

**Sutherland, Kelly**

---

**From:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only)  
**Sent:** 20 October 2005 11:46  
**To:** Sutherland, Kelly  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to decision

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Strong, Bob  
**Sent:** 17 October 2005 18:34  
**To:** Wassell, Julia  
**Cc:** Edwards, Roger; Sutherland, Kelly; Capjon, Clare; Davies, Anne (Legal); Evans, Tracie; Batchelor, Gerry; Woods, Katharine; Allen, Bruce; Dewar, Margaret; Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only); Taylor, Dean; Gray, Clare (Dem.Services)  
**Subject:** RE: Objection to decision

Dear Julia

With regard to your comments raised in your objection to the decision on consultation, responses are below;

The process of decision making was undertaken following advice from relevant officers.

The document itself is an internal report but in the interests of openness and transparency has been made available in full. A two page background paper is currently being put on the Web site. This covers closure proposals and the provision of alternative services.

Research data was the latest available at the time of the Review, though later data relevant to Phase 2 of the Review (post September 2005 implementation ) was used where relevant to that area of review. Where data is used to make comparisons it is taken from the same source. e.g. catchment area statistics.

Chapter 9 of the review provides relevant information for each library. This can be extracted for individual libraries when the consultation is agreed.

Research for the Review was rigorous and was approved by external experts. The snapshot figures refer to the number of people who had material on loan at specific times, not who borrowed material on a specific day. I cannot see how this is unrepresentative.

Distances between libraries were calculated using a route planner database.

The Review treats the eight libraries individually and makes the case for closure and the provision of alternative services on an individual basis.

I agree that Members would wish to see the latest figures on costs, membership and usage and I will ensure that these are provided before a decision to close is considered.

At the time the Review was undertaken the 2004 Index of Multiple Deprivation was not available. Even if Micklefield was allocated a 4, its overall assessment would predicate proposal for closure.

Issues of talking books and audiovisual material were included in the issue statistics for all the libraries concerned.

With regard to catchment area statistics the WDC neighbourhood population figures were regarded as being the best available for the area.

The closure proposal is based on a range of objective criteria. Good partnership working is developing well and this will continue in Micklefield regardless of whether the library closes or remains open. S106 funding will require a developer contribution and I am not aware of any plans to develop Micklefield in this way.

Yours sincerely

Bob Strong  
Head of Libraries & Heritage  
Buckinghamshire County Council

**Sutherland, Kelly**

---

**From:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only)  
**Sent:** 20 October 2005 11:46  
**To:** Sutherland, Kelly  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to decision

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Strong, Bob  
**Sent:** 17 October 2005 18:03  
**To:** Oxley, Alan; Baldwin, Mary  
**Cc:** Taylor, Dean; Edwards, Roger; Sutherland, Kelly; Capjon, Clare; Davies, Anne (Legal); Evans, Tracie; Batchelor, Gerry; Woods, Katharine; Allen, Bruce; Dewar, Margaret; Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only); Taylor, Dean; Gray, Clare (Dem.Services)  
**Subject:** RE: Objection to decision

Dear Alan and Mary

With regard to your comments raised in your objection to the decision on consultation, responses are below;

The criteria used to score libraries is based on an assessment approved by the British Library and applied by Cambridgeshire Council. We widened it to reduce the emphasis on quantitative measures.

Physical proximity to other libraries is clearly relevant as many people have a choice in visiting libraries, as in Iver, but not in Ivinghoe, for example.

The proposal to close a library is based on a wide range of assessment criteria as noted in Chapter 9 Assessing the value of libraries. Net costs are one factor. I intend to present Members with the latest figures (end of September 2005) regarding issues, costs etc before any decision to close is considered. SAP has enabled more precise cost centre management which Members will find helpful.

Stoke Poges Library was operational to March 2004 and those costs are rightly included in the table.

I agree that issue statistics are more reliable than visitor numbers in providing cost figures, but re iterate that the assessment criteria was much broader than cost.

2002/3 statistics were the latest available when the major part of the Review was undertaken. This includes the staffing figures. The Review makes the point that the (then) high level of staffing is directly related to the size of the branch library infrastructure. During 2004/5 18 posts were lost to the Library Service, 12 as a result of implementing Phase 1 of the Review, a major staff restructuring, 6 through natural wastage. The vast majority of these posts were managerial and administrative and I would expect that further posts of this nature will be lost through the forthcoming merger with Adult Learning.

Yours sincerely`

Bob Strong

14

20/10/2005

## Sutherland, Kelly

---

**From:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only)  
**Sent:** 20 October 2005 11:46  
**To:** Sutherland, Kelly  
**Subject:** FW: Library Service Review

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Strong, Bob  
**Sent:** 17 October 2005 15:06  
**To:** Jones, Chester  
**Cc:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only); Dewar, Margaret; Taylor, Dean  
**Subject:** RE: Library Service Review

Dear Councillor Jones

The Library Review proposes to deliver library services to certain local communities in a different way, it does not seek to withdraw them, so I do not believe it is at variance with Getting Closer to Local Communities.

With regard to bamboozling the reader a 2 page background summary of the Review will be put on the web site before consultation.

Yours sincerely

Bob Strong  
Head of Libraries & Heritage  
Buckinghamshire County Council

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only)  
**Sent:** 13 October 2005 11:38  
**To:** Strong, Bob; Allen, Bruce  
**Cc:** Dewar, Margaret; Taylor, Dean; Davies, Anne (Legal); Evans, Tracie; Woods, Katharine; Jennings, Brenda; Pushman, Richard  
**Subject:** FW: Library Service Review  
**Importance:** High

Please note the representation from Chester Jones below.

Bob - Please could you respond to the points Chester Jones has made.

many thanks

Clare Gray  
Senior Democratic Services Officer  
01296 383610

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jones, Chester  
**Sent:** 12 October 2005 22:06  
**To:** Cabinet (Messages to Head of Policy Support only)  
**Cc:** Strong, Bob  
**Subject:** Library Service Review

Dear Democratic Services Team

Please be advised that I wish to ask for the proposal to be called in as the proposals is at variance with the objective of (1) "Getting Closer To Communities" (2) the 69 pages of explanation on the web site only help to confuse and bamboozle the reader.

Chester Jones