

NOTICE OF POLICY DECISIONS

The Policy and Finance Committee made the following decisions at its meeting on 10 June 2003:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Charging for Discretionary Services (Minute 259/03)	That the Officer comments in the report of the Corporate Director (Finance & External Services) be this Council's response to the consultation paper. CD(F&ES)
Proposals for Parliamentary Constituencies in Essex, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock and the implications for Rochford District Council's area (Minute 260/03)	That representations be made to the Boundary Commission for England on the basis set out at Appendix 1 of this notice. (HAMS)
Local Government Act 1999: Part 1 – Best Value and Performance Improvement (Minute 261/03)	That the guidance now issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and its implications for the Council's Corporate Plan/Best Value Performance Plan be noted. (CE)
Thames Gateway – South Essex Partnership – Progress (Minute 262/03)	(1) That the progress being made in terms of developing a mechanism through which Castle Point and Rochford projects can be advanced be noted. (2) That the range of bids to be submitted to the Partnership Office, which reflect priorities within the Corporate Plan/Best Value Performance Plan and the emerging Local Plan, be endorsed. (CE)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Staff Reward Scheme (Minute 263/03)	That the Council Staff Reward Scheme be confirmed, subject to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the addition that any employee leaving the Authority having completed ten years or more service without the benefit of a long service award should receive a gift to a value equivalent to that of their last landmark anniversary. The inclusion of the names of staff who have achieved long service in the Members' Bulletin. (CD(LP& A))
Chief Executives Appraisal (Minute 264/03)	That the exempt note of the Chief Executive's appraisal held on 9 April 2003 be received. (CE)
IT Contractor (Minute 265/03)	That the negotiations with SIS/Vivista, as outlined in the exempt report, be endorsed. (HAMS)

The above decisions will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of five working days after the publication of this Notice, unless referred to Full Council by a minimum of 3 Members or called in by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Signed
Head of Administrative and Member Services

Dated.....

Appendix 1

“Rochford District Council supports the proposal made by the Boundary Commission for England to bring those electors in Hawkwell South ward who are presently in Rochford & Southend East constituency, numbering approximately 600, into Rayleigh constituency.

The Council objects to the proposal made by the Commission to move Ashingdon & Canewdon ward from Rayleigh constituency to the re-named Southend East constituency with Rochford ward being transferred from Rochford & Southend East constituency to Rayleigh constituency. Our objections are for the following reasons:

- The swapping of wards would mean that 8,472 electors would be moved from one constituency to another for no obvious benefit.
- The ward of Ashingdon & Canewdon is physically separated from Southend by the town of Rochford and, if the proposals of the Commission are accepted, it would not be possible to travel by road from Southend to Ashingdon & Canewdon ward without going through the constituency of Rayleigh.
- We do not believe that the electors in Ashingdon & Canewdon ward, being a largely rural area, see themselves as being part of the hinterland of Southend.
- Under the Commission’s proposals, the new Rayleigh & Wickford constituency with 73,815 electors would be the largest one in Essex whereas Southend East having 68,064 electors would be the twelfth largest. The retention of the two wards mentioned in their existing constituencies would give Rayleigh & Wickford 71,975 electors, which would still make it the largest one in the county. The additional electors would give Southend East 69,904 electors and make it the seventh largest Essex constituency. This change from the Commission’s proposals would, therefore, reduce the disparity in numbers of electors between constituencies.

The numbers of electors quoted above are taken from the 2000 figures, which are being used by the Commission as “building blocks” for this exercise”