

## APPENDIX 1

A number of options for MLRB membership, including those operated by other local authorities, were considered by officers and those considered the most viable for MLRB are set out below :-

OPTIONS	MEMBERSHIP	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>STATUS QUO</b></p> <p><b>LRB MEMBERSHIP OF THREE DRAWN FROM A POOL OF 8 MEMBERS, 1 FROM EACH OF THE 8 COUNCIL WARDS, ON A 3 MONTHLY ROTA BASIS.</b></p>	<p>This option spreads the workload associated with the LRB across 8 members in the course of a year, and this may be seen as a significant advantage by current members.</p>	<p>It is the view of officers that this option is not sustainable given the issues outlined in Section 4 of the report. Continuation with this arrangement carries with it the risk of exposure of the Council to adverse comment and/or appeal if a case is unable to progress, for example due to the illness of a member.</p>
2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>LRB WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 5 WITH OR WITHOUT A STANDING CHAIR</b></p>	<p>A membership of five (quorum of 3) would avoid the risk of the meeting becoming inquorate provided the 5 members regularly attended meetings, whilst still allowing a degree of flexibility if a member could not sit as the application concerned a site in the member's ward, or could not attend a meeting due to illness or some other pressing reason.</p>	<p>The workload which the five members of the LRB would require to handle over the course of a year would be substantial, and as there is no pool suggested in this option, this workload could not be expected to abate over the year, for example when the member was not scheduled to sit. If a local Ward member required to declare an interest and leave the meeting, the chair would have the casting vote in the event of a tie in votes relative to the merits of the review.</p>

Deleted:

		Officers are of the view that a membership of 5 strikes an appropriate balance between efficiency of decision making and avoidance of the risk of cases being unable to progress as the LRB is inquorate.	In the event of the standing chair being the local ward member then in the event of an equality of votes the member chairing the meeting at the time has the casting vote.
3	<b>LRB WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 7 WITH OR WITHOUT A STANDING CHAIR</b>	The advantages of this option are similar to those for option 2 above.	Officers are of the view that 7 may be a difficult number of potentially opposing views for the chair to marshall. It is important to remember that the process which the LRB requires to undertake is quasi-judicial in its nature, and is not therefore the same as that undertaken at Planning and Regulatory Services Committee where members have an officer's recommendation before them.  The challenges presented by the need to rationalise and harmonise a number of opposing views into a fully reasoned decision increase as the membership increases.  As membership increases so do the administrative costs of preparing case papers for each meeting.  The chair would have a casting vote in certain circumstances as at 2 above.

<p><b>NB</b></p>	<p><b>LRB WITH A STANDING CHAIR</b></p>	<p>Appointment of a standing chair may be viewed as promoting both efficiency and consistency of approach to the decision making process.</p> <p>Appointment of a standing chair would alleviate the need to appoint a new chair for every LRB constituted. If the current format/membership is continued, a chair requires to be appointed several times in the course of one sitting. (see Section 4.2 (ii) of the report)</p> <p>The appointment of a standing chair would be open to all 26 members of the Council</p>	<p>Members may be of the view however that this objective will be achieved as the MLRB members each gain experience chairing this Committee.</p> <p>It may be seen from a public perspective that a Standing Chair may significantly influence the decision making process in a MLRB with a small membership.</p> <p>Whilst open to all 26 members it was previously the Council's position that, in terms of openness and transparency, it would not be appropriate for a member of the Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee to be a member of the MLRB.</p> <p>It would place additional responsibilities on one member as opposed to being shared as is the current practice.</p> <p>Were the Council to agree to a MLRB with a standing chair no allowance would be payable given that the Council's special responsibility allowance budget has been fully utilised.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>ANY OTHER OPTION OR A COMBINATION OF OPTIONS THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS APPROPRIATE.</b></p>	<p>*</p>	<p>*</p>

- \* Officers will be available to answer questions as to the advantages and disadvantages of any other options considered appropriate