COUNCIL CABINET
3 August 2016

ITEM 9

Report of the Cabinet Member for Communities
and City Centre Regeneration

Derby City Council

Libraries Strategic Review: Options for a new service delivery model

SUMMARY

1.1   As a result of the Government continuing to cut local government funding, the Council has to make substantial cuts to its budget. The Council has already endured £116m of savings between 2010 and 2015, with a further £45 million to cut between 2016 and 2019.

1.2   Under the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), Libraries are required to absorb a further budget reduction of £648k. Savings on this scale, on top of those already made in previous years, cannot be achieved without transformational changes to the current service delivery model.

1.3   To ensure compliance with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, major changes to the service delivery model must be based on a needs assessment that has, at its heart, a full public and stakeholder consultation.

1.4   This paper includes, at Appendix 2, the final report of a public and stakeholder consultation exercise carried out between November 2015 and February 2016. It goes on to describe the needs assessment that was undertaken using the data collected during the consultation exercise, and a range of other information derived from various sources.

1.5   Based on the needs assessment the report describes four versions of a service delivery model that would each, if adopted, deliver the required MTFP savings – Options A to D.   The number of libraries run by the Council would fall from 15 to four under Options A and B, to eight under Option D and to 10 under Option C. A one page summary of the four options is provided at Appendix 4.

1.6   Under all four options it is proposed, subject to approval of a detailed business case, that city centre lending services would move from the Central Library to be delivered from a new 'Derby Riverside Library,' to be located on the ground floor of the Council House. Weekly opening hours would increase by 55%, from 33 to 51.

1.7   The Labour administration is determined to avoid the necessity for library closures, so under Options B and D the Council would work closely with local people with a view to creating a number of Community Managed Libraries, outside of its statutory offer. A financial and in-kind support package is proposed to assist local groups in establishing and maintaining effective volunteer-run libraries in place of the existing Council-run service points.

1.8 The report discusses the relative merits of the four options and one – Option B – is identified as the preferred way forward for Derby's library service.

1.9 Option B would result in the Council continuing to run the following four libraries: Alvaston, Pear Tree, the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library, and Derby Riverside Library replacing the existing Central Library. The opening hours of all four libraries would be greater than the current offer, with an average increase of 52%. The 11 remaining libraries would potentially become community managed, with a support package being made available to volunteer groups willing to take them over.

1.10 Since the Council took over responsibility for running library services in the city at Local Government Reorganisation in 1997 there has never been a formally agreed statement of the service vision and objectives. The paper seeks to make good this omission, basing its proposals on the recent statement of corporate priority outcomes and on the findings of the public and stakeholder consultation.

1.11 The report recommends that the public and service stakeholders be consulted on the four options, and on the proposals for the future of lending services in the city centre. It proposes that following consideration of the findings, a further report recommending a new service delivery model be presented to Cabinet alongside a full Equalities Impact Assessment of the recommended option.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To adopt the service vision and objectives described in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 respectively.

2.2 To approve the needs assessment ranking shown in paragraph 6.20, and the methodology from which it is derived including the double weighting of the socio-economic component (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.19).

2.3 To support the proposal that for the reasons outlined in paragraph 6.25 the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library be included within the Council's statutory offer.

2.4 To support in principle the proposal, subject to approval of a detailed business case and consideration of feedback from the 'phase 2 consultation', to relocate city centre lending library services from the Central Library to Derby Riverside Library on the ground floor of the Council House (paragraphs 6.26 to 6.36).

2.5 Subject to the Riverside Library project going ahead, to support the proposal to maintain a supplementary off-site stock collection at Blagreaves Lane Library, on rolling stacks currently occupied by the Derby / Derbyshire Joint Fiction Reserve, and the slimming down of the current Fiction Reserve to accommodate it (paragraph 6.37).

2.6   To support the proposal that, if the Council adopts Community Managed Libraries (CMLs) as part of its strategy for the future of the Library Service in Derby, a financial and in-kind support package be provided to assist in their establishment and sustainability. The precise details of that package, and allocation of available resources between CMLs, would be determined later in the Review (paragraphs 6.42 to 6.53).

2.7   If, as part of the proposal, any CMLs are established in Derby, to support the proposal principle that they be deemed to be outside the Council's statutory offer (paragraphs 6.54 and 6.55).

2.8   To agree the proposals for the core elements common to all four service delivery model options, as outlined in paragraphs 6.56 to 6.62.

2.9   To note the four versions of service delivery model described in this report (paragraphs 7.1 to 7.18).

2.10   To agree that Option B be acknowledged within the proposed 'phase 2' consultation process as the Council's preferred option (paragraphs 7.19 to 7.34).

2.11   To authorise a 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation (paragraph 7.37), which would cover and seek feedback on:

- the preferred service delivery option and the three other options described in this report
- the proposal to close the Central Library and deliver a replacement city centre lending service from Derby Riverside Library at the Council House
- the working assumptions described in this report for the operation of CMLs.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1   Clarifying the role and purpose of the library service will provide a firm foundation for future decisions about a new service delivery model.

3.2   The needs assessment ranking provides an objective and systematic framework against which future decisions about a new service delivery model can be made. Double-weighting the socio-economic component gives some priority to areas of the city where libraries have the greatest potential to contribute to the Council's aspiration to try to 'close the gap for economic and social inequalities within Derby'.

3.3   The Derby Local Studies and Family History Library is not susceptible to the needs assessment methodology, so a decision on its future has to be made based on other criteria.

3.4   The Central / Riverside Library proposal enables the continuation of city centre lending services in an appropriate modern environment while releasing resources that can be re-directed to support library services elsewhere in the city.

3.5   A supplementary off-site collection at Blagreaves Lane will allow the breadth and depth of the city's library stock to be maintained following closure of the Central

Library. The shelves at Blagreaves Lane that are earmarked for it are currently full and some will need to be cleared to make space for the new collection.

3.6   Providing a support package for CMLs is more likely to enable them to get off the ground and then to thrive.

3.7   Excluding CMLs from the statutory offer ensures that the Council will not need to step in, and incur extra costs, if a CML proves to be unviable.

3.8   The core elements describe the services that the Council proposes to provide.

3.9   The options describe four strategies for meeting the MTFP savings target while continuing to deliver a service that complies with statutory requirements.

3.10   Option B is judged to be, on balance, the most robust version of the service delivery model, the version that offers the greatest resilience in the longer term for a much-loved service that may be confronted by demands for further budget savings.

3.11   Major decisions on the future shape of the service should not be taken without consultation with the public and stakeholders. Consultation will help Cabinet to objectively assess the options presented in this report.

Derby City Council

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

4	CONTEXT

Financial background

4.1 A report to Council Cabinet on 20 January 2016 identified 'permanent cuts requirements of £45m over three years to address the impact of funding reductions, meet rising costs, maintain priority services and invest for the future.'

4.2 Libraries have already delivered revenue budget savings in excess of £1.3m since 2010/11. Savings have been achieved through a reduction in the bookfund of around 40% and by decreases of over 30% to established opening hours. Reductions in the numbers of frontline, managerial, professional and specialist staff have led in turn to a decrease in the range and level of services provided.

4.3 On top of these reductions, the MTFP requires Libraries to make further savings of £673k from a net revenue budget of £2.563m, split equally between 2017/18 and the following year. A saving of £25k has already been achieved through the deletion of a vacant post. Given the savings already made since 2010/11 a further reduction on the scale required by the MTFP can only be achieved through a fundamental transformation of the service delivery model.

4.4 Anticipating the scale of savings that would be required, Cabinet agreed on 15 July 2015 to initiate consultations in a number of service areas, including Libraries, 'debating the needs of the community and the way in which these needs can be met.' Authority was delegated to the relevant Strategic Director, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member, to progress consultation exercises at the earliest opportunity.

Legal background

4.5 Public libraries are a statutory service under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964. The Act requires library authorities to provide a 'comprehensive and efficient service' for people who live, work or study within the authority area, but the meaning of this term is not defined.

4.6 The government superintends library authorities' compliance with their duties under the Act. If he receives a complaint that an authority is failing to deliver a comprehensive and efficient service the Secretary of State can order an enquiry, and if the complaint is upheld he can require the authority to take remedial action.

4.7 A precedent dating back to the enquiry in 2009 into library closures proposed by Wirral Council indicates that major changes to an authority's service delivery model

must be made in the context of a strategic review that is in turn informed by a needs assessment. This precedent has been reinforced more recently in written comments by the Secretary of State, and by several High Court judgments. It is argued that only through the strategic review / needs assessment process can an authority demonstrate that any proposal to fundamentally change the service delivery model would continue to secure the delivery of a comprehensive and efficient service.

4.8 A library authority is required to ensure the provision of a public library service in its area, but the legislation does not state a minimum number of libraries that must be provided. In 2014, Sheffield City Council proposed to reduce the number of libraries from which it operated from 26 to 12. Campaigners referred this proposal to the Secretary of State, arguing that the library service would no longer be comprehensive and efficient. The Secretary of State disagreed, a Ministerial letter quoting relevant High Court judgments in 2011 (London Borough of Brent and Gloucestershire County Council) and 2014 (Lincolnshire County Council), that the meaning of 'comprehensive and efficient' is to be interpreted in the context of the availability of resources, and that a comprehensive service cannot mean that every resident lives close to a library.

4.9 Events in Sheffield, and in other councils up and down the country, indicate that there is significant scope for Derby to make major changes to its library service while still remaining legally compliant. However it is also clear that the Council needs to base any decisions on a robust strategic review which includes a comprehensive needs assessment drawing on extensive and inclusive consultation. Failure to do this risks intervention by the Secretary of State under the Public Libraries and Museums Act.

Libraries Strategic Review: proposed outcomes, objectives and schedule

4.10 Noting the Council's challenging financial position and the need to generate substantial savings through a transformation of the service delivery model, at a Cabinet Member Meeting on 8 September 2015 the Cabinet Member for Communities and City Centre Regeneration approved a recommendation that officers carry out a Libraries Strategic Review and Needs Assessment, including a comprehensive 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation exercise.

4.11 The intended outcomes of the Libraries Strategic Review are:

- clarity as to the role and purpose of Derby's Library Service

- agreement on and implementation of a legally compliant delivery model that will enable the Library Service to fulfil its role and purpose, and to be sustainable

- a contribution to corporate savings targets.

4.12 The key objectives of the Libraries Strategic Review are:

- To carry out an assessment of Derby's public library needs through a combination of desk research and public / stakeholder consultation.

- To explore strategies for reducing the net cost of the Library Service. These include, but are not limited to:
  o increased engagement with volunteers, including through support for the creation of Community Managed Libraries.

- o deployment of innovative technology.
- o shared and/or more effective use of library buildings.
- o reducing the number of Council operated public libraries in Derby.
- To agree a vision and service offer for the Library Service.
- To recommend an affordable service delivery model (physical, extramural and digital) and staffing structure that is best able to deliver the vision and service offer.
- To undertake public / stakeholder consultation on the proposed service model, and to use this to identify any necessary adjustments before seeking final Cabinet approval.
- To implement the agreed service delivery model, thereby generating a reduction in operating costs.

4.13 The Libraries Strategic Review has been planned as a project with five distinct stages. The current report brings stage 3 to a conclusion and sets the scene for stage 4. The stages of the Review (dates amended) are as follows:

- **Stage 1**: Prepare for / launch project (July – September 2015).
- **Stage 2**: Gather information / assess needs, including a 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation, (September 2015 – March 2016).
- **Stage 3**: Formulate a range of alternative service delivery models, and identify a preferred option (March – July 2016). Seek Cabinet approval to consult on the options, (this report, August 2016).
- **Stage 4**: Carry out 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation on service delivery model options, lasting 12 weeks. Consider feedback, and make final determination of the proposed way forward (adjusted as necessary in the light of the feedback received). Complete full Equality Impact Assessment on the proposed way forward. Seek Cabinet approval of the proposed way forward.
- **Stage 5:** Implementation, to begin immediately following approval of the recommendations of the Stage 4 Cabinet paper.

Current service provision and performance

4.14 Derby has 15 libraries: the Central Library, the Local Studies and Family History Library and 13 neighbourhood lending libraries.

4.15 In accordance with the Public Libraries and Museums Act membership of Derby Libraries is available to anyone who lives, works or studies in the city. A longstanding reciprocal agreement between the Council and Derbyshire County Council enables holders of a county library ticket to borrow from city libraries, and vice versa. For licensing reasons this arrangement does not include the downloading of e-Books.

4.16 Data from the Library Management System indicates that there were 38,144 unique users of Derby's libraries during the period April 2015 to March 2016. This figure excludes any customers who neither borrowed books/audio books, nor used a library computer. Many used just one library in the city, but others used two or more.

4.17   During the calendar year 2015 a total of 653,000 item loans were made from Derby's libraries, excluding renewals and eBooks, and 717,000 visits to libraries were recorded. During the year to February 2016 there were 155,000 computer usage sessions, each session being 30 minutes in length.

4.18   In common with services across the country, use of Derby's libraries has fallen substantially in recent years. While this is partly due to changes in society that have reduced the appeal of the service for some groups of people, it is also likely that the budget cuts since 2010 have contributed significantly to the decline. Opening hour reductions of nearly a third, and a fall in spending on books of two-fifths, are certain to have reduced both the accessibility and attractiveness of the service.

4.19   Regardless of the MTFP savings target, falling usage on the scale experienced in recent years suggests the need for a fundamental review and reshaping of the service to ensure that it remains relevant and cost-effective.

---

5   'PHASE 1' CONSULTATION

Public and stakeholder consultation, November 2015 to February 2016

5.1   The 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation took place between 30 November 2015 and 19 February 2016. It was conducted for the Council by Enventure Research, an independent market research agency. The methodology that was employed combined quantitative and qualitative techniques, and was chosen in order to provide statistical validity, robustness and representativeness, and also depth of understanding.

5.2   The quantitative element of the consultation took the form of a paper and online survey. The survey was also available in Urdu, Punjabi and Polish online and in paper format. A paper format Large Print version was also available. The qualitative element involved a series of focus groups and in-depth telephone interviews.

5.3   The consultation enquired into four main areas:

- It sought more information on current library users and the services they use.

- It explored the importance to current library users of the book-lending and internet services.

- It invited comments on a draft service vision and statement of the core and supplementary service offers.

- It requested preliminary feedback on strategies that other councils have adopted to reduce the cost of their library services in response to budget pressures, strategies that might also be adopted in Derby.

5.4   Response to the consultation was outstanding, with a total of 4,990 questionnaires being completed. Most responses were received from adult library users. The final report on the consultation, prepared by Enventure Research on behalf of the Council, is given at Appendix 2.

Consultation headline results: library service points (see Appendix 2, pages 8-9)

5.5   Around half of respondents had used only one library in the past 12 months, with the proportions being highest at Spondon Library, Chellaston Library, and Allestree Library. Customers whose use is restricted to just one library are more likely to be disadvantaged if the Review leads to that library's closure.

5.6   Allenton Library, Derwent Library and the Central Library have the smallest proportions of users who use only that library. Customers whose use is not restricted to one library are less likely to be disadvantaged if the Review leads to that library's closure, unless the other service point(s) they use are also closed.

5.7   Derby Central Library, Allestree Library and Mickleover Library were the most preferred libraries amongst respondents. This implies that the closure of these libraries as a result of the Review would have an impact on the greatest number of people.

5.8   Derwent Library and Allenton Library were the least preferred libraries amongst respondents. This implies that the closure of these libraries as a result of the Review would have an impact on the smallest number of people.

5.9   There is a discrepancy between the proportion of respondents who use Derby Central Library (44%) and the proportion who said it was their preferred library (15%). This reflects the fact that a very large proportion (83%) also used at least one other library in the previous 12 months. Taken together, these facts raise interesting questions the role played by Central in the city's library service.

5.10   The majority of users choose their preferred library because it is close to home. Many walk there, making special visits and go at least once a month. This implies that if the Review leads to a library's closure, most of its users will need to travel further and possibly incur more cost if they want to access library services.

5.11   People's use of libraries will decrease if they can no longer access their preferred library. Nearly a quarter of respondents said they would stop using libraries altogether if they could not access their preferred library and almost a half would still use libraries but less often than they do now. Clearly, therefore, cost-saving solutions that prevent library closures will help maintain library usage – it cannot be assumed that if their preferred library closes, all users will simply redirect their custom to another one instead.

Consultation headline results: services and vision (see Appendix 2, pages 10-12)

5.12   Borrowing books is the most heavily used part of the Library Service and is overwhelmingly regarded as the most important service on offer.

5.13   Libraries play an important role in supporting the reading habits of their users, particularly those from ethnic minority backgrounds. Almost eight out of ten library borrowers would read less if they could not obtain reading materials from the library,

with almost half saying they would read a lot less. Almost six in ten respondents from a non-White ethnic background said it would mean they would read a lot less, a much larger proportion than respondents from a White ethnic background.

5.14 Taken together, paragraphs 5.12 and 5.13 suggest strongly that books and reading should be central to the Library Service offer, and should feature prominently in library promotion. Given that literacy is a fundamental life-skill and that libraries give everyone free access to books and reading the service is therefore adopting the promotional strapline 'everything begins with reading.'

5.15 Library computers and access to the internet are used by many, but are not as important to users as borrowing books.

5.16 The online library service is accessed by fewer than half of all respondents; older users are less likely to use the online service. More than half of survey respondents never read e-Books or e-Magazines, with usage being lowest amongst those aged over 65. Therefore, although online / digital services are an important component of the modern library service, they are not a replacement for the 'physical' offer.

5.17 The draft vision for the Library Service received overwhelming support. Almost 19 out of every 20 respondents agreed with the draft vision, with two thirds agreeing strongly. This vision is to 'improve life chances by encouraging reading, informal learning and digital access in a safe and welcoming environment.' It is therefore **recommended** that the Council formally adopts this statement as the vision for its Library Service.

5.18 Based on feedback received at various points during the consultation, it is **recommended** that the vision be expanded through the formal adoption of the following objectives for the Library Service:

- 'To promote reading and support literacy
- To promote and support digital inclusion
- To provide access to knowledge, information and learning opportunities
- To support people in improving their health and wellbeing
- To provide accessible, neutral and inspiring community spaces
- To encourage and support local people to take an active part in the delivery of their library service
- To ensure the library service is efficient and sustainable:'

Consultation headline results: cost saving options (see Appendix 2, pages 13-16)

5.19 The consultation invited feedback on four strategies other councils have adopted to reduce the cost of their library service. Respondents we are asked say if they supported or rejected each strategy. The responses are summarised in the following table:

Cost saving strategy	Support	Reject	Don't know
Share accommodation with other service providers (move Libraries into other Council buildings <u>or</u> move other Council services into Libraries)	55%	38%	7%
Transfer some libraries to community management, with Council providing some training, guidance and financial support	53%	38%	9%
Introduce 'unstaffed opening:' customers access locked library buildings using a swipe card and PIN. Relies on self-service (no staff on duty)	34%	59%	7%
Operate fewer libraries and close the remainder, increase opening hours of those that remain and increase investment in online services eg e-Books	28%	66%	7%

5.20 Sharing accommodation with other service providers was the cost savings strategy that attracted the most support. When, in another part of the questionnaire, the question was rephrased, 72% of respondents agreed with the statement that 'reducing costs by sharing accommodation with other services is acceptable to me.' Sharing accommodation was a clear favourite amongst focus group and interview participants, who also observed that for this to work the service with which accommodation is shared would need to be a good fit with libraries and be able to work alongside them. It should be a service that is widely used and in demand.

5.21 However, there were a few concerns raised in regards to sharing accommodation with other services, such a loss of space for books and other resources, people having to travel further to their local library if it moved elsewhere and the impact the other service(s) might have on the noise levels or people's safety.

5.22 Transferring some libraries to community management was also supported by more than half of all respondents. When a related question was asked in another part of the questionnaire, 56% of respondents agreed with the statement that 'the local community should take a more active role in running their local library.'

5.23 In the focus groups there was support from some quarters as people would rather see the libraries remain open than be closed and some felt there would be no shortage of volunteers. The latter point was borne out by responses to another question, which asked if respondents would be interested in volunteering if their local library were to be run by volunteers. A total of 871 people said they would be interested in volunteering, equivalent to 20% of respondents. However, interest in volunteering was not distributed evenly across the city: when analysed by 'preferred library' the number of potential volunteers varied between 140 for Mickleover and 2 for Derwent.

5.24 Focus groups also raised a number of concerns about Community Managed Libraries (CMLs). These included how to choose groups to run the libraries, the reliability of volunteers, and the loss of knowledge and skills of library staff. Most people thought it

could only work if volunteers or community groups worked alongside professional library staff who had the required qualifications, training and experience of the community and the service.

5.25 'Unstaffed opening time' had considerably more opponents than supporters. When, in another part of the questionnaire, this issue was approached from a different angle, 60% of respondents disagreed with the statement that 'I'd feel comfortable entering and using a library when there are no staff on duty.'

5.26 Discussion amongst focus group and interview participants revolved mainly around the absence of library staff and possible consequences for people's safety, vandalism, theft and inappropriate use of computer facilities. Concern was expressed that it would bring about the loss of a welcoming atmosphere and a reduction in access to knowledgeable staff. There was a general consensus that people would use the libraries less, particularly vulnerable people due to a feeling of insecurity.

5.27 Opening fewer libraries for longer and closing the remainder had the most opponents and the fewest supporters. Elsewhere in the questionnaire, answers to a related question indicated that 61% of respondents disagreed with the statement that 'I accept that the number of Council-run libraries may reduce, and am willing / able to travel further to visit one.' Disagreement was higher amongst the older age groups than the younger age groups, and amongst those who said they were disabled or had children.

5.28 Focus group and interview participants also discussed distance and transport issues that would affect people's ability to travel further to visit a library. There was a general consensus that this would have a negative effect for many, but particularly those who were elderly and disabled, and those who relied on public transport. There was also a feeling that some people, particularly older people, go to the library primarily for the social aspect, and so could miss out on seeing their friends and feeling part of a community.

5.29 It is clear from the consultation responses that most library users do not want to see a reduction in the number of libraries in Derby, even if those remaining were open longer and supplemented by more online provision. The majority of respondents were willing to accept other strategies to save costs, as long as they keep libraries open. However one strategy was deemed unacceptable: unstaffed opening appears particularly unpopular and would ultimately reduce access to and use of library services. On the other hand, CMLs and shared premises both enjoy majority support, and it is evident from the consultation that these are the cost savings options that most users would like the Council to explore further.

6   DEVELOPING A NEW SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

Needs assessment

6.1 The precedent of the Wirral Inquiry in 2009 established that major changes to an authority's service delivery model must be made in the context of a strategic review that is in turn informed by a needs assessment. The Council has therefore embarked upon a rigorous needs assessment process to assist it in scoping out the service it

should provide under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964.

6.2   There is no standard methodology for carrying out a libraries needs assessment, no right or wrong way to do it. Monitoring of what has happened in other parts of the country suggests there is considerable scope for any council to shape a libraries needs assessment according to local circumstances. This is confirmed by a letter from the Minister of State to the Leader of Sheffield City Council in March 2015 in which he wrote '[the Secretary of State] recognises that it is for SCC [Sheffield City Council], as the democratically accountable local representatives, to make the required value judgements with regard to the needs assessment for its library service and these are within the proper bounds of SCC's discretion.'

6.3   It is difficult to imagine any methodology that could measure, in the context of the Council's statutory duty, the *absolute* level of need for a specific library, particularly given the lack of a clear definition of 'need' as well as the vagueness of the terminology used in the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964. Moreover the High Court has made it clear that a 'comprehensive and efficient service' is, in itself, not an absolute concept, but rather must be understood in the context of the budget available (see paragraph 4.8).

6.4   Instead, a methodology has been employed that enables the *relative* need for each of Derby's lending libraries to be established. This has made it possible to rank those libraries according to the relative need for them, creating a framework for decisions about which libraries are retained within the Council's statutory offer.

6.5   The needs assessment has three components, as follows:

- Socio-economic profile of library catchments
- Library performance (levels of usage / "busy-ness")
- Library location.

6.6   Before the needs assessment could begin it was necessary to define library catchment areas. This was done using information taken from a customer survey in 2013. A number of approaches were trialled, and it was concluded that basing catchments on the 85th percentile of Derby residents produced the most useful results. In other words a circle was drawn, centred on each library building, of sufficient radius to enclose the addresses of 85% of its users resident in the city.

6.7   The socio-economic profile component of the needs assessment was calculated by drawing on the following seven data-sets:

- Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD) average score – rank
- Index of Deprivation Affecting Children Index 2015 (IDACI) average score – rate
- Percentage of population aged16-64 claiming Job Seekers Allowance, January 2016
- Percentage of the working age population claiming Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) / Incapacity benefits, May 2015

- Percentage of people aged 16+ with no qualifications, 2011
- Percentage of Key Stage 4 pupils achieving 5+ GCSE passes at grades A* - C, 2014-15
- Percentage of young people Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs), August 2015

6.8 For each data-set the library catchments were ranked from 1 (the most deprived / disadvantaged catchment) to 14 (the least deprived / disadvantaged catchment). Adding together the seven ranks for each library catchment gives an overarching score for each. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the socio-economic component of the needs assessment, beginning with the most deprived / disadvantaged (lowest score).

6.9 The ranking thus generated for the socio-economic profile component of the needs assessment was as follows:

1	Pear Tree
2	Allenton
3	Derwent
4	Mackworth
5	Alvaston
6	Central
7	Sinfin
8	Chaddesden
9	Blagreaves
10	Spondon
10	Springwood
12	Chellaston
13	Mickleover
14	Allestree

6.10 The library performance component of the needs assessment comprises the following four data-sets:

- Visitor count, 2015
- Items borrowed, 2015
- Use of library computers (30 minute sessions), February 2015 to January 2016
- Number of individual users, 2015, based on usage of their library tickets to borrow books or use a computer.

6.11 For each data-set the libraries were ranked from 1 (the busiest / most used library) to 14 (the least used library). Adding together the four ranks for each library gives an overarching score for each. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the library performance component of the needs assessment, beginning with the most heavily used (lowest score).

6.12 The ranking thus generated for the library performance component of the needs assessment was as follows:

1	Central
2	Mickleover
3	Pear Tree
4	Allestree
4	Alvaston
6	Sinfin
7	Blagreaves
8	Chellaston
9	Chaddesden
9	Spondon
11	Mackworth
12	Allenton
12	Springwood
14	Derwent

6.13 The library location component of the needs assessment comprises the following two data-sets:

- The proportion of a library's catchment area that does not overlap with that of any other library.

- The percentage of users of each library who do not use any other library, as determined by the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation.

6.14 For each data-set the libraries were ranked from 1 (the library with the most discrete catchment / user-base) to 14 (the library with the least discrete catchment / user-base). Adding together the two ranks for each library gives an overarching score for each. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the library location component of the needs assessment, beginning with the library with the most discrete catchment / user-base (lowest score).

6.15 The ranking thus generated for the library location component of the needs assessment was as follows:

1	Spondon
2	Chellaston
3	Mickleover
4	Alvaston
5	Springwood
6	Allestree
7	Chaddesden
8	Blagreaves
8	Central
10	Pear Tree
10	Sinfin
12	Allenton
12	Mackworth

14	Derwent

6.16 Having ranked libraries according to each of the three components, a simple (un-weighted) overall needs assessment ranking can be achieved by adding the three component scores together and ranking the libraries again in order of their aggregate score, from lowest to highest. The combined needs assessment ranking thus generated is as follows:

1	Alvaston
2	Pear Tree
3	Central
4	Mickleover
5	Spondon
6	Chellaston
7	Sinfin
8	Chaddesden
9	Blagreaves
10	Allestree
11	Allenton
12	Mackworth
13	Springwood
14	Derwent

6.17 However a more sophisticated approach to the needs assessment ranking is possible, one that gives some priority to those libraries that have the greatest potential to deliver a positive outcome for local communities. This is achieved by double-weighting the socio-economic profile component.

6.18 Applying a weighting in this way gives some priority to libraries in areas with higher levels of material and social deprivation, on the basis that residents of these areas are likely to benefit the most from library services that are free at the point of delivery and are less likely to be able to afford to travel to libraries in other parts of the city. This approach is in line with the Council's priority outcome of Enabling Individuals and Communities by trying 'to close the gap for economic and social inequalities within Derby'.

6.19 Having double-weighted the socio-economic profile score, a final score for each library was generated by adding together the scores for the three needs assessment components, with libraries ranked in order from lowest to highest score. Where two or more libraries scored the same, they were placed in order of their score for the socio-economic profile component. This provided a final ranking of libraries from 1 (greatest need) to 14 (least need).

6.20   The final needs assessment ranking produced by this methodology is as follows:

1	Pear Tree
2	Alvaston
3	Central
4	Allenton
5	Sinfin
6	Spondon
7	Mackworth
8	Mickleover
9	Chaddesden
10	Blagreaves
11	Chellaston
12	Derwent
13	Springwood
14	Allestree

6.21   Cabinet is **recommended** to approve the needs assessment ranking shown in paragraph 6.20, and methodology from which it is derived including the double weighting of the socio-economic component (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.19).

6.22   The table shown in paragraph 6.20 is an indication of relative need. Given that the starting point for the Libraries Strategic Review is that the budget will be insufficient for things to carry on as they are, a decision is needed on 'where to draw the line', with only the libraries above the line in this table remaining part of the Council's statutory offer. Factors informing this decision will be the budget available and judgments on the comprehensiveness of the total offer that is being proposed. This process has enabled the identification of four distinct options for a future service delivery model (described below, beginning paragraph 7.1), which will be subject to further public and stakeholder consultation.

6.23   Appendix 3 provides more information about the needs assessment process, including details of the thirteen data-sets that have been used. The Appendix shows how each library was ranked against each data-set.

6.24   As a specialist research library, the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library is not susceptible to the ranking / scoring methodology described above. A decision about whether or not to retain it within the Council's statutory offer must therefore be made on other grounds.

6.25   Local Studies is a unique resource, a vast and expanding collection documenting the growth, development and achievements of Derby and its people over the centuries. It is the storehouse of the city's memories, recording stories of the people and events that have made Derby what it is today. It is previous Derbeians' legacy to us, and our legacy to future generations. We all have a stake in this library. For all these reasons Cabinet is therefore **recommended** to support the proposal that the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library be included within the Council's statutory offer.

Library provision in the city centre

6.26 The Central Library is the busiest in the city. The core of the building dates back to the opening of the library in 1879. It is of some architectural merit, and is Grade 2 listed.

6.27 Central is, however, a library that is struggling to live up to 21st century expectations. The spaces available are inflexible. It is a difficult building in which to work and from which to deliver a modern public service. Central's name belies its location: it can no longer be described as truly central, the city centre having shifted towards the south. Footfall on the Strand / Wardwick is relatively low, and perhaps because of this the library has in recent years attracted increasing numbers of disruptive users. As a result a constant security presence is needed. This increases costs, but may not be sufficient to reassure traditional library users who have witnessed unsettling incidents.

6.28 The Central Library is also expensive to operate and to maintain, and yet is open just 33 hours every week. At a time when budgets are under intense pressure it must be questioned whether the current arrangement is the most appropriate for delivering a library service in the city centre. With this in mind a feasibility study has been undertaken into delivering a city centre library service from the ground floor of the Council House.

6.29 The Council House has a number of things in its favour as a city centre location for library services. It is well located, close to the bus station, Intu and the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library. The Council House itself generates significant footfall, and many visitors to it fit the profile of people who use or could benefit from library services. It offers the prospect of a modern, comfortable library environment, contrasting starkly with the tired and inflexible interior of Central. Locating a library within the Council House offers the prospect of integrating the service more directly with wider Council priorities, and of developing new, shared ways of working. A number of respondents to the 'phase 1' consultation suggested the development of library cafés, and the proximity of *Relish* would constitute a positive response to this aspiration at a city centre library.

6.30 A Stage 1 feasibility study undertaken on behalf of the Council has identified an area of 400 square metres on the ground floor of the Council House, incorporating part of the customer management area closest to *Relish*, some meeting rooms and some staff accommodation that could be re-purposed as a library. A single, open plan area is envisaged incorporating six zones flowing into one another:

- Adults' books zone
- Children's area
- Teen zone
- Public access computer zone
- Information and study area
- Self-service zone

6.31 The estimated costs for redeveloping the ground floor of the Council House including the provision of a public library are in the region of £1.7m. A full business case will need to be prepared and approved by Cabinet, and results of the phase 2 consultation considered carefully, before the proposed Council House library project can go ahead.

6.32 Given that the floor area available at the Council House will be less than at Central the service envisaged from it would be very different. With this in mind it the title 'Central Library' would be dropped in favour of 'Derby Riverside Library'.

6.33 The reduced floor area at Riverside, when compared with the current Central Library, would mean less space for books. The stock would focus on material for which demand is greatest, primarily fiction and some recreational non-fiction. Lending stock would be actively managed: every book would have to earn its place on the Riverside Library shelves. Alternative arrangements would be made to accommodate material that deserves a place in city library stock but which is borrowed too infrequently to merit being held on the open shelves at Riverside (see paragraph 6.37).

6.34 Riverside would be built around self-service. Staff would be on hand to assist users unfamiliar or lacking confidence with self-service technology, but would also spend a lot of their time delivering / supporting activities – for example rhyme-times and job clubs – and providing support with IT, for example in relation to completing applications for Universal Credit. Staff time spent on 'traditional' library routines would be kept to an absolute minimum, with the focus being on activities that add value.

6.35 Adopting the approach described here, and taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by an environment that has been designed with modern customer service in mind would make it possible to substantially increase library opening hours in the city centre while reducing costs. Current thinking is that Riverside's opening hours would be 55% above Central's, while its staffing level would be around 53% less.

6.36 Riverside offers the opportunity to transform lending library services in the city centre, in line with the Council's priority outcomes of Delivering our Services Differently and Making the Most of our Assets. The 'phase 1' consultation showed that a majority of respondents were in favour of reducing costs by delivering library services from shared accommodation. Cabinet is therefore **recommended** to support in principle the proposal, subject to approval of a detailed business case and consideration of feedback from the 'phase 2 consultation', to relocate city centre lending library services from the Central Library to Derby Riverside Library on the ground floor of the Council House.

6.37 It has been explained in paragraph 6.33 that Riverside would lack the breadth and depth of stock currently available on the shelves of the Central Library. This would inevitably cause dissatisfaction to some existing users of Central. To mitigate their concerns a supplementary collection could be maintained off-site at Blagreaves Lane, on rolling stacks currently occupied by the Derby / Derbyshire Joint Fiction Reserve. The reserve dates back decades, to the time when Derby's library service was run from Matlock. Officers would consult with colleagues from the County Council to agree a process for slimming down this reserve to make space for the new off-site supplementary collection. Stock in the off-site collection could be reserved ('held')

online and delivered to Riverside – or any other library in the city – within 48 hours. Cabinet is therefore **recommended,** subject to the Riverside Library project going ahead, to support the proposal to maintain a supplementary off-site stock collection at Blagreaves Lane Library, on rolling stacks currently occupied by the Derby / Derbyshire Joint Fiction Reserve, and the slimming down of the current Fiction Reserve to accommodate it.

6.38   There is currently a small charge to reserve ('hold') items not immediately available on library shelves, and current heavy / specialist users of Central could legitimately complain that in the future they may have to pay to hold items that they would previously have found on the library shelves because the shelf stock at Riverside would be much smaller than that at Central. To mitigate this objection it is proposed that each library member with a City Council ticket be entitled (initially) to 12 free holds per year. Administration of this offer would be relatively simple, and the terms could be re-considered annually during the normal charges review.

6.39   Having relocated the library service to Riverside, the Council would then be in a position to consider the future of the Central Library building. This will form part of the business case referred to in paragraph 6.31.

6.40   In making the Central Library building available for other purposes it will be necessary to clear the basement. Much of the 'reserve' stock there has not been used for many years and it is proposed that this would be sold or otherwise disposed of as appropriate. Items of continuing value to library users would be transferred to the proposed off-site supplementary collection at Blagreaves.

6.41   Two small collections belonging to local societies have been stored free of charge in the Central basement for several decades. This historic arrangement is unsustainable, and in the event of the Riverside proposal going ahead the collections' owners would be given notice that they should find an alternative home for their material.

Community Managed Libraries

6.42   While recognising that it can no longer afford to run all 15 of its libraries, the Council's aspiration is that no library in the city should be forced to close. Passing some libraries over to community management is potentially a way of avoiding library closures, while simultaneously empowering local residents. Over recent years many other councils have supported the creation of Community Managed Libraries (CMLs) as an alternative to library closures.

6.43   The 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation suggests that adopting a similar strategy in Derby in order to avoid library closures enjoys net support amongst respondents (see paragraphs 5.19 and 5.22). Doing so would also be in line with the Council's priority outcomes of Delivering Services Differently and Enabling Individuals and Communities.

6.44   CMLs are not, however, a magic bullet that will eliminate the prospect of library closures in Derby. Setting them up is challenging, and keeping them going requires from volunteers a long term time commitment as well as organisational and

fundraising ability. Experience from other councils shows that initial enthusiasm for them does not always translate into action once the challenges inherent in their establishment and operation become apparent. It is also clear that the required social capital is not distributed evenly, and that CMLs are far more likely to succeed in some areas than others.

6.45   In order to encourage CMLs to get off the ground and then thrive, most councils have offered some form of support to groups willing to run their local libraries. Without such support, the prospects for establishing successful CMLs in Derby are slim. Cabinet is therefore **recommended** to support the proposal that if the Council adopts CMLs as part of its strategy for the future of the Library Service in Derby, a financial and in-kind support package be provided to assist in their establishment and sustainability. The precise details of that package, and allocation of available resources between CMLs, would be determined later in the Review. Options B and D, described later in this report, each assume the existence of a support package.

6.46   A finalised package to support some libraries to transition from Council-run to community-managed would most likely comprise four elements:

- A financial grant

- Creation of an in-house Community Libraries Development Team

- Specialist, time-limited external support to assist groups in setting themselves up to take over the running of their local libraries

- Access to a version of the Library Management (computer) System tailored for the use of volunteers, and to broadband connectivity.

6.47   The financial grant would be available to help cover a CMLs running costs, and to provide some funding for the purchase of new books. The costing of Options B and D assumes the availability of a sum of money for this purpose. The mechanism for determining how that funding would be allocated between CMLs is still under development, but the factors likely to be taken into consideration include premises costs, the size of a library's stock and the number of items borrowed from it, and the likely ability of local groups to be able to raise additional funds themselves.

6.48   In order to access a grant, community groups would be required to sign a Service Levels Agreement which would set out clearly the responsibilities of both parties. More work will be done to develop a draft SLA during summer and autumn 2016.

6.49   The Community Library Development Team would provide training and advice on the operational, legal and technical aspects of delivering a library service. It would also act as the interface between groups and Library / other Council employees, to help them identify the right person to talk to about a particular issue or problem.

6.50   The third element of the package would be specialist input from an organisation outside the Council that has experience of supporting the establishment of similar community-run libraries elsewhere in the country. This support would be time-limited, focusing on providing help for groups setting themselves up and preparing to take over the running of a library.

6.51 The Library Management System (LMS) is an application that is essential for efficient library operations. A cut-down version could be provided, offering CMLs access to business-critical functionality while ensuring compliance with data security legislation.

6.52 The working assumption is that CMLs would operate out of existing library buildings and the Council would be responsible for their maintenance. A sum would be set aside from the current Libraries' budget to help cover the costs incurred by the Property Design and Maintenance department. However the sum available would not be sufficient to cover all costs, meaning that CMLs would continue be a pressure on that department's budgets.

6.53 The Council is willing to consider alternative ways of delivering CMLs. These could include, for example, groups delivering services out of other local premises rather than from existing library buildings. Asset transfer could also be considered, whereby groups would take over full responsibility for existing library buildings. The costs and benefits of the various approaches would have to be considered carefully before any final decision were made to implement CMLs as part of the Council's strategy for library services in the city. Views on this issue will be invited as part of the 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation scheduled for autumn 2016.

6.54 Some councils have incorporated CMLs within their statutory offer. This appears to mean that if a CML fails those councils will have to step in to support them, as not doing so would put them in breach of their self-designated statutory duty. Alternatively they would have to go through the process of revising their statutory offer. For the Council to designate any CMLs in Derby as part of its statutory offer appears unwise given its very challenging financial circumstances. It is therefore **recommended** that if, as part of the proposal, any CMLs are established in Derby, Cabinet supports the proposal principle that they be deemed to be outside the Council's statutory offer.

6.55 Excluding CMLs from the statutory offer means that if one should fail the Council would be under no obligation to take it over and run it. It may also be inferred from the a Ministerial letter to the leader of Sheffield City Council in March 2015 that if CMLs are excluded from the statutory offer the Secretary of State will disregard them if asked to make a decision on whether or not Derby's library service complies with the requirements of the Public Libraries and Museums Act.

The new service delivery model: core elements common to all four options

6.56 Having considered carefully the feedback from the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation and the results of the needs assessment in the context of the Council's overall budget situation, four versions of a service delivery model have been developed. This section describes the elements that are common to all four options.

6.57 Council-run lending libraries will stock a wide range of books and audio books to borrow, suitable for all ages and a variety of interests. Stock immediately available in libraries will be supported by a supplementary collection maintained off-site at Blagreaves Lane. A 'holds' (click and collect) service will be provided to enable users to request and reserve items not immediately available on the shelves. Experienced and enthusiastic staff will provide a range of events and activities to support literacy,

22

encourage reading and promote a love of books.

6.58   The Derby Local Studies and Family History Library will maintain and develop its vast collection of printed, manuscript, photographic and electronic resources about the history of the city and the lives of its inhabitants. Expert staff will assist customers to find and use the resources they need, and will deliver events, activities and courses for people interested in local and family history. Working with volunteers, the library will continue its project to digitise a range of the most interesting resources in its collection.

6.59   Council-run libraries will provide free access to the internet and free Wi-Fi. Staff will be available to help support users unfamiliar with the technology, and will offer occasional internet taster sessions.

6.60   All Council-run libraries will provide support for learners, and people seeking information but unsure where to find it. The nature of this support is likely to change over time, but could include, for example, job clubs, code clubs and homework clubs.

6.61   The Home Library Service will provide doorstep deliveries of books and audio books for elderly / disabled people unable to visit a library in person.

6.62   The Council's buildings-based offer will be supplemented by Derby Libraries Online, which includes 24/7 access to the library catalogue, selected e-Books, e-Audiobooks and e-Reference sources, and a selection of digitised content from the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library.

6.63   Cabinet is **recommended** to agree the proposals for the core elements common to all four service delivery model options, as outlined in paragraphs 6.56 to 6.62.

7	OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE SHAPE OF DERBY'S LIBRARY SERVICE

Option A

7.1   Four options have been developed in respect of the number libraries to be run by the Council and their opening hours, together with the level of support – if any – for CMLs. In Option A, resources would be targeted at the three lending libraries where identified service need is greatest, plus the Local Studies Library. The libraries that would be part of the Council's statutory offer under Option A are therefore as follows:

Library	Proposed weekly hours	Current weekly hours
Alvaston	43	26 [1]
Local Studies	32	26
Pear Tree	43	26 [1]
Riverside	51	33 [2]
Total	*169*	*111*

[1] Current weekly hours exclude temporary additional hours funded through Livewell
[2] Current hours at Derby Central Library

7.2 In all four libraries the new opening hours would be substantially above the current, permanently funded hours. Riverside Library would be open six full days per week, including all day Saturday, from 8.30 to 5.00. Alvaston and Pear Tree would both be open five and a half days per week, including all day Saturday. Pear Tree would open on Sunday afternoons, between 1.00 and 5.00, the first time that any Derby library has opened on a Sunday. Local Studies would open six days per week, including three full days.

7.3 The driving force behind Option A is to maximise the financial saving available to the Council, while making intensive use of those libraries that it continues to run. To achieve this no financial or in-kind support would be provided to aid the creation or operation of CMLs. Implementation of Option A would therefore likely result in the closure of the following libraries: Allenton, Allestree, Blagreaves, Chaddesden, Chellaston, Derwent, Mackworth, Mickleover, Sinfin, Spondon and Springwood.

7.4 The building of Allenton (2009), Chellaston and Mackworth Libraries (both 2010) was funded by a £2m grant the Big Lottery, with an expectation that the libraries would operate for a minimum of 20 years. The Big Lottery advises that in the event of these libraries closing before 20 years have elapsed it would seek 'to take back a proportion of the funding according to the time remaining on the asset liability period.'

7.5 Libraries' net MTFP savings target is £648k. However Option A would deliver full year savings of around £967k.

Option B

7.6 Option B retains the same four libraries with the same opening hours within the Council's statutory offer:

Library	Proposed weekly hours	Current weekly hours
Alvaston	43	26 [1]
Local Studies	32	26
Pear Tree	43	26 [1]
Riverside	51	33 [2]
Total	*169*	*111*

[1] *Current weekly hours exclude temporary additional hours funded through Livewell*
[2] *Current hours at Derby Central Library*

7.7 Option B differs from Option A in that it does not seek to exceed the Libraries MTFP savings target, leaving substantial resources to support the creation and operation of CMLs at the other 11 libraries. The support envisaged includes an average annual distribution grant per CML of around £17.5k and an in-house 2.5 FTE Community Managed Libraries Development Team. The distribution grant figure is an indicative average only; the actual level of grant that would be available to each library would vary. Potential grants to each library will, if appropriate, be calculated later in the Review based a number of factors such as those listed in paragraph 6.47.

7.8   Although the envisaged financial support package is generous, it would not cover all a library's existing running costs. In order to be sustainable CMLs would therefore need to reduce costs and/or raise additional income.

7.9   Option B therefore combines enhanced provision at those libraries for which the need is greatest with a strong commitment to CMLs across the rest of the city. It gives a guarantee of stability to those libraries in the Council's statutory offer, and generous levels of financial and in-kind support for CMLs to reduce the risk of closures. Option B would meet the Libraries' net MTFP savings target of £648k.

Option C

7.10 Option C seeks to maximise the number of libraries within the Council's statutory offer. Two thirds of Derby's existing libraries, ten service points in total, would be retained, as follows:

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	26
Allenton	20
Chaddesden	20
Local Studies	26
Mackworth	20
Mickleover	26
Pear Tree	26
Riverside	51
Sinfin	26
Spondon	26
Total	*267*

7.11 With the exception of the Riverside (formerly Central) Library, opening hours are equivalent to the current, permanent patterns. As a result, therefore, library buildings would continue to be used inefficiently. To help tackle this a post would be created within the establishment, part of whose remit would be to seek to increase opening hours through the direct involvement of local volunteers. The success of such an initiative is however far from certain.

7.12 In order to maximise the number of libraries in the Council's statutory offer, no financial or in-kind support would be provided to aid the creation or operation of CMLs. Implementation of Option C would likely result in the closure of the following libraries: Allestree, Blagreaves, Chellaston, Derwent, and Springwood.

7.13 Moreover, in order to balance budgets while retaining two-thirds of existing libraries, a further reduction to the bookfund of over £50k would be required over and above reductions already built into the costing methodology. Therefore, although Option C retains more libraries within the Council's offer, this would have a negative impact on the funding available to stock them.

7.14 The building of Chellaston Library in 2010 was funded by the Big Lottery. The grant for this part of a three-library project was in the region of £800k. The Big Lottery advises that in the event of closure in under 20 years from opening it would seek 'to take back a proportion of the funding according to the time remaining on the asset liability period.'

7.15 Option C would meet the Libraries' net MTFP savings target of £648k.

Option D

7.16 Option D seeks to balance the number of libraries retained within the Council's statutory offer with the need to provide some financial support for those existing libraries not retained in that offer. The Council's statutory offer would therefore comprise the following eight libraries:

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	26
Allenton	20
Local Studies	26
Mackworth	20
Pear Tree	26
Riverside	51
Sinfin	26
Spondon	26
Total	*221*

7.17 As with Option C, the limited opening hours would mean that library buildings would not be used to their full potential. Again a post would be created within the establishment, part of whose remit would be to seek to increase opening hours through the direct involvement of local volunteers, but once more without any certainty of success.

7.18 Option D includes a package to support the creation and operation of CMLs at the 7 other libraries, although this is significantly less generous than that contained within Option B. The support envisaged includes an average annual distribution grant per CML of around £10k and an in-house 1.5 FTE Community Managed Libraries Development Team. The distribution grant figure is an indicative average only; the actual level of grant that would be available to each library would vary. Potential grants to each library will, if appropriate, be calculated later in the Review based a number of factors such as those listed in paragraph 6.47. Option D would meet the Libraries' net MTFP savings target of £648k.

Preferred option

7.19 Appendix 4 provides a simple, one page comparison of the four options for the new service delivery model.

7.20 Option A has been developed in response to the Council's very challenging financial circumstances. If implemented it would, in one step, achieve the Libraries net MTFP savings target (£648k) and generate a surplus of around 49% (£319k) which would make a welcome contribution towards addressing the Council's revenue budget pressure.

7.21 The Council's aspiration is that no library in the city should close. However Option A includes no support for the creation of CMLs, and its implementation would likely

result in the swift closure of all eleven libraries not retained within the Council's statutory offer: Allenton, Allestree, Blagreaves, Chaddesden, Chellaston, Derwent, Mackworth, Mickleover, Sinfin, Spondon and Springwood.

7.22   Under Option A around 75% of current users would see their 'preferred library' close. The 'phase 1' consultation indicated that 24% of all users would stop using libraries altogether if they could not access their preferred library, while another 47% would use libraries less. There would be a significant knock-on effect to customers' reading habits and their access to reading materials.

7.23   The consultation also shows that, in order to avoid closures, a majority of customers would prefer the Council to adopt innovative strategies, including supporting the creation of CMLs.

7.24   Although it is judged to be legally compliant Option A is not supported by the consultation's findings and condemns 79% of Derby's lending libraries to likely closure within months of a final decision being made. It is recognised that the Library Service may, in the future, have to find further savings over and above the current MTFP target; however all the other options do at least provide a breathing space to explore new, transformative ways of delivering the service and could thereby offer a long term future for more libraries. Option A is therefore *not* the preferred way forward for Derby's library service.

7.25   Option C proposes a statutory offer comprising ten libraries. However, like Option A, it offers no support for the creation of CMLs and, contrary to the Council's aspiration, would likely result in the swift closure of Allestree, Blagreaves, Chellaston, Derwent and Springwood libraries.

7.26   Under Option C, the guaranteed opening hours of nine out of the ten libraries retained would revert to the current, permanently funded-pattern.   Allenton, Chaddesden and Mackworth libraries would each open for just 20 hours per week, with the remaining service points opening for only 26 hours a week. This makes inefficient use of buildings with substantial fixed costs, and although attempts would be made to boost hours with the assistance of volunteers this project would be fraught with difficulties.

7.27   Option C also requires a further reduction to the bookfund, over and above reductions already built into the costing methodology. Therefore, although Option C retains more libraries within the Council's offer, this would have a negative impact on the funding available to stock them.

7.28   Furthermore Option C would not end uncertainty about the future of the ten libraries. Such is the difficulty of the Council's financial situation that the need to make further savings from Library Service budgets cannot be ruled out. There is no room for manoeuvre within the financing of Option C to be able to cope with this: a further review would be inevitable. Having already, in all probability, seen five libraries close, further closures – as well as further project costs – would most likely result from a second review.

7.29   Therefore, Option C would likely result in the closure of 36% of Derby's lending libraries while doing little to prepare the ground to deliver additional budget savings in

the future. Option C is therefore *not* the preferred way forward for Derby's library service.

7.30 Options B and D both have the potential to see all 15 libraries remain open, through a combination of Council-run libraries and CMLs. Avoiding library closures by investing in CMLs is in line with the findings of the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation.

7.31 However, Option D has some limitations. Like Option C, Option D would result in all but one of the libraries in its statutory offer being underused, with only limited prospects for increasing hours through the assistance of volunteers. Meanwhile the envisaged CML financial support package is significantly less generous, being less than 60% of what would be provided under Option B. This is an important point to note as the size and scope of the CML support package is likely be a determining factor in the future of libraries that the Council can no longer afford to run.

7.32 Additionally, some uncertainty would remain about the future of the eight libraries included in the Council's statutory offer. If further revenue budget savings are required it may only be possible to accommodate these through the undertaking and implementation of a further review, which would likely result in a reduction in the number of Council-run libraries.

7.33 Although apparently offering a positive way forward, Option D may deliver less than it promises if CMLs fail to materialise as intended and/or if further budget savings have to be identified. Option D is therefore *not* the preferred way forward for Derby's library service.

7.34 On balance, Option B appears to offer the best solution. It concentrates resources on a small number of libraries where the need is demonstrably greatest, and exploits those buildings to their full potential. Meanwhile it invests heavily in CMLs, maximising their chances of becoming established and thriving. As such Option B is the most robust version of the service delivery model, the version that offers the greatest resilience in the longer term for a much-loved service that may be confronted by demands for further budget savings. For these reasons *Option B is proposed as the preferred way forward* for Derby's library service.

7.35 Cabinet is **recommended** to note the four service delivery options described in this report.

7.36 Cabinet is **recommended** to agree that Option B be acknowledged within the proposed 'phase 2' consultation process as the Council's preferred option.

7.37 Cabinet is **recommended** to authorise a 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation' on the preferred service delivery option and the three other options described in this report, the consultation to also include the proposal to close the Central Library and deliver a replacement city centre lending service from Derby Riverside Library at the Council House and the working assumptions described in this report regarding the operation of CMLs.

Next steps

7.38 Subject to Cabinet's approval of the recommendation in paragraph 2.11, the details of which are more particularly set out in paragraph 7.37, a 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation exercise will be carried out in autumn 2016. The consultation will last for 12 weeks. It will seek feedback on each of the four options, and on the Central / Riverside Library proposal.

7.39 In anticipation of the possibility of CMLs becoming part of the Council's strategy for libraries in the city through the adoption of Options B or D, the consultation will invite respondents who think they might be interested in taking part in such an initiative to provide, without obligation, their contact details. It will also explore whether respondents think the proposals could be improved to increase the prospects of CMLs being successful.

7.40 Having considered carefully the 'phase 2' consultation feedback and adjusted the options as necessary in the light of it, a final determination will be made of the proposed way forward. This will be reported to Cabinet for consideration alongside a full Equality Impact Assessment.

7.41 If the proposed way forward includes the creation of CMLs, the Cabinet report will give details of the CML support package and the mechanism for inviting and evaluating formal expressions of interest from groups willing to take over the management of their local library.

7.42 A separate business case will be developed on the ground floor redevelopment in parallel with the activity outlined above and a cabinet report prepared on the options available and funding requirements of the scheme.

8 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

8.1 During the course of the Libraries Strategic Review four options for a new service delivery model have been developed and worked up in detail. All four are described in this report. Continuing to deliver the service in its current form is not an option given the scale of the budget challenge that the Council continues to face.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer	Olu Idowu, Head of Legal Services
Financial officer	Mandy Fletcher, Head of Finance
Human Resources officer	
Estates/Property officer	Phil Derbyshire, Head of Property Design and Maintenance
Service Director(s)	Claire Davenport, Director of Leisure, Culture and Tourism
Other(s)	Nick O'Reilly, Director of Digital Services
	Gordon Stirling, Director of Strategic Services and Organisational Development
	Ann Webster, Lead on Equality and Diversity
	Richard Boneham, Head of Governance & Assurance
	Adrian Jeffs, Health and Safety Team Leader

For more information contact:	David Potton 01332 641719 david.potton@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	None
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications
	Appendix 2 – Phase 1 Public and Stakeholder Consultation – Final Report
	Appendix 3 – Needs assessment – underlying data-sets and analysis
	Appendix 4 – New service delivery model – comparison of four options
	Appendix 5 – Interim assessment of the equalities implications of the four service delivery model options

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

1.1 The Council's financial position remains challenging. The Libraries Strategic Review and Needs Assessment is helping the Council determine whether, and if so how the service can make a further substantial contribution to corporate savings targets while still meeting its statutory obligations under the Public Libraries and Museums Act. The MTFP requires that £673k be saved from Libraries budgets, split between 2017/18 (£336k) and 2018/19 (£337k). However £25k of this saving has been achieved early so the saving for 2017/18 now stands at £311k. The potential savings on Libraries budgets achievable from each of the options are included in Appendix 4; calculations assume a 1% payrise in 2016/17, that salaries are costed at the penultimate Spinal Column Point and that no turnover levy is applied to budgets for frontline posts. There will be some additional savings in respect of cleaning costs; these will be shown in Facilities Management budgets.

1.2 The MTFP savings target assumes that the new service delivery model is fully implemented by the mid-point of the financial year 2017/18. Evidence from other councils suggests that this timescale is highly ambitious, particularly if CMLs are to be part of the strategy for the future of library services in Derby. Funding will be sought from the Delivering Differently budget to buy-in additional support for the project manager, and assistance will also be sought from members of the Delivering Differently Programme Team. However it must be recognised that community groups may move at different speeds in setting up CMLs, and the Council may therefore need to accept some delays in these being launched and consequent deferrals in revenue budget savings coming on-stream if either Option B or Option D is finally opted as the way forward.

1.3　In relation to the Central / Riverside Library proposal, the estimated cost of the ground floor redevelopment including the provision of a public library, based on the Stage 1 design proposals is in the region of £1.7m. As outlined in the report, a full business case will be prepared for consideration and approval by Cabinet. The costings underpinning the report – and therefore the calculation of potential savings – are based on the following assumptions, and will be reviewed when full business case is available...

- The capital cost of the project is met from the corporate capital reserve, without any recharge to Libraries' revenue budgets.
- The premises costs of operating Riverside Library out of the Council House are absorbed by the existing Council House budget, without any recharge to Libraries' revenue budgets.
- Libraries' budgets will absorb the cost of a security officer at the Council House during Riverside opening hours on Saturdays.
- Additional cleaning costs at the Council House resulting from the Riverside Library will be covered from savings that Facilities Management would make from no longer cleaning the Central Library.
- Holding costs for the Central Library, when it is vacated, will be covered from corporate budgets.

1.4　The building of Allenton, Chellaston and Mackworth Libraries was financed primarily through a grant of £2m from the Big Lottery. One of the grant conditions was that these libraries had to operate for at least 20 years; if they did not the Big Lottery would be able to seek claw back. The 20 year period ends in 2029 (Allenton) and 2030 (Chellaston and Mackworth). Interim advice from the Big Lottery indicates that if a community organisation takes over the running of a library with financial and/or in-kind support from the Council claw back may not be sought, subject to the Lottery having agreed to the Agreement that the Council would enter into with that organisation. In the event of a library closure the Big Lottery would look 'to take back a proportion of the funding according to the time remaining on the asset liability period.' Further discussions will be held with the Big Lottery to clarify these matters.

Legal

2.1　In carrying out the Libraries Strategic Review the Council must be mindful of its duties under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964. The Act requires the Council to provide a 'comprehensive and efficient' public library service, but the terms 'comprehensive and efficient' are not defined. However the Act specifically requires library authorities to provide, free of charge, access for people who live, work or study in their area, to borrow books or other material in line with their needs.

2.2　In carrying out the Libraries Strategic Review the Council must also be mindful of its duties under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This Section, known as the public sector equality duty, requires the Council, and Cabinet members as decision makers in particular, to have due regard to the needs to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected

characteristic and those who do not share it.

2.3 In light of the foregoing, a full Equalities Impact Assessment will be undertaken and published alongside the final proposals for the service delivery model that will be presented to Cabinet, following consultation, around the end of 2016. In the meantime an interim assessment of equalities implications of adopting the preferred model is given at Appendix 5.

2.4 Consultations undertaken as part of the Libraries Strategic Review must be carried out in good faith and with an open mind. The Council must not enter into such consultations having already pre-determined the outcome. It was this issue that led, in July 2014, to the High Court quashing Lincolnshire County Council's proposed changes to its library service. The judgment notes that while it is proper for an authority to have a preferred option and to consult on it, for the consultation to be meaningful the authority must be prepared to think again if those consulted are unhappy with the proposal and suggest a reasonable alternative. Ruling out such reasonable alternative, should that be the outcome of the decision making process, must therefore be capable of being objectively justified.

Personnel

3.1 The impact of each option on Libraries staffing structures and staffing levels will be slightly different. Current estimates of those impacts are as follows:

option	impact on FTEs	net impact on jobs
	%	no.
Option A	-42%	-47
Option B	-37%	-44
Option C	-28%	-25
Option D	-30%	-32

There will also be some impacts on Facilities Management (cleaning) staff.

3.2 Libraries have traditionally drawn heavily on relief workers to provide cover when front-staff are unavailable due to annual leave, sickness and training. These workers provide important flexibility, enabling the service to cope with staff absences at very short notice. However, in accordance with the commitments of the Employment Charter, the Libraries Strategic Review will seek to reduce reliance on these workers through the creation of a small number annualised hours posts that can be used across multiple sites.

IT

4.1 The availability of public access computers in libraries has the potential to support people who would otherwise be face disadvantage in the era of 'digital by default,' and is therefore in line with wider Council objectives. If Derby is to have fewer libraries in the future it is important to make the most of those that remain.

4.2 Libraries have the potential to act as drop in hubs for mobile Council employees, enabling them to quickly dock or access secure Wi-Fi without returning to the Council House. The impact on the space available for library customers would be modest. Costs can be explored during the course of the project.

4.3 If there is to be any IT link between CMLs and the Council's network it will be necessary to identify and implement the steps required to ensure PSN and PCI compliance. The Council's minimum expectations in relation to data security must be set out clearly, together with the steps that it will take if these expectations are not met. The project team will work closely with the Director of Digital Services and his team to identify the challenges and potential mitigations

4.4 There is a lead time to amend or terminate voice and data network connections to library buildings. Currently no savings are earmarked on the basis that even if the Council no longer operates some libraries, connectivity will be required by CMLs that

operate in place of them. This situation will be reviewed as the project proceeds.

4.5 For data security reasons CMLs cannot be given access to the full Library Management System. The practicalities of offering them access to a cut-down version of the system will be explored (if appropriate) with the system supplier and Digital Services colleagues. The operational impact on Council-run libraries will also be examined.

4.6 Before the Council's transfer of any hardware or software to CMLs it will need to check with suppliers if this is permitted within licence terms, and there may be some costs of novation. In most cases suppliers support this but one supplier (Oracle) does not and when the Museums Trust was established that meant they had to source a separate financial management system. These issues will be considered further during the course of the Review.

4.7 The IT suite at Sinfin Library supports the Council's emergency planning function by acting as the base for Secondary Gold Command. Option A would see the closure of Sinfin Library, meaning that new base would be required to fulfil that role. If Sinfin Library were to become a CML under Option B it could continue to host Secondary Gold Command, subject to this being clearly specified in the agreement between the Council and the CML. Options C and D would have no implications for Secondary Gold Command.

Equalities Impact

5.1 The Library Service is keen to make sure that the review captures the needs of Derby's diverse communities. The Head of Service worked closely with the Council's Lead on Equality and Diversity to ensure that members of these communities could take part in the 'phase 1' consultation process, advising on reasonable adjustments to the questionnaire. These included accessible versions in Large Print and particular languages.

5.2 Equality Impact Assessments will be produced, with the support of the Council's Lead on Equality and Diversity and the involvement of members of the Diversity Forum so that they are available for consideration prior to final determination. Meanwhile an interim assessment of equalities implications of the preferred model is given at Appendix 5.

Health and Safety

6.1 Handing over some libraries to community management may have implications for health and safety. The Council would retain some health and safety responsibilities for the volunteers operating from its premises and undertaking work on its behalf. Training and supervision will be important in transfer of management. There may also be implications in terms of property safety if, for example, asbestos checking and fire risk assessment work is not carried out correctly. Given its corporate landlord function the Council will need to determine the level of risk it is prepared to take in relation to CMLs.

Environmental Sustainability

7.1 The 'phase 1' consultation showed that most people prefer the library that is nearest to where they live, and many walk there. If the Review ultimately results in some libraries closing there could be an increase car journeys, or longer car journeys, by customers whose regular library has closed.

Property and Asset Management

8.1 The Library Service is delivered from 15 libraries across the city, the majority of which are in Council ownership. The level of running and building maintenance cost associated with the various libraries cannot form part of the consideration in the Libraries Strategic Review as these savings are already under consideration through the property rationalisation project and the reduction in the Property Design and Maintenance budget. If the Strategic Review succeeds in delivering substantial additional budget savings there are likely to be significant property and asset management implications, the details of which will be determined during the course of the project.

8.2 The following table sets out the average spends for the libraries consideration under property rationalisation. The actual spends for maintenance in 2014/15 are identified which are lower than the average spend as the council implements a regime of essential maintenance only.

	2011-2014 Average Planned/Reactive maintenance including Revenue Projects	2014/2015 Planned/Reactive maintenance
Allenton Library (part of Allen Park Centre)	-	Part of Allen Park Adult Centre
Allestree Library	£7,782.98	£8,223.49
Alvaston Library	£11,289.99	£7,837.81
Blagreaves Library	£12,405.99	£9,682.75
Central Library	£20,736.71	£17,209.98
Chaddesden Library	-	£5,006.77
Chellaston Library	£2,963.51	£5,044.44
Derwent Library	£61.20	£88.00
Local Studies Library	-	Part of Riverside no costs attributed directly to LSL
Mackworth Library	£2,780.48	£4,760.75
Mickleover Library	£5,450.62	£5,047.36
Pear Tree Library	£24,015.04	£7,221.43
Sinfin Library	£11,456.42	£4,762.96
Spondon Library	£3,950.10	£2,253.07
Springwood Library (part of Springwood Leisure Centre)		No costs identified as attributed to the Library
Total	**£102,893.04**	**£77,138.81**

8.3   Options A and C would reduce the number of Council-owned library buildings, thereby also reducing the pressure on corporate property maintenance budgets.

8.4   Options B and D assume that libraries not directly operated by the Council would be run by communities as CMLs. The working assumption currently underlying the costing of these options is that the Council would continue to maintain the CML buildings that it owns. Project costings assume that a sum is earmarked and set aside from Libraries' budgets to help cover those maintenance costs. However that sum available would be insufficient to cover all costs, and the buildings from which CMLs operate would therefore continue to be a drain on property maintenance budgets.

8.5   If a CML is delivered from a Council-owned building landlord responsibility will rest with the Council, which will need to re-assure itself that the management board is doing what it is required to do in relation to, for example, asbestos checks and fire risk assessments. There may be a temptation for CMLs to attempt to save money by cutting corners, in which case the Council would need to take action to protect its interests. This in turn could cause the CML to collapse, leaving the Council to decide whether it should step in to run the library or allow it to close. In either case the liability for property issues would pass back to the Council and put further strain on an already insufficient maintenance budget.

8.6   The Property Rationalisation project sets out to significantly reduce the number of building the Council owns and from which it delivers services. By retaining the buildings and the maintenance responsibilities on both CML and Council-run libraries it would be impossible, under Options B and D, to make the necessary property maintenance budget savings for any of these buildings apart from the Central Library. The property maintenance savings for the Central Library would be subject to leasing the building out with a full repairing lease or disposing of the asset through sale or asset transfer. Investigations are required to understand how the Central Library building could be operated in isolation to the adjoining Museum in relation to building services and fire evacuation.

8.7   The service delivery model that is ultimately chosen may affect insurance premiums and/or cover. This will be explored during the course of the project.

8.8   Blagreaves Lane Library is also the base for Home Library Service and the stock acquisitions and children's services teams, and houses the shared Derby / Derbyshire Joint Fiction Reserve. All options assume that the Council ceases to offer a publicly accessible library service from Blagreaves Lane; Options B and D assume that the community is invited to operate a CML there instead. However the building would continue to act as a base for the citywide functions described above, although the Joint Fiction Reserve would be largely superseded by an off-site supplementary stock collection stored on the same shelves linked to the closure of the Central Library and its replacement by Derby Riverside Library. These points are reflected in the calculation of potential savings, and in any calculation of the CML support grant available for Blagreaves under Options B and D.

8.9 The concept of Derby Riverside Library forms part of a wider proposal to transform and modernise the delivery of customer services in the Council House. The synergies between the various services and opportunities for closer working between them will be actively explored during the course of the project.

Risk Management and Safeguarding

9.1 Failure to carry out a robust strategic review informed by a comprehensive needs assessment would put the Council at risk of intervention by the Secretary of State as it would be unable to demonstrate that the Library Service will remain comprehensive and efficient. In seeking to manage this risk, officers have sought to learn from the experience of other authorities whose proposals for changes to their library services have been referred to the Secretary of State and/or the High Court.

9.2 Failure to adhere to Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 would place the Council at risk of Judicial Review. Several authorities have had their proposals for changes to library services referred to the High Court, and some of these challenges have been upheld because the councils' processes have contravened the Equality Act. In seeking to manage this risk, officers have sought to learn their experiences. The proposed Equality Impact Assesment, and transparent consideration of its produce will, alongside the other measures set out within the report, assist the Council in demonstrating its open-mindeness to alternative proposals.

9.3 Predetermining the outcome of the Strategic Review and failing to carry out consultations in good faith would also place the Council at risk of an adverse Judicial Review decision. In managing this risk, officers seek to learn from the experience of Lincolnshire CC.

9.4 Evidence from similar reviews by authorities up and down the country indicates that proposals for major changes to libraries services are highly sensitive, affecting the reputation of councils and the morale of their employees. While we cannot pre-judge the outcome of the Libraries Strategic Review, we can seek to manage this risk by committing the resources necessary to ensure that the project is thorough and inclusive, and by pro-actively managing communications to ensure that everyone potentially affected has access to information that is accurate, timely and easily understood, enabling them to participate in the consultation exercise.

9.5 The Riverside Library proposal is likely to be controversial, both with service users and with people who value the Central Library building for its architectural merit and its place in Derby's civic history. It will therefore be important to explain the thinking behind this element of the options, and in particular on how savings made on service delivery in the city centre can help secure the future of libraries in the neighbourhoods.

9.6 More than a year will elapse between the publication of this report and the implementation of a new service delivery model. Given the negative impact on jobs resulting from any of the options described in this report it is inevitable that many staff will begin looking for alternative employment, and this may affect the Council's ability to maintain service continuity over many months.

9.7 CMLs present a number of potential risks for the Council relating to, for example, its role as corporate landlord and the security of its data. It may also risk reputational damage by association if it is seen to be providing financial or in-kind support to a group whose service standards do not comply with legal requirements or Council values. If support for CMLs is to be part of the Council's strategy going forward a working group of senior officers will be established to determine the level of risk the Council is prepared to accept, to agree how it will manage that risk and to document its expectations. The group will also firm up the details of the financial and in-kind support package that the Council will offer to groups establishing CMLs, learning from best practice at other councils where appropriate. This will lead to the development of a draft Service Level Agreement.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

10.1 Through the network of library buildings, the services delivered and the resources made available to communities the Library Service contributes to the vision outlined in the Derby Plan 2030 to be a safe, strong and ambitious city.

10.2 Public libraries in Derby make a significant contribution to three of the Council's priority outcomes:
- Enabling Individuals and Communities
- Promoting Health and Well-being
- Raising Achievement and Skills.

10.3 Change is at the heart of the Libraries Strategic Review, which therefore aligns closely with the Council's priority outcome of Delivering our Services Differently. In particular, turning some of our service points into CMLs would transform the way library services are delivered in Derby. This would demonstrate commitment to the corporate priority outcome of Enabling Individuals and Communities which, the Council Plan 2016-2019 says 'may include the transfer of some key responsibilities back to our communities as the budget we have available to deliver services declines.'

10.4 Relocating the city centre lending library provision to the Council House and finding an alternative use for the existing Central Library building is in line the corporate priority outcome of Making the Most of our Assets.

Needs assessment – underlying data-sets and analysis

Defining library catchment areas

1   Before the needs assessment could begin it was necessary to define library catchment areas. This was using information taken from a customer survey in 2013. Several approaches were trialled, and it was concluded that basing catchments on the 85th percentile of Derby residents produced the most useful results. In other words a circle was drawn, centred on each library building, of sufficient radius to enclose the addresses of 85% of its users resident in the city.

2   Using this methodology the radius of each library's catchment area was calculated as follows:

Allenton	1.6	km	Allestree	1.5	km	Alvaston	1.5	km
Blagreaves	1.9	km	Central	3.9	km	Chaddesden	1.3	km
Chellaston	1.2	km	Derwent	1.3	km	Mackworth	1.1	km
Mickleover	1.7	km	Pear Tree	1.7	km	Sinfin	3.0	km
Spondon	1.1	km	Springwood	1.6	km			

Needs assessment component 1: socio-economic profile of library catchments

3   The socio-economic profile component of the needs assessment was calculated by drawing on the following seven data-sets –
  - Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD) average score – rank
  - Index of Deprivation Affecting Children Index 2015 (IDACI) average score – rate
  - Percentage of population aged16-64 claiming Job Seekers Allowance, January 2016
  - Percentage of the working age population claiming Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) / Incapacity benefits, May 2015
  - Percentage of people aged 16+ with no qualifications, 2011
  - Percentage of Key Stage 4 pupils achieving 5+ GCSE passes at grades A* - C, 2014-15
  - Percentage of young people Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs), August 2015

4   For each data-set the library catchments were ranked from 1 (the most deprived / disadvantaged catchment) to 14 (the least deprived / disadvantaged catchment). Each data-set and its ranking is shown in the tables below.

5   The ranking of library catchments based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD) average score (rank) was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Pear Tree	49.48	1
Allenton	41.63	2
Derwent	35.25	3
Alvaston	33.79	4
Central	31.74	5
Mackworth	31.24	6
Sinfin	30.42	7
Chaddesden	27.92	8
Blagreaves	27.10	9
Springwood	17.42	10
Spondon	17.04	11
Chellaston	10.73	12
Mickleover	7.12	13
Allestree	7.08	14

6   The ranking of library catchments based on the Index of Deprivation Affecting Children 2015 (IDACI) average score (rate) was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Allenton	0.381	1
Pear Tree	0.365	2
Derwent	0.320	3
Alvaston	0.294	4
Mackworth	0.291	5
Central	0.280	6
Sinfin	0.278	7
Blagreaves	0.244	8
Chaddesden	0.235	9
Spondon	0.155	10
Springwood	0.151	11
Chellaston	0.111	12
Mickleover	0.086	13
Allestree	0.060	14

7   The ranking of library catchments based the percentage of the population aged16-64 claiming Job Seekers Allowance, January 2016, was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Pear Tree	2.8	1
Allenton	2.0	2
Sinfin	1.9	3
Blagreaves	1.8	4
Central	1.8	4
Alvaston	1.6	6
Derwent	1.5	7
Chaddesden	1.4	8
Mackworth	1.2	9
Springwood	0.8	10
Chellaston	0.7	11
Spondon	0.7	11
Allestree	0.4	13
Mickleover	0.3	14

8   The ranking of library catchments based on percentage of the working age population claiming Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) / Incapacity benefits, May 2015 was calculated as follows:

	Index	**Rank**
Pear Tree	10.1	1
Derwent	9.5	2
Allenton	9.3	3
Alvaston	8.6	4
Mackworth	8.5	5
Chaddesden	8.0	6
Central	7.8	7
Sinfin	7.5	8
Blagreaves	6.9	9
Spondon	5.4	10
Springwood	5.3	11
Chellaston	3.6	12
Allestree	2.9	13
Mickleover	2.9	14

9   The ranking of library catchments based on the percentage of people aged 16+ with no qualifications, 2011, was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Allenton	31.7	1
Derwent	31.6	2
Mackworth	31.1	3
Pear Tree	30.9	4
Alvaston	30.3	5
Chaddesden	28.7	6
Sinfin	26.8	7
Central	24.8	8
Blagreaves	24.7	9
Spondon	23.9	10
Springwood	22.7	11
Mickleover	16.8	12
Allestree	15.9	13
Chellaston	15.4	14

10   The ranking of library catchments based on the percentage of Key Stage 4 pupils achieving 5+ GCSE passes at grades A* - C, 2014-15, was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Mackworth	32.3	1
Pear Tree	32.4	2
Derwent	34.4	3
Sinfin	37.9	4
Allenton	39.6	5
Alvaston	41.9	6
Central	43.2	7
Blagreaves	43.8	8
Chaddesden	45.6	9
Chellaston	51.9	10
Springwood	56.2	11
Mickleover	65.7	12
Spondon	71.6	13
Allestree	78.5	14

11   The ranking of library catchments based on the percentage of young people Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs), August 2015, was calculated as follows:

	Index	Rank
Mackworth	6.5	1
Pear Tree	5.6	2
Allenton	5.1	3
Alvaston	4.8	4
Central	4.4	5
Derwent	4.3	6
Chaddesden	4.2	7
Sinfin	3.8	8
Blagreaves	3.4	9
Mickleover	3.0	10
Spondon	2.9	11
Springwood	2.7	12
Chellaston	2.6	13
Allestree	0.7	14

12   Adding together the seven ranks for each library catchment produces an overarching score for each. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the socio-economic component of the needs assessment, beginning with the most deprived / disadvantaged (lowest score). This is shown in the following table.

	IMD	IDACI	JSA	ESA	no quals	KS4	NEETs	Total ranks	RANK OF RANKS
Pear Tree	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	13	1
Allenton	2	1	2	3	1	5	3	17	2
Derwent	3	3	7	2	2	3	6	26	3
Mackworth	6	5	9	5	3	1	1	30	4
Alvaston	4	4	6	4	5	6	4	33	5
Central	5	6	4	7	8	7	5	42	6
Sinfin	7	7	3	8	7	4	8	44	7
Chaddesden	8	9	8	6	6	9	7	53	8
Blagreaves	9	8	4	9	9	8	9	56	9
Spondon	11	10	11	10	10	13	11	76	10
Springwood	10	11	10	11	11	11	12	76	10
Chellaston	12	12	11	12	14	10	13	84	12
Mickleover	13	13	14	14	12	12	10	88	13
Allestree	14	14	13	13	13	14	14	95	14

Needs assessment component 2: library performance

13   The library performance component of the needs assessment comprises the following four data-sets:
- Visitor count, 2015
- Items borrowed, 2015
- Use of library computers (30 minute sessions), February 2015 to January 2016
- Number of individual users, 2015, based on usage of their library tickets to borrow books or use a computer.

14   For each data-set the libraries were ranked from 1 (the busiest / most used library) to 14 (the least used library). Each data-set and its ranking is shown in the tables below.

15   The ranking of libraries based on the 2015 visitor count was calculated as follows:

	count	rank
Central	203,189	1
Mickleover	66,836	2
Pear Tree	62,193	3
Allestree	55,223	4
Sinfin	52,665	5
Alvaston	52,158	6
Blagreaves	44,852	7
Spondon	33,395	8
Chaddesden	32,833	9
Chellaston	30,650	10
Derwent	21,638	11
Springwood	21,562	12
Allenton	18,343	13
Mackworth	12,901	14

16   The ranking of libraries based on the 2015 count of items borrowed was calculated as follows:

	count	rank
Central	142,218	1
Mickleover	78,533	2
Allestree	72,059	3
Alvaston	51,384	4
Blagreaves	46,049	5
Chellaston	43,335	6
Spondon	40,175	7
Pear Tree	38,370	8
Sinfin	37,158	9
Chaddesden	36,068	10
Springwood	27,331	11
Mackworth	18,263	12
Allenton	11,291	13
Derwent	11,246	14

17   The ranking of libraries based on the count of library computer sessions was
      calculated as follows:

	count	rank
Central	53,415	1
Pear Tree	21,439	2
Sinfin	19,598	3
Alvaston	17,604	4
Mackworth	6,407	5
Allestree	5,740	6
Mickleover	5,363	7
Allenton	5,271	8
Blagreaves	4,600	9
Chaddesden	4,548	10
Chellaston	4,373	11
Spondon	3,098	12
Springwood	2,396	13
Derwent	829	14

18   The ranking of libraries based on the number of individual library users was calculated
      as follows:

	count	rank
Central	15,707	1
Pear Tree	4,337	2
Mickleover	4,330	3
Alvaston	4,239	4
Allestree	3,801	5
Sinfin	3,418	6
Blagreaves	2,644	7
Chaddesden	2,621	8
Chellaston	2,547	9
Spondon	2,126	10
Springwood	1,605	11
Mackworth	1,411	12
Allenton	1,137	13
Derwent	672	14

19 Adding together the four ranks for each library produces a set of overarching scores. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the library performance component of the needs assessment, beginning with the most heavily used library (lowest score). This is shown in the following table

	Visits	Loans	PCs	Users	*Total ranks*	RANK OF RANKS
Central	1	1	1	1	*4*	**1**
Mickleover	2	2	7	3	*14*	**2**
Pear Tree	3	8	2	2	*15*	**3**
Allestree	4	3	6	5	*18*	**4**
Alvaston	6	4	4	4	*18*	**4**
Sinfin	5	9	3	6	*23*	**6**
Blagreaves	7	5	9	7	*28*	**7**
Chellaston	10	6	11	9	*36*	**8**
Chaddesden	9	10	10	8	*37*	**9**
Spondon	8	7	12	10	*37*	**9**
Mackworth	14	12	5	12	*43*	**11**
Allenton	13	13	8	13	*47*	**12**
Springwood	12	11	13	11	*47*	**12**
Derwent	11	14	14	14	*53*	**14**

Needs assessment component 3: library location

20 The library location component of the needs assessment comprises the following two data-sets –
   • The proportion of a library's catchment area that does not overlap with that of any other library
   • The percentage of users of each library who do not use any other library, as determined by the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation.

21 For each data-set the libraries are ranked from 1 (the library with the most discrete catchment / user base) to 14 (the library with the least discrete catchment / user base). Each data-set and its ranking is shown in the tables below.

22   The ranking based on the proportion of a library's catchment area that does not overlap with that of any other library was as follows:

	% catchment not overlapping	rank
Spondon	97	1
Chellaston	88	2
Mickleover	76	3
Alvaston	35	4
Springwood	26	5
Central	21	6
Allenton	14	7
Chaddesden	6	8
Sinfin	3	9
Allestree	2	10
Blagreaves	0	11
Derwent	0	11
Mackworth	0	11
Pear Tree	0	11

23   The ranking based on the percentage of each library's users who do not use any other library was as follows:

	users of this library only (%)	rank
Spondon	45.1	1
Chellaston	41.8	2
Allestree	38.8	3
Mickleover	38.6	4
Alvaston	29.7	5
Springwood	26.5	6
Blagreaves	26.4	7
Chaddesden	25.3	8
Pear Tree	23.4	9
Mackworth	21.1	10
Sinfin	20.0	11
Central	17.1	12
Derwent	16.4	13
Allenton	11.2	14

24   Adding together the two ranks for each library produces a set of overarching scores. Arranging libraries in order from lowest to highest score generates an overall ranking for the library location component of the needs assessment, beginning with the library with the most discrete catchment / user-base (lowest score). This is shown in the following table:

	Catchments	Users	Total ranks	RANK OF RANKS
Spondon	1	1	2	1
Chellaston	2	2	4	2
Mickleover	3	4	7	3
Alvaston	4	5	9	4
Springwood	5	6	11	5
Allestree	10	3	13	6
Chaddesden	8	8	16	7
Blagreaves	11	7	18	8
Central	6	12	18	8
Pear Tree	11	9	20	10
Sinfin	9	11	20	10
Allenton	7	14	21	12
Mackworth	11	10	21	12
Derwent	11	13	24	14

Preparing a final ranking

25   Having ranked libraries according to each of the three components, a simple (un-weighted) overall needs assessment ranking can be achieved by adding the three component scores together and ranking the libraries again in order of their aggregate score, from lowest to highest. The combined needs assessment ranking thus generated is as follows:

	Socio-economic profile rank	Performance rank	Location rank	Total ranks	RANK OF RANKS *
Alvaston	5	4	4	13	1
Pear Tree	1	3	10	14	2
Central	6	1	8	15	3
Mickleover	13	2	3	18	4
Spondon	10	9	1	20	5
Chellaston	12	8	2	22	6
Sinfin	7	6	10	23	7
Chaddesden	8	9	7	24	8
Blagreaves	9	7	8	24	9
Allestree	14	4	6	24	10
Allenton	2	12	12	26	11
Mackworth	4	11	12	27	12
Springwood	10	12	5	27	13
Derwent	3	14	14	31	14

nb Where total scores are equal, ranking position is determined by socio-economic profile rank

26   However a more sophisticated approach to the needs assessment ranking is possible, one that gives some priority to those libraries that have the greatest potential to deliver a positive outcome for local communities. This is achieved by double-weighting the socio-economic profile component. In a Ministerial letter to the leader of Sheffield City Council written in March 2015 the Secretary of State is quoted as

recognising that there is no standard approach to undertaking a libraries needs assessment and that it is up to councils 'as the democratically accountable local representatives, to make the necessary value judgements with regard to the needs assessment.' It is therefore within the power of the Council to double-weight the socio-economic component of Derby's needs assessment if it judges it appropriate to do so.

27 Applying weighting in this way gives some priority to libraries in areas with higher levels of material and social deprivation, on the basis that residents of these areas are likely to benefit the most from library services that are free at the point of delivery and are less likely to be able to afford to travel to libraries in other parts of the city. This approach is in line with the Council's priority outcome of Enabling Individuals and Communities by trying 'to close the gap for economic and social inequalities within Derby.'

28 Having double-weighted the socio-economic profile score, a final score for each library was generated by adding together the scores for the three needs assessment, components with libraries ranked in order from lowest to highest score. Where two or more libraries scored the same, they were placed in order of their score for the socio-economic profile component. This provided a final ranking of libraries from 1 (greatest need) to 14 (least need).

29 The final needs assessment ranking produced by this methodology is as follows:

	Socio-economic profile rank	Performance rank	Location rank	Total ranks	FINAL RANK OF RANKS
Pear Tree	2	3	10	15	1
Alvaston	10	4	4	18	2
Central	12	1	8	21	3
Allenton	4	12	12	28	4
Sinfin	14	6	10	30	5
Spondon	20	9	1	30	6
Mackworth	8	11	12	31	7
Mickleover	26	2	3	31	8
Chaddesden	16	9	7	32	9
Blagreaves	18	7	8	33	10
Derwent	6	14	14	34	11
Chellaston	24	8	2	34	12
Springwood	20	12	5	37	13
Allestree	28	4	6	38	14

nb Where total scores are equal, ranking position is determined by socio-economic profile rank

30 The table shown in paragraph 29 is an indication of relative need. Given that the starting point for the Libraries Strategic Review is that the budget will be insufficient for things to carry on as they are, a decision is needed on 'where to draw the line', with only the libraries above the line in this table remaining part of the Council's statutory offer. Factors informing this decision will be the budget available and judgements on the comprehensiveness of the total offer that is being proposed.

The Derby Local Studies and Family History Library

31   As a specialist research library, the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library is not susceptible to the ranking / scoring methodology described above. A decision about whether or not to retain it within the Council's statutory offer must therefore be made on other grounds.

Comparison of four options for a new service delivery model

Option A

Savings: £967k

Council-run libraries (statutory offer)

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	43
Local Studies	32
Pear Tree	43
Riverside	51
Total	*169*

(Potential) Council-supported CMLs

None

Average distribution grant per CML

nil

Option B

Savings: £648k

Council-run libraries (statutory offer)

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	43
Local Studies	32
Pear Tree	43
Riverside	51
Total	*169*

(Potential) Council-supported CMLs

Allenton
Allestree
Blagreaves
Chaddesden
Chellaston
Derwent
Mackworth
Mickleover
Sinfin
Spondon
Springwood

Average distribution grant per CML

c.£17.5k

Option C

Savings: £648k

Council-run libraries (statutory offer)

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	26
Allenton	20
Chaddesden	20
Local Studies	26
Mackworth	20
Mickleover	26
Pear Tree	26
Riverside	51
Sinfin	26
Spondon	26
Total	*267*

(Potential) Council-supported CMLs

None

Average distribution grant per CML

nil

Option D

Savings: £648k

Council-run libraries (statutory offer)

Library	Weekly hours
Alvaston	26
Allenton	20
Local Studies	26
Mackworth	20
Pear Tree	26
Riverside	51
Sinfin	26
Spondon	26
Total	*221*

(Potential) Council-supported CMLs

Allestree
Blagreaves
Chaddesden
Chellaston
Derwent
Mickleover
Springwood

Average distribution grant per CML

c.£10k

Interim assessment of the equalities implications of the four service delivery model options

1. Preamble

A further report to Cabinet will make a final recommendation on the future shape of Derby's library service. The recommended option could be identical to one of the options described in the main body of the current report, or a variation on one of those options.

When formulating a recommendation the Libraries Strategic Review project manager and his team will work with the Council's Lead on Equality and Diversity, and through her with members of the Diversity Forum, to carry out a thorough Equality Impact Assessment on the emerging proposal. This EIA will be published alongside the recommended option, enabling Cabinet Members to make an informed decision about its suitability.

In the meantime the following sections give a brief overview of the Equalities implications of each option, and some relevant background information about users of each library.

2. Overview of equalities implications: Options B and D

Under one scenario Options B and D will have no adverse impact on persons who share a relevant protected characteristic as defined by the 2010 Act. This scenario is that:
- the four Council-run libraries (Option B) / eight Council-run libraries (Option D) operate as described in the main body of the report
- communities take responsibility for the eleven / seven libraries that the Council no longer operates itself, providing similar services and opening hours. It should be noted that the Council grant will be dependent on groups ensuring that CMLs are welcoming and accessible to everyone, and that all relevant Equalities legislation is adhered to. Libraries staff will provide training on Equalities issues to CML volunteers about to take on the running of a library, and will be available thereafter to provide advice on these issues.

However, at this stage it is far too soon to say whether all potential CMLs will get off the ground. If they do not there could be some equalities implications for regular or occasional users of libraries where CMLs are not formed and the library therefore closes.

It should be noted that while Option D guarantees the future of more libraries than Option B through their inclusion in the Council's statutory offer, it is judged that CMLs have better prospects of becoming established and thriving under Option B because of the more generous financial support that would be provided.

3. Overview of equalities implications: Options A and C

Option A would likely result in the swift closure of all eleven libraries not retained within the Council's statutory offer: Allenton, Allestree, Blagreaves, Chaddesden, Chellaston, Derwent, Mackworth, Mickleover, Sinfin, Spondon and Springwood.

Option C would likely result in the swift closure of Allestree, Blagreaves, Chellaston, Derwent and Springwood libraries.

Any library closure would impact on persons who share a relevant protected characteristic as defined by the 2010 Act. People sharing some protected characteristics may be more impacted than people sharing other characteristics. The closure of specific libraries may result in an increased impact on specific protected groups.

Information contained in the following paragraphs provides a framework for assessing the impact of (specific) library closures on specific protected groups.

4. Age

Libraries are most heavily used by older people and by children, particularly younger children.

25% of all respondents to the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation were aged 65-74, with a further 15% being aged 75+; this appears broadly typical of the age profile of adult library users By contrast, only 7% of respondents were aged 25-34, and 13% aged 35-44. Older people will therefore be disproportionately affected by library closures.

The catchments of Allestree and Spondon have the highest proportions of residents aged 65+; Pear Tree and Chellaston have the lowest:

Catchment	% aged 65+
Pear Tree	9.9
Chellaston	13.6
Central	14.7
Sinfin	15.0
Allenton	15.3
Derwent	15.6
Blagreaves	15.7
Springwood	15.9
Derby City	15.9
Alvaston	16.7
Mackworth	17.5
Chaddesden	19.2
Mickleover	22.9
Spondon	24.1

Allestree	26.7

The Home Library Service is unaffected by the Libraries Strategic Review, and will continue to provide a doorstep delivery service for people unable to visit the library in person due to age or disability.

Children were under-represented in the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation as the format and content of the questionnaire was tailored to adult respondents. However loans data indicates that over a third of loans are of children's books, suggesting that children will be disproportionately affected by library closures. The consultation suggests that people in the 25-44 age group are more likely to stop using libraries altogether if their preferred library closes (30%), as are people with children (38% compared to 22%); these two facts may be linked. Since most younger children rely on adults to take them to a library this is another indication that children may be disproportionately affected by library closures.

The catchments of Pear Tree and Allenton Libraries have the highest percentage of residents aged nine and under; Allestree and Mickleover have the lowest:

Catchment	% aged 0-9
Allestree	10.6
Mickleover	10.6
Spondon	11.1
Springwood	13.3
Chaddesden	13.5
Derby City	13.7
Mackworth	13.9
Central	14.1
Alvaston	14.3
Blagreaves	14.9
Sinfin	15.5
Derwent	15.6
Chellaston	15.7
Allenton	15.8
Pear Tree	17.6

5. Disability

10% of all respondents to the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation considered themselves to be disabled. Disabled library users are more likely to visit their preferred library every day, when compared with those who are not disabled. Respondents who are disabled were also more likely than other respondents to say that they would stop using libraries altogether if they could no longer access their preferred library (29% compared to 23%).

Respondents who are disabled were also:

- more likely than other respondents to say that they would use the internet a lot less if they could not use it at the library
- more likely than other respondents to say that they would use read a lot less if they could not get reading materials from the library

It may therefore be inferred from the information above that disabled people are likely to be disproportionately affected if by library closures.

The Home Library Service is unaffected by the Libraries Strategic Review, and will continue to provide a doorstep delivery service for people unable to visit the library in person due to age or disability.

The catchments of Mackworth and Alvaston have the most residents whose day to day activities are limited either a little or a lot; Chellaston and Springwood's catchments have the fewest:

Catchment	% of the population whose day-to-day activities are limited either a little or a lot
Chellaston	13.5
Springwood	17.2
Mickleover	17.7
Derby City	18.6
Blagreaves	18.8
Central	18.9
Allestree	19.1
Pear Tree	19.1
Sinfin	19.2
Allenton	20.7
Spondon	20.7
Chaddesden	20.8
Derwent	20.9
Alvaston	21.1
Mackworth	23.1

6. Sexual orientation

No information available in relation to usage of libraries

7. Gender re-assignment

No information available in relation to usage of libraries

8. Marriage and civil partnership

No information available in relation to usage of libraries

9. Pregnancy and maternity

No information available in relation to usage of libraries

10. Race

84% of respondents to 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation described their ethnic background as White; 8% preferred not to answer. The consultation also shows that:

- Respondents from non-White ethnic groups were more likely than White ethnic groups to say they would read a lot less if they could not get reading material from the library
- Respondents from non-White ethnic groups were more likely than White ethnic groups to say they would use the internet a lot less if they could not access it at the library.

It may therefore be inferred that members of non-White ethnic groups could be disproportionately affected by library closures.

The catchments of Pear Tree, Blagreaves and Sinfin have the most residents from BME groups; Spondon, Chaddesden and Allestree have the fewest:

Catchment	% from a Black or Minority Ethnic, (BME) Group
Spondon	5.1
Chaddesden	7.2
Allestree	7.7
Springwood	7.7
Derwent	9.4
Mackworth	9.6
Alvaston	13.4
Mickleover	13.9
Chellaston	14.7
Allenton	18.6
Derby City	24.7
Central	29.6
Sinfin	40.8
Blagreaves	41.2
Pear Tree	59.1

11. Religion or belief or none

No information available in relation to usage of libraries

12. Sex

Excluding 'prefer not to say' 62% of the 'phase 1' public and stakeholder consultation respondents were female, and 36% male. This appears to be broadly typical of the gender profile of library users…Females will therefore be disproportionately affected by library closures.

Male respondents indicated that they were more likely than females to go to another library just as often as now if their preferred library closes (23% compared to 17%), whereas females were more likely than males to stop using libraries altogether (25% compared to 22%).

13. Families and people on low income

Libraries give free access to reading materials and the internet. Therefore people and families on low income can benefit substantially from the public library offer, and stand to be affected disproportionately by any changes that limit access to library services.

Insofar as they have the most to gain from library services it may be inferred that families and people on low income have the most to lose if libraries close.

The Pear Tree and Allenton catchments are the most deprived according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation; Mickleover and Allestree are the least deprived:

Catchment	Index of Multiple Deprivation average score
Pear Tree	49.48
Allenton	41.63
Derwent	35.25
Alvaston	33.79
Central	31.74
Mackworth	31.24
Sinfin	30.42
Chaddesden	27.92
Derby City	27.79
Blagreaves	27.10
Springwood	17.42
Spondon	17.04
Chellaston	10.73
Mickleover	7.12
Allestree	7.08