratford South
- 41 Studley
- 42 Wellesbourne

Warwick

- 43 Bishop's Tachbrook
- 44 Cubbington
- 45 Kenilworth Abbey
- 46 Kenilworth Park Hill
- 47 Kenilworth St. John's
- 48 Leamington Brunswick
- 49 Leamington Milverton
- 50 Leamington North
- 51 Leamington Willes
- 52 Leek Wootton
- 53 Warwick North
- 54 Warwick South
- 55 Warwick West
- 56 Whitnash

