

---

**TITLE: SINGLE MEMBER VOTE AT ANGLIA REVENUES PARTNERSHIP (ARP) JOINT COMMITTEE**

Committee: Regulatory & Support Services Committee

Date: 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015

Author: Richard Quayle, Director (Support Services)

[Q89]

---

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To reduce the number of voting Members representing each Council on the ARP Joint Committee from two Members to one.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 To recommend to Council that

- (i) the Council, along with the other partners on the Joint Committee of the ARP, reduce the number of Members able to vote at Joint Committee to one Member per Council;
- (ii) the Council has two Member substitutes for the Joint Committee, with the option for one of the substitutes to attend and take part in debate (but not vote);
- (iii) the ARP Joint Committee constitution in the Council's constitution is revised to reflect (i) and (ii) above;
- (iv) the Council appoints one Member on to the ARP Joint Committee and two substitutes.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 In 2003, ARP started its operation as a Joint Committee of two authorities, Breckland and Forest Heath district councils. The Joint Committee was established with two Members from each council, making a total committee of four. Each council had two substitutes.

3.2 In 2007 East Cambridgeshire District Council joined ARP, initially through a contracting arrangement, but subsequently as full members of the Joint Committee. This took the committee to three authorities with six Members.

3.3 In 2011 St Edmundsbury Borough Council joined ARP as a full member, followed by Fenland, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney district councils in 2014. This took the total membership to seven authorities, represented by 14 Members.

3.4 The Joint Committee has worked very effectively since the inception of ARP. However, as the partnership has expanded, both in terms of membership and activities, and in light of the potentially significant changes relating to the implementation of Universal Credit, it is likely that the committee will need to become more nimble, be able to meet at shorter notice, and be able to respond

more quickly to events. Latterly if a Joint Committee meeting has had to be rearranged it has proved extremely difficult to get a date which is suitable for everyone.

3.5 There is significant evidence that a board of ten or more creates coordination and communication issues which have a negative effect on performance <sup>1</sup>. The Joint Committee itself has realised that we may have past the optimum number of members, by virtue of having asked officers to look at moving to one member vote per Council.

3.6 At its meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015, the ARP Joint Committee partners agreed to seek agreement from their council to “move to a single member and two substitutes per authority, with the option for one of the substitutes to attend and take part in debate (but not vote) and for paired councils to choose to send only one member who can cast a vote for each council. In effect the solution would create ‘one council one vote’ but retain some flexibility around attendance at Joint Committee meetings”.

#### 4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 None.

#### 5.0 APPENDICES

None.

---

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer</u>
None	Room 105, The Grange, Ely	Richard Quayle Director (Support Services) (01353) 616218 E-mail: Richard.quayle@eastcambs.gov.uk

---

<sup>1</sup> The European Journal of Finance, Volume 15, Issue 4, June 2009, Pages 385-404; The Impact of Board Size on Firm Performance: Evidence from the UK