

Laverstock & Ford Parish Council

Incorporating Milford, Bishopdown Farm, Old Sarum & Longhedge

REPORT.CCE.24.007_02

Author: CCE Officer/Ops Manager

Subject: Working Groups v. Sub Committees

Date: November 2023

THREATS/NEEDS		
TN1	Maintaining current arrangements places a time burden on the part time hours of staff	
TN2	Less time currently available to staff to deal with ongoing PC business matters	
TN3	Need to be time rich and time effective	
TN4	A working group can include residents, this could become a lobbying group rather than a part of the PC decision making-process	
STRENGTHS		
S1	Flexibility to call WG meetings on an as needed basis	
S2	Virtual WG meetings on line	
S3	Number of WG attendees not fixed	
	Enables greater engagement of ward councillors on specific issues	
WEAKNESSES/CHALLENGES		
WC1	Current arrangement places a requirement on councillors to attend full council and committee meetings in person	
WC2	Duplication of effort-committee can only make recommendations to full council where the matter is referred to for further debate and resolution	
WC3	Committees do not have delegated spending powers	
WC4	Working group may not be considered as a priority due to it being an undelegated group	
OPPORTUNITIES/ OPTIONS		
OP1	O01. Reduce admin time: preparing agendas, reports and minutes	
OP2	O02. Reduce administrative time and mileage expenses filing and posting agendas and minutes	
OP3	Engagement of PC residents in discussions	
OP4	Simpler budgeting: Allow for budget recording to fit within RFOs current structure and not increase the columns and detail which separate Steering Groups generate	
EXCEPTIONS		
EX1	Officers are already having to deal with items that fall between meetings	S1/S2 & S3
EX2	When there are not enough Cllrs present to make a steering committee quorate, our response is either delayed or dealt with via Full Council,	T1 WC1/2
EX3	80 percent of matters arising at steering committees are, in any case, taken to full council	WC3



Laverstock & Ford Parish Council

Incorporating Milford, Bishopdown Farm, Old Sarum & Longhedge

REPORT.CCE.24.007_02

Author: CCE Officer/Ops Manager

Subject: Working Groups v. Sub Committees

Date: November 2023

RESPONSIVENESS		Responsiveness:	
R1		CCE: Many of the community events that are held, planned and that we are invited to, are set on days and times that are not under our control such as Bank Holidays, Weekends, Evenings etc. Engaging and organising participation in these as part of our outreach and engagement means that these can fall between planned meeting times.	
R2		Cllrs are busy people and often lack the time or notice to be able to attend. As a working group, residents could be engaged and help to support Cllrs by being volunteer advocates for amplifying Parish Council work	
EFFECTIVENESS			
EF01		Work can be identified and specific to Wards	
EF02		Cost saving benefit on time: Staf time. Cllr time, reduce time in dealing with issues	
EF03		Direct engagement of interested Residents: could lead to new councillors/wider understanding of PC process and operating structures/better ownership of PC by residents	
IMPROVEMENT			
I01		Reliability: with ability for groups to be attended 'online' we are more inclusive, and accessible. (Open and transparent).	
I02		By making meetings more responsive to NEED (some times of the year – such as school holidays, are a bigger demand on time and a target period for public events and campaigns) we can be more effective in scheduling meetings.	
I03		Flexible Meeting scheduling allows for Cllrs to be more involved in planning, communication, and to take a more pro-active lead.	
I04		Operating as a working group rather than a sub-committee, the group is still an 'effective group' in bringing issues /needs/campaigns/ideas to Full Council in a more robust and considered format. Minutes can still be produced and available via our website. Actions can still be allocated and delivered.	