

Community Governance Reviews

Summary:	Following consultation with relevant stakeholders, final recommendations are now being made on the series of Community Governance Reviews to reflect changes to the boundaries of several parishes within the district; as well as the proposed grouping of the Hempton and Pudding Norton parishes which had previously been requested by the two Parish Councils. We have also run a recent consultation on whether or not a warding arrangement should be implemented within the parish of Raynham, should the boundary change with Helhoughton be implemented.
Conclusions:	The report contained herewith details final recommendations relating to the series of Community Governance reviews to be considered by Full Council for implementation.
Recommendations:	That Full Council considers the community governance reviews and approves implementation.
Reasons for Recommendations:	These final recommendations are being made in order to address some historical administrative anomalies, reflect better, clearer boundaries which reflect the identities of those living within the areas concerned and establish sustainable community governance structures.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS AS REQUIRED BY LAW

(Papers relied on to write the report, which do not contain exempt information and which are not published elsewhere)

*Appendix 1: Maps and summaries of proposals pdf
Appendix 2: Sculthorpe/Fakenham proposals and implications pdf
Appendix 3: Cromer/Roughton/Northrepps revised final recommendations and implications pdf
Appendix 4: Raynham and Helhoughton proposed mapping and implications pdf*

Cabinet Member(s) Cllr S Butikofer, Leader	Ward(s) affected Various
Contact Officer, telephone number and email: Rob Henry. X6327, robert.henry@north-norfolk.gov.uk	

1. Introduction

Having concluded relevant consultation into the series of Community Governance Reviews which commenced earlier in the year, Final Recommendations are now being put to members of Full Council for approval.

2. Administrative Corrections

2.1 The following proposals are recommended as previously submitted to Full Council in July 2021 as draft recommendations and in the maps and explanations shown in Appendix 1. Mostly these are inconsequential boundary anomaly changes but the ones marked with an * do have slight changes in Council Tax and or Governance from the parish/ward they currently sit in and further details are provided later in the main report. Orders in respect of these changes will now be drawn up and mapping data will be changed to reflect the amendments:

- 1) Aldborough and Alby;
- 2) Barsham and Fakenham North;
- 3) Binham and Hindringham;
- 4) Blakeney and Wiveton;
- 5) Brinton and Stody;
- 6) East and West Beckham;
- 7) East Runton and Cromer (West)*
- 8) Felbrigg, Cromer Town and Roughton;
- 9) Gunthorpe (South) and Briningham;
- 10) Gresham and Sustead;
- 11) Sidestrand and Northrepps and Sidestrand and Trimingham;
- 12) Upper Sheringham and Sheringham (South)

2.2 Fakenham North/South and Sculthorpe:

This proposal is made to relocate properties in Sandy Lane and Sculthorpe Eastgate which currently fall within the parish of Sculthorpe into the Fakenham parish i.e. the Land east of the A1065/A148 bypass.

The opinion on this review is split with the majority of respondents affected being against the idea. The District Member for Lancaster North had previously backed the proposal for his own ward while stating he could see it being more of an issue for those in Lancaster South and that he would leave it to members representing that ward to provide feedback. Cllr Punchard, member for Lancaster South indicated that 'proposals aligned residents to the town which serves them and the representation more appropriately more so in terms of NCC divisional boundaries currently under Wells Division' Following a meeting at Sculthorpe Parish Council, opposition to the plans was received which was echoed by the County Member, Cllr FitzPatrick. The Parish Council indicated they had previously undertaken a consultation through doorstop canvassing and stated that comments received were mostly not in support or was ambivalent to the changes proposed. The Chair of the Parish Council in summing up commented 'If it is not broke, why fix it' and the proposals being an exercise to make the boundaries look tidier. Following the meeting of Sculthorpe Parish Council meeting of 3rd November a petition has been carried out by the parish council to which 40 responses have been received from residents who do not support the proposals being put forward.

The financial implications of the proposed changes can be seen in appendix 2 but in summary, it has been advised by Finance that the reduction of funds to Sculthorpe Parish Council would be £1308.85 which based on a band D property assumption would be an extra £4.22 per year or £0.35 per month to the remaining Council Tax Payers within the parish.

While acknowledging the feedback received officers do consider the proposals to align the properties on Sandy Lane and Sculthorpe Eastgate within Lancaster South ward, due to their geographical proximity and the reasonable expectation that they could both identify as being a resident of the ward, and where they are likely to be using the town services and infrastructure.

2.3 Northrepps and Cromer:

This proposal sought to include those parts of the Northrepps parish north of the Norwich Road railway bridge i.e. Norwich Road, Stevens Road, Christophers Close, The Ridgeway, Finch Close and Nightingale Close into Cromer parish.

The proposal has not received support during the consultation process including from the Parish Council in Northrepps, local parishioners and the local ward member for Poppyland ward, Cllr Fitch-Tillett and indeed was met with resistance at the Parish Council meeting attended by Officers in October 2021.

As such the proposal has been amended for final recommendations as shown in the map and explanation in Appendix 3. In summary, the proposed boundary would still be amended such that properties on The Ridgeway, Finch Close and Nightingale Close which are accessed off Hillside in Cromer, are moved into the Cromer Town ward. For consistency, the two properties at the end of Stevens Road, Capri and Maryfield which are currently within Cromer Town ward would be moved to Northrepps parish with the rest of the road and all other properties on Norwich Road, Christophers Close would remain in Northrepps parish. Appendix 3 also shows a breakdown of the revised proposal's effect on Council Tax parish precept for both the properties which would remain in the parish of Northrepps, including the two properties on Stevens Road which would be moving from Cromer and finally the effect of the change on Cromer Town Councils precept and the properties which would now find themselves in that Parish ward.

2.4 West Raynham and Helhoughton:

The initial part of the proposals to change the boundary between Helhoughton and Raynham to place all properties at the former RAF West Raynham into Raynham parish is recommended to proceed as originally proposed given the favourable response received in the initial consultation period.

There are 128 houses proposed to move from Helhoughton to Raynham parish with 126 of them being Band A properties and two being Band B. The difference between the two is an increase of parish precept of £1.84 per year and £2.14 per year respectively.

It has been advised by Finance that the reduction of funds to Helhoughton Parish Council would be £3067.50 per annum which, based on a band D property assumption would be an extra £26.67 per year or £2.22 per month to the remaining Council Tax Payers in the parish. Mapping and details of the properties relating to this proposal is shown in appendix 4.

N.B The follow up proposals into the warding arrangement within Raynham parish which is currently being consulted does not form part of the final recommendations at this point and will form a separate decision at a later date.

2.5 Sheringham and Upper Sheringham:

This proposal was to amend the boundary between Sheringham and Upper Sheringham so that the new Norfolk Homes development on Holway Road would be within the Sheringham parish.

This proposal received acceptance from residents living in the streets in close proximity to the development, however, it did not have the support of the parish council in Upper Sheringham and one of the District Members for Sheringham South aligned themselves with the Parish Council's reasons for objections. However, while acknowledging the comments made we consider the proposal should be agreed as proposed and for the new properties in the new development be designated within the parish ward of Sheringham South given the distance to town facilities, schools and polling arrangements and indeed the strong links and common identities which will be established with residencies in their immediate proximity. The mapping for this proposal is within appendix 1.

2.6 East Runton and Cromer;

This is boundary anomaly which does have consequences in terms of council tax precept and governance for the three properties concerned, however no response was received during consultation and the proposal to move the properties from East Runton Parish to Cromer Town West, in line with the remaining properties on Sandy Lane and Bittern Rise remains unchanged. The mapping for this proposal is shown within appendix 1.

2.7 Grouping of Hempton and Pudding Norton Parish Councils

This proposal is following a request from both Hempton and Pudding Norton (with Testerton) parish councils to implement a grouping arrangement between the two parish councils. Over recent years it has been a challenge to maintain membership levels so the grouping arrangement would be a way of alleviating that issue with both current parish councils being dissolved and a new common parish council being implemented.

Consultation was undertaken during autumn which provided a small number of positive responses with none being received in objection. Conversations have taken place with the clerk and chair of the Parish Council who are keen on implementing this grouping arrangement at the earliest opportunity so the grouping arrangement is recommended for approval in order to allow the parishes to move forward with sufficient local representation.

3. Conclusion

In respect of the inconsequential boundary anomaly proposals, these changes are recommended for approval as they will deliver sensible revisions to district boundary mapping. Where there are more consequential changes in terms of Council Tax and governance, it is believed that the proposals do bring about sensible adjustments which either reflect more recent developments or align them with the parish where they are closer to geographically or could be reasonably considered to identify as being a part of.

4. Implications and Risks

Council Tax implications in terms of Parish Precept for both Parish Councils and also residents affected either by moving or those staying in a parish with a reduced tax base.

Possible change in governance for some residents who would change ward if proposed changes are adopted.

5. Financial Implications and Risks

There will be changes to Council Tax precepts in some of the properties where they will be moving to a different parish as a result of the changes that have been suggested. These are all outlined in the appendices to show the impact on the properties which will be moving and broken down in to each band. Also the impact on each Parish Council in terms of loss or gain and what the average increase will be in terms of parish precept to each property remaining in a parish with a reduction in Council Tax Base.

6. Sustainability

There are no sustainability implications relating to this report.

7. Equality and Diversity

There are no considerations in relation to this.

8. Section 17 Crime and Disorder considerations

There are no considerations required in relation to this.