North Somerset Council

REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

DATE OF MEETING: 21 JUNE 2016

SUBJECT OF REPORT: COMMUNITY ACCESS REVIEW

TOWN OR PARISH: ALL

OFFICER/MEMBER PRESENTING: EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND SAFETY, TOURISM AND LEISURE, CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS, CUSTOMER SERVICES, LIBRARIES AND LICENSING

KEY DECISION: YES

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive:

i. Notes the progress made so far in the initial stages of the review
ii. Endorses the principles behind the developing operating model to take the project forward
iii. Notes the potential financial implications and the interdependencies between elements of change
iv. Agrees the principles for staff restructures and service redesign
v. Note the options considered for each locality delivery model and the emerging plan for consultation
vi. Notes the stakeholder feedback and impact on business case development
vii. Agrees the proposed implementation plan
viii. Authorises officers to progress with engagement and consultation on the emerging delivery models in accordance with the proposed engagement/consultation plan
ix. Agrees the completion of feasibility studies on solutions for Clevedon, Nailsea and Weston Central
x. Notes the risks associated with this programme
1.0 SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

1.1 At its meeting of the 8th December 2015 the Executive endorsed the aims and objectives of the Community Access Review (CAR), noted the contribution of the review to achieving strategic ambitions and approved a number of high level review principles.

1.2 The CAR constitutes a major review of the Library and Children’s Centres buildings and services that the authority runs in the community. It is being undertaken to ensure that these are fit for purpose, in the right place and cost effective within the current financial environment, whilst meeting the current and future needs of local residents.

1.3 The Council is committed to delivering services within local communities and the review seeks to maintain or even improve these services where possible. At this point in time no decisions have been made with respect to locality options.

1.4 In order to continue to deliver relevant and sustainable services and meet the Councils’ objectives, it is essential that the following key components of the programme are delivered:

- A presumption of co-location of library and children’s services within communities, leading to a reduction in the number of buildings
- Maximising the use of our new building network through the deployment of self-service technology solutions
- Enhancing our broadband and IT capabilities – to support officer mobile working and support community needs
- A move to more integrated working and staffing structures, to support front line delivery of both library and children’s centre services
- Review of suppliers and service budgets to secure value for money, i.e. through the letting of joint contracts
- Maximising income generation through the letting of facilities outside normal office hours and the letting of office space/facilities to partner organisations
- Co-location with partners where possible

1.5 This report provides an update in terms of CAR progress over the last seven months outlining key activities and actions. It summarises the current position and seeks Executive support in terms of the developing business case, emerging locality solutions and proposed approach to public engagement and consultation. The report sets out the next steps for the programme and provides a timeline of implementation over the next three years.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Nature of the Challenge Ahead

2.1 Like many authorities the Council delivers a wide range of community based front facing services. These services are traditionally delivered through a
variety of buildings, sharing an ethos of open access with targeted service provision where required.

2.2 During the last five years these services have gone through significant change and the council has forged a good track record of delivering successful outcomes and change by working across services and with partners. Last December however, the Executive acknowledged that further change is required to address challenges such as on-going reductions in government funding, changes in the demographic profile and advances in technology.

**Community Access Review - Goal, Objectives and Approach**

2.3 The review has a clearly defined goal:

> To ensure that the community based front facing services are fit for purpose and meet the current and future needs of our communities, whilst rationalising the number of service centres to release cashable savings and deliver integrated, relevant and digitally enhanced services.

2.4 The review also has a developing role with respect to the corporate ambition of town centre regeneration and therefore the wider strategic objectives of job growth and economic prosperity. Similarly, the health needs of an expanding population also provide opportunities to align services to improve health outcomes and to realise joint strategic ambitions.

2.5 In order to realise these goals, the review is driven by a number of agreed outcomes and design criteria. These are summarised in table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 Summary of outcomes and design criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes – what we want to achieve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated/co-located core services supplemented through targeted service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New/improved service offer and network for staff and customers - services that are appropriate to the need within that locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced revenue cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Greater service flexibility for staff and customers through  
  • Enhanced flexible working (touchdown stations)  
  • Flexible, multipurpose spaces  
  • Reviews in opening hours and self-service opportunities | • Proposals will clearly identify net cashable savings and therefore reduce on-going revenue costs |
| • Integrated partnership working where possible to provide a more ‘joined up’ service for service users  
  • Enhanced community digital access | • There will be comprehensive community engagement, co-production and involvement |
| • Supports digital self-service by customers | • Service changes and enhancements will support mobile and more flexible working arrangements by NSC and other partner agency staff |
2.6 In summary, through careful management and innovative use of resources, linking with partners where appropriate, the review aims to maintain a network of services tailored to the needs of each locality but operated within an affordable financial envelope. In this way the Council will continue its commitment to these services and whilst they may look different once the programme is completed, services will be retained, or even improved, rather than lost as is happening elsewhere across the country.

Services in Scope

2.7 The services in scope for the review were originally defined as Libraries, Children’s Centres, Community Halls, Leisure Centres and Gateways. In reality however, the main focus of the review is on Libraries (12) and Children’s Centres (14).

2.8 The Executive is asked to note that the Council has recently reviewed its’ leisure contracts, and the report received by the Executive in April 2016 identified medium term savings of close to £1 million per annum. Further discussions will be held with our leisure contractor as we develop our multi-service model for Scotch Horn in Nailsea. In addition, recent service reviews of Community Halls have ensured that these venues now operate at no cost to the authority. Officers will continue to liaise with Agilisys regarding Gateway provision to ensure that we are maximising the value and resource to support our front line services, such as those delivered in the Town Hall.

Service Information

2.9 The Public Library and Museums Act 1964 places a duty on library authorities to provide a ‘comprehensive and efficient’ library service, though this is not defined in statute. Likewise, the Childcare Act 2006 (as amended) places a duty on authorities to commission or provide Children’s Centres that meet the needs of families with children under the age of five.

2.10 Both services are well established within North Somerset communities and are highly valued and rated by residents. The performance information below reflects this level of satisfaction. It is the aim of this project to ensure that service performance will not diminish as a result of this review. The review also presents opportunities to address those areas of service which have traditionally scored lower in our on-going customer satisfaction surveys. For example, computer facilities generally receive a lower satisfaction level across all our Libraries. Facilities that only open a few hours a week also score low for satisfaction in the hours of opening category (e.g. Pill, Congresbury libraries).

Libraries:

- 95% loan and book issues are via RFID (self-service)
- Increasing satisfaction rates:
  - Adults: 2015, 95% (2012, 91%; 2009, 88%)
Children: 2013, 89% (2008, 86%; 2004, 74%)
(Source: Public Library User Survey)
- Overall satisfaction rate: 93%
- Standard of customer care: 96%
- Opening hours: 90%
- Information provision: 86%
- Computer facilities: 77%
- Book choice: 76%
- Attractiveness of the library: inside 92% and outside 72%
(source: CIPFA Adult Plus Survey 2015)
- Currently 250 volunteers

Children’s Centres:
- 9 Children’s Centres were rated as ‘Good’ as part of the Ofsted inspection regime over the last two years
- 92% of parents responding to the 2014 North Somerset Residents Survey stated that they were either ‘Very’ or ‘Fairly’ satisfied with the services provided by the Children’s Centres (Service Users)

2.11 High levels of user satisfaction however are not always matched by high levels of use. For example, the number of library users varies across the district with some libraries seeing an increase in visitors whilst the majority reflect the national trend of falling numbers. This is illustrated in table 2.2 and is a material consideration when considering service reconfiguration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries with rising visitor numbers</th>
<th>Libraries with falling visitor numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yatton (+87%)</td>
<td>Worle (-55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Ashton (+68%)</td>
<td>Clevedon (-41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All Healthy Living Centre (+352%)</td>
<td>Congresbury (-30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston-super-Mare (+32%) (+ 85% since relocation to Town Hall in 2012)</td>
<td>Pill (-58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile (-18%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailsea (-44%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus (no change)</td>
<td>Portishead (-17%) (-14% since opening of new library in 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winscombe (-49%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12 It is accepted that such quantitative data needs to be considered alongside the qualitative elements and activities delivered by these services.
Medium Term Financial Plan Contribution

2.13 The financial targets identified for this review in the MTFP are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Saving (£000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total annual savings achieved by 2019** 500

2.14 2016/2017 net budgets for Libraries and Children’s Centres (broken down by staffing costs and ‘other’ costs) are given in table 2.3. The MTFP target represents savings of approximately 14% across these two services. Whilst for individual services this would represent a significant impact on service delivery, when shared across the two services it becomes more realistic with the impact on separate services mitigated through a more integrated service delivery model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3 High level service budget 2016/17</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Centres</td>
<td>£1,220,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>£1,686,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some income targets are historic and as part of this process budgets will be realigned to ensure that revenue budgets are sustainable.

3.0 UPDATE SINCE DECEMBER EXECUTIVE REPORT

3.1 Since December considerable progress has been made to move the project forward. Key actions are outlined in the bullet points below and can be summarised broadly as activities that build a better understanding of the localities and their needs:

- Collated service and property data to develop an in depth understanding of the services in scope
- Undertaken locality visits to understand how services operate in communities and to identify service opportunities
- Undertaken locality option appraisals and commissioned feasibility studies
- Development of future service requirements/outcomes - visioning exercises
- Commenced discussions about service structures to align and deliver new service vision
- Health partner discussions to link with existing and emerging communities and health needs
- Undertaken stakeholder analysis and identified key stakeholders for further engagement and consultation
- Collated service user data and commenced stakeholder engagement
- Commenced briefings with staff
- Engaged with Community and Corporate Organisation panel and Working Group
- Engaged with Equality Scheme Implementation Group to identify and address specific needs
- Established links with other partners through the North Somerset Partnership to identify opportunities for district-wide and locality projects, digital access, Gateway services and mobile working
- Established robust project governance and management.

4.0 THE CURRENT POSITION

Summary

4.1 The project has now reached a critical stage. Following engagement with staff, Councillors and key stakeholders the next step is to further inform the public. It is timely therefore that this report is presented to the Executive for endorsement of the next steps.

4.2 It is important to note that no decisions have been made with respect to service offers or new delivery and locality models. Most options that have been identified remain open and will be the subject of further engagement and consultation with a wider audience. This is not to say however that given the information collected and option appraisal undertaken that some preferred options aren't emerging and indeed this is the case in a number of localities. This will be explored in the next section of this report.

Year 1 Savings

4.3 Cashable savings for year one have been identified largely from vacant posts that can be absorbed within the service without material impact. Service leads are also exploring opportunities for further year one savings.

Strategic Influences

4.4 The CAR is heavily influenced by a number of on-going programmes which, due to their complexity may substantially impact on timelines yet offer the opportunity for a joined-up strategic approach. Key influences include:

- Weston town centre regeneration – an opportunity (long term) for integration of the current Children’s Centre into a multi-provider hub
- Clevedon town centre regeneration – an opportunity for the library to relocate and increase footfall in the town centre
- North Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and provider(s) local estates review – an opportunity to consolidate and share property
- One Public Estate – if successful, an opportunity to work with key partners to adopt a strategic approach to asset management through property-focused programmes. The ambitions of this LGA/Central Government initiative are similar to those of the CAR project.

5.0 THE DEVELOPING OPERATING MODEL

5.1 The operating model for achieving the objectives of the Community Access Review and vision is predicated on the following key elements:

- Changes to the service offer – more self-service, outreach, longer opening hours
- Staffing reviews and re-design
- Property co-location and change in key localities
- Service reviews
- Income generation

The Vision and New Service Offer

5.2 The vision for a new integrated service is currently in development. Current thinking is outlined in appendix 1 and will be the subject of formal engagement with staff and service users. The vision is however shaped by a number of general principles:

- Communities will be provided with an integrated service offer from a co-located service hub where it is possible to achieve this. Where this is not possible or where there is no case to change existing arrangements services will work together to improve the outcomes for families with children under five and library users alike.
- Buildings will be as accessible to the public as possible and will include a review of opening hours and increased self-service
- Services will offer a broad range of activities for all service users
- Service hubs will offer welcoming spaces where the culture is front-facing, friendly, inclusive and community focused
- Where possible services will be offered with partner organisations such as North Somerset Community Partnership (Health Visitors) and mental health
- Safeguarding will include that of children, vulnerable adults and staff safety
- A combined outreach offer will be developed for both services

5.3 There will remain a need for specialist and targeted Library and Children’s Centre services and these are currently being defined.

Staffing Considerations

5.4 Service re-design will necessarily require restructuring of staff. This will be based on the following principles:
• Managing the programme over three years to minimise the need for compulsory redundancies
• Streamlining management arrangements
• Services will seek to establish some cross service generic roles to support service delivery
• To establish a number of apprenticeship roles across the services to better reflect the demographics of our local community
• The authority will commit to retraining and the provision of other support where required

5.5 Engagement with staff has already commenced and to date over 140 members of staff have been informed of the project and progress so far. This has taken the form of face to face locality meetings, newsletters and emails. Informal discussions have also taken place with recognised trade unions. Service Leads are working with colleagues in Human Resources to ensure early engagement. It is envisaged that there will be a full consultation process with staff during the autumn 2016.

Property and localities

5.6 The project group has identified a number of localities where there is potential to explore alternative or enhanced property options for service delivery. These localities are summarised in table 5.1. This table also outlines the options identified so far for each locality and orders them in terms of emerging preferred options (as a result of feedback, business intelligence and feasibility studies), options that potentially remain open and those that have been rejected.

5.7 It is clear from the summary that potential solutions vary from locality to locality and that one solution does not fit all. It should also be noted that preferred options will require further exploration and development.

5.8 Table 5.1 also indicates when change is likely to be implemented. Note that a phased approach is proposed with property change commencing in year 2 (2017/18) moving to year 3 for more complex localities, subject to approval.

5.9 Appendix 2 gives further information for each locality setting out the context, options identified and option appraisal together with initial stakeholder feedback.

5.10 It is important to reiterate again that at this stage no decisions have been made as further options may emerge as part of the proposed engagement process. Similarly, options may be re-visited in light of any new intelligence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Options identified</th>
<th>Summary of key feedback (where undertaken so far)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yatton and Congresbury 2017/18 | Emerging locality options:  
- Co-locate Yatton Moor CC with Yeo Valley CC but continue to deliver CC services to Yatton Moor’s CC community via outreach i.e. using library as a venue or other community facilities as appropriate  
- Service transfer for Congresbury library to Parish Council with support from NSC  
Other open options:  
- Move Yatton Moor CC into Yatton library to create community hub  
- Service re-model for NSC run library at Congresbury e.g. move to self-service  
- Close Congresbury library  
- Move Congresbury library to Yeo Valley CC  
Options rejected:  
- New integrated facility (library and CC) to service both communities | Yatton and Congresbury should be considered as distinct localities  
- Regard for needs of vulnerable residents eg older people  
- Congresbury PC is open to consider service transfer of library subject to further discussion and inclusion in NSC library network  
- Bigger picture needs to be kept in mind re role of schools  
- Moving Congresbury library to Yeo Valley CC not considered viable  
- Need to consider the role of the mobile library |
| Winscombe 2017/18 | Emerging locality options:  
- Library service re-modelling  
- Community service transfer of library  
Options rejected:  
- New library provision with community partner  
- Move library to Banwell Children’s Centre  
- Close library  
- New integrated facility (library and CC) to service both communities |                                                                                                               |
| Worle 2017/18 | Emerging locality options:  
- Co-locate library with CC  
- Co-locate CC with library | See petition – feelings enforced at the stakeholder meeting |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th></th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Re-model existing library to reduce footprint and create rental space for partners  
• Close library without alternative service provision | • Would consider reduction of existing library footprint with Partners sharing space if this safeguarded the existing library  
• CCs and libraries not seen as natural bedfellows  
• Concern that existing CC is too small to integrate services  
• Service offer needs to focus on core business | |
| Options rejected:  
• Relocate CC to school premises  
• Retain library and CC as is  
• New site for integrated provision | |
| Long Ashton  
2017/18 | Emerging locality options:  
• Keep library ‘as is’ but undertake service review | Consensus that library should remain in its current location  
Focus should be on reducing costs of the existing library through renegotiation of the lease or attracting a partner  
Need to explore the possibility of alternative premises in the village  
There is little opportunity to relocate the library to the Community Association but agreed that both the Association and NSC need to work closer together. |
| Other open options:  
• Reduce library footprint  
• Relocate library to a partner site  
• Close library and extend mobile reach service  
• Maintain CC ‘as is’ but undertake service review | |
| Options rejected:  
• Relocate library to CC  
• Relocate CC to library  
• Split library provision between CC (children’s) and community partner (adults).  
• New site for integrated provision | |
| Pill  
2017/18 | Emerging locality options:  
• Relocate CC to library | Overall would support move of CC to library location  
Would need to consider the impact on local residents  
Highways need to be consulted regarding safe access for residents and users that park outside the library  
Would like to see more detail on service offer and timings of activities  
Safeguarding is an important consideration |
| Other open options:  
• Library service transfer to Parish Council  
• Integrated solution for both services co-located with community partner  
• Retain CC within Crockerne school site but undertake service review | |
| Options rejected:  
• Close Library | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Emerging locality options:</th>
<th>Other open options:</th>
<th>Options rejected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Weston South 2017/18 | • New site for integrated provision  
• Close Children’s Centre  
• Regard for needs of vulnerable residents eg older people  
• Need to explore further work with Public Health colleagues to improve wider community outcomes | • Review of current HLC service costs  
• Integration of Drove Road/Health partners to HLC/Oldmixon Family Centre |  
| Clevedon (complex locality) 2018/19 | • Reduce footprint of the library and attract partner to share space and costs  
• Relocate to smaller town centre location  
• Retain CC at the Barn but undertake a service review | • Relocate service from Oldmixon Family Centre to HLC (or vice versa)  
• Explore potential to sub-let space at HLC to partners  
• Explore opportunities to work more effectively with WestonWorks |  
| Weston Central (complex locality) 2018/19 | • CC provision integrated into Walliscote Grove/Rose Lawn regeneration project  
• Relocate CC to alternative town centre site | • Castlewood not considered to be a viable option for library location  
• The Barn location would be ideal but appreciate that it is running at capacity  
• Viable options considered to be: sharing existing site with a partner  
• Move to a smaller town centre location  
• Any capital receipt should be re-invested into the community |  
<p>| Weston Central (complex locality) 2018/19 | • Maintain CC in current location (Meadow Street) | • Both officers and ward members have highlighted the limitations imposed by the size of the existing building in Meadow Street |<br />
| Weston Central (complex locality) 2018/19 | • Maintain CC in current location (Meadow Street) | • Ward members have requested that officers look for an interim solution, with a view to working with |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CC to relocate to Carlton Centre</td>
<td>partners (particularly health) to find a sustainable long term solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relocate CC to Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailsea (complex locality)</td>
<td>• Relocation of the library and Children’s Centre to refurbished leisure centre at Scotch Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complex Localities**

5.11 Whilst all locality solutions carry a degree of complexity there are three localities where the development of a service solution is presenting more complexities than most.

5.12 These localities are Nailsea (an amalgamation project of Leisure, Library, Children’s Centre and other services at Scotch Horn), Weston Central and Clevedon (both town centre regeneration projects). For these communities more time is required to develop the service offer and business case whilst realising the broader strategic ambitions and will therefore be year 3 (2018/19) projects. It is also likely that for these areas a two-part, short and long term, solution may be appropriate as will a later engagement/consultation timeframe. Nailsea will be the subject of a separate project.

**Other Service Delivery/Business Models**

5.13 The project group is aware of the current focus nationwide on Libraries and Children’s Centres and is continually scanning the wider environment for service models that could be appropriate for North Somerset Council. For the most part authorities seem to be adopting similar models (where services are not being closed) using opportunities to co-locate or integrate services alongside each other or with partners.

5.14 The library service in Devon has recently transferred to a Trust model comprised of a staff and community-owned mutual – a company limited by guarantee with charitable status. Members of the project team have considered this option but are of the opinion that it is not suitable for the North Somerset Council library offer for the following reasons:

- NSC is already part of a wider collaborative library consortium (Libraries West). This consortium has been established for some time and works well attracting benefits through procurement, technology and operating procedures.
- The consortium (of 7 authorities) is unlikely to consider a Trust business model anytime in the near future
- On its own NSC would be too small to make this model viable
- It does not facilitate the integrated approach of services as already endorsed by members of the Executive
Service Reviews

5.15 There are a number of sites where services are already operating effectively from premises that are fit for purpose and where no substantial change is envisaged. In these cases, it is proposed to undertake a service review to ensure that supplies and services are cost effective, identify opportunities for joint procurement and determine whether leasing arrangements are fair and equitable. It is hoped that small savings can be realised from these reviews which will be conducted during 2016/17. This includes the following localities:

- Portishead library and St Barnabas CC
- Banwell CC
- Ashcombe CC
- Castle Batch CC
- Long Ashton CC
- The Campus and Locking Castle and Locking CC (services already co-located at this venue)
- Weston Library (already integrated in to the Town Hall Gateway)

5.16 Notwithstanding the above, these sites will be kept under review with respect to future partnership opportunities.

Income Generation

5.17 The project team is actively looking at how it may generate further income to offset service costs. It is likely that income will come from the following key areas:

- Rental income from partners
- A review of fees and charges
- Other, such as rental by community organisations

Digital First and the developing Digital Strategy

5.18 The development of a new service delivery model inevitably offers opportunities not only to contribute to the realisation of the Digital First programme through mobile working for staff and Agilisys Digital (CRM) but also to the ambitions of the developing Digital Strategy and promotion of greater digital inclusion within the community. Key areas where this may play include:

- Provision of infrastructure that supports highly connected digital communities where human intervention remains a vital part of NSC service provision such as:
  - Provision of upgraded physical customer access points through increased self-service
  - Support to develop digital skills within the community through gadget clubs, device lending pilots, improved Wi-Fi connectivity for digital access and digital skill assessment
Promoting digital solutions and behaviours to enable NSC to deliver secure, high-quality and effective services by supporting an agile and flexible workforce through the provision of dispersed hubs (workspaces and multi-site connectivity)

5.19 The costs to implement these proposals will be included in the property elements of this review.

6.0 Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation

6.1 The Community Access Review (CAR) will result in changes to service delivery in some parts of the district. There is therefore a need for a robust and effective consultation and engagement plan to ensure that all those residents who wish to express a view about the proposed changes have the opportunity to do so. The council holds comprehensive data on our existing service users and their views about how we deliver our current services. This information has been used to inform the review to date and we will continue to use this intelligence to inform our future delivery models.

6.2 Attached as appendix 3 to this report is the CAR Consultation and Engagement Plan. The plan has been developed by officers with experience of consultation and engagement and has been agreed by the CAR project board.

6.3 The intention of the review is that any changes to services and budget savings will have been completed by March 2019. To achieve this, all decisions on changes will need to have been made by the end of 2017. The engagement process will therefore be in two phases, the first to cover year 2 localities (June to November 2016) with changes implemented by April 2017 and the second for year three localities (commencing April 2017) with implementation April 2018. All engagement and consultation will therefore be completed by November 2017. See also section 9 which simplifies the next steps for the programme.

6.4 The engagement will have the following principles at its core:

- It is meaningful: that all views expressed will be listened to and seriously considered and could result in changes to what is being thought about or proposed. All collated views will be reported to Councillors making any final decisions and the response to the views expressed will be published following the relevant meeting.
- It is open to everyone: while it is recognised that no engagement process can reflect or represent the views of everyone, it is vital that as many people as possible are made aware of the opportunity to have their say through the widest promotion and publicity.
- It is inclusive: every effort will be made to ensure that there are no barriers to anyone who wishes to take part in the engagement. This includes ensuring people receive on request, any information in the format and language they prefer and that any meetings are accessible.
6.5 There is a statutory requirement for consultation / engagement over changes to children’s centre services. Case law has also established the need for a clear engagement plan and process regarding changes to library services.

6.6 The plan includes consultation and engagement with the public, community and voluntary groups and all relevant council bodies.

6.7 Some engagement has been undertaken with key community stakeholders in those localities where there is most likely to be a degree of change. This preliminary engagement has been useful and has fulfilled a number of purposes:

- To keep stakeholders informed
- To canvass views and feedback at an early stage on potential options
- To identify other options
- To inform members of the Executive of the initial feedback

6.8 Feedback generally has been positive and there is an appreciation of the need for change. Understandably however, there is anxiety over job security and the perceived loss of services in some localities.

6.9 Members will be aware of the petition recently received on behalf of the Worle Library Defence Group. The views expressed by those signing the petition will be considered as part of the broader consultation process as we develop bespoke solutions that meet the needs of this community. In response to the initial feedback (petition), it is confirmed that the options to utilise either the Library or the Children’s Centre (as our future service hub) in central Worle are still open and will be subject to further consideration. The Executive will receive a more detailed report on the Worle options and those for other localities after the public consultation process.

6.10 The project group is also working with the Community and Corporate Organisation Policy and Scrutiny Panel through the CAR Working Group and has a programme in place to report progress at critical points of the process. Similarly, the group is working with the Equality Scheme Implementation Group to ensure that specific needs are identified and addressed wherever possible (see section 11).
7.0  MEASURES OF SUCCESS

7.1  Measures are being developed in order to ensure the success of the programme. Table 7.1 shows the emerging indicators, which will be subject to further refinement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1 Illustrative success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reduction in number of premises from which services are delivered | • 26 sites  
• Number of sites where there is co-located service provision |
| Increased self-service                  | Existing opening hours                                         |
| Reduced revenue costs                   | • 2015/16 baseline figures  
• Average cost of FTE for both services |
| Reduced property costs                  | 2015/16 baseline figures                                      |
| Increased income                        | Existing income                                               |
| Meeting the needs of the community/improved service offer | Satisfaction rates e.g. various using 2015 Adult Plus as baseline year  
CCs satisfaction rates  
CC registration rates  
Number of active library users |
| Increased partnerships                  | Number of partners currently working with                     |
| Flexible working                        | Number of current touch down points                           |
| Improved connectivity                   | No of premises that currently have adequate Wi-Fi facility     |

8.0  FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS – THE BUSINESS CASE

8.1  As described in paragraph 2.5, the MTFP targets annual savings from this review of £500k by 2018/19. At this stage, initial modelling indicates that this level of cost reduction is possible, but it can only be achieved by following the review’s principles that are outlined in Section 1 of this report. In addition, it is worth noting that whilst the £500k annual savings target appears reasonable given the vision for the service, the timing of its achievement will depend upon the pace in which service changes can be made. Any delays in achieving the savings would require a temporary call on reserves.

8.2  Given that a large proportion of the service costs relate to staffing, it is reasonable to assume that a significant proportion of savings will need to come from staffing costs and the principles associated with this are discussed in paragraph 5.2.

8.3  More detailed financial implications will be modelled and illustrated when the final options are considered later in the year following consultation.

8.4  It is recognised that capital investment will be required in order to ensure that remaining buildings are flexible, fit for purpose and appropriately equipped, particularly from a technology point of view. At this stage, the working
assumption is that any capital investment will be funded either from additional revenue savings or from any capital receipts associated with this project.

9.0 NEXT STEPS AND EMERGING TIMELINE

9.1 The next steps and timeline are summarised in table 9.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.1: Next steps and timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 savings delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of supplies and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor review of some library opening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service review: Campus, Castle Batch, Banwell, HLC, Portishead, Ashcombe, Long Ashton CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Year 1 savings delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of supplies and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor review of some library opening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service review: Campus, Castle Batch, Banwell, HLC, Portishead, Ashcombe, Long Ashton CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work in preparation for implementation 17/18
- Completion of feasibility studies
- Community consultation commences
- Staff consultation 2016
- Property changes 2016/17 onwards
- Partnership commitments sign-off

Work in preparation for implementation 18/19
- Further community consultation as appropriate
- Property changes
- On-going HR changes

Work in preparation for implementation 18/19
- Business case development and sign-off by Executive etc.
10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The Childcare Act 2006 (as amended) places a duty on Authorities to:

- Improve the wellbeing of young children in their area, and
- Reduce inequalities between young children in their area in relation to
  - Physical and mental health and emotional wellbeing
  - Protection from harm and neglect
  - Education, training and recreation
  - The contribution made by them to society, and
  - Social and economic wellbeing

10.2 Children’s Centres are a key means to deliver these duties, and Section 5A of the Childcare Act 2006 explicitly requires Local Authorities to, as far as is reasonably practicable, ensure sufficient provision of Children’s Centres to meet local need.

10.3 There is also an obligation to notify the Department for Education of any disposal of an asset as this may trigger a claw-back condition associated with grants originally awarded to establish the Centres. This could present a risk for the Council (section 11). In addition, there is a duty to consult when making significant changes to the range and nature of services provided or how they are delivered (section 5D Childcare Act 2006).

10.4 Similarly, the library authority has a duty under the Public Library and Museums Act 1964 to maintain a ‘comprehensive and efficient’ library service. This is not defined in legislation although there is guidance in legal precedence. Unlike Children’s Centres there is no legal requirement to advise the Department for Culture, Media and Sport or the Arts Council of any service change, nor is there any legal requirement to consult. In reality however, this is an essential requirement (backed by legal precedence) and consultation has to be full and open and accompanied by Equality Impact Assessments that are wide ranging and of high quality. Failure to adhere to this guidance could lead to judicial review.

11.0 RISK MANAGEMENT

11.1 A project of this size and scope has the potential to generate significant risks for the authority. Risk is managed and mitigated in accordance with the normal methods of project management with links to the CAR project board and the Transformation Board.

11.2 Significant risks currently revolve around the duty to consult, ensuring the needs of the community are considered under the Equality Act 2010 and the potential for claw-back of Children’s Centre funding.

11.3 The risk regarding the duty to consult is mitigated by the presence of a robust engagement and consultation plan (section 6, appendix 3), whilst the duty within the Equalities Act 2010 is mitigated through the development of an
Equalities Impact Assessment (section 12, appendix 4) linking with on-going engagement.

11.4 Claw-back conditions can be triggered where an asset funded wholly or partly by Department for Education (DfE) grant is disposed of, or the asset is no longer used to meet the aims and objectives consistent with the Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant (SSEYCG) or Aiming High for Disabled Children Grant (AHDC).

11.5 Local authorities must notify the DfE of any plans to dispose of grant funded assets and should operate on the presumption that claw-back will be enforced. However, subject to prior approval from the DfE, claw-back may be waived or deferred where an asset is sold and the proceeds are reinvested in another asset for a similar purpose consistent with the aims of the grant.

11.6 Disposal means a sale, transfer, or change of use of a capital asset. It includes the transfer of ownership of a lease, or freehold assets.

11.7 Sites where this may present a risk for the authority include Yatton Moor, Weston Central, Pill and Worle depending on which solutions may ultimately be deployed.

11.8 Where a Children’s Centre is located on a school site and the site is transferred due to a school’s change in status (i.e. conversion to an academy such as in the case of Crockern e School, Pill), all efforts to retain the asset for use in line with the appropriate funding agreement must be secured.

12.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The project group is mindful to ensure that the needs of all members of the community are considered when reviewing services, and what is required to ensure the duty to pay ‘due regard’ to the public sector equality duties as set out in the Equality Act 2010 is fully met. The project group has taken a number of positive steps to ensure that this happens:

- Equalities Impact Assessment has been written and is being reviewed during key stages of the project
- Early presentations and engagement with the Equality Scheme Implementation Group to identify any concerns that require more in depth consideration through the life of the project
- Detailed profiling of services including an analysis of the age, sex, ethnicity, disability and socio-economic status of service users
- Development of inclusive engagement and consultation plans picking up key groups in localities
- Identification of key stakeholders for further engagement and consultation on equality issues

12.2 Through early engagement one particular concern has been identified. This is the possible loss of social contact for vulnerable, isolated service users where self-service options could be extended. The needs of older people using the
library service has also been highlighted repeatedly during the initial consultation. Service leads are mindful of this and will work to find new ways of working that don’t compromise this social need.

12.3 The final equality impact assessment will be available to members prior to the final decision report, details of any equality implications and the actions taken to mitigate any impacts will also be included. The current equality impact assessment is attached as Appendix 4.

13.0 CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

13.1 At the Executive meeting held in December, members of the Executive were advised of a number of corporate considerations, including the impact on services required to support the review, such as HR, Property, IT, Legal, Marketing and Communications. These remain relevant but work is on-going to mitigate workload impacts arising from this review.

13.2 Since December a number of other corporate considerations have surfaced including the Total Transport and Town Centre Regeneration projects. A watching brief will be maintained to ensure that opportunities for the CAR are not lost. There will be a sharing of data between the relevant council projects.

Health and Safety

13.3 The Corporate Health and Safety Manager has been consulted on the proposed operating model and advises that the following matters will need to be considered as we develop the services:

- Impacts of self-service
- Property changes – particularly in relation to accessibility, fire strategies and emergency evacuation procedures
- The provision of robust safeguarding and security procedures
- The requirement to undertake a general review of our staff practices and health and safety procedures (where changes are proposed)

14.0 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

14.1 The Council is faced with a significant financial challenge over the next few years. The Community Access review is one of several key transformational projects which together support the MTFP and ensure we continue to deliver sustainable services with our communities.

14.2 The Council is committed to the delivery of Children’s Centre and Library services. The alternative to a comprehensive redesign of our front facing services is to rationalise or stop some of our local provision, to support the Council delivery of a balanced budget. In order to prevent service closures a review of our property, staffing structures and service offer is essential to maintain provision. This latter approach is the preferred service delivery model outlined in this report.
14.3 The report also sets out a number of locality and service options which are being explored and will form the basis for our wider community consultation and engagement.
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Appendix 1

Draft vision for integrated Libraries & Children’s Centres in North Somerset – Version 3 (26.05.2016)

Many communities will have a collocated and integrated Library and Children’s Centre offer, whilst some will maintain a separate Children’s Centre and/or Library where it makes sense to do so. Children’s Centre services could be running from a library in communities where a stand-alone library remains. The opening times and how the building is open will vary from site to site. Areas open to the public will be rich with resources spanning age ranges. It is obvious on entry to the building that it caters for children and adults of all ages, with a focus on under 5’s, and older people. The building is an information point.

Most sites will be shared by the CC and library workforce. It may be open for part of the week exclusively as a CC, part of the week as a Library and the remainder of the week with both functioning at the same time. The aim is to have buildings accessible to the public as often as possible which includes some evening and weekend use. The reception point will be the same whether you have come to use the library or the CC or both. The greeter at the reception point may be a member of the library and CC team or a volunteer.

Hubs will offer a safe, welcoming and seated space, where people can read a book, or newspaper or use a PC. It may offer simple refreshments; remembering that hot drinks and the CC offer do not mix. There will be other organisations and workers from other agencies using the building e.g. Health visitors, Alliance Homes, Health Trainers, Mental Health practitioners, Counsellors, childcare social workers, adult and community learning, childcare providers.

The culture is front facing, friendly, inclusive and community focused. Staff will be approachable, knowledgeable, empathetic, who understand about the delivery of quality front facing customer services including telephone work. Safeguarding includes both that of children, vulnerable adults and staff safety.

There is a broad spectrum of job roles that span the age range and stage people are at in their job role. Libraries and CC’s will employ apprentices, adults with learning difficulties and volunteers to work alongside existing staff. Some support roles will work across the library and CC function. Everyone who works in a joint centre will have an understanding of both functions and will have the ability to signpost to each other’s services. There will be cross-sector training; library staff may be given the opportunity to undertake an NVQ in childcare whilst Children’s Centre workers extend their skills set to cover Library requirements. Over time there may be an integrated workforce.

Staff will support the Council’s ‘Gateway Offer’ as a point for the public to get answers to enquiries. Customers can access activities, across the age range through the Council’s key priorities of:

- Digital First
- Health & wellbeing
• Resource management
• Quality places

You will know what the programme is on offer and the opening times from the council website.

Details in terms of the Library and Children’s Centres services are currently in development with respective teams and will be the subject of further consultation with service users.

It is also hoped that a joint service offer will be developed within localities during year 1 of the CAR programme, ensuring that learning and development from each team is shared throughout the service.
Appendix 2

Locality option appraisal as at 27/5/16

NB those options referred to as ‘preferred’ are those options that, given feedback, business intelligence and option appraisal are those that at this time represent the best solution for the community and North Somerset Council. This may change as a result of the proposed wider consultation programme.

YATTON AND CONGRESBURY

Services involved for the Yatton and Congresbury area

- Yatton Library
- Congresbury Library
- Yeo Valley Children’s Centre
- Yatton Moor Children’s Centre

Initial options identified:

- Co-locate Yatton Moor CC with Yeo Valley CC but continue to deliver CC services in Yatton Moor’s community via outreach i.e. using the library as a venue or other community facilities as appropriate
- Community Service transfer Congresbury Library
- Move Yatton Moor CC into Yatton library to create community hub
- Move Congresbury Library to Yeo Valley CC
- Close Congresbury Library
- Remodel the current service provision for Congresbury Library
- Create a new integrated facility to serve both communities

Rejected options

The option to create a new integrated facility to serve both communities has been rejected due to the following reasons:

- More cost effective solutions are available
- Two of the existing buildings can meet customer needs for both localities
- Capital to invest is not available

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-locate Yatton Children’s Centre with Yeo Valley Children’s Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced service costs from move from current location (staff and running costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible income generation from leasing existing the children’s centre site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity for some children’s book provision at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better outdoor space at Yeo Valley Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces the isolation of, and risk for, lone working staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No major capital costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of kitchen facilities for working with families (Yatton Children’s Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No children’s centre in Yatton when facing growth in this area (estimated 600 new homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of one-to-one space for family work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of kitchen facilities for working with families (Yatton Children’s Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No children’s centre in Yatton when facing growth in this area (estimated 600 new homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of one-to-one space for family work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB initial feedback suggests this won’t be a viable option without some support from NSC library service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No integrated service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Potential adverse public response to service changes and introduction of new service model

### Closure of Congresbury Library, merging service with Yatton Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Reduced service costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>No library service provision in this locality (however not needed to maintain the statutory network provision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service remodel for Congresbury Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Reduced revenue costs through:</th>
<th>Library remains part of the service network albeit with a different service offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased self-service options</td>
<td>No major capital costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of volunteer support</td>
<td>Opportunity for support from Parish Council with costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longer opening hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>Little opportunity to deliver service savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital costs of Bibliotheca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced 'serviced' hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No integrated service offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emerging preferred options

Co-locate Yatton Moor CC with Yeo Valley CC but continue to deliver Children’s Centre services to Yatton Moor’s CC community via outreach using Yatton library as a venue or other community facilities as appropriate.

Maintain library service provision at Congresbury either through service transfer to the Parish Council but with support from NSC or through enhanced self-service facilities.

### Summary of feedback

- Yatton and Congresbury are distinct communities and not considered to be in close proximity
- Care needs to be taken to include the needs of vulnerable people including older people and young families.
- Upgrading of the lift in Yatton Library is required as a matter of urgency to ensure this facility is fully accessible.
- Congresbury PC is open to consider the transfer of the library to the PC subject to:
  - Further discussion (to include details of running costs and possibility of s106 etc.)
  - Continued inclusion within the NSC library network to ensure support for its volunteers from the authority
- The role of schools should not be undervalued and need to be seen as part of the bigger picture
- Moving Congresbury library to Yeo Valley CC is not a viable option
- Can the review be an opportunity to redefine CC reach areas?
- Cost of managing vacant properties should be included in costings
- The mobile service also needs to be included as part of the whole ‘service package’ specifically its role in reaching more vulnerable service users who are unable to leave home
- Transport and logistics between villages should be considered
PILL AND PORTISHEAD

Services involved for the Pill and Portishead area:

- Pill Library
- Crockerne Children’s Centre (Pill)
- Portishead Library
- Portishead Children’s Centre

Portishead

Portishead Library recently saw significant investment to build a brand new purpose built library facility. Due to this it is envisaged only a service review will be conducted.

Similarly, Children’s Centre services in Portishead will only be the subject of an internal service review. No change is envisaged.

Pill

Initial options identified:

- Relocate Crockerne CC to library
- Transfer the library service provision to the parish council
- Create an integrated solution for the Crockerne CC and/or library, potentially co-locating with partners
- Close Pill Library without re-provided services
- Retain current Crockerne CC location but conduct a service review
- New site/solution for children’s centre and library
- Close children’s centre without re-provided services

Rejected options

The option to build a new integrated facility is rejected due to the capital costs.

Options to close Pill library and Crockerne CC without alternative suitable provision has been rejected due to the evidence of need for these services within the community.

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocate the children’s centre to the library</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced revenue costs for both services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated service offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential space to undertake re-configuration, for example provision of small meeting room, customer WC, outdoor space etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for children’s centre/ library new delivery model and self-service options – for example longer opening hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased footfall for both services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Larger space for the children’s centre to operate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Flexibility in opening hours to meet the needs of both services
- Partner use, e.g. immunisation clinics, supervised contact

### Negatives
- Capital cost of adjustments to make premises suitable for both services, for example, relocated entrance and enlargement of front facing windows
- Reduction in library area
- Relocating children’s centre away from primary school and nursery

### Library service transfer to Parish Council

#### Positives
- Community integration of service
- Retains service network albeit in a different guise

#### Negatives
- Reliance on volunteers to run service

### Integrated solution for children’s centre and library within community partner site e.g. Resource Centre

#### Positives
- Reduced revenue costs
- Integrated service offering
- Maintains network provision
- Various NSC officers and partner agencies already use the Resource Centre

#### Negatives
- Limited sites available
- Resource/capital implications unknown
- Savings therefore could be limited/nil
- Some sensitivities around library service/Resource Centre provision and overlaps
- No outdoor space for the children’s centre

### Retain the children’s centre in current location and undertake service review

#### Positives
- Reduced revenue costs
- Academy status of Crockerne School may reduce revenue costs due to redrafting of leasing terms

#### Negatives
- No integrated service provision
- Lack of adequate space (inside and outside)
- Public access to site difficult

### Emerging preferred option

The emerging preferred option for the Pill area is to relocate the children’s centre to the library. This is due to it being more cost effective to run and the potential to increase space and facilities for the children’s centre - including outdoor space.

This would be mutual beneficial to both services and their service users due to the potential increased footfall, crossover of services for children and families.

If selected this would mean the shared facility would have the potential for increased opening hours and signposting to services, as well as capital investment to make the necessary changes on site.
Summary of feedback

- Encouraged that the offer is a positive one for the community with an improved library with outdoor space
- Concern re car parking and potential increase in traffic on road leading to the library
- Use of the space will require careful timetabling to ensure that all the needs of the community are met. Would like to see service proposals as early as possible.
- Concern that needs of older users are not overlooked
- Need to safeguard the relationship between the children’s centres and nursery/school brought about by their close proximity
- Potential disturbance for residents who live in the vicinity of the library. There have been previous issues re noise – children’s centres are not designed to be quiet spaces.
- Would like to see more contribution to the wider health and social wellbeing agenda to improve outcomes for the community. NB currently do have schemes such as books on prescription and links with the Mental Health team but need to expand this offer and develop relationships.
- Questions about how self-service (Open Plus) would work in practice at the library
- Concerns raised over how income would be increased
- Staff very positive about the idea of working more closely in Pill, and could see lots of opportunities for enhanced service delivery
- Suggestions about potential sites for Pill services
- Staff suggested some other local groups and contacts to engage with in Pill
CLEVEDON

Services involved for the Clevedon area:

- Clevedon Library
- The Barn/Clevedon Children’s Centre

Initial options identified

- Relocate the library to Castlewood
- Relocate the library to the children’s centre
- Relocate the children’s centre to the library
- Co-locate a partner at the library to reduce the footprint and generate income/share operating costs
- Children’s centre service review
- Relocate/downsize library to alternative town centre site

Rejected options

The option to relocate Clevedon Library to the children’s centre has been rejected due to the following reasons:

- The Barn/Clevedon Children’s Centre is full to capacity and already works effectively with partner agencies
- No suitable space within the building to accommodate the library

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library in current location with co-located partner to share costs/generate income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positives | • Shared running costs due to reduced library footprint  
• Income generation  
• Re-modelled (smaller) library service - increased self-service (Open Plus)  
• Opportunity for service review (review of contract costs etc.)  
• Various opportunities depending on partner identified e.g. digital, cultural |
| Negatives | • No service integration with Children’s Centre  
• Capital cost for necessary adjustments e.g. fire, separation etc. (potential to share this cost with partner)  
• Public perception of reduced service due to smaller footprint |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of other buildings for downsized library and possible integrated solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positives | • Reduced revenue costs due to reduced footprint  
• Opportunity to share space (and costs) with suitable partner / more flexible space  
• Children centre services could be delivered from new space  
• High Street environment will lead to higher footfall  
• Opportunity to review service model |
### Negatives
- Availability of suitable premises
- Community (emotional attachment) to existing library
- Public perception of reduced service due to smaller footprint

### Children’s centre service review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced revenue costs</td>
<td>• No service integration with library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Move Clevedon Library to Castlewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Co-location with partners</td>
<td>• Too far out of town for general access - loss of custom and footfall; lack of car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital receipt from sale of existing library premises</td>
<td>• Capital cost of alternative provision likely to be prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Income receipt if existing library premises leased</td>
<td>• Possible new service charge (rent) that currently is not levied on the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced revenue costs</td>
<td>• Existing library premises in conservation area which might impact on future use of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-location with DWP offers opportunity to develop links and signposting (national DWP priority)</td>
<td>• Does not reflect ambition for integrated model with Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates more of a service hub and therefore fulfils project objective</td>
<td>• May be difficult to achieve 'open and free access' to library service with configuration of the existing and proposed Castlewood site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreases vitality of the town centre due to reduced visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Castlewood could be seen as ‘authoritarian’ or ‘corporate’ building and not as welcoming for a public facing service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relocate children's centre to Clevedon Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared and reduced revenue costs for each service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Income generation from space released at the Barn - dependent on move of Community Family Team (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity for inter-generational activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps to integrate Bookstart at an early stage and may encourage greater adult use through parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased footfall due to co-location may encourage customers to use children’s centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single site manager opportunity - opportunity for new integrated service model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for longer opening hrs and/or self-service at lib.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for better accommodation for Community Families Team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging preferred option

Clevedon Library is costly to run alone, so opportunities to reduce revenue costs have been identified. These include; co-locating a partner on the current site to share the space or to relocate and downsize the library.

Co-locating with a partner offers opportunity to reduce/share revenue costs and generate income. This improves the scope for partnership working and allows for more flexible use of space.

This would be in conjunction with a service review of the children’s centre.

Summary of feedback

- Castlewood not considered to be a viable option by the community
- The Barn Management Committee would be unable to match fund any capital investment at the Barn and approaches to funding bodies are unlikely to be successful
- Any move to The Barn would need to come with capital for investment
- Need to ensure that whatever solution is agreed, the needs of vulnerable people are included, for example, space to socialise
- Preferred ‘viable’ options:
  - Downsize existing site and attract partner
  - Move library to a smaller premise (town centre location) and sell existing library premise
- Any capital receipt received from selling the library (if this should happen) should be invested back into the community
LONG ASHTON

Services involved for the Long Ashton area:

- Long Ashton Library
- Long Ashton Children’s Centre (Birdwell School)

Initial options identified

- Keep library ‘as is’ with service review to reduce costs
- Reduce library footprint
- Relocate and work with partners on alternative community site
- Keep Children’s Centre ‘as is’ with service review
- Close the library with alternative provision through mobile outreach service
- Relocate the library to the children’s centre
- Relocate children’s centre to library
- Split library provision between community centre and children’s centre
- Create new integrated solution to house library and children’s centre

Reasoning for rejected options

The options to: relocate the library to the children’s centre, relocate children’s centre to library, split the library provision or create a new integrated solution have been rejected due to the following reasons:

- Essential for library to have a central location – the distance and location of children’s centre may present problems.
- The children’s centre doesn’t have space to accommodate library service
- Splitting the library provision would fragment service delivery – not customer friendly
- Existing children’s centre is purpose built and fit for purpose – relocation to library would detract from this
- No suitable sites available for co-location of library and children’s centre (capital cost prohibitive)

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep library as is with service review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Introduce OpenPlus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity to explore potential of sharing space with other partners to reduce revenue and lease costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintains library service in this locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity to renegotiate the lease and reduce leasing cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revenue costs remain high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reduce footprint of library

**Positives**
- Reduced revenue costs through renting of vacated half
- Opportunity for alternative library service model

**Negatives**
- Capital investment required for necessary adjustments
- No integrated service offer
- Demand for space and/or ability to attract partner is uncertain

### Relocate library with other partners or on other village sites

**Positives**
- Reduced revenue costs
- Co-location with key partner and other community services
- Potential to increase footfall due to other services delivered from this site e.g. café
- Maintains library service network
- Lots of community activity already at the Community Centre – library could benefit from increased footfall and usage

**Negatives**
- No integrated service offer with children’s centre

### Close the library with alternative mobile outreach provision

**Positives**
- Reduced revenue costs
- Increase mobile outreach service

**Negatives**
- No integrated service offer
- Adverse impact on statutory network

### CC as is but with service review

**Positives**
- Reduced revenue costs (review of contracts)
- Opportunity to reconfigure space in current children’s centre to lease/rent to partners (Health Visitors) in short term
- Opportunity to use library on closed days to extend provision of children’s centre services
- Opportunity to use library meeting room for supervised visits
- Improved signage may increase footfall

**Negatives**
- No integrated service offer with library – potentially some picture books could be located at children’s centre

### Emerging preferred option

The emerging option is that of retaining the library on the current site but to explore ways of reducing costs (specifically leasing costs) and/or footprint. The Council would still wish to explore opportunities of working with community partners as the opportunity arises.
Summary of feedback

- Consensus that library should remain in its current location
- Focus should be on reducing costs of the existing library through renegotiation of the lease or attracting a partner
- Need to explore the possibly of the former British Legion premises
- There is little opportunity to relocate the library to the Community Association but agreed that both the Association and NSC need to work closer together
CAMPUS, CASTLEBATCH AND BANWELL

Services involved for the above mentioned areas:

- Campus Library
- East Group Children’s Centres (Locking Castle and Locking CC; Castle Batch CC; Banwell, Winscombe and Sandford CC). NB Milton and Old Worle considered separately

Options identified/ preferred option

Due to the current premises of the Campus and East group children’s centres being fit for purpose, the preferred option is to undertake service review to explore contract savings and income generation. Currently looking at colocation with an Early Years provider at Castle Batch.
WINSCOMBE LIBRARY

(NB Children’s Centre service for this area covered by East Group CCs – see above)

Initial options identified:

- A new integrated solution for the library and children’s centre
- New library provision with a community partner
- Relocate the library to the Banwell children’s centre
- Close the library with introduction of mobile outreach service
- Service review of the library
- Service transfer of the library to community partner

Options rejected

- New integrated solution for the library and children’s centre
  o Both sites are fit for purpose and in the right locality for service users
  o Capital cost of any new build is prohibitive
- New library provision with a community partner
  o Significant investment in remodel of library recently
- Relocate the library to the Banwell children’s centre
  o Current library is situated in a good location and is well used
- Close the library with alternative provision
  o Library service committed to providing a service to this area

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winscombe Library service review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced revenue costs (staff review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for new service model - self-service, longer opening hours, volunteers. NB new Library Management System provides for greater flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for CC to deliver outreach service at this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains library network and provides better return on investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation of services for customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer engagement needs developing; volunteers may not want the extra responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service transfer for Winscombe library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains library network albeit in different guise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced revenue costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrates with community partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging preferred options:

The preferred options for Winscombe is currently to either transfer the service of Winscombe Library or review and remodel the current library service to reduce revenue costs (self-service) and integrate with community partners (volunteers).
WORLE

Services involved for the Worle area:

- Worle Library
- Milton and Old Worle Children’s Centre

Initial options identified

Worle:
- Co-locate library with the children’s centre
- Co-locate children’s centre with library
- Reduce and remodel the current library, and engage with partners to share space
- Close the library (no alternative provision available)
- Provide new (build) site for integrated provision
- Relocate children’s centre into the school premises
- Retain the library and children’s centre ‘as is’

Rejected options

The following options were rejected:

- Retain library and children’s centre ‘as is’
  - Not financially viable
  - Revenue savings have to be made
- Relocate children’s centre into school premises
  - Unlikely the school has space
- New site for integrated provision
  - Resource limitations for capital investment

Impact analysis of remaining options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-locate library service with current children’s centre</th>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will retain library service rather than closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for integrated service &amp; creation of local hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for new integrated service model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location of children’s centre is just as good - parking, close to school and High Street facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced/shared running costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No reduction in library opening hours (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for self-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capital receipt from library site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint children’s activities and greater access to books for children’s centre users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in footfall and therefore use of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People First volunteers are located at children’s centre - potential to share across library service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>Co-locate children’s centre with library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Capital cost to reconfigure internal and external layout of existing children’s centre  
  • Smaller library and children’s centre footprint (mitigated by shared use of space and self-service options for library users)  
  • Older users may not feel as comfortable with new location  
  • Reduced library offer e.g. local history (but available at Town Hall)  
  • Council Connect payments machine - need to establish whether it would need to relocate  
  • A detailed EIA required  
  • Safeguarding issues will need to be considered vis a vis protection of children from harm |                                                                                                               |
| Positives                                                                 | Positives                                                                 |
| • Will retain library service rather than closure  
  • Opportunity for integrated service & creation of local hub  
  • Opportunity for new integrated service model  
  • Reduced/shared running costs  
  • Joint children's activities and greater access to books for children’s centre users  
  • Increase in footfall and therefore use of services  
  • People First volunteers are located at children’s centre - potential to share across library service | • Will retain library service in current location  
  • Potential to generate income to offset costs  
  • Reduced revenue costs through review of service charges |
| Negatives                                                                 | Negatives                                                                 |
| • Parking at existing library site is inadequate for Children’s Centre users  
  • No external play space  
  • Capital cost to reconfigure internal and external layout of existing library  
  • Smaller library and children’s centre footprint (mitigated by shared use of space and self-service options for library users)  
  • A detailed EIA required  
  • Safeguarding issues will need to be considered vis a vis protection of children from harm | • Smaller library footprint (but possibly too large in current guise)  
  • Lost opportunity for integrated service  
  • Difficulty in attracting partners to share space  
  • Generation of income uncertain  
  • Lost opportunity for capital receipt and contribution to remodelling of services |
| Retain reduced/remodelled library service in current location but attract partners to share space |                                                                                                               |
Close library with no alternative service provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Revenue saving</td>
<td>• Impact on local community too great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital receipt for building</td>
<td>• Older library customers may suffer most if unable to access local library services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customers have access to other libraries within a 2-3 mile radius (Weston Central, Campus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emerging preferred option

Co-locating the library with the current children’s centre will retain the library service for the area, provide new opportunities for an integrated service model and local hub. This option will also reduce/ share running costs and release capital from the sale of the library.

Other potential benefits would be an increased footfall from the merge of the services localities and improved access to books for the children’s centres users.

Summary of feedback

- There is real concern that closing the library or moving it from its existing site will remove one of the ‘hearts of the community’ particularly as the community has already seen the closure of other community facilities
- This strength of feeling has materialised in a petition that has been signed by over 1000 local residents. This has revealed other concerns (see above).
- Would support reduction of library footprint within existing site but with partners to share space and costs
- Children’s centre and library services are not seen as natural bedfellows
- There is greater synergy between children’s centre and health partners
- Concern about the current footprint of the children’s centre and the ability to deliver library services from the same premises – ‘too small’? Concerns re safeguarding and privacy.
- Services need to focus on their core business and outcomes
- Discussion around the potential to join up the offer to some community groups, children’s activities etc. Adult literacy and children’s speech and development – possibility of all kinds of interesting projects out in the community
- Agreement that children’s centre lends itself to shared space and joint working
- Need to ensure that People First continue to be involved in Worle
WESTON – SOUTH AND CENTRAL

Services involved for the Weston area

- Ashcombe Children’s Centre
- Weston Central Children’s Centre (Meadow Street)
- Weston South Children’s Centre (For All Healthy Living Centre, Oldmixon Family Centre and Windwhistle School)
- Weston-super-Mare Library (Town Hall)
- Weston Library (For All Healthy Living Centre)

No significant change is anticipated for Ashcombe Children’s Centre and the libraries at the Town Hall and Healthy Living Centre. These centres will therefore only undergo service reviews with an aim to reduce running costs and generate income.

The focus therefore in Weston is on Children Centres which will be referred to as Weston South and Weston Central.

Initial options identified:

WESTON CENTRAL

- Children’s centre provision to integrate into Walliscote Grove/ Rose Lawns regeneration project
- Relocate to alternative town centre site e.g.
  o Clifton Road (NSC site)
  o Crossroad Centre
  o The Firs
  o Carlton Centre
  o Town Hall
- Children’s Centre (Meadow Street) to continue in current location
- Provision of the Children’s Centre in redevelopment of Locking Road car park
- Children’s Centre to relocate to a new premise

Rejected options (Weston Central):

- Children’s Centre to relocate to Clifton Road (NSC owned)
  o Location not suitable
  o Estimated cost of refurbishment high
- Children’s Centre to relocate to another/available town centre site
  o Property now sold
- Children’s centre to relocate to The Firs
  o Wrong location for catchment area
  o Some shared service run there already
## Impact analysis of remaining options

### Children’s centre provision integrated into Walliscote Grove / Rose Lawns regeneration project

| Positives | • Very central location, next to library, primary school and other agencies/services  
• Children’s centre could be designed and planned as fit for purpose |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Negatives | • Costs to lease space likely to be high  
• Timescales and costs not known yet; significant capital investment needed for build  
• No outdoor space or parking |

### Children’s Centre (Meadow Street) to continue in current location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>• Provides a short term solution with re-negotiated lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Negatives | • Size of premises currently not fit for purpose, with no room for expansion  
• No parking provision  
• No space for private meetings  
• Lease expires in 2017 |

### Children’s Centre to relocate to Town Hall

| Positives | • Integrated service provision  
• Children’s centre services fit for purpose |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Negatives | • Capital costs to reconfigure space  
• No outdoor space, limited parking (charged)  
• Other services currently located on the ground floor would need relocating  
• No outdoor space for Children’s Centre  
• Potential to reduce revenue costs is unclear due to existing leasing and recharge arrangements. |

### CC to relocate to Carlton Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>• Ideal location, close to other services, library, Town Hall and Walliscote Grove Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Negatives | • Future plans for Carlton Centre site not known; existing services would have to relocate  
• Limited outdoor space and parking |

### Provision of CC to be included in redevelopment of Locking Road car park

| Positives | • Children’s centre would be fit for purpose (and could allow for future growth/demand); right location  
• Potential for partners/lettable space |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Negatives | • HCA plans for the site not known and discussion re: providing a children’s centre on this land hasn’t taken place  
• Capital costs unknown  
• Timescales unknown  
• Property and Asset Management resource requirement |
## Children’s Centre to other town centre location - potential commercial premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Possibility of finding a good central location better suited to children’s centre requirements than Meadow Street site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>Potential for higher revenue costs for lease or capital requirement if buying a property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emerging preferred option

The preferred option for Weston Central is currently to relocate the Children’s Centre to a new premises, largely due to the existing site is not fit for purpose. A larger premises with an outdoor space will help deliver a better standard of service to the families in Weston Central.

### Initial feedback:

Both officers and ward members have highlighted the limitations imposed by the size of the existing building in Meadow Street.

Ward members have requested that officers look for an interim solution, with a view to working with partners (particularly health) to find a sustainable long term solution. It is likely therefore that a short term solution will be considered pending the identification of a longer term solution.

### WESTON SOUTH

#### Initial options identified:

- Review of current HLC service costs
- Integration of Drove Road/ health partners into HLC/ Oldmixon
- Relocate service from Oldmixon to HLC (or vice versa)
- Explore potential sub-rent/ let space at HLC to partners
- Explore opportunities to work more effectively with Weston Works

#### Preferred option:

Reviewing the lease for the premises, in conjunction with; consideration of shared space/ further partnership working. Reviewing how the children’s centre service use the spaces will also be looked into. This will include a review of all the above options.
Appendix 3
North Somerset Council Community Access Review

Engagement Plan

1. North Somerset Council (NSC) is clear that it will seek the views of and listen to the people who live in North Somerset. This includes changes to policies and services. The Community Access Review (CAR) will result in significant changes to service delivery in some parts of the district. This paper sets out a plan for how consultation / engagement with all those affected by or interested in the CAR will have the opportunity to engage with the council about the review and its implications.

2. The intention of the review is that any changes to services and budget savings will have been completed by March 2019. To achieve this it will need all decisions on changes to be made by the end of 2017. The key engagement period for the review is therefore 2016 and 2017.

3. The engagement will have the following principles at its core:

   - It is meaningful: that all views expressed will be listened to and seriously considered and could result in changes to what is being thought about or proposed. All collated views will be reported to Councillors making any final decisions and the response to the views expressed will be published following the relevant meeting.

   - It is open to everyone: while it is recognised that no engagement process can reflect or represent the views of everyone, it is vital that everyone is made aware of the opportunity to have their say through the widest promotion and publicity.

   - It is inclusive: every effort will be made to ensure that there are no barriers to anyone who wishes to take part in the engagement. This includes ensuring people receive any information on request in the format and language they prefer and that any meetings are accessible.

4. There is a statutory requirement for consultation/engagement over changes to children centre services. Case law has also established the need for a clear engagement plan and process regarding changes to library services. There is no detail to define what is required.

5. In order to meet the above requirements this plan has drawn on best and good practise in engagement and consultation. It distinguishes between engagement and consultation. Engagement is a process to work with stakeholders to consider in detail options. Consultation is the consideration of formal proposals and plans prior to a committee decision. Where possible it seeks the longest time-frame possible for both engagement and consultation.

6. In any consultation/engagement process there are a range of methods available
to use. The choice of methods is determined by which methods can enable the maximum number of people to participate, and the available resources to undertake the consultation/engagement. For the CAR review the following are proposed. These would be used both in the engagement and consultation phases:

- NSC E-consult: the options for engagement and consultation proposals would be put on E-consult with suitable questions to seek both qualitative and quantitative views.

- Public meetings: there would be one public meeting in each of the affected geographical areas which would be open to anyone to attend.

- Attending pre-existing meetings and groups: local voluntary and community groups would be offered officers to visit meetings to explain the options/proposals and gather views.

- Focus groups: individuals and group representatives would be invited to attend small groups to have focused discussions on particular issues.

- Written responses: individuals / organisations can submit written responses to the options / formal proposals.

7. Communications are an essential element of effective consultation and engagement. Media releases, articles and social media will be used to promote and publicise every stage of the consultation and engagement including North Somerset Life.

8. The timetable for engagement and consultation has been developed taking in to account key decision-making by the NSC Executive. The key Executive meetings are:

- June 2016: agreeing to next stage of the review including options for engagement / consultation and the consultation/engagement plan

- November 2016: decision on which options to proceed with in 2017-18 taking in to account outcomes of the consultation/engagement

- March 2017: agreement of options for engagement to take place in 2017 - 2018 for implementation in 2018-19

- July 2017: agreement of formal consultation proposals taking in to account outcomes of the engagement

- November 2017: final decision on options taking in to account outcomes of the consultation for implementation in 2018-19

9. The timetable for consultation/engagement is therefore:
• 2016: engagement commences May with discussions with key stakeholders. 1st July to 30th September consultation/engagement over options agreed at the June Executive

• 2017: engagement process 1st April to 15th June. Consultation process from 15th July to 30th September.

10. The consultation/engagement will be overseen and led by the relevant service leads for children’s centres and libraries in the geographical area concerned. An officer from People and Communities with experience of consultation and engagement will provide expert advice and support including undertaking practical arrangements with the relevant project support. Some financial resources will be required for promotion, publicity, hire of venues and meeting accessibility costs.
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Equality Impact Assessment: Community Access Review
Service Area: Development and Environment & People and Communities
Equality Impact Assessment Owner: Mandy Bishop
Review date: June 2016 v3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget Reduction Proposal</th>
<th>Budget Reduction (£)</th>
<th>Staffing Reduction (FTE)</th>
<th>Service user impact before mitigating actions</th>
<th>Service user impact after mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORP_3_3</td>
<td>Community Access Review</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1 – The proposal

Background to proposal – Max 250 words
(Please provide a brief explanation of the project/proposals, you should consider both the impact on customers and staff)

The proposal will be known as the Community Access Review (CAR). The review aims to assess, evaluate and where appropriate reconfigure current access to customer facing front line services - developing and building on opportunities of integration (of services) and co-location (with Partners) whilst maintaining a network of services that are fit for current and future use, relevant and appropriate for each community.

The review also seeks to maximise the use of technology to increase self-service and inclusion and contribute to the achievement of the NSC Medium Term Financial Plan. It is likely that there will be an impact on staff in terms of re-defining roles and responsibilities and users in terms of access to services.
Whilst originally the services in scope of the project were Libraries, Children’s Centres, Leisure Centres, Community Halls and Gateways, the reality is a focus on Libraries and Children’s Centres. This is due to a recent review of leisure contracts that has made considerable savings and mitigated the need for further review at this stage. Similarly, service reviews of Community Halls have ensured that these facilities now operate at no cost to the Council. Officers continue to work with Agilisys regarding Gateway provision to ensure that value and resource are maximised to support front line services.

The proposed redevelopment of Scotch Horn in Nailsea to create a community hub of integrated services (leisure, libraries, children’s centres and partners) remains under the umbrella of the CAR but will constitute a separate project likely to commence in the autumn of 2016. Further discussions will be held with Parkwood Leisure and stakeholders as the delivery model is developed.

In summary, through careful management and innovative use of resources, linking with partners where appropriate, the review aims to maintain a network of services tailored to the needs of each locality but operated within an affordable financial envelope. In this way the Council will continue its commitment to these services and whilst they may look different once the programme is completed, services will be retained, or even improved, rather than lost as is happening elsewhere across the country.

Since the outline of the review was presented to the Executive Board in December 2015, much progress has been made. Key actions are outlined below and can be summarised broadly as activities that build a better understanding of the localities and their needs.

- Collated service and property data to develop an in depth understanding of the services in scope
- Undertaken locality visits to understand how services operate in communities and to identify service opportunities
- Undertaken locality option appraisals and commissioned feasibility studies
- Development of future service requirements/outcomes - visioning exercises
- Commenced discussions about service structures to align and deliver new service vision
- Health partner discussions to link with existing and emerging communities and health needs
- Undertaken stakeholder analysis and identified key stakeholders for engagement and consultation
- Collated service user data and commenced stakeholder engagement
- Commenced briefings with staff
- Engaged with Community and Corporate Organisation panel and Working Group
- Engaged with Equality Scheme Implementation Group to identify and address specific needs
• Established links with other partners through the North Somerset Partnership to identify opportunities for district-wide and locality projects, digital access, Gateway services and mobile working
• Established robust project governance and management.

Current position:

The project team are currently developing the service level delivery model using the background information and preliminary key stakeholder feedback. Initial thoughts are the subject of the report to the June Executive meeting which seeks support of a number of recommendations that will help move the programme forward. The success of the review is predicated on the following deliverables:

• A presumption of co-location of library and children’s services within communities, leading to a reduction in the number of buildings
• Maximising the use of our new building network through the deployment of self-service technology solutions
• Enhancing our broadband and IT capabilities – to support officer mobile working and support community needs
• A move to more integrated working and staffing structures, to support front line delivery of both library and children’s centre services
• Review of suppliers and service budgets to secure value for money, i.e. through the letting of joint contracts
• Maximising income generation through the letting of facilities outside normal office hours and the letting of office space/facilities to partner organisations
• Co-location with Partners where possible

Please detail below how this proposal may impact on any other organisation and their customers.

It is the intention of this review that full use will be made of opportunities to co-locate services with key partners. Existing partners include the Weston Area Health Trust (WAHT) and the North Somerset Community Partnership (NSCP). Going forward other partners could include Avon and Somerset Police, the North Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group (NSCCG) and the Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership Trust (AWP).

It is not known yet whether this would be existing NSC service sites, partner sites or on new integrated provision. It is hoped however that where feasible co-location/integration will provide a holistic, joined-up service for users and staff. From feedback received already the project group is also mindful of the need to work closely with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations.
Section 2 - What do we know?

Customer/Staff profile details - What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

A considerable amount of customer, staff, service and asset profiling has already been undertaken. For example:

For each Library (12 in total) we know:
- The number of active borrowers, by age group (0-4, 5-10, 11-17, 18+, 60+)
- The number of active borrowers (groups and care homes)
- The number of active borrowers where a disability has been declared and who are unable to leave home or have limited mobility
- Number of visits, number of items borrowed, computer usage in hours

In addition to the above for each library site we have collected information of ethnicity and disability. This information needs to be fully analysed to determine the impact on service provision but gives some insight into those who may need support in terms of mental health, learning as well as physical disability.

We also know that there are a total of 55 FTEs (including 8 qualified Librarians) and 243 volunteers (source CIPFA library stats 2014/15). Many staff work part time hours.

In 2013 a detailed profile of libraries was undertaken by North Somerset research officers. Whilst this data may now need updating it does provide some valuable socio-economic background information in terms of library use in different locations. This report will be re-evaluated and any current relevant information included within our evidence base.

For each of the Children’s Centres (14 in total) we know
- The number of under 5’s within reach area
- Carers seen by volume
- Individual carers by volume

We also have details regarding targeted groups (children/carers) who have been registered and seen as a percentage of those in the reach area (2014 & (partial) 2015). This information relates to support for children with additional needs, children who are part of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community, BME groups and teenage mothers.
Final staff details are still being determined but it is estimated that there are in excess of 150 staff many of which work on a part time/sessional basis.

In April 2016 the CAR Project Board commissioned a piece of work from the Business Intelligence team to support and enhance the above data. The resulting report (Usage and Locality Information to Support the Community Access Review, April 2016) provides valuable further insight into both Children’s centre and Library services at service level and within localities. This intelligence is critical both for overall service perspectives but also specific locality considerations as the team works to identify locality service solutions. Key criteria covered for services includes:

For Libraries:
- Age
- Known ethnic origin
- Disability
- Area of residence by Index of Multiple Deprivation

For Children’s Centres
- Ethnic origin of children
- Index of multiple deprivation of LSOAs where recent users lived
- Numbers of 0 – 4 children living in reach area
- No of children in out-of-work benefits claimant households by reach area

In addition to the specific service information above the project team has collected information vis a vis customer satisfaction, population growth and location in order to understand the bigger picture in terms of current and future service provision. It is the aim of the project that there should be little or no diminution of service satisfaction for all users.

What does the data or evidence tell us about the potential impact on diverse groups and how is this supported by historic experience/data?

Key data sets now include the following and will help develop the service and locality level picture:
- Usage and Locality Information to Support the Community Access Review (April 2016)
- Libraries Adult PLUS survey (October 2015) (a public library user survey)
- Children’s Centre Data Pack (January 2016)
The data (thus far) tells us that potentially there will be impact with respect to some diverse groups such as disabled people, people in particular age groups, those who are unable to leave home, carers and parents. An aging population may also have an impact on service access and provision.

It is also apparent that a focus on targeted groups (those in most need of support) will be necessary in any reconfiguration of services. The information also highlights the importance of outreach services for those who are unable to leave home or who do not traditionally access council buildings but who still require support such as the Gypsy, Roma and Travelling community.

Initial analysis of the data also highlights variations in service access and support across the North Somerset area. It will be seen from the feedback summarised below that this type of profiling is critical in developing the right service solution for each community area. The project group will work to ensure profiling will be complete as soon as possible and acknowledges that there is more information to gather to inform each community picture with respect to other diverse groups and protected characteristics.

Are there any gaps in the data, for example; across protected characteristics where information is limited or not available?

As mentioned above data has now been gathered with respect to ethnicity, gender, disability, income and age and will be subject to detailed analysis. There are still gaps however in terms of sexual orientation and faith and whilst in reality the impact may be low the project team needs to explore this further to ensure to fully understand the impact on users within these protected characteristics. The team will look to the Equality Scheme Implementation Group for support in identifying contacts in reaching these users.

How have we involved communities and groups that could be affected?

The project has received approval from the NSC Executive (meeting Dec 8) and the objectives, aims and approach for the project have been endorsed. Members have therefore been alerted to the potential impact on their communities. Members are also engaged through a Community and Corporate Organisation (CCO) Policy and Scrutiny working group.

On 7th January 2016 a presentation was made to the Stakeholder Equality Scheme Implementation Group outlining the nature of the project and the outcomes it seeks to achieve. The project group is grateful for the feedback from this group specifically for its support of the EIA and will use the comments made to help shape service re-configuration.

Feedback is summarised in the following table together with the appropriate response from the project leads. The feedback has been analysed and categorised into 5 main considerations: Consultation, Profiling, Community Engagement, ICT and General.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td>The project group is thankful for the comments made. The group and is mindful of the importance of consultation and will be working to develop a consultation strategy once detailed proposals are known. This will include using different methods to ensure community engagement so that smaller communities are not disadvantaged. Our starting point is stakeholder identification and analysis to identify key stakeholders and how we might work with them going forward. This will include identifying engagement leads to align with EIA specific groups. The Board will also engage further with the Equalities Scheme Implementation Group during the course of the project life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of comments were received regarding the need to ensure that consultation is targeted and undertaken on an area by area basis reflecting different approaches for different communities as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profiling</strong></td>
<td>One of the key outcomes of this project is that the service solution for each locality is fit for purpose and relevant to that community. The project group is aware that it cannot achieve this without profiling existing services and localities and has already undertaken an amount of work to address this. See report to Executive 8 Dec <a href="http://apps.n-somerset.gov.uk/cairo/docs/doc27043.htm">http://apps.n-somerset.gov.uk/cairo/docs/doc27043.htm</a> Going forward the intention is to undertake more in-depth diversity and socio-economic profiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of comments were received regarding the need to use data to build up community profiles so that so that the nature of communities is understood by all. Examples of data mentioned include socio-economic data, mapping of existing services to localities and estates, building usage, good practice (e.g. HLC and Campus sites) and public transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td>The project group is mindful of the excellent work undertaken by volunteers, champions and VCSE organisations and would seek to strengthen this relationship going forward. It is our intention to engage further with these key stakeholders as we develop our proposals. The Board acknowledges the need to have a robust volunteer policy and will investigate this further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of comments were made regarding community engagement (as opposed to consultation). These relate to engagement with community champions and village agents, use of and impact on local volunteers and the possible impact on other VCSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organisations as a result of service changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of comments have been made regarding ICT and the use of technology. Examples include support for those who do not have access to online facilities, the quality of on-line forms, security of personal information, navigation of website for protected characteristics and response times to queries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the key outcomes of the CAR project is enhanced digital inclusion and access for residents and staff. The project group is aware of the Digital First transformation programme which represents a key dependency for the Community Access Review. The Board will be working with closely with this project to ensure that the use of technology is maximised in service provision whilst maintaining safeguards for those who do not have access to digital platforms or find them difficult to use. Comments regarding the security of personal information, navigation of the website for protected characteristics and impact of users on response times will be fed into the DF programme and the Councils IT team who have responsibility for IT operations and cyber security. In addition the organisation undertakes measures to ensure its digital products and services are inclusive through the presence of a digital inclusion group whose role is to engage with a range of user groups that have particular access requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As well as the above a number of general comments were received that cannot be easily categorised:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The need for major change at Nailsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incremental changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The need for genuine benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Defining expectations of staff to deal with sensitive issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborative working with partners and support for VCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project group acknowledges the fact that public facing services within Nailsea require reconfiguration. The proposal for change in Nailsea (Scotch Horn) has been in the public domain for some time and will form one project within this programme. The review will have a lifespan of 3 years with projects phased over this period. There is no question of undertaking all change within the first year. The benefits and costs for the programme will be subject to a robust business case and tracked during the course of the project(s) to ensure that the proposals deliver real change. One of the stated ambitions of the project is to work collaboratively with partners through colocation and integration. The project group will be looking closely at how this can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further presentation was made to the Equality Scheme Implementation group on April 2016 to provide an update of progress and to outline the next steps.
The project group has also undertaken a number of preliminary engagement sessions with key locality stakeholders. The purpose of this exercise was to:

- Keep stakeholders informed of progress
- Canvass views and feelings at an early stage on emerging options
- Identify other options
- Inform members of the Executive of initial feedback

Over 140 staff have now been updated through a series of face to face briefings supported with e-updates and information sheets.

What has this told us?
Feedback from the Equality Scheme Implementation Group has told us that project group priorities in terms of equality should focus on 4 key areas:

- Consultation - making sure that both engagement and consultation is targeted to the right community groups and individuals in order to address the protected characteristics
- Community profiling to ensure service solutions are appropriate for the communities they serve – both now and in the future
- Community engagement – identifying and making the most of local knowledge and resources through community champions and VCSE organisations
- ICT – acknowledging that not all service users are able to access services electronically and that support mechanisms need to be in place to ensure these users can still access services. For digital users there needs to be confidence that personal information is safe and that information is current and easy to locate on the website.

Feedback from initial community engagement has been generally positive although it has identified the possible loss of social contact for vulnerable, isolated service users where self-service options might replace staff. The needs of older people using the library service has also been highlighted repeatedly. Service groups are mindful of this and will work to find new ways of working that won’t compromise this social need.
If we have not involved communities and groups that could be affected, what are our plans for the future?

The project team are currently identifying communities and groups that it can engage with going forward to help shape and test any new service delivery models. It has already identified Parent Groups and Partnership Boards that are aligned to our Children’s Centres as key consultees. Further research is currently being undertaken to identify all stakeholders. This information will be used to inform the project going forward and to develop a robust communication, engagement and consultation plan that will see engagement with all relevant groups and communities.

Since this initial statement the project team developed a robust engagement and consultation plan acknowledging the importance of community engagement and consultation as outlined in the feedback above. The plan will be triggered by the agreement of the Executive at its June meeting (subject to the Executive agreeing the report recommendations) and will build on the preliminary engagement already undertaken.

In short, it is envisaged that the engagement process will be in two phases: the first to cover year 2 localities (June to November 2016) with changes implemented by April 2017 and the second for year three localities (commencing April 2017) for implementation April 2018. All engagement and consultation will therefore be completed by November 2017.

The engagement will have the following principles at its core:

- It is meaningful: that all views expressed will be listened to and seriously considered and could result in changes to what is being thought about or proposed. All collated views will be reported to Councillors making any final decisions and the response to the views expressed will be published following the relevant meeting.
- It is open to everyone: While it is recognised that no engagement process can reflect or represent the views of everyone, it is vital that as many people as possible are made aware of the opportunity to have their say through the widest promotion and publicity.
- It is inclusive: every effort will be made to ensure that there are no barriers to anyone who wishes to take part in the engagement. This includes ensuring people receive any information on request in the format and language they prefer and that any meetings are accessible.
## Section 3 – Assessment of Impact

Will the proposed savings included in this assessment have an impact on any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual or potential negative impact</th>
<th>Actual or potential positive impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled People</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from different ethnic groups</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual People</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on low incomes</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in particular age groups</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of particular faith groups</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender People</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave</td>
<td>□ high □ medium □ low □ none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specific impacts, for example carers, parents. Please specify</td>
<td>Potential impact on parents, carers and volunteer groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please describe the impacts listed above:

**Positive/improvements**
- For all groups it is hoped that services will be accessible, of a high quality and fit for current and future purpose. This is not currently the case where some services are delivered from inadequate premises that are in disrepair.

**Negative/potential barriers**
- Specific negative impacts need to be scoped once options are clear and relevant groups consulted.

### Does this proposal have any potential Human Rights implications? If yes, please describe

### Does this proposal have an impact on health inequalities? If yes, please describe

60
| No | Yes potentially for 0-4 yr olds (Children’s Centres services). Child development, access to Health Visitor, anti and post-natal clinics. |

### Section 4: Action

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of this EIA has identified areas that will require more focused consideration in terms of protected characteristics and impact on service users and staff. The project group’s understanding has been helped and informed by the feedback from the Implementation Group. Preliminary engagement has identified the social needs of particularly elderly library users and role that libraries play in providing this. As mentioned Service Leads will be mindful of this in designing service and locality solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project team recognises that the EIA is an on-going process and will be developed as the picture is understood in terms of diversity for service options. As such it will be an important consideration in the development of the project business case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What course of action could we take/have we taken to mitigate the identified impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once the impact on equalities has been fully assessed suitable adjustments will be put in place. Successful adjustments made in the past include the review of community transport (buses, dial-a-ride etc.), improvements to building access and location, provision of a variety of materials, review of opening hours, improved staff training and awareness etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the plans to monitor the actual impact of this budget proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the impact of this budget proposal on equalities will be undertaken through the CAR Project Board which meets monthly. It is proposed to have Equalities as a standing item on the Board agenda so that progress can be tracked, reviewed and suitable adjustments made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>