Parish 1.

From:

Susan Allum

Sent:

01 May 2013 09:20

To:

Service of the servic

Subject:

Publicity Code Consultation 2013

Attachments: Response form - Publicity_Code_Consultation.doc

Dear Wark

Please find attached Uckfield Town Councils response to the Publicity Code Consultation 2013.

Regards

Susan Allum Civic Centre Manager

Uckfield Town Council Civic Centre Uckfield East Sussex TN22 1AE

www.uckfieldciviccentre.com

www.uckfieldtc.gov.uk

Follow us on facebook http://www.facebook.com/uckfieldtowncouncil

This message and any attachments contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient please accept our apologies and delete the email after advising the sender of the error. Please do not disclose copy or distribute information in this e-mail or take any action in reliance on its contents: to do so is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

The information contained within it may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), unless it is legally exempt from disclosure.

A Save the environment - think before you print

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Response form

Publicity Code Consultation 2013

About you

i) Your details

| ~ | 1 |
|---|--|
| Name: | Ashley Serpis |
| Position (if applicable) | Town Clerk |
| Name of Organisation | Uckfield Town Council |
| (if applicable) | |
| Address: | Civic Centre, Uckfield, East Sussex, TN22 1AE |
| tion to the state of the state | |
| | 86 |
| | * |
| e mail: | Townclerk@uckfieldtc.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number: | |
| 157 | * |
| ii) Are the views expres | ssed on this consultation an official's response |
| | you represent or your own percent viewe? |

| ii) Are the views expressed on this | consultation an official's response |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| from the organisation you represer | nt or your own personal views? |

| Organisational response | | | | X |
|-------------------------|---|--|-----|---|
| Personal views | * | | 9 - | |

iii) Please tick the box which best describes you or your organisation:

| District council | |
|---|---|
| Metropolitan district council | |
| London borough council | |
| Unitary authority/county council/county | |
| borough council | |
| Parish council | |
| Membership organisation | |
| Newspaper proprietor · | |
| Newspaper staff | |
| Business | |
| Councillor | |
| Member of the public | |
| Other | X |

| (please comment): | Town Council | | W. | F. 25 | ĭi. |
|-------------------|--------------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | l | 820 | 7.0 | 3 | 9 |

Questions:

1. Views on the proposed legislation are invited, and in particular do consultees see the proposals as fully delivering the commitment to give greater force to the Publicity Code by putting compliance on a statutory basis?

The suggested legislation appears to be excessive and requiring statutory compliance no longer makes it a Code of Recommended Practice. Nothing is provided to indicate the extent of the perceived issue and no indication is given from where complaints are being received. It is not considered, indeed not known, that this is of such significant importance that it requires such draconian government intervention.

Providing the Secretary of State with powers to make direction, 'whenever he considers it appropriate to do so' and dictate the number of editions of a newsletter a council can produce a year seems to move away from the government's stated aim of encouraging localism. Decisions and remedies are not being made and decided at a local level, but are being decided centrally.

If it is felt that there is a need to give such force to a Code of Recommended Practice as is being suggested then perhaps there is a need to change the Code into legislation.

2. If there is alternative to the power of direction, how will this meet the aim of improved enforcement of the code?

In the case of principal authorities the Local Government Ombudsman could be used to investigate such claims and it is accepted that this would not be relevant to town and parish councils. However, as mentioned there is no evidence given that the practice is rife in town and parish councils which are largely non-political. In addition the number of towns and parishes that publish local newsletters are a small percentage of the total and of those, there is an even smaller percentage that publishes their newsletters more than quarterly.

If it is really felt necessary to give greater force to the Code then there is a need for some balance. The onus should continue to be on the complainant to prove that a law has been broken rather than the Secretary of State being given powers to do so. In addition there is always the opportunity for any resident to make such complaints through the auditing processes.

3. This consultation invites evidence of the circumstances where the code was not met and the implications of this on competition in local media

Uckfield Town Council is not aware of any evidence or circumstances where the Code was not met nor, therefore, the implications on competition in local media. The Town Council has good relations with the local press and it is suggested that this would be the case with most town and parish councils.

There is some concern that the consultation asks for examples of evidence and does not provide any evidence that non-compliance with the Code is a significant issue for the press, but yet seems to be keen to provide the Secretary of State with additional powers to take councils to task over an issue which does not seem to have been proved.

Ē т в ×