

APPENDIX C. b

Type of Respondent	Response	Service notes
Anon	<p>I wish to leave the following feedback on the Registry Office Consultation :</p> <p>Option 1 – Keep things as they are:</p> <p>Clearly SCC do not see this as an option as this in a cost cutting exercise.</p> <p>Option 3- Centralise in Shrewsbury: It is totally unacceptable in a rural county the size of Shropshire, with very poor public transport infrastructure, to centralise registration services in Shrewsbury. The difficulties for those without cars would make registration of very important and often emotional life milestones extremely stressful it is the duty of the Council to deliver (or no doubt “Commission”)the best service to its customers and this option does in no way do this.</p> <p>So this leaves us with Option 2.</p> <p>There seems to be almost perverse elements to the proposals in this option. In particular with regard to the South of the County, which needs consideration. Church Stretton is to close. Ludlow, which along with Shrewsbury has the highest usage, and also the cheapest running costs of all the Registry Offices in Shropshire including Shrewsbury, is to have hours reduced and staff redundancy. The ONLY office to incur this. Despite the fact that usage might be increased because of closure of Church Stretton, Bridgnorth, the most northerly and is the only south Shropshire Register Office not to have hours reduced. This is despite having a lower usage rate of 36% to Ludlow’s 49% and a £13 per appointment higher running cost. Despite this it will have more than twice the opening hours of Ludlow in the option 2 proposal. On the other hand in the North, Oswestry hwith 10% less usage and higher running costs than Ludlow is to have it’s hours increased to provide a greater resource for the North. In fact other than the closure of Wem, all offices in the North of the County will have increased opening times. It would appear that increased hours in the North are at the expense of residents in the South of the County. Equality of Service doesn’t seem to be in the running and I urge a rethink of Option 2 to make it more fair to the South of the county before further decisions are made.</p>	<p><i>Any redundancies in the service were or would be voluntary, which we accept was not made clear in the consultation document</i></p>

<p>Member of the public/community transport organiser</p>	<p>3 as someone with disabilities. I understand that but I also understand one is required to report a death within 5 days. If you were to close Wem that period would need to be extended. Do your proposals stack up in the light of the Equalities Act 2010? I suspect that this applies to most isolated communities. If I were to die tomorrow afternoon (Friday) it would be 7 days before my wife, a non driver, could get to Whitchurch. There is only bus per week leaving 0830 each Friday.</p> <p>5 There is an assumption that rural residents have access to personal transport. THIS IS NOT ACCURATE. You would need to establish that the 900 (or so) rural people without access to adequate public transport can get to the places where they can register events in a timely and legal way.</p> <p>As people age their ability and legal entitlement to drive personal transport changes. The medical requirements for entitlement to drive are becoming more restrictive. It should not be assumed that isolated residents will be able to drive the additional distances closure of Wem would leave some residents without the ability to drive disadvantaged and potentially in breach of the law. - You should try to get a taxi to come to Whixall!</p> <p>9 Locating services in Shrewsbury would mean that my death may go unregistered for reasons of accessibility and disability. From North Shropshire it is easier to shop in Manchester than Shrewsbury for disabled people.</p> <p>10 For example If I were to die tomorrow afternoon (Friday) it would be 7 days before my wife, a non driver, could get to Whitchurch. There is only 1 bus per week leaving 0830 each Friday.</p>	
<p>Local Councillor</p>	<p>I comment via e-mail as the online form does not allow me to express my opinions fully. In summary: I do not see the case for a change in hours for the Ludlow office and believe the office should remain as open as at present.</p> <p>The three options given are to: 1 Continue as we are 2. Reduce the hours of the Ludlow Office 3. Close Ludlow completely. Faced with these three alternatives, only Option 1 is acceptable. But with a change to Option 2 to keep Ludlow's hours as at present, this might be acceptable.</p>	

<p>Nothing can be more exciting than recording a birth, though finding time to do it can be hard.</p> <p>Nothing can be more painful than registering a death, which needs to be done with dignity and without fuss. Residents of Ludlow and its hinterland should not have to go to Shrewsbury to register a birth, and certainly not to register a death. To force people to take a sixty mile round trip to register the death of a loved one is cruel.</p> <p>It costs Shropshire Council almost the same to register a death, birth or marriage in Ludlow as Shrewsbury. There is the same level of usage of the service. The options are cut back the hours at the Registrars Office in Ludlow or even close it. But the Shrewsbury Registrars Office ill not be cut back under any scenario.</p> <p>We are a town with a significant elderly population. A quarter of our residents are aged 65 or over, higher than in Shrewsbury or across Shropshire as a whole. A quarter of households in Ludlow have no car or van; considerably greater than the Shropshire average. If our Registrars office closes will people have to go on the bus? We are talking about a journey three hours each way from Clee Hill to Shrewsbury.</p> <p>In Ludlow, 49% of potential appointments were filled in 2013/2014. Under Option 2, it will get a cut of hours. Up in Oswestry, just 39% of appointment slots were filled. Under Option 2, it gets an increase in hours.</p> <p>The nature of the Registrar business means that not all appointment slots can be filled. In Ludlow, the Registrars Office is open for 1.5 hours for every visit by a member of the public. In Oswestry, it is open for 1.8 hours. Under Option 2, Ludlow will be reduced to 0.9 hours per visit and Oswestry increased to 2.1 hours.</p> <p>It already costs more for a 30 minute appointment in Oswestry: £88.00 compared to Ludlow's £67. This disparity can only increase under the current Option 2.</p> <p>I cannot see any demographic or operational reason for this difference in treatment. It is blatantly favouring Oswestry at the expense of services in the south of the County.</p> <p>Given these statistics, I do not see the case for a change in hours for the Ludlow office and believe the office should remain open with the same hours as at present.</p> <p>**The inadequate Eina.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Needs Assessment (EINA) for this consultation is inadequate. I cant see it meets legislative requirements. For example, for Ludlow the EINA says for disability "minimal impact as there are no sweeping changes proposed". That's not the case. Option 3 for this consultation is to close Ludlow Registrars Office altogether, a sweeping change in any book. The Eina for Bishops Castle, again on disability says: "As utilisation rate of the office is so low (disabled) people are obviously able to get to other offices to complete their business. There are no numbers on how many people with disabilities or have mobility problems use the service at Bishops Castle. There are no numbers on people with mobility issues or not, who are "obviously able to get to other offices". We</p>	<p>**Please note that all registration services have provide domiciliary services for those people who are in desperate need and who cannot attend an office to conduct their business. There is no guesswork involved with this at all. This facility is rarely used (less than once per year, with the exception of those in the dreadful position of having to have a "death bed marriage or civil partnership") but none the less provides a safeguard to those most vulnerable.</p>
--	--

	<p>cant meet the needs of people who are vulnerable or have mobility problems using guesswork. I do not believe that any changes should be made without a more robust EINA</p>	
Town Council	<p>At the Church Stretton Town Council meeting on 23rd June, the issue for the proposed closure of the Church Stretton service was discussed. Councillors were concerned that other options which preserved access for our local population, whilst providing the necessary savings for you, seemed not to be under consideration. For example, we would be happy to host a Registrar in the Town Council offices (or Silvester Horne Institute next door) by appointment, reducing your office overheads considerably. In Staffordshire the service to outlying rural areas is delivered via part-time, peripatetic staff, rather than fixed f/t equivalents. There is also the possibility that some appropriately qualified (and willing) Town Clerks could be trained to provide the service locally – again reducing your overheads considerably.</p> <p>We offer these thoughts in full understanding of the pressure you are under to make savings. However we must always seek to secure the best service we can for the townsfolk of Church Stretton.</p>	
Town Council	<p>At a full council meeting on the 22nd June 2015, members discussed the consultation on the provision of the Registrars Service in Shropshire. Members felt that none of the options proposed were suitable and resolved the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A very cost effective and efficient registrars service is currently provided in Ludlow; ii) An increase in opening and staff hours at Ludlow registrar office is requested iii) The current office provision is disgraceful and more fitting and dignified office accommodation needs to be provided at Ludlow Library 	
Member of the public	<p>Regarding the Register Office proposals I would vote for option 3. The registrations are only very occasionally required, and the additional effort to travel to Shrewsbury for recording the event etc would not be great for the individuals concerned.</p>	
Member of the public	<p>I would be opposed to registration services at Ludlow being reduced or discontinued altogether. The demand appears to be as great at the Ludlow office as in Shrewsbury where there is no proposal to reduce services. People in Ludlow and South Shropshire would find it extremely arduous and costly to travel to Shrewsbury if there were no facilities in Ludlow. It is not fair that people in this rural area should be faced with extra costs simply to enable the service to make savings. This is always the easy option</p>	