

Public Document Pack



Resources Directorate

David Wilcock

Assistant Director (Legal, Governance & Workforce)

Governance & Committee Services

Floor 2, Number One Riverside, Smith Street,
Rochdale, OL16 1XU

Phone: 01706 647474

Website: www.rochdale.gov.uk

Enquiries to: Alison James

Telephone: 01706 924711

Date: 13th January 2017

To: All Members of the Cabinet

Dear Councillor

Cabinet

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Cabinet to be held in Training and Conference Suite, First Floor, Number One Riverside, Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU on **Monday, 23rd January 2017** commencing at 6.15 pm.

The agenda and supporting papers are attached.

If you require advice on any agenda item involving a possible Declaration of Interest which could affect your right to speak and/or vote, please refer to the Code of Conduct or contact the Monitoring Officer or staff in the Governance and Committee Services Team at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

Yours Faithfully

David Wilcock

Assistant Director (Legal, Governance & Workforce)

Cabinet Membership 2016/17

Councillor Iftikhar Ahmed

Councillor Daalat Ali

Councillor Jacqueline Beswick

Councillor Allen Brett

Councillor Neil Emmott

Councillor Janet Emsley

Councillor Richard Farnell

Councillor Donna Martin E

Councillor Peter Williams

Rochdale Borough Council

CABINET

Monday, 23rd January 2017 at 6.15 pm

**Hollingworth C, Training and Conference Suite, First Floor, Number One
Riverside, Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU**

A G E N D A

Apologies for Absence

1. Declarations of Interest

Members must indicate at this stage any items on the agenda in which they must declare an interest. Members must verbally give notice of their interest at the meeting and complete the form attached with this agenda.

Members are also advised to take advice with regard to any matter where there is potential bias or predetermination in any business to be considered at the meeting and whether they should take part in decision making at the meeting.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and the Council's adopted Code of Conduct, they must declare the nature of any discloseable pecuniary interest; personal interest and/or prejudicial interest required of them and, in the case of any discloseable pecuniary interest or prejudicial interest, withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the item, unless permitted otherwise within the Code of Conduct.

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| 2. | Minutes | 3 - 8 |
| | To consider the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 19 th December 2016. | |
| 3. | Review of Community Centre Grant funding | 9 - 19 |
| 4. | Remodelling of the Supported Living Offer for people with Learning Disabilities | To Follow |

Director of Adult Care to report.

Agenda Item 2

CABINET

Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 19th December 2016

PRESENT: Councillor Farnell (in the Chair); Councillors Iftikhar Ahmed, Daalat Ali, Beswick, Brett, Neil Emmott, Emsley and Martin

OFFICERS:	Steve Rumbelow	Chief Executive
	Pauline Kane	Director of Resources
	Gail Hopper	Director of Children's Services
	Sheila Downey	Director of Adult Care Services
	John Searle	Director of Economy
	Mark Widdup	Director of Neighbourhoods
	Andrea Fallon	Director of Public Health and Wellbeing
	David Wilcock	Assistant Director (Legal Governance and Workforce)
	Mark Robinson	Assistant Director (Planning and Development)
	Mark Dalzell	Assistant Director (Information, Customers and Communities)
	Peter Gregory	Senior Property Manager
	Janet Butterworth	Property Client & Strategy Officer
	Alison James	Governance and Committee Services

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Cecile Biant, Surinder Biant and Cocks

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Williams

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

95 Councillor Farnell declared a personal interest in respect of Minute No. 104 - Transfer of Land to Kingsway Park High School.

PRESENTATION - GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE

96 Cabinet received a presentation from Superintendent Alastair Mallen detailing achievements and challenges for Greater Manchester Police (GMP) including the strategic and operational direction for GMP within the Borough.

MINUTES

97 Decision:

That the Minutes of the meetings of Cabinet held on 31st October 2016 and 21st November 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ROCHDALE BOROUGH SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

98 Cabinet considered the report of the Independent Chair of the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Adult Board that provided an update on the work of the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Adult Board (RBSAB), national policy direction and safeguarding trends and activity for 2015/16 and which outlined key issues in relation to Adult Safeguarding.

Decision:

That the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Adult Board Annual Report 2015/16 be noted.

Eligible for call in – no, the report was presented for information only.

ROCHDALE BOROUGH SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

99 Cabinet considered the report of the Independent Chair of the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board that provided an update on the work of the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board (RBSCB), national policy direction and safeguarding trends and activity for 2015/16 and which outlined key issues in relation to Children's Safeguarding.

Decision:

That the Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2015/16 be noted.

Eligible for call in – no, the report was presented for information only.

REVIEW OF SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPDS)

100 Cabinet considered the report of the Director of Economy which sought approval of proposed changes to the Council's portfolio of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), which have been reviewed in the light of the adoption of the Core Strategy to ensure that the SPDs meet the requirement to reflect and relate to policies contained within the Core Strategy.

Alternatives Considered:

The alternative would be to not undertake the proposed changes to the portfolio of SPDs, with the result that the Council would have adopted planning documents which do not relate well to local planning policies and do not reflect up to date national legislation, which could not be used to assist in planning decisions and in providing useful guidance for developers and householders.

Decision:

That the recommended changes to the Council's portfolio of SPDs be approved so that they can be taken forward to be used in conjunction with the Core Strategy for the purposes of sound and effective planning decisions and to provide accurate guidance for developers and the general public.

Reasons for Decision:

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are local development documents which provide technical detail to expand upon planning policies set out in the main local planning policy documents, i.e. Unitary Development Plans (UDPs) or Core Strategies; SPDs cannot make policy in themselves. SPDs can be thematic or area specific, provide guidance and / or set out requirements, and are material considerations which can be taken into account when making planning decisions.

Eligible for call in – yes

SCHOOLS ACADEMY CONVERSION CHARGES AND COUNCIL COST RECOVERY

101 Cabinet considered the report of the Director of Economy which sought authorisation for a process to ensure the recovery of costs incurred by the Council in the undertaking of Schools Academy Conversions and to provide existing maintained schools with clarity on and an estimate of costs relating to the conversion process, based on school status.

Alternatives Considered:

To not charge schools for the costs of conversion was not considered viable given the potential number of conversions

To charge a standard rate per school regardless of the actual work undertaken was not considered equitable given the different levels of input that are required and individual school circumstances.

Decision:

That the proposal for a full cost recovery for Council resources used in the Schools Academy Conversion process as detailed within the submitted report be approved.

Reason for Decision:

The actions to undertake a schools academy conversion is a critical process and needs to be resourced appropriately, utilising expertise including that which lies with the Council. However, this cost varies case by case depending upon the level of complexity involved in each individual academy conversion, particularly in regard to TUPE, land and property legal issues associated with that site and whether the conversion forms part of a multi-academy trust or is a PFI.

The council receives no additional income or grant targeted to meet the costs of conversion. This means that all of the associated costs are currently being met by the Council from revenue. In contrast, prospective academies receive a grant of £25,000 from The Department for Education which is intended to meet their costs of conversion.

In a climate of increasing volume of academy conversions combined with reducing income to the council revenue, the implementation of a financial contribution from the schools undertaking conversion is now required in order to secure both the capacity for an efficient conversion process and the management of cost-pressures to the Council.

Eligible for call in - yes

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

102 Decision:

That the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business, in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

Reason for Decision:

Should the press and public remain during debate on these items there may

be a disclosure of information that is deemed to be exempt under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

MANAGEMENT OF THE DR CHADWICK TRUST - IMPLICATIONS FOR ROCHDALE COUNCIL

103 Cabinet considered the report of the Director of Economy which advised of recent work undertaken by the Trustees of the Dr Chadwick's Trust in respect of assets held by the Trust, to present the implications to the Council and to seek approval and funding for a number of courses of action.

Alternatives considered:

The alternative courses of action in respect of each asset was detailed within the submitted report.

Decision:

1. That the actions of the Trustees in respect of the assets detailed at paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 of the submitted report be noted;
2. That the recommendations as detailed in paragraphs 2.3 – 2.8 of the submitted report relating to plots C, D, E and F as detailed in the plans accompanying the report be approved;
3. That following receipt of any instructions, the Assistant Director, Legal, Governance & Workforce be authorised to advise appropriate Council Services, to prepare the appropriate legal documents and execute such documents on behalf of the Council that may be required in connection with the transactions detailed in the submitted report.

Eligible for call in - yes

Reason for Decision:

The property assets of the Dr Chadwick Trust, located in Newhey, are formally owned by the Council, but held and administered by the Council through the Charitable Trustee Committee (CTC). The aims of the Trust are to invest its funds into sports provision within the boundaries of the former Milnrow Urban District Council.

The CTC began to consider the future of the assets due to a) local concerns about their condition and b) a desire to consider how full value might be realised from the assets. This work has resulted in the identification of a number of opportunities, which the Trustees have presented to Pennines Township for consideration. However, several anomalies have also come to light in the Council's management of the Trustees' assets, which have implications for Cabinet to consider.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO KINGSWAY PARK HIGH SCHOOL

104 Cabinet considered the report of the Director of Economy which recommended the transfer of a parcel of land to Kingsway Park High School so that it has sufficient land to meet its requirements as a 1200 place school.

Alternatives considered:

Alternative options of different parcels of land that could be transferred to Kingsway Park High School were outlined within the submitted report.

Decision:

1. That the transfer of land at Lower Place Playing Fields to Kingsway Park High School be approved as detailed within the submitted report.
2. That the Assistant Director (Legal, Governance and Workforce) be authorised to advise appropriate Council Services and to prepare the appropriate legal documents and execute such documents on behalf of the Council.

Reason for Decision:

Cabinet has previously considered a report on these issues and requested further information before making a decision. The issues that Cabinet requested be investigated had been looked into and the findings were outlined within the submitted report.

It was proposed that an area of land at Lower Place Playing Fields should transfer to Kingsway Park High School. The area of land concerned was shown on Plan 1 on the submitted report along with the proposed route from the school to the site.

LEGAL SERVICES COLLABORATION/SHARED SERVICES PROJECT

105 Cabinet considered the report of the Director of Resources which provided an update on progress towards achievement of the £150,000 savings identified as part of savings proposal CC104 approved by Cabinet on 10 February 2016. It detailed the work towards the identification of a collaboration/shared service partner for the Children's & Adults legal team and sought approval to proceed with the implementation of the shared service with Manchester City Council subject to final costings and the outcome of formal consultation with staff affected.

Alternatives considered:

Alternative options were outlined within the submitted report.

Decision:

1. That subject to the outcome of formal consultation with staff affected and to the financial viability of the proposal, approval be given to Rochdale entering into a shared service with Manchester City Council in relation to its children's and adult services legal team;
2. That the commencement of formal consultation with staff in scope be approved;
3. That the final decision relating to the financial viability be delegated to the Director of Resources in consultation with Cabinet Member for Corporate and Regulation;
4. That the final decision relating to the outcome of staff consultation be delegated to the Director of Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate and Regulation and the Chair of the Employment and Equalities Committee;

5. That the Assistant Director (Legal Governance & Workforce) be authorised to settle the terms of the legal agreements with Manchester City Council and complete all necessary legal agreements to give effect to this approval.

Reason for Decision:

A key element of savings proposal CC104 was a review of the children and adult legal services staffing structure, which included the deletion of certain posts and proposed the entering into of a shared service for this part of the legal service only, with one or more authorities across Greater Manchester.

Eligible for call in - yes

Agenda Item 3



Subject: Review of Community Centre Grant Funding

Status: For publication

Report to: Cabinet

Date: 23rd January 2017

Cabinet Member: Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community

Report of: Director of Neighbourhoods

Author: Mark Dalzell

Author Email: mark.dalzell@rochdale.gov.uk

Tel: Tel: 01706 924328

Comments from Statutory Officers:

Monitoring Officer: Yes
Section 151 Officer: Yes

1 Recommendations

- 1.1 Members note the outcome of the consultation undertaken during Phase 1 of the savings proposals which discussed the proposed impact assessment criteria to be applied to each Community Centre.
- 1.2 Members note the criteria, which was previously approved at Cabinet on 21 November 2016 which are detailed in Paragraphs 2.6 to 2.7 of this report.
- 1.3 As a consequence of the approval of the above mentioned criteria, Members are asked to approve the specific grant reductions as detailed in the table in Paragraph 2.11 of this report, following the application of the criteria, as a basis for consultation.
- 1.4 Members note the proposal will mean the removal of all Council funding from two centres that have the least impact based on the criteria – Wardleworth Community Centre and Castlemere Community Centre. These centres delivered least value for money for the Council.

Reason for recommendation

- 1.5 In order to contribute to the Council's savings requirement it has been necessary to examine all areas of non-statutory service provision.
- 1.6 Phase 1 savings proposal (report reference - NH-2017-311) has reported following consultation, a proposed criteria for an impact assessment of each of the grant-funded community centres. The proposed criteria was the subject of formal consultation during Phase 1 of the savings proposals and approved by Cabinet on 21 November 2016.

2 Background

- 1.1 There is no statutory duty to fund Community Centres. However, Community Centres provide a valuable service to the communities they serve. They

should meet the needs of their individual communities and have a significant impact upon the health and wellbeing of individuals and the quality of life of people in the community.

- 1.2 Currently 16 Community Centres have received annual grants from the Council to enable them to deliver community activity.
- 1.3 The review conducted as part of Phase 1 savings proposal (Report reference - NH-2017-311) examined the level of activity and the positive impact that each Centre has on the local community.
- 1.4 The level of saving attached to this proposal was initially £75,000. However, it was stated that the level of saving may increase/reduce depending on the outcome of the review.
- 1.5 During the Phase 1 consultation exercise a proposed criteria was discussed with stakeholders.
- 1.6 The application of the impact assessment criteria shows the impact each community centre has on the community it serves. Contributory factors included in the criteria are;
 - Usage of centre (visitor count (excluding nurseries, private functions and elections) and weekly sessions);
 - Number of people living nearby;
 - Proximity to other Centres
- 2.7 Each element was weighted in importance as follows;
 - Usage (80%) – Usage consists of footfall (excluding nurseries and private functions) and numbers of high impacts on the community (IT Training, jobs, advice, language and health/wellbeing.
 - Location (20%) – Location consists of number of other community centres nearby and number of people living near the Centre.
- 2.8 The application of the impact assessment criteria concluded that the two centres with least impact upon the community are Wardleworth Community Centre and Castlemere Community Centre. It is proposed that the Council grant is removed from each of these two centres. This amounts to a £59,800 saving to the Council.
- 2.9 In summary, Wardleworth Community Centre is rated as the least effective centre as it has comparatively low usage and is located near three other grant funded community centres which could be used by current Wardleworth Community Centres users if delivery models were altered. The centre is also nearby other community venues with high quality provision, including Rochdale Central Library – although this was not part of the assessment criteria.
- 2.10 In summary, Castlemere Community Centre is rated as next least effective as it has lowest number of visits (excluding nurseries, elections and private functions), and it is located near another grant-funded community centre. It is also located near other community venues such as the Freehold Community Project and Rochdale Central Library, although these were not part of the assessment criteria.

2.11 Table 1 - financial impact on the Grant-funded Centres following the application of the criteria;

Community Centres	2016-17 funding	Proposed reduction	2017-18 proposed funding
Wardleworth	£46,700	£46,700	£0
Castlemere	£13,100	£13,100	£0
Other 14 community centres grant funding	£404,000	£0	£404,000
TOTALS	£463,800	£59,800	£404,000

The following 14 Community Centre organisations will continue to receive their current level of funding:

- Back O Th Moss
- BACP
- Burnside
- Crimblecroft
- Deeplish
- Demesne
- KYP
- Meadowfields
- Rochdale Women's Welfare
- Sparth
- Spotland and Falinge
- Syke
- Turf Hill
- Wardleworth

The following centres are managed by the Council, and do not receive grants. These were not considered by this review.

- Castleton Community Centre
- Heady Hill Community Centre
- Junction Community Centre
- Smallbridge and Wardle Community Centre
- Stannycliffe Community Centre

3 Financial Implications

3.1 The saving proposal is 13% of the total budget for grant-funded community centres.

3.2 There will not be a full year saving in 2017/18. If this report is approved, a 45 days consultation will begin. Cabinet will then consider responses received during consultation. If approved, the Borough of Rochdale Compact dictates that funders "Give a minimum of three months' notice in writing when changing or ending a funding relationship or other support, and provide a clear rationale for why the decision has been taken". Therefore savings will not be achieved until 2nd quarter 2017-18.

	Savings 2017/18 £k		Savings 2018/19 £k		Total savings £k	
	On-going	One off	On-going	One off	On-going	One off
Employees						
Other Costs	45		15		60	
Income lost						
Net savings	45		15		60	
Additional income generated						
Total savings	45		15		60	
Implementation costs						
Total savings less implementation costs						

4 Asset implications

- 4.1 Both organisations directly affected by this proposal offer their services from buildings owned by the Council and leased to the Centre. If services do cease to be delivered from either building, the building could be released for disposal. This would achieve a capital receipt for the property in addition to the revenue savings.

5 Voluntary Sector impact

- 5.1 Both the Council and service users are reliant upon the services and support provided through our partnership working with the voluntary sector. The Council has a commitment through the Borough of Rochdale Compact to continue to support local services and to involve them in the development and provision of services. The Council will continue to work with both of the organisations affected to ensure that any detrimental impact upon service users is minimised and to provide support in the future development of each of the services. We will work with Rochdale CVS to support the organisations with developing a sustainable operational model, which could involve closer relationships with neighbouring community centres.

- 5.2 Wardleworth Community Centre's current weekly timetable is as follows;

- four advice drop-in sessions;
- five language sessions;
- a computer class and;
- seven varied sessions for older people.
- There are weekend sessions for young people, including a boys and a girls youth club, and an indoor/outdoor sports club.
- The centre also offers two play schemes, a work club and KS2 – GCSE learning tuition.
- In addition there are monthly luncheon clubs for men and for women, and the centre takes bookings for one-off events such as meetings, conferences, training, birthday parties, mendhi parties and weddings.

- 5.3 Castlemere Community Centre's weekly timetable is as follows;

- five children's classes per evening Monday – Friday,
- four job search sessions, eleven language sessions and seven youth sessions;

- In addition the timetable shows a total of 14 advice sessions, and 14 health related sessions which include holistic therapy, health screening and homeopathy.
- The centre has regular bookings for private social events such as weddings and mendhi's, parties, funerals and khatams, parties and festival celebrations.

6 Consultation

- 6.1 A Service Delivery consultation plan is attached at Appendix 2.
- 6.2 The Council must ensure that it remains open-minded throughout the next consultation period to all alternative proposals and expressions of interest.
- 6.3 The Council will ask each centre to explain what impact the proposed reductions in grant funding will have on the activities detailed in paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 above. If some sessions are at risk of stopping, the Council will initiate discussions as to whether any sessions can be run at nearby centres or whether closer relationships can be forged with nearby centres.

7 Alternatives considered

- 7.1 Members could decide not to implement this proposal and provide alternative options.
- 7.2 Members could decide to achieve the funding through reducing the grant for each centre by 13%. However, this option would reduce funding from those centres that have a significantly greater impact upon their communities, and that offer value for money for the Council.

8 Risk Assessment Implications

The following risks arise from the issues raised in this report as set out below:

- 8.1 There is a risk that one or both of the community centres affected will struggle to be viable as a result of these funding reductions. In recent years, every community centre has been encouraged to be less reliant upon Council funding.
- 8.2 Wardleworth Community Centre organisation, which faces by far the largest reduction in funding will be encouraged to work with nearby organisations – for example Bangladeshi Association Community Project to ensure services continue, consolidating services in one venue. We will work with Rochdale CVS and the organisation to try and ensure services continue.

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 There are no legal implications.

10 Personnel Implications

- 10.1 There are no personnel implications.

11 Equalities Impacts

Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

11.1 There are no significant workforce equality implications.

12 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

12.1 There are equality/community issues arising from this report. An Equality Impact Assessment is attached and will be further developed for each affected centre, as part of the consultation.

Directorate	Neighbourhoods
Service Name	Neighbourhood Services
Area of Service	Community Centres

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR SAVINGS PROPOSALS

1. Please state the name of the officers leading the EIA
M Dalzell
2. Who has been involved in undertaking this assessment?
M Dalzell
3. What is the scope of this assessment?
To assess whether this proposal disproportionately impacts upon any of the protected equality groups
4
a). What does the function currently do? b). Describe the needs which this service meets?
There is no statutory function for the Council to fund community centres. 16 Community Centres have received annual grants from the Council to enable them to deliver community activity.
5. What proposed changes do you wish to make?
The proposal is to remove funding from the two centres that have least impact – Wardleworth Community Centre and Castlemere Community Centre.
6. Who are the key stakeholders who may be affected by the proposed changes?
Current users of Wardleworth Community Centre Current users of Castlemere Community Centre
7. What impact will this proposal have on all the protected groups?
Service levels will be affected at Wardleworth Community Centre and possibly Castlemere Community Centre
Race Equality

In relation to Rochdale Borough, the 2011 Census confirms the following data on ethnicity. The overall population of Rochdale Borough is 211, 699. Of these, 166, 481 are classified as white British (79%); and 45,218 (21%) as BME. BME groups now account for a greater proportion of the population than was the case in 2001. Pakistani is the largest population among the BME groups and now accounts for 10.5% (22,265) of the total population in 2011, having grown by over 40% over the past decade.

There is no data relating to demographics of the current users of the Centres.

There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres, which can accommodate additional sessions.

Disabled People

The 2011 Census confirms that 21% of the Borough consider themselves to be disabled or their activities are limited due to a health-related issue. This is an increase of 4.8% from 2001. Rochdale Borough has higher rates of residents noting a long-term health problem or disability when compared to Greater Manchester or England and Wales. In general terms, therefore, the levels of disability and associated health issues are acknowledged to be of relevance to this Borough.

There is no data relating to current users of the Centres.

There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.

Carers

There is no data to suggest that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal.

There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.

Gender

The 2011 Census provides the following breakdown of figures for the Borough:

- there are 103,642 males (an increase of 3.9% from 2001, when there were 99,705); and
- there are 108,057 females (an increase of 2.3% from 2001, when there were 105,652).

This seems to indicate a relatively even split between male and female residents of the Borough

There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.

Age

The Census 2011 gives the following breakdown of the Borough's population by age:

Age group	No in 2011	%age in 2011	Proportional change from 2001
0 – 14	41,827	19.7	-1.7%
15 – 29	42,541	20.1	+1.5%
30 – 44	42,914	20.3	-1.8%
45 – 64	53,601	25.4	+1.8%
65+	30,816	14.6	+0.3%

Totals	211,619		
<p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Armed Forces and Ex-Armed Forces Personnel			
<p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Religion or Belief			
<p>The 2011 Census confirms the following religious groups in the Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christian (128,186, or 60.6%, a decrease of 11.5% since 2001) • No religion (40,014 or 18.9%, an increase of 8.1% from 2001) • Muslim (29,426 or 13.9%, an increase of 4.5% from 2001) <p>Rochdale's proportion of Muslim residents exceeds the comparative figure for Greater Manchester (8.7%) and also England and Wales (4.8%).</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Sexual Orientation			
<p>The 2011 Census does not record this data directly.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Gender Reassignment			
<p>The 2011 Census does not record this data directly.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Pregnant Women or Those on Maternity Leave or Those who have given Birth in the Previous 26 weeks			
<p>The 2011 Census does not record this data directly.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.</p>			
Marriage or Civil Partnership			
<p>The 2011 Census shows that there are now fewer people in the Borough living as a married couple. In 2001, 40.3% of the population were not living as a couple and that figure has risen to 44.4% in 2011. The prime reason for this is that a higher percentage of people are now living as single, the number of people living as single has risen by 23.8% over the past decade and increased by 3.9% proportionally.</p> <p>There are now 5,625 fewer people in the Borough living as a couple in a married or civil partnership than in 2001; this equates to a drop of 7.4%. This is a proportionally greater decrease than across Greater Manchester (3.1%) and England and Wales (1%).</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this</p>			

proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

What are the main conclusions and recommendations from this analysis?

There is no reason to believe that this group will be disproportionately affected by this proposal, as the two centres affected by this proposal are located nearby other community centres.

9. In the box below please provide details of who you will consult with on the proposals, when you consult, and the methods which you will use to consult. In the box below

The Consultation and Inclusion Methodology Used

- Public consultation through the Council’s web site
- Meeting with the Wardleworth Community Centre organisation
- Meeting with the Castlemere Community Centre organisation
- Meeting with Rochdale CVS to support both the affected organisations

10. Produce an action plan detailing the mitigation measures that you propose to put in place to address any adverse impacts.

Mitigation Measure	Action	Responsible Officer	Implementation Date	Review Date	Evaluation Measure
If Wardleworth Community Centre is not able to continue delivering services, work with nearby community centre organisations to ensure services are delivered at nearby centres	Work with Wardleworth Community Centre to assess whether they are a viable organisation. If not, work with nearby organisations, for example Bangladeshi Association and Community Project.	Philip Cooke	March 2017	April 2017	Relocated services, if Wardleworth Community Centre is not viable.

Directorate	Neighbourhoods
Service Name	Neighbourhood Services
Area of Service	Community Centres

Consultation Action Plan

Proposal Title: Review of Community Centre grant funding

Type of Consultation: Service Delivery

Group affected	Method of consultation	Date (s) consultation activity to be delivered	Resource required	Venue	Targeted survey questions
Rochdale Borough Citizens	Proposal will be on the Council's web site	Ongoing	Web pages	Website	
Community Centre organisations	Letters to be sent to each of the 16 grant funded community centre organisations	TBC	TBC	TBC	
Meeting at Wardleworth Community Centre with the organisation		TBC	TBC	TBC	
Meeting at Castlemere Community Centre with the organisation		TBC	TBC	TBC	