

Report for: INFORMATION
Item Number:



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	NO – Part I
Title	Devolution of Services to Parishes
Responsible Officer(s)	Andrew Elkington – Head of Policy & Performance
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Harjit Hunjan, Community Partnerships Manager 01628 796947
Member reporting	Councillor Bateson – Lead Member
For Consideration By	Big Society Panel
Date to be Considered	22nd January 2014
Implementation Date if Not Called In	
Affected Wards	All 'Parished' Wards
Keywords/Index	Devolution of Services, Parish Councils

Report Summary

1. This report reviews progress on the Devolution of Services to Parishes and recommends actions for taking the project forward.
2. It seeks to identify: why parishes have taken up the services that they have, why parishes have declined the services that they have and why there are a significant number of services where parishes have not come to a decision.
3. It draws on a survey of parishes undertaken over the pre and post Christmas period, e mail feedback from parishes and a meeting of responsible officers.
4. It looks at what can be done to make existing services more attractive to parishes and at further services that could potentially be offered for devolution.
5. The report considers whether there is a more effective way of working with town and parish councils in relation to devolution of services and recommends preparation of an action plan in consultation with town and parish councils.
6. A number of options are recommended for future consideration these include:
 - a geographical approach to devolution of services that will look at progress on a 'parish by parish' basis rather than a 'service by service' basis and give a better understanding of the local issues and barriers from the perspective of individual parishes
 - establishing a working party to take the project forward with representation and full involvement of 2 or 3 champions from town and parish councils
 - a staged approach to devolution that will focus in the first instance on

<p>giving parishes more say over how local services are designed and delivered rather as a first stage prior to devolving responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - devolving services to a cluster of parishes together with the resources they need to manage the services - asking local ward councillors (who have a good understanding of local issues and an established relationship with their parish council) to approach parishes on the Council's behalf - appointing a champion on the Council's Corporate Management Team from one of the operational Directorates - Establishing a forum, outside of Big Society Panel/ Parish Conference, where there will be more opportunity for detailed discussion of offers. <p>7. There are no direct financial implications arising from the current report but some of the options considered would have implications in the future if adopted.</p>
--

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?	
Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference
Devolution of services to parish councils is intended to ensure that decisions about local services are made as close as possible to the people affected by them and to maximise residents' influence over issues that matter to them leading to better services that meet local need.	July 2014 (next but one Parish Conference).

1. Details of Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.1 That officers should establish a workshop to specifically address to secure further feedback from parishes and develop an action plan for taking devolution of services forward in full consultation with parishes.

1.2 That a working party should be established to take the project forward with representation and full involvement of two or three parish champions.

1.3 That the working party should explore, as one of the options, the potential for services (e.g. in relation to planning) being delegated to a cluster of parish councils.

1.4 That, subject to the views of town and parish councils, the Council could adopt a staged approach to devolution of services focusing, in the first instance, on giving parishes more say over how local services are delivered.

2. Reason for Recommendation(s) and Options Considered

Option	Comments
Stop seeking to devolve services to town and parish councils.	The Council is committed to the Big Society and to maximising local people's influence over local services.
Continue to promote the existing menu of services –adding new services to the	Progress has slowed and there is evidence that some parishes see

menu on an 'as and when' basis.	devolution as a top down process rather than as an opportunity for working in partnership with the Council to deliver better services for residents.
Work with parishes to understand devolution from a parish perspective and develop a menu based on their aspirations.	The process of devolving local services will be more effective if parishes own the process and understand the potential benefits. This is the recommended option.

2.1 The report draws on an officer meeting to consider progress on Devolution to Services that took place on January 6th and a survey of parishes that was undertaken over the Christmas/New Year Period 20th December to 10th January.

2.2 Four parishes: Bisham, Waltham St. Lawrence, Bray and Eton Town Council have completed the questionnaire to date and a further four: Datchet, Old Windsor, Cookham and White Waltham have responded by email. Three parishes - Sunninghill and Ascot, Hurley and White Waltham have indicated that they will complete the full questionnaire but need more time.

Given that there was a limited time to undertake the consultation and the importance of fully engaging parishes it is strongly recommended that there needs to be fuller consultation with parishes to establish their concerns.

One parish responded to a follow up e mail by saying, "Time is needed to devote to this matter and most Clerks will be currently preparing for their next Parish meeting (I certainly am!) However, if you are agreeable, I hope to be able to devote some time to preparing a response to you over the next week or so."

2.3 Unless parishes are fully involved with the process there is a risk they will see devolution of services as a top down process rather than as an opportunity to exercise more local influence over the design and delivery of local services for the benefit of local residents.

2.4 Whilst further feedback from parishes is essential if there is to be an agreed way forward there are a number of assumptions that can be made based on; feedback to date, previous discussions with parishes, officer feedback and uptake of services to date.

Why have parishes taken up the services that they have

2.5 There is a good response from parishes in terms of take up for services that allow a more local response whilst placing minimal responsibility on the parish council (i.e. eleven out of fifteen parish councils have accepted the offer of grit bins, nine out of twelve parishes with libraries have agreed to promote library volunteering on their noticeboards).

2.6 There is a good response from parishes in relation to offers, such as greater involvement in plan policy making, that that give parishes increased influence over their local area.(Cookham is the only parish council not to have taken up this offer).

2.7 Parishes are readier to take up a monitoring and reporting role (e.g. Old Windsor in relation to street cleaning, Cookham and Cox Green in relation to street lighting) than to take full responsibility for delivering services.

2.8 Parishes are readier to take offers up when they come with additional resources. (e.g. Old Windsor took on responsibility for cleaning and maintenance of toilets because it was linked to Community Hub funding. There is interest from parishes in having more say over S106 funding.) Plan policy making, taken up by all but one town/ parish council was supported by funding made available to RBWM as a Vanguard Authority so that £20,000 funding was made available to each group.

2.9 The response from Old Windsor Parish Council to ‘Why have parishes opted in to the services they have?’ was, “ We have opted to take on the services we did as we knew we would offer a better service and the difference between what was being offered and the real cost of providing the service was financially viable”.

Old Windsor have taken on the sign cleaning function, transparency in relation to S106, management of over hanging vegetation, greater involvement in plan policy making and routine vegetation clearance and are looking at the offer of delegated planning decisions.

Why have parishes declined the services that they have?

2.10 Eton Town Council gave a standard response to most survey questions. Their response to most questions was, “We do not have adequate resources to manage the service, costs could increase for smaller contracts and future funding from RBWM is not certain”. This was reflected in some of the other responses received as identified below.

2.11 Old Windsor responded by e mail saying, “Many of the services offered are something parishes could never offer and the ones that we might have been able to were not financially viable. The amount of money being offered was around 20-30% of the real cost of providing the service. With parish precepts being so low we were not prepared to cut back on our existing services to provide something that RBWM is already doing which would result in a net loss to our residents.”

A parish councillor from Waltham St. Lawrence responded, “We are a small Parish but big geographically. We have lots of roads and footpaths. The cost for all your proposals would be expensive for us. We also pay council tax for the services you would like to delegate.”

2.12 Parishes employ a parish clerk (who is often part time) as often their only direct employee. Most work is carried out under contract or by members of the parish council who are unpaid volunteers. Consequently there is limited resource to take on additional tasks.

Bisham Parish Council responded to an e mail following up the survey as follows, "The Parish Council have not made a bid for additional services, mainly, I think on cost grounds. The Council comprises six Members and employs one Officer".

White Waltham Parish Council responded, "I acknowledge that White Waltham Parish Council has thus so far failed to move forward with the majority of Devolution Services offered. The main reason being that council did not want to take on additional work load bearing in mind that in all cases this would involve additional work for the clerk or would require additional staff to be employed and if there was a financial inducement for so doing initially what guarantee if any is given that such funding would continue to be in place ad infinitum or ultimately expected to be funded through the precept. There are some items where the council has always assisted e.g. reporting of pot holes, street light failure etc as part of its ongoing commitment to the community."

2.13 The observation from Eton Town Council that costs could increase for smaller contracts is borne out by Old Windsor's experience in relation to Management of Highway and Amenity Grass Verges. The Parish Council obtained quotes for the work but found the quotes higher than the previous contractor so not financially viable for the parish to take on.

2.14 There is reluctance on the part of some parishes to take on an enforcement role. The discussion at various Parish Conference meetings has focused on the difficulty of enforcing e.g. fines for littering or dog fouling for people who are in effect neighbours.

2.15 Some parishes have responded in relation to the offer to supplement street lighting scouting to parishes by saying that parish councillors are elderly and feel uncomfortable going out at night. Officers have responded by suggesting a more limited scheme.

2.16 Some services are not seen as being relevant to certain parishes e.g. some parishes have limited street lighting and a number have no libraries in the parish. S106 funding has generally been taken on by parishes that have significant development in the local area and stand to benefit whilst others have minimal development and there would in effect be little funding to determine. There are exceptions to this rule however and some parishes that would potentially benefit from determining how S106 funding could be spent have failed to take the offer up.

2.17 Some Town and Parish Councils do not think they have the necessary expertise. Eton Town Council responded in relation to the offer to delegate planning issues currently delegated to officers that qualified planning officers are better qualified to take decisions than part time councillors.

2.18 In some cases it is difficult to explain why parishes have not taken a service up. A prime example is the recent offer to devolve prioritisation of minor maintenance and non urgent repairs. This is in effect a pot of money that will be kept and managed by the Council who will deliver the service but parishes can identify how the money is to be spent.

The offer was circulated to parishes and followed up by a letter and phone call to each parish offering to discuss the proposition. Officers attended the Parish Conference and invited any parish that was interested to discuss with them at the end of the session but no parishes came forward to take up this opportunity. It is sometimes difficult for officers to get beyond the first hurdle and explain propositions properly.

2.19 Officers are concerned that communications don't always get to everyone they need to within the parish council which may limit the opportunity for full consideration.

2.20 Feedback relating to specific services is summarised as Appendix B.

Why are there a significant number of services parishes have neither declined nor accepted?

2.21 This may in part be a communication issue. The response from Eton Town Council identifies a number of services that Eton Town Council say they have declined but that were shown on the tracker as awaiting a response. Similarly Old Windsor Parish Council responded, "We made decisions on every one and RBWM have been informed"; but there are a number of offers that according to the tracker the parish has not responded to.

2.22 Cookham Parish Council responded by e mail saying, "I think our Councillors feel that they have not been given enough information or opportunity to discuss the implications of accepting these offers. Where we already carry out similar functions e.g. footpath clearance, we can evaluate what will be involved in accepting more responsibility and accept or decline accordingly. New areas of service would obviously need more consideration. I understand that Cllr Mandy Brar has in the past suggested that it would be helpful for Officers to visit the Parishes in order to promote this initiative and answer questions. Perhaps this could be considered at the forthcoming meetings."

2.23 A letter from Datchet Parish Council cited an instance where negotiations had stalled because an officer had retired and another instance where an officer had been off sick. In the latter case negotiations had picked up again and were awaiting consideration by RBWM councillors.

2.24 There were also negotiations in Datchet's case where agreement has not yet been reached on the appropriate financial contribution. Datchet's position in relation to various services is summarised in Appendix B and the appropriate officers have been requested to follow up.

What could be done to make services more attractive to parishes?

2.25 The Council could adopt a staged approach to devolution of services focusing in the first instance on giving parishes more say over how local services are delivered.

The National Association of Local Councils (NALC) identify three stages of devolution:

- i) Parishes can be offered a basic level of delegation with formal power to direct the operation of local services and monitor performance but RBWM would retain full ownership and responsibility for the service.
- ii) As they become more confident parishes could take on a delivery role and effectively become the local contractor providing the service to an agreed frequency and standard under a service level agreement.
- iii) Parishes could in time take on full responsibility for the service with the necessary land and buildings transferring to the parish and RBWM no longer having responsibility.

Securing 'buy in' from parishes at the first level where what is essentially on offer is more say over how local services are delivered may be the best way of securing their support; building to more ambitious schemes of delegation in the future.

2.26 Smaller parishes in particular may not have the resources they need to manage the contract. A potential way around this problem would be to offer services (and a proportion of the management cost) to a cluster of parishes.

The Head of Planning has proposed that with the (anticipated) adoption of the Ascot and the Sunnings Neighbourhood Plan we have an opportunity to seek to persuade the two parish councils, acting jointly, to take on some local planning decision-making together with the s106 delegation, which will enable people locally to have a real stake in how their Neighbourhood Plan is being implemented and their policies put into place.

2.27 There are some examples of agreements with a cluster of parishes being delivered through a trust at arms length from the parishes.

2.28 Uncertainty around longer term funding arrangements could be resolved by committing to a level of funding for devolved services over 3-5 years but this would limit the Council's flexibility in relation to achieving future budget savings.

2.29 Alternatively, if the staged approach is adopted, parishes assume a monitoring role and budgets are retained centrally; uncertainty around future funding is less of an issue for parishes.

2.29 Similarly, a focus on the basic level of delegation addresses the issue in relation to smaller contracts potentially costing more. Service specifications would reflect local wishes and priorities but RBWM would retain the procurement role wielding extra purchase power through economies of scale.

Are there additional services that could potentially be devolved?

2.30 The list of services currently on offer to parishes is very similar to the list identified by the Commission for Rural Communities & National Association of Local Councils (NALC) attached as Appendix A.

2.31 The officer meeting did not identify any additional services that could be offered. It was felt more important at this stage for the Council to go back to town and parish councils and seek to understand the situation from their perspective. There will be an opportunity for this at the forthcoming Parish Conference in February but the officer meeting concluded that the Parish Conference may not be the best forum for taking this issue forward.

What have we done so far to engage parishes?

2.32 Engagement with parishes to date has encompassed:

- Circulation of the menu
- Regular follow up by e mail and telephone
- Attendance at parish meetings
- Discussion at parish conference
- Specific workshops focusing on devolution of services (but these were a little while ago).

What can we do to engage parishes more effectively in future?

2.33 An officer group has been established to review progress on Devolution of Services and will allow for more effective co-ordination of the project in future.

2.34 However there is evidence that some parishes see devolution as something that the Council is trying to impose upon them, rather than as an opportunity to assert local influence. As such it will be essential to ensure that parishes are fully involved in reviewing and developing the menu of services and that an action plan for taking devolution of services forward should be developed in full consultation with town and parish councils.

2.35 The officer group identified the following suggestions for taking the project forward:

- Identify 3 or more 'champions' from parish councils who will work with officers to take the project forward.
- Look to organise a workshop or a series of smaller workshops with Parishes to go through the existing menu & see how the offers could be made more attractive. Given that the Parish Conference/ Big Society Panel have a heavy agenda; they may not be the best forum for detailed discussion of menu options.
- Consider presenting the tracker on a 'parish by parish' rather than 'service by service' basis. This will help to give an understanding of what the barriers and issues are on a 'parish by parish' basis and to get a better understanding of issues from a local parish perspective.

- Seek to attend more parish meetings and to engage with a wider audience of parish councillors.
- Look at opportunities to devolve services to a group of parish councils – shared service model.
- Focus on those parish councils that have taken up more offers.
- Look to secure assistance from Ward Councillors (particularly councillors who are themselves parish councillors) to engage with parish.
- Appoint a CMT Devolution of Services Champion from one of the operational directorates.

2.36 What should we do next?

Devolution of services to town and parish councils is on the agenda for the next Parish Conference in February.

It is important that we get a clear view of devolution from a town and parish council perspective and develop an action plan that recognises parishes' concerns and aspirations.

3. Key Implications

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
Agreement with parish councils on how Devolution of Services should be taken forward.	There is no agreed action plan for taking the project forward.	An action plan is in place and has been agreed by all parties.	-	-	June 2014 (Next but one parish conference).
The number of offers a majority of parish councils have chosen to take up.	There has been no improvement against the current position (i.e. 4 services taken up by 8 or more parishes).	At least 6 services have been taken up by 8 or more parishes).	At least 7 services have been taken up by 8 or more parishes.	At least 8 services have been taken up by 8 or more parishes.	March 2015

4. Financial Details

a) Financial impact on the budget

There are no direct financial implications arising from the current report.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The powers to allow town and parish councils to deliver certain functions are defined in Local Authority Regulations 2000 and Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972.

5.2 P&TCs have a wide range of existing powers to deliver services and in the majority of cases, there is no legal bar to them taking on services or managing assets. They, and principal authorities, frequently have concurrent powers where both can provide a service so delegation from one to the other is possible.

6. Value For Money

The value for money implications of individual offers will be considered by RBWM and the relevant parish council in respect of each agreement entered into.

7. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

Increasing local influence over the environment is anticipated to have a beneficial effect.

8. Risk Management

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Parishes do not engage with the devolution process.	High	Parishes will be invited to play an active part in developing the project and shaping it to their needs.	Medium
Parishes take on responsibilities they do not have the resources to manage.	Medium	Parishes capacity to take on responsibility will be evaluated in relation to each agreement entered into.	Low

9. Links to Strategic Objectives

Residents First

- Support Children and Young People
- Improve the Environment, Economy and Transport
- Work for safer and stronger communities

Value for Money

- Deliver Economic Services
- Improve the use of technology

Delivering Together

- Enhanced Customer Services
- Deliver Effective Services
- Strengthen Partnerships

Equipping Ourselves for the Future

- Equipping Our Workforce

- Changing Our Culture

10. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

There are no specific equalities, human rights or community cohesion implications arising from this report.

11. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications – None

12. Property and Assets – None

13. Any other implications – None

14. Consultation

14.1 an officer group has been established and contributed to preparation of the report.

14.2 An online survey of parishes was undertaken from 19th December to 10th January and was followed up by e mail and telephone. Parish responses to date are reflected in the report.

14.3 The report proposes further consultation and involvement as key to taking the project forward.

15. Timetable for Implementation

15.1 The report will be discussed at the Parish Conference in February.

15.2 The Working Group, with parish representation, would be in place by March 2014 and an action plan prepared by the date of the next parish conference in July 2014.

16. Appendices

Appendix A – Typical Services and Functions Delegated (from Commission for Rural England/ National Association of Local Councils guidelines on delegation to town and parish councils).

17. Background Information

17.1 The references to National Association of Local Council Guidance relate to: Commission for Rural Communities Guidance Note – Delegations to Town and Parish Councils, 2009.

18. Consultation (Mandatory)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Andrew Elkington	Head of Policy & Performance	10/01/14	10/01/14	
Cllr Burbage	Leader of the Council	10/01/14		
Cllr. Bateson	Lead Member for Policy and Performance	10/01/14		
Andrew Brooker	Head of Finance	10/01/14		
Maria Lucas	Head of Legal Services	10/01/14		

Report History

Decision type:	Urgency item?
For information	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Andrew Green	Community Partnership Officer	01628 682940

Typical services and functions delegated*

What types of principal authority service or function are appropriate for delegation to P&TCs? The list in the box below is not intended to be exhaustive but covers those which seem to be most frequently cited within delegation schemes.

Functions that might be considered for delegation:

Control of markets

Maintenance of highway verges, open spaces, footways and footpaths

Allotments

Tree preservation orders

Maintenance of closed churchyards

Street cleansing (such as litter picking, sweeping and graffiti removal)

Public conveniences

Noise and nuisance abatement

Recycling provision

Street naming

Street lighting (except on principal roads)

Parking restrictions

Off street car parking

Road safety measures

Issue of bus and rail passes or other transport voucher schemes

Licences for taxis, street trading of public entertainment

Some aspects of planning development control

Some aspects of library and museum management

Some aspects of leisure and tourism provision (e.g. permits, playing fields, play areas)

In practice, some services are much more frequently delegated than others. Probably the most common delegations are those covering services which maintain the local environment, such as:

- cutting grass verges;
- looking after local footpaths;
- clearing gullies; and
- managing council allotments.

*From: Guidance note: Delegations to town and parish councils - Commission for Rural Communities and National Association of Local Councils, 2009.

Appendix B – Feedback Relating to Specific Services

Overhanging vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are a Large Parish with small population with plenty of tree and hedge lined streets. We could not afford the cost. RBWM has the advantage of economies of scale and you are able to spread the cost. • We have no machinery or storage area and all our current maintenance work has to be contracted out or is sometimes done by volunteers at their own expense and risk. • We are already working with the borough on this.
Public conveniences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from anything else we have no public convenience in the parish. • We have no public toilets. • This is not of interest to the parish council.
Street Cleaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have no machinery or storage area and all our current maintenance work has to be contracted out or is sometimes done by volunteers at their own expense and risk. • Large Parish with small population with plenty of streets. We could not afford the cost. RBWM has the advantage of economies of scale and you are able to spread the cost. • Does not apply to Datchet.
Enforcement of Dog Fouling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have special bins in our Orchard which is owned by the parish and these are used. We would not wish to manage Enforcement and anyway we think this should be the job of the Borough. • We do not have the manpower to patrol the roads and footpaths in the Parish. I note in all the years I have lived here I have never seen the RBWM dog wardens. • Lack of resources and funding.
Involvement in Plan policy making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This one would be a question of time rather than anything else. For 6 councillors dealing with a large area parish we have enough to do now. Would the parishes really have a policy voice? • There has not been sufficient information as to how Parishes would get involved. • Lack of resources and funding.
Management of amenity and highway grass verges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impossible. We have miles of verges. • Large Parish with small population with plenty of tree and hedge lined streets. We could not afford the cost. RBWM has the advantage of economies of scale and you are able to spread the cost. • Lack of resources and funding. • I have had a number of meetings and discussion with Stephen Anderson on this proposal. He has indicated that a contribution in the sum of £10,000 could be available. However, when taking into account the scale of work which would mean an increase in

	<p>Parish Office staff, the preparation of contract paperwork, site supervision and administration it is my view that the contribution to PC cost should be a more realistic £16,000-£18,000. (Datchet).</p>
Offer of grit bins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be a Borough job, with all bins around the Borough being filled at the same time in Autumn and then as required during the winter. We would also have nowhere to store the grit. • Cost of maintaining and refilling. • This is not of interest to the parish council. • We probably should have considered this (Datchet).
Cleaning of street signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anything to do with roads should either be the Highways Agency or the Borough's responsibility. In many places this could be a dangerous occupation without proper bollards. Sometimes individuals will clean a particular sign which has become badly soiled as a voluntary action. • Large Parish with small population with plenty of street signs. We could not afford the cost. RBWM has the advantage of economies of scale and you are able to spread the cost. • Some months ago I had discussions with Nigel Davies who I understand has retired this item has therefore stalled. Datchet would consider undertaking this role but not at the offered value of a £500 contribution. My discussion with Nigel had reached the point where he agreed with my view that a more sensible, reasonable and cost effective contribution would be £2,500 per annum. In this instance it is my view that the administrative work load in the PC office would increase. This is not to suggest we would need extra staff, just increased office hours. • Lack of resources and funding.
Offer to supplement street lighting scouting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This does not apply to our parish. We have no street lights other than in the Travellers site. Service declined. • Lack of resources. • Street lighting is something we do not have and do not want. The A404 already pollutes the village badly and everywhere else is very rural.
Vegetation clearance of public rights of way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Parish probably has more footpaths than Maidenhead and Windsor combined. • We could not afford the cost. RBWM has the advantage of economies of scale and you are able to spread the cost." • Lack of resources and funding. • Could be of interest (Datchet).

Offer of planning delegation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not wish to make decisions about planning applications in what is a small community. If the applications are unimportant then we probably would not object to them and if they were important then we would object and if necessary take them to the Planning Panel. Bisham Village itself has a large number of listed buildings. • "We do not have the expertise and we do not have the time to hold at least two more meeting a month to deal with planning applications. • Parish Councillors would probably get some sort of abuse from granting or declining any application. RBWM could take a bit more notice of Parish Council views." • BPC are very proactive in this area and therefore were prepared to expand their involvement. • A meeting was held some months ago but to date nothing else has happened. (Datchet).(Since established that training documentation has been produced but will be used to brief borough members before the parish.)
Offer to devolve management of parking schemes & free to park surface car parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not have any public parking except at the two churches as this is a rural area. The experience of Hurley parish council, trying to improve their parking situation with large numbers of weekend visitors just shows how difficult parking is to manage without legal backup. • We have no public car parks. • This is not of interest to the parish council.
Recruitment of volunteers to enhance opening hours of libraries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not have a library - we are in an area where the mobile library is the only library service. • "No library in WSL .Town libraries are somewhat remote from this Parish". • This is not of interest to the parish council. • We do not have adequate resources to manage the service.
Greater transparency in relation to s106 funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 is a very raw subject for us. We very seldom qualify for it and when we do, we get told that the money cannot be used for our only parish asset (our Orchard and its playground) because it does not qualify for one reason or another. We have never received any S106 money. • Further information and or clarification required. • BPC are very proactive in this area and therefore were prepared to expand their involvement, we felt that the available funding could be utilised best at a local level, and that we had the resources necessary. • Consultation and discussion with Hilary Oliver continues. The PC has yet to formally consider this item . However I am

	<p>confident members will agree this aspect of devolution also. In my view both these items will have a low level impact on the administration of the PC both in time and financial terms. (Datchet).</p>
<p>Offer to devolve fixed penalty notices for litter offences</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is another example of something that does not apply to our parish. It should be a Borough commitment anyway to give Enforcement backup. • This would make Parish Councils ever more disliked. • This is not of interest to the parish council.
<p>Offer to devolve minor maintenance and urgent pot hole repairs to parish councils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this only refers to roads then all maintenance and pothole work is a Borough job. Also see Q2. • Large Parish with small population with plenty of roads. We do not have the manpower to carry out such a scheme.
<p>Offer to devolve speed limit monitoring / informal enforcement (speed watch)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only place we might think about doing this would be on Marlow Bridge where vehicles of all types regularly and in large numbers flout the three tonne limit. Without the police taking action no-one cares. • We are finding that this could be a costly exercise. We note that no legal action would be taken in the event of someone being reported for speeding.
<p>Are there any other services you would consider?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appears to this Parish that the grants from RBWM would not cover the additional costs to the Parish. • Not at this stage and with the items we have taken on and the current resources and budget the parish council are not in a position to taken on any further commitments.