



Haringey Council

Agenda item:

[No.]

General Purposes Committee

On 10th March 2011

Report Title: Future of the Neighbourhood Management Service

Report of: Niall Bolger, Director of Urban Environment

Signed :

Contact Officer: Jean Croot, Head of Safer Stronger Communities

Email: jean.croot@haringey.gov.uk

Wards(s) affected: All

Report for: [Key/Non Key Decision]

1. Purpose of the Report (That is, the decision required)

- 1.1 On the 25th January 2011, the Cabinet endorsed proposals to dis-establish the Neighbourhood Management Service.
- 1.2 On 15th February 2011, the General Purposes Committee endorsed the proposals – in principal – for the closing down of the Neighbourhood Management Service and achieve the associated financial savings. The Committee agreed that the final decision, following the consultation period and resultant response to staff and unions, be delegated to the Chair of the General Purposes Committee and the Director of Urban Environment.
- 1.3 This report requests the decision be made by General Purposes Committee taking into account the response from the Union and the Equalities Impact Assessment attached to this report.

2. Introduction by Cabinet Member (if necessary)

- 2.1 Not required.

3. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:

3.1 Council Plan Priorities are:

- A Greener Haringey-Becoming one of London's greenest boroughs
- A Better Haringey-cleaner, greener & safer places
- A Thriving Haringey-encouraging lifetime well being at home, work, play and learning
- Driving change, improving quality-customer focussed, cost effective services achieving high levels of satisfaction.

4. Recommendations

4.1 That the decision be given to serve notice on all posts within the Neighbourhood Management Service, except for the community development/project officer posts.

4.2 That a report be prepared to return to General Purposes Committee as soon as a way forward has been identified regarding the community development/project officer posts.

5. Reason for recommendations

5.1 To achieve the reductions in Council funds and resources required in order to set a legal budget in 2011/12, it is no longer viable to maintain the Neighbourhood Management Service, which is neither a statutory nor essential service.

6. Summary

6.1 As stated in the previous report to the General Purposes Committee, it is no longer viable to maintain the Neighbourhood Management Service which is neither a statutory nor an essential service. Hence the previous decision by Cabinet on 25th January 2011 to close the Neighbourhood Management Service, and the 'in principal' decision by General Purposes Committee to delete the Service.

6.2. Of the twenty-eight staff employed in Neighbourhood Management Service, twelve have applied for and been accepted for voluntary redundancy. The posts are described in the chart below, indicating which ones will leave through voluntary redundancy and which ones remain after that process.

Posts	Total number	Leaving through Voluntary redundancy	Number remaining
Strategic Manager	1	1	0
Neighbourhood Managers	7	4	3
Principal Events Manager	1	1	0
Community Development Officer	15	4	11
Finance & Admin Officer	4	0	4
Total	28	10	18

- 6.4 To achieve the savings of £1,400k for 2011/12, the timetable attached at Appendix A has been achieved, except for the last three actions added to enable officers to resolve the impact of new posts to be created within the Single Front Line Service.
- 6.5 Please see Section 11 below regarding consultation carried out with affected staff and their Union representatives.
- 6.6 If the decision is made to accept the recommendations of this report, notice will be given to staff (except for the community development/project officers) by the end of this week. All outstanding work will be completed by the staff before their notice periods expire, with longer term work being appropriately transferred.

7. Chief Financial Officer Comments

- 7.1 The draft budget includes a saving of £1,400,000 for Neighbourhood Management Service disestablishment.
- 7.2 The net current budget for Neighbourhood Management is £2,266,500. Of this £457,100 relates to Corporate recharges and cannot be taken as a saving. It is assumed a further £380,000 will be allocated to other Council departments as detailed in Section 6.3 of this report.
- 7.3 Any remaining budget will contribute to the saving for the establishment of a Single Front Line which has a savings target of £1,750,000 across 2 years in the draft budget, although it should be acknowledged there may still be staff costs in 2011-12 relating to Neighbourhood Management staff whose notice periods have not expired as of 31st March.
- 7.5 It is assumed any redundancy costs will be met centrally.

8. Head of Legal Services' Comments

- 8.1 The Head of Legal Services has been consulted on the contents of this report. Consultation with staff and recognised trade unions is an essential part of the responsibilities of an employer in the course of a business re-organisation. The requirement for consultation with employees and their trade union representatives is recognised within the report and is scheduled for completion in early March 2011.
- 8.2 Due consideration should be given to responses received as a result of the consultation before any final decision is reached concerning the proposals outlined, including any decision to issue notices of dismissal. Further, due consideration must also be given to the authority's public sector equality duties before such a final decision, taking into account the outcome of the completed equality impact assessment.
- 8.3 The process by which the restructuring exercise is to be achieved must comply with the Council's procedures regarding organisational change. Further the position of any members of staff at risk of displacement must be considered under the Council's procedures regarding redundancy and redeployment.

9. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

- 9.1 The Equalities Impact Assessment Statement has been fully completed following the end of the consultation period.
- 9.2 As this Assessment covers the deletion of the Neighbourhood Management Service, and no new structure is being either proposed or set up, parts of this Assessment were not relevant.
- 9.3 The Neighbourhood Management Service is being deleted due to the current need to identify the biggest cuts to Council services ever experienced in local government, making it no longer viable to maintain a service that is neither essential nor statutory.
- 9.4 The staff team affected includes:
- A higher percentage of people from BME communities than in the Council staff profile and the Borough profile
 - A higher percentage of women than in the Borough profile
 - A younger group than in the Council staff profile and the Borough profile

10. Consultation

- 10.1 The staff consultation which ran from 26th January to 27th February involving officers affected and their Union representatives has been completed.
- 10.2 Only one controversial matter arose during this consultation period, which was regarding the new community engagement posts to be developed in the setting up of the new Single Frontline Service (in the Place & Sustainability Directorate).
- 10.3 All other comments received in the consultation period have been addressed or noted as appropriate, in line with the Council's policy and procedure.
- 10.4 These issues raised in the consultation are included and responded to in the Equalities Impact Assessment attached.

Appendix A
Neighbourhood Management Services:
Consultation Process & Timetable

Action	Date	Leads
Report to CAB	23/12/10	Director/Cabinet Member
Report to Leader's Conference	4/1/11	Director/Cabinet Member
Informal discussion with NMS staff re proposals	10/1/11	Director/ Head of Service
Cabinet	25/1/11	Cllr Canver/Head of Service
General Purposes Sub-Committee	15/2/11	Head of Service
Issue formal consultation packs [including EqIA]	By 26/1/11	Head of Service; HR Advisor
Consultation period	26/1/11 to 27/2/11	Staff/Unions
Deadline for receipt of staff/TU comments on consultation	27/2/11	NMS staff/Unions
Management response to consultation	By 2/3/11	
Report to General Purposes Committee	10/3/11	G&P Committee: Head of Service; HR Advisor
Outcome of process including issuing of letters to staff (except for community development/project officers) confirming notice/redeployment	11/3/11	HR Advisor
Resolution sought regarding community development/project officer posts and new community engagement posts.	TBC	Head of Service; HR Advisor
Consideration by General Purposes Committee regarding remaining NMS posts	TBC	G&P Committee: Head of Service; HR Advisor
Outcome of process including issuing of letters to community development/project officers confirming notice/redeployment	TBC	HR Advisor

Appendix A



Haringey Council

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures

Date: 4th February 2011 (started) 28th February 2011 (completed)
Department and service under review:
Neighbourhood Management Service
Urban Environment Department
Lead Officer/s and contact details:
Niall Bolger, Director, Urban Environment
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions):
Jean Croot, Corporate Head of Safer Stronger Communities

Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports)

The Equalities Impact Assessment Statement has been fully completed following the end of the consultation period.

As this Assessment covers the deletion of the Neighbourhood Management Service, and no new structure is being either proposed or set up, parts of this Assessment were not relevant.

The Neighbourhood Management Service is being deleted due to the current need to identify the biggest cuts to Council services ever experienced in local government, making it no longer viable to maintain a service that is neither essential nor statutory.

The staff team affected includes:

- A higher percentage of people from BME communities than in the Council staff profile and the Borough profile
- A higher percentage of women than in the Borough profile
- A younger group than in the Council staff profile and the Borough profile

The Equalities Impact Assessment for service restructures should assess the likely impact of restructuring on protected equalities groups of employees by: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (gender), sexual orientation.

The assessment is to be completed by the business unit manager with advice from HR. It is to be undertaken by an assessment of the basic employment profile data and then answering a number of questions outlined below.

PART 1
TO BE COMPLETED DURING THE EARLY STAGES OF CONSULTATION WITH
STAFF/ UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE

Step 1 – Aims and Objectives

1. Purpose – What is the main aim of the proposed/new or change to the existing service?

Given the current need to identify the biggest cuts to Council services experienced in local government, it is no longer viable to maintain the Neighbourhood Management Service which is neither a statutory nor an essential service. This recommendation is offered due to recognition of other Council services importance to ensuring the Council can both support its most vulnerable residents and deliver on the Administration's manifesto pledges, and due to both the size and speed of the reductions to funding required following the reductions in local authority funding introduced by the Coalition Government.

A review of the Neighbourhood Management Service (NMS) has been undertaken to consider the work of the current NMS, what key functions of the service would need to be repositioned to ensure these would be appropriately delivered, and what functions are no longer viable given the significant cost reductions required of non-statutory services.

2. What are the main benefits and outcomes you hope to achieve?
Cost savings and realignment of key functions as detailed above.
3. How will you ensure that the benefits/ outcomes are achieved?
Plans are being developed to facilitate the transfer of key functions

Step 2 – Current Workforce Information & Likely Impact of your proposals

1. Are you closing a unit? Yes.

- If No, go to question 3.
- If Yes, please outline how many staff will be affected broken down by race, sex (gender), age and disability. 28 FTEs

Strand	Council staff profile %	Borough profile %	Staff affected profile %
Age			
16 -24	3.8	13.9	0
25-34	20.3	26.6	14
35-44	26.8	22.8	18
45-54	32.4	15.5	43
55-64	15.5	9.5	25
65+	1.2	11.7	0
Disability	5.5	7.6	18
		(NOMIS Feb 2010 Percentage of working age population claiming ESA or incapacity benefits)	
Race			
BME	44.3 (inc Schools)	34.2	61
White	55.7	65.8	31
Sex			
Male	25.6	50.6	39
Female	74.4	49.4	61

- In addition if you have information on the breakdown of your staff by the following characteristics: gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation; you must consider the impact on these groups.

There is one member

of staff currently on maternity leave. She has received a home visit to provide a personal and tailored consultation session; been given access to Haringey's staff web site at home in order to be able to gain information about staff support and redundancy matters; her questions have been promptly responded to; and she will be assisted according to the HR policies for women on maternity leave being made redundant and their redeployment period.

There is no information available regarding breakdown of the affected staff by: gender reassignment, pregnancy, religion or belief, sexual orientation;

2. Can any staff be accommodated elsewhere within the service, business unit or directorate?
Standard re-deployment arrangements will apply. Service and Business Unit to be disestablished

- If Yes, identify how many by race, sex, age and disability. And where possible identify the number by gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, and sexual orientation.

3. Provide a breakdown of the current service by Grade Group and Racial Group following the format below.

Racial Group Analysis

Grade Group	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other		BME sub total		White		White Other		Not declared		TOTAL STAFF
	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
Sc1-5									0								0
Sc6-SO2		0%	2	67%		0%	1	33%	3	100%		0%		0%		0%	3
PO1-3		0%	10	59%		0%	2	12%	12	71%	5	29%		0%		0%	17
PO4-7		0%	2	29%		0%		0%	2	29%	5	71%		0%		0%	7
PO8+		0%		0%		0%		0%	0	0%	1	100%		0%		0%	1
TOTAL	0	0%	14	50%	0	0%	3	11%	17	61%	11	39%		0%	0	0%	28

4. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared with the council profile and where relevant the borough profile.

The staff involved includes a considerably higher percentage of people from BME communities than in the Council staff profile and the Borough profile.

4. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one ethnic minority group (white, white other, Asian, black, mixed race) or Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) staff only? N/A

5.

- If No, go to question 8.
- If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?

6. By how much does these staff change the % (percentage) of BME staff in the structure? Show start and end %.
Service to be disestablished

7. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.? **N/A**

- If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on the BME %? Show start and end %.

8. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Gender breakdown following the format below

Grade Group	Female		Male		TOTAL
	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
Sc1-5					0
Sc6-SO2	3	100%		0%	3
PO1-3	10	59%	7	41%	17
PO4-7	4	57%	3	43%	7
PO8+		0%	1	100%	1
TOTAL	17	61%	11	39%	28

9. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared to the % of females/males in the council.

There is no significant difference with the Council staff profile but considerably more women employees than involved than in the borough profile.

10. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on impact on female or male staff? **N/A**

- If No, go to question 13.
- If Yes, how many female / male staff might be displaced?

11. By how much do these staff change the % (percentage) of female/male staff in the whole structure? Show start and end %.
N/A

12. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.? **N/A**

- If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on the female/male%? Show start and end %.

13. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Age breakdown following the format below

Age Analysis

Grade Group	16-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+		TOTAL
	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
Sc1-5													0
Sc6-SO2		0%	1	33%		0%	1	33%	1	33%		0%	3
PO1-3		0%	3	18%	4	24%	6	35%	4	24%		0%	17
PO4-7		0%		0%	1	14%	4	57%	2	29%		0%	7
PO8+		0%		0%		0%	1	100%		0%		0%	1
TOTAL	0	0%	4	14%	5	18%	12	43%	7	25%	0	0%	28

14. Highlight any grade groups with a high level of staff from a particular age group compared to the compared to the council profile.

The staff involved are generally younger than the Council staff profile and the Borough profile. There are no staff involved under the age of 25, or over 65 years of age.

15. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one age group only? **N/A**

- If No, go to question 18.
- If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?

16. Does the displacement of these staff result in no representation of staff from a particular age group within the structure as a whole? N/A

17. If Yes, can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

- If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on a particular age group? Show start and end %.

18. Identify the total number of disabled staff in the service following the format below:

Disabled %	No. Disabled Staff	% of Grade Group
		0%
	4	24%
	1	14%
		0%
	5	18%

19. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on disabled staff?

- If No, go to question 21 N/A
- If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced? Show start and end numbers and %.

20. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.? N/A

- If Yes, what effect will this have on the number of disabled staff? Show start and end numbers and %.

21. In addition to the above analysis of race, sex, age and disability you will need to consider the impact on groups with the following characteristics: gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation. There is one member of staff currently on maternity leave. She has received a home visit to provide a personal and tailored consultation session; been given access to Haringey's staff web site at home in order to be able to gain information about staff support and redundancy matters; her questions have been promptly responded to; and she will be assisted according to the HR policies for women on maternity leave during the redeployment period.

Data not available on:

- Gender Reassignment
- Religion/ Belief
- Sexual Orientation
- Pregnancy

22. If you provide services to residents please also identify the potential impact/ issues relating to the change in service delivery as a result of your proposals.

Under these proposals the key deliverables owned previously by the Neighbourhood Management Service (NMS) will be shared among partners and other council departments in order to minimise negative impact on residents. This is because the current service is subject to a complete unit closure.

Although attempts have been made, very little clear equalities data has been gained regarding Area Assembly attendance or on the impact of other activities currently under the responsibility of the Neighbourhood Management Service. Specific work with minority communities under the Access to Services scheme ceased in early 2010 due to reductions in the Area Based Grant funding stream.

Funding for 'Making the Difference' (MTD) is likely to be reduced under new arrangements due to the significant budget reductions of the council. This scheme previously covered some activities such as day trips for elderly residents and benefited various diverse community groups. Discussions have started regarding a smaller 'Community Chest' style scheme but these discussions are in early stages.

Any future MTD or other funding stream will retain the links and community networks established by the NMS. Work will continue to ensure that the impact of changes on minority groups and communities is kept to a minimum and

as much as possible the council will make efforts to maintain at least a basic standard of service to communities who previously benefited from the activities of the NMS.
 New Directorates, Units and Departments undertaking key elements if this work in the future will need liaise with residents and community groups to understand their needs and aspirations.

Date Part 1 completed - 26 Jan 2011

PART 2
TO BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/ UNIONS
ON THE STRUCTURE

Step 3 – Consultation

Outline below the consultation process you undertook, what issues were raised (especially any relating to the eight equalities characteristics).

Date	Event	Present
10/1/11	Briefing on Proposals in Cabinet report	All NMS staff invited: 16 staff attended plus Director, Head of Service, Union and HR representatives
26/1/11	Consultation process started: meeting; all NMS staff invited; packs given out	All NMS staff invited: 16 NMS staff attended plus Head of Service and HR Business Partner
27/1/11	Consultation packs sent to all staff affected.	All NMS staff affected (28)
31/1/11	Home visit to member of staff on maternity leave to take consultation pack and go through with her, plus	By Head of Service, cc to Union and HR representatives Head of Service, NMS Manager, member of staff and her husband.

	info re maternity leave	
2/2/11	General Consultation session held at NRC Tottenham	All NMS staff invited: 3 NMS staff affected attended plus Head of Service and HR Business Partner
10/2/11	General Consultation session held on 9 th floor, Alexandra House	All NMS staff invited: 9 NMS staff attended plus Head of Service and HR Business Partner
23/2/11	Meeting held led by Union representatives for staff who are Union members.	Not known who attended; management agreed time off for meeting.

The employee side response to the consultation was received from UNISON on 25 March 2011. This is attached in full at Appendix B.

The management response to the issues raised is as follows:

Community Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) – Management have noted comments about the need for a community impact assessment. The current EIA includes a section on the impact to the community of these changes. Management has added to this section to reflect the wish to minimise the impact of these changes on the community.

The need for a communications strategy to publicise changes – Management has written to all residents and community groups on the Area Assembly databases and has updated the Council website to explain about the changes ahead for neighbourhoods and what will happen in the future. Management will also write to residents on our databases once a final decision has been made.

Staff time off work for interviews etc – All reasonable requests for time off from work to attend interviews etc will be treated sympathetically.

Finance/admin staff to be included the Support Function Review - A meeting to discuss the scope of the Finance Management SFR took place with the trade unions and a senior finance manager at the end of January 2011. Following this meeting an email was sent to all finance staff within Neighbourhood Management services outlining the scope of the FM SFR that had been agreed by CEEM. The employees affected were asked to provide evidence to demonstrate how they felt their roles

met the criteria outlined and, thereby, to support their inclusion in the SFR. We understand that no such case has been provided by the staff concerned and they remain out of scope of the Finance Management review.

A request for consideration of 'bumping' : The Trades Unions re-stated their opposition to compulsory redundancies, and their concern that they "seek consideration for an element of bumping elsewhere in the Council in order to free up potential opportunities. They have state that "such bumping is lawful so long as it is with consent rather than imposed". Management's response is that:

- In order to mitigate the impact of compulsory redundancies from the service, we have already considered and approved a number of voluntary redundancy applications
- There is currently no agreed process for 'bumping' except within the context of service reviews and Support Function Reviews
- We would find it difficult to envisage how such a scheme would work.

Delay notices to Neighbourhood Development/Project Officers on grades PO1/2/3 until such time as the establishment of the new Community Enablement Service has taken place - Management are seeking advice from Senior Management in the Urban Environment Directorate and Legal Service about this issue.

Delay notices to staff until after the initial referral and assessment by the deployment team - The process will be as follows: on 11th March letters will be sent to the staff affected to confirm that they have been referred to the redeployment pool and asking them to complete a skills assessment form. On the 18th March they will be sent a letter confirming their notice of redundancy which, running concurrently with their redeployment period, commences from this date.

Employee side's comments to be appended in full to the GP report – Comments are included at appendix B as requested.

Step 4 – Address the Impact

1. Are you in a position to make changes to the proposals to reduce the impact on the protected groups e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc. - please specify?
No, because the issues raised were not significant and the need to make the savings of £1.4m is critical to the Borough being able to set a legal budget for 2011/12.
2. What changes or benefits for staff have been proposed as a result of your consultation?
All staff posts will still be deleted, but the deletion of the community development/project officer posts will be delayed until the matter regarding the new posts in the new Single Front Line Service have been resolved.
3. If you are not able to make changes – why not and what actions can you take? **N/A**
4. Do the ringfence and selection methods you have chosen to implement your restructure follow council policy and guidance? **This is not a restructure of a service.**
5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how?
No – critical functions will transfer to other Council departments.
6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users?
No – critical functions will transfer to other Council departments.

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed – 28th February 2011

Step 5 – Implementation and Review

1. Following the selection processes and appointment to your new structure are there any adverse impacts on any of the protected groups (the eight equalities characteristics). Please identify these.
No new structure being set up; this is the deletion of a Service.
2. If there are adverse impacts how will you aim to address these in the future? **N/A**
3. Identify actions and timescales for implementation and go live of your new service offer. **N/A**
4. If you are not in a position to go ahead on elements of your action plan – why not and what actions are you going to take?
N/A
5. Identify the timescale and actions for review of the restructure to ensure it achieved the expected benefits/ outcomes.
No new structure being set up; this is the deletion of a Service.

Step 6 – Sign off and publication

There is a legal duty to publish the results of impact assessments. The reason is not simply to comply with the law but to make the whole process and its outcome transparent and have a wider community ownership. You should summarise the results of the assessment and intended actions and publish them.

COMPLETED BY (Contact Officer Responsible for undertaking this EqIA)

NAME: Jean Croot
SIGNATURE:

DESIGNATION: Head of Safer Stronger Communities
DATE: 4th March 2011

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Equalities.)

NAME: Eve Featherstone
SIGNATURE:

DESIGNATION: Head of Equalities
DATE: 4th March 2011

SIGNED OFF BY Director

NAME: Niall Bolger
SIGNATURE:

DESIGNATION: Director of Urban Environment
DATE: 4th March 2011

SIGNED OFF BY Chair Directorate Equalities Forum

NAME: Marc Dorfman
SIGNATURE:

DESIGNATION: Assistant Director, Planning & Regeneration
DATE: 4th March 2011

Note - Send an electronic copy of the EqIA to equalities@haringey.gov.uk; it will then be published on the council website