

## PROGRAMME OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS – CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOLLOWING STAGE ONE CONSULTATION

**Summary:** In mid-February 2021, the programme of Community Governance Reviews were started with the Notice of Review being published. This signalled the commencement of the initial stage of consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the proposed changes to existing parish boundaries.

The deadline for the stage one consultation was on 30<sup>th</sup> April and received 73 responses across the various separate reviews.

**Conclusions:** This report now details the Draft recommendations to be considered by Full Council to be approved for further consultation

**Recommendations:** **To approve the draft recommendations proposed and authorise the second stage consultation which will run to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2021 when the final recommendations would be prepared for consideration once again by Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

Cabinet Member(s) Cllr S Butikofer	Ward(s) affected
Contact Officer, telephone number and email: Rob Henry, Senior Elections Officer	

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 In mid-February 2021 the programme of Community Governance Reviews were started with the Notice of Review being published. This signalled the commencement of the initial stage of consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the proposed changes to existing parish boundaries.
- 1.2 The deadline for the stage one consultation was on 30<sup>th</sup> April and received 73 responses across the various separate reviews.

### 2. Draft recommendations for further consultation

- 2.1 This report now details the Draft recommendations to be considered by Full Council to be approved for further consultation:

- **Aldborough and Alby:** Initial consultation has generated three responses, all in favour of the initial proposals so we do not therefore suggest any amendment to this proposal and that the draft recommendations are as stated in initial recommendation.
- **Binham and Hindringham:** Two responses were received during the initial consultation, from each Parish Council, both supporting the initial proposals. No amendment on these proposals is required so the draft recommendations are as stated in initial recommendation.
- **Blakeney and Wiveton:** Three responses received with two being in favour and one neutral from Wiveton PC, who have some concerns relating to the proposals surrounding loss of precept, and seeking assurances that they would be consulted on any future planning applications on the land/property which is being removed from their parish. The Draft recommendations are to proceed as originally stated.
- **Brinton and Stody:** No representations were received relating to this proposal so no amendments required for the draft recommendations
- **Barsham and Fakenham North:** One comment received from Barsham Parish Council who are in support of the changes proposed therefore no amendment is required for the draft recommendations.
- **East & West Beckham:** One representation received with a counter proposal to run the new boundary line behind the back of 9-12 Church Road and numbers 1-2 Hall Farm Cottages and then southwards until it joined the existing boundary. Please see the attached supplementary sheet which shows the new draft recommendation for this proposal.
- **East Runton and Cromer:** No representations were received relating to this proposal so no amendments required for the draft recommendations.
- **Felbrigg, Cromer and Roughton:** No representations were received relating to this proposal so no amendments required for the draft recommendations.
- **Great and Little Walsingham:** Three comments have been received in relation to this proposal which were all against the amended boundaries being suggested. The Parish Council provided some information which showed there is a great deal of history behind the particular boundary line proposed for changes, so with that in mind this proposal will not be taken forward.
- **Gunthorpe (South) and Briningham:** Three representations have been received in respect of this proposal, all of which are in favour of the changes to the boundary which has been suggested in the initial consultation. As such, no changes are being proposed for the draft recommendations.
- **Gresham and Sustead:** Two representations have been received which are both in favour of the proposed amendments. There is a query about the siting of the village sign which can be passed on to the County Councillor for the Parish to raise with Norfolk County Council Highways Department but otherwise the draft recommendation would be to proceed with the amendments as originally proposed.
- **Sidestrand and Northrepps:** No representations were received relating to this proposal so no amendments required for the draft recommendations.
- **Sidestrand and Trimmingham:** One representation received with a positive response to changing the boundary albeit with a counter proposal which keeps the entire property concerned at Bizewell Farm within the same parish. Please see the attached supplementary sheet which shows the new draft recommendation for this proposal.

- **Upper Sheringham and Sheringham South:** We have received nine responses as part of the initial consultation, six of which are in favour of the proposals, two against and one where no comments were made and only the name and address of the respondent was provided. It is the plan to proceed to stage two consultation based on the initial proposals.

2.2 The three following proposals each affect more properties and as such have a greater impact on local communities concerned:

- **Fakenham and Sculthorpe:** 16 responses were received in relation to the initial proposal here with six being in favour and 10 rejections. The responses in favour are from Serving District Councillors from the Lancaster North ward and one of the South ward Councillors as well as Fakenham Town Council and residents on the Fakenham Town side of Sandy Lane with the objections being received from those who would be moved from Sculthorpe Parish to Fakenham South ward and Sculthorpe village. The draft recommendations are to proceed with the proposals as originally stated as no objection raises any issue which would give necessary cause to move from this position.
- **Northrepps and Cromer:** 26 responses have been received relating to this proposal with 23 being wholly in objection and two responses seemingly more in support albeit with concerns. Given the relationship and proximity of Bridge Terrace, Christophers Close, Finch Close, Nightingale Close, Norwich Road, Ridgeway and Stevens Road to the town of Cromer the proposal will remain as they were in the initial recommendations. The Council will however, provide further clarity of the proposals during the secondary period of consultation and look at meeting with both Cromer Town Council and Northrepps Parish Council during this period.
- **Raynham and Helhoughton:** We have received three responses in relation to this proposal, all of which are in favour of the plans. We are yet to hear back from either Raynham or Helhoughton Parish councils who were going to discuss at their next meetings after the consultation deadline. The draft proposals would remain the same as initially stated although some consideration should now be given to implementing a warding arrangement within the parish of Raynham so the dwellings occupying the former RAF base site have their own representation on the Parish Council with the other ward representing West Raynham village. The Parish Council is currently made up of seven councillors. This would be the case even following the transfer of the dwellings over from the Helhoughton Parish, as the total would still sit within the bracket of up to 900 electors. One suggestion would be to look at a warding arrangement of five councillors in the 'Village' ward and two councillors in the 'Kipton' ward ie those living on the former RAF site. Warding arrangements already occur in several other smaller parishes across the district including The Runtons, Ryburgh, Gunthorpe and Walsingham and if this arrangement was accepted as part of this process of Community Governance Review, the new warding arrangements could be implemented to take effect from the May 2023 Parish Council elections.

2.3 **Merging of Hempton and Pudding Norton Parish Councils –**

No consultation was initially taken on this earlier in the year but letters will now be drafted to each Parish Council and all households within each Parish

to gauge opinion on this requested merger between the two with a proposal to put this in place from the next Parish Council elections in May 2023.

**4. Financial and Resource Implications**

There will be changes in the Parish Precepts which will affect some of the Parishes affected by boundary changes, especially within the three proposals which will see a higher number of property moves. As a result this will also mean the Council Tax liability will change for the households which will be subject to moving to a different parish as a result of these proposals

**5. Conclusion and Recommendations**

That Full Council approve the draft recommendations proposed and authorise the second stage consultation which will run to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2021 when the final recommendations would be prepared for consideration once again by Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.