

Public Document Pack



Date: 14 October 2014
Our ref:
Ask For:
Direct Dial: 01843 577194
Email: lyn.davey@thanet.gov.uk

BOUNDARY AND ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS WORKING PARTY

22 OCTOBER 2014

A meeting of the Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party will be held at **7.00 pm on Wednesday, 22 October 2014** at the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Membership:

Councillor D Green (Chairman); Councillors: Duncan, Gideon, Hornus, Nicholson, Roberts and W Scobie

A G E N D A

Item
No

Subject

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**
To receive any declarations of interest. Members are advised to consider the advice contained within the Declaration of Interest form attached at the back of this agenda. If a Member declares an interest, they should complete that form and hand it to the officer clerking the meeting and then take the prescribed course of action.
3. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 JULY 2014** (Pages 1 - 4)
4. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW** (Pages 5 - 18)
5. **REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES** (Pages 19 - 38)

Declaration of Interests Form

This page is intentionally left blank

BOUNDARY AND ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2014 at 7.00 pm at Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: Councillor David Green (Chairman); Councillors Duncan, Gideon, Nicholson, Roberts, W Scobie and K Gregory

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hornus, who was substituted by Councillor K Gregory.

12. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

13. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 JULY 2014

It was proposed by Councillor Duncan and seconded by Councillor Gideon that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 July were approved as a correct record subject to substitution of the word “but” for “and” so that the second line of paragraph 3 of minute 10 reads “... and recognised that it...”.

MATTERS ARISING FOR THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager gave an update on the review of electoral arrangements being undertaken by Kent County Council (KCC).

He had spoken with the Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership who confirmed that there were no specific proposals within KCC’s review which would affect Thanet’s district wards. Furthermore, KCC’s review had not yet been submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and the outcome would not be implemented until May 2017. Currently, although KCC had expressed a preference for single member electoral divisions it had not specifically requested them from the LGBCE.

14. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager introduced the report on proposed second-stage public consultation arrangements and details of the precepts that might be set by the new town/parish councils.

He then introduced the Corporate Information Manager and Finance Manager who both spoke on their respective elements of the consultation document.

Public consultation (Stage 2)

Members asked that the proposed online questionnaire be kept as clear as possible and easy to follow.

With this in mind it was agreed to amend some of the questions to make the online form easier to complete.

On the grounds that the full range of governance options had been offered for public consultation in Satge 1, it was decided to remove the second part of question 3, so that the question is closed:

“Do you agree with the proposal above for two new Parish/Town Councils (Margate Town Council and Westgate-on-Sea Parish Council)?”

Furthermore, it was agreed to add the following question to the end of the online form:

“Do you have any other comments about the proposal for the above for the future governance of Westgate-on-Sea?”

The Corporate Information Manager informed Members that a paper copy of the consultation document would be made available to people that requested one. The Working Party agreed that the consultation document needed to be made “attractive” in order to generate interest.

Hyperlinks would be used throughout the online consultation document. Due to the restrictions of the web publishing software it was not possible to have “dialogue boxes” which would provide further information when a cursor was moved over certain words.

Some members raised concerns that the consultation wouldn’t be seen by those with no internet access. The Corporate Information Manager informed Members that as budgets were limited, targeting all residents was impossible. The Communication Implementation Plan detailed the proposed methods of reaching residents within the budgetary constraints.

It was agreed that the consultation document would reiterate the different roles/powers between the Charter Trustees and town/parish councils so that residents could make up their own minds.

Proposed precepts

The Finance Manager gave a summary of the possible precepts for the town and parish councils based on a number of assumptions. However, he stressed that these figures were based on existing levels of service provision and functions that must transfer from the Margate Charter Trustees to the new town/parish Councils. Any additional services the town or parish councils would like to deliver would increase the precept.

Some Members discussed the possibility of using the existing reserves of the Charter Trustees to pay for the inaugural elections but were advised against basing projected precepts on that basis. The decision of what to do with the reserves would be down to the newly created town and parish council.

The Working Party agreed that the Finance Manager’s assumptions would not be included in the public consultation document in detail because there were best guesses based upon the limited information currently available; however the precepts for a Band D property would be included (but without the percentage increase from the Current precept of the Margate Charter Trustees). Thus the consultation documents would cite possible Band D precepts of £14.86 for Margate Town Council and £24.58 for Westgate Parish Council.

Also, it was agreed that that it would be a good idea to show the yearly precepts for other local town/parish councils in the consultation thus giving residents a comparison.

With this in mind the consultation document would also be amended to emphasise that the suggested precepts for a Margate Town Council and Westgate-on-Sea Parish

Council were based on no additional service provisions being made available; and that any additional services would increase the precept.

It was proposed by Councillor K Gregory, and seconded by Councillor R Nicholson that:

1. The programme and content of the second stage public consultation programme be agreed as amended;
2. The consultation documents would cite possible Band D precepts of £14.86 for Margate Town Council and £24.58 for Westgate Parish Council.

RESOLVED

Meeting concluded : 8.20 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

REVIEW OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS - MARGATE

To: **Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party, 22 October 2014**

By: **Glenn Back, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager;**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Wards: **Cliftonville East, Cliftonville West, Dane Valley, Garlinge, Margate Central, Salmestone, Westbrook, Westgate-on-Sea**

Summary: This report sets out the results of the second-stage public consultation, and seeks recommendations from the Working Party to submit to the extraordinary Council meeting on 18 November.

For decision

1.0 Introduction and Background

1.1 The Working Party met on 3 and 24 July 2014 to consider the outcome of the first stage public consultation and agree proposals to be included in a second stage public consultation exercise, prior to reporting a recommended way forward to Council, at the extraordinary Council meeting on 18 November 2014.

1.2 On 3 July 2014 the Working Party agreed that:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A "Margate Town Council" be created for the un-parished area of Margate excluding the District Ward of Westgate on Sea; with the same number and distribution of Councillors as the current District Wards, that is to say 17 Councillors in all; and,2. A "Westgate Parish Council" be created for the area covered by the current District Ward of Westgate-on-Sea, with 10 parish councillors. |
|---|

1.3 On 24 July 2014 the Working Party agreed that:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The programme and content of the second stage public consultation programme be agreed as amended;2. The consultation documents would cite possible Band D precepts of £14.86 for Margate Town Council and £24.58 for Westgate Parish Council. |
|---|

2.0 Stage 2 public consultation – activities undertaken

2.1 Following the Working Party agreeing a programme of consultation on 24 July 2014, a very wide range of activities were undertaken. These included:

- a) A very wide range of information was made available on the Council's web site, including an on-line version of the consultation questionnaire. A "banner" highlighting the consultation was placed on the Council's home page for the duration of the consultation period (see Figure 1), linking directly to the information and questionnaire.
- b) Press advertisements were run in both the Isle of Thanet Gazette (page 14 Aug 15th edition & 19th Sept & 26th Sept editions); and the Thanet Extra (page 9 Aug 20th edition & 17th Sept & 24th Sept editions).
- c) There was a press release from which articles were printed on p.16 of the Thanet Extra (13 Aug edition) "Public given say on creation of fresh councils" and p.2 of the Isle of Thanet Gazette (15 Aug edition) 'Westgate plots to break from Margate in Review'.
- d) The PR & Publicity team liaised with local papers to seek further editorial coverage in the run-up to the consultation deadline.
- e) Two tweets per day were broadcast via the Council's Twitter account for the duration of the consultation period.
- f) A random sample of 1,000 Margate and Westgate residents were sent letters introducing the consultation process and inviting them to respond.
- g) Posters and postcards were hand-delivered to shops in the highest footfall areas of Margate, Westgate, Westbrook and Garlinge.
- h) There was a generic post card produced and a slightly different "door-drop" postcard that was delivered to all Margate and Westgate properties in September detailing the content of the proposal and how to respond (see Figures 2 to 4 regarding the post cards and Figures 5 and 6 regarding the posters).
- i) There were two public meetings held in August, one in Westgate and the other in Margate. Around seventy people attended the meeting in Westgate and around twenty people attended in Margate). The background to the review was outlined and the proposals made by the Working Party were explained. A wide range of questions were answered and many hard copies of the questionnaire and consultation posters were handed out. After those meetings, several people that attended also requested paper copies of the questionnaire.
- j) Hard copy consultation documents were provided to local libraries, the Council Reception and the Gateway.
- k) All Thanet District Councillors were provided with posters and postcards as well as some additional hard copy questionnaires.
- l) Posters and postcards were sent to community groups and leisure facilities in Margate and Westgate.
- m) Posters were displayed around the Council offices as well as information being displayed on the Council's intranet and in staff briefings.
- n) A full page advertorial in the KM Extra newspaper with the full consultation questionnaire, which could be cut out, completed and returned.

Figure 1

The “banner” on the home page of the Council’s web site.



Figure 2

The “post card” (front)



Figure 3

The generic “post card” (rear)



Figure 4

The door drop "post card" (rear)

The council's Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party has proposed, and would like YOUR views on, the following change to local governance in Margate.



The replacement of the Margate Charter Trustees by dividing the unparished area into two separate Parishes; a Town Council which will serve the wards of Cliftonville East, Cliftonville West, Dane Valley, Garlinge, Margate Central, Salmestone and Westbrook and will be known as Margate Town Council. Ward boundaries will not change and 17 Town Councillors will be elected;

a Parish Council which will serve only the ward of Westgate-on-sea and will be known as Westgate Parish Council. The ward boundary for Westgate-on-sea will not change and 10 Parish Councillors will be elected.

For more info and to complete the survey visit:
thanet.gov.uk/speakup

If you would like information in an alternative format please contact 01843 577165.
Closing date: Monday 29 September 2014



Figure 5

The A3 poster (for public meetings):



**Do YOU WANT A
MARGATE TOWN COUNCIL &
WESTGATE PARISH COUNCIL ?**



Give us your views.

Public meetings:

7pm 27 August:
Westgate Pavilion, 44 Sea Road, Westgate-on-sea CT8 8QW

7pm 28 August:
Council Chamber, TDC Offices, Cecil Street, Margate CT9 1RE

For more info and to complete the survey:
thanet.gov.uk/speakup

Closing date: 29 September 2014
If you need information in an alternative format please call 01843 577050.



Figure 6

The A3 generic poster:



3.0 Stage 2 public consultation - outcome

- 3.1 This section analyses the responses to the second stage consultation. Note that there were a few “non-responses” to some specific questions, and that where applicable, the analysis below focuses upon those responses that did express a preference one way or another. Thus it is possible that a small variation in the “totals” may appear from time to time.
- 3.2 Three-hundred and thirty-seven responses to the consultation were received. The overwhelming majority of responses were from people living within the un-parished area of Margate subject to the review; all but eight responses, in fact.

Where do you live?	Number	% of total
Not in Margate	8	2.4
Cliftonville East	41	12.3
Cliftonville West	25	7.5
Dane Valley	17	5.1
Garlinge	35	10.5
Margate Central	20	6.0
Salmestone	10	3.0
Westbrook	44	13.2
Westgate on Sea	134	40.1

- 3.3 Overall, a clear majority of respondents expressed a preference not to have a town/parish council

Do you agree with the proposal... for two new parish/town councils (a Margate Town Council and a Westgate Parish Council)?	Number	% of total
Yes	137	40.7
No	200	59.3

- 3.4 An analysis of responses to the previous question has been undertaken based upon area of residence, given that the public consultation meeting in Westgate did suggest a high level of support for the creation of a local parish council. For residents of Westgate, the result is as follows:

Do you agree with the proposal... for two new parish/town councils (a Margate Town Council and a Westgate Parish Council)? <i>Residents of Westgate Only</i>	Number	% of total
Yes	81	68.1
No	50	38.2

- 3.5 Thus, a significant majority of the responses in Westgate favoured the creation of a parish council.
- 3.6 A number of comments were made at the public consultation meeting held in Westgate by residents of nearby Wards, such as Westbrook, that they would like to form a parish council together with the Westgate area. Thus the following table shows the preference expressed within each of the other Wards of the review area, and for the un-parished area of Margate as a whole but excluding Westgate:

Do you agree with the proposal... for two new parish/town councils (a Margate Town Council and a Westgate Parish Council)?	Number of responses	%age supporting parish/Town Council	% opposing parish/Town Council
Clintonville East	41	24.4	62.5
Clintonville West	25	44.0	56.0
Dane Valley	17	35.3	64.7
Garlinge	35	17.1	82.9
Margate Central	20	30.0	70.0
Salmestone	10	30.0	70.0
Westbrook	42	26.2	73.8
The whole review area <u>except</u> for Westgate	190	27.9	72.1

- 3.7 It is therefore clear that in no Ward other than Westgate was there a majority of responses supporting the creation of a parish/town council.
- 3.8 For residents living outside of the review area (i.e. outside of the un-parished area of Margate), the result was as follows:

Do you agree with the proposal... for two new parish/town councils (a Margate Town Council and a Westgate Parish Council)? <i>Residents outside of the un-parished area of Margate Only</i>	Number	% of total
Yes	3	37.5
No	5	62.5

- 3.9 Some comments regarding the boundaries of a possible parish/town council were also made to the open-ended question at the end of the survey. Given the results of the specific survey questions, these have been analysed in terms of whether they favoured joining a Westgate parish council with any other area. Overall, 23 such comments favoured a Westgate parish council on its own, 11 supported a combined Westgate & Westbrook parish council, and 10 supported a combined Westgate, Westbrook and Garlinge parish council. If responses are analysed from Westgate residents only, 21 favoured Westgate parish council on its own, and only 13 combined with Westbrook or Garlinge.
- 3.10 It must be concluded that there is more support for a stand-alone Westgate parish council than there is for any other combination, plus it needs to be borne in mind in any case that a majority of responses from all the Wards except for Westgate were opposed the idea of creating a parish council.
- 3.11 Although it is for the Working Party to agree recommendations to Council, the above analysis does seem to suggest that it could possibly consider a different recommendation for Westgate, compared to the rest of the review area.

3.12 In terms of any new town/parish council boundaries, the responses were as follows:

Do you agree that the current ward boundaries within the two proposed parish/town councils remain unchanged?	Number	% of total
Yes	282	87.0
No	42	13.0

3.13 Bearing in mind that only in Westgate did a majority of responses favour the creation of a parish council, the following table shows the responses to this question for the Westgate area only:

Do you agree that the current ward boundaries within the two proposed parish/town councils remain unchanged? <i>Residents of Westgate only</i>	Number	% of total
Yes	107	85.6
No	18	14.4

3.14 In terms of the proposed number of parish/town councillors, it needs to be borne in mind that this was covered in two questions. One was a “closed” question – do you agree with the number proposed by the Working Party? The other was an “open” question – if you do not agree with the proposed number, how many do you think there should be? The responses to the “closed” question were as follows:

Do you agree with the suggested number of new parish/town councillors for each of the proposed parish/town councils?	Number	% of total
Yes	138	43.7
No	178	56.3

3.15 Again, bearing in mind that only in Westgate did a majority of responses favour the creation of a parish council, the following table shows the responses to this question for the Westgate area only:

Do you agree with the suggested number of new parish/town councillors for each of the proposed parish/town councils? <i>Residents of Westgate only</i>	Number	% of total
Yes	73	58.4
No	52	41.6

3.16 In contrast to the rest of the currently un-parished area of Margate, a majority of the residents in Westgate agreed with the proposed number of parish councillors serving on the parish council (ten).

3.17 There was also a separate “open” question asking how many parish/town councillors there should be. This has been analysed for residents of Westgate given that it is only there that a majority of responses supported a parish council. The responses to this open question included the following suggestions for the desirable number of parish councillors:

Suggested number of parish councillors: Residents of Westgate only	Number	% of total	Comment
Below five	3	16.7	Not lawful - too few
Five	5	27.8	
Six	2	11.1	
Seven	2	11.1	
Eight	4	22.2	
Nine	1	5.6	
Ten	1	5.6	The number proposed in the consultation
Above ten	0	0.0	

3.18 In terms of the responses to the open-ended question, there was a clear preference for fewer than 10 parish councillors (17 out of 18 responses). But that needs to be considered within the context that when responding to the "closed" question (do you agree with the suggested number of 10 parish councillors), many more (73 out of 125, or 58.4%) of the responses from residents of Westgate did indeed agree that there should be 10 parish councillors.

3.19 The consultation documents included indicative precepts if a Margate Town and Westgate parish Council were to be created. The views expressed regarding these were as follows:

Do you think the estimated precept for Margate Town Council is:	Number	% of total
Too high	148	55.0
The right amount	104	38.7
Too little	17	6.3

Do you think the estimated precept for Westgate Parish Council is:	Number	% of total
Too high	157	57.7
The right amount	102	37.5
Too little	13	4.8

3.20 Overall, respondents felt the suggested precepts were too high.

3.21 Because it is only in the Westgate Ward that a majority of respondents favoured the creation of a parish council, the responses to this question in the Westgate Ward are shown below:

Do you think the estimated precept for Westgate Parish Council is: <i>Residents of Westgate only</i>	Number	% of total
Too high	51	42.9
The right amount	61	51.3
Too little	7	5.9

3.22 Again, there is a significant difference from the rest of the review area, with a majority of responses from residents in Westgate thinking the indicative precept of £24.58 is about right.

4.0 Options available to the Working Party

4.1 There appear to be only three main options available to the Working Party, as follows:

4.1.1 The Working Party could recommend no change to the current arrangements; that is to say, no new town/parish council is created and the existing Charter Trustees remain.

4.1.2 Noting that it is only in Westgate that a majority of responses favoured the creation of a parish council, the Working Party might recommend the creation of a Westgate Parish Council, but that the remainder of the area retains Charter Trustees.

4.1.3 The third option is not supported by the above analysis of the consultation responses, but the Working Party could reaffirm its original proposals, to recommend the creation of a Margate Town Council and a Westgate Parish Council.

5.0 Corporate Implications

5.1 Financial and VAT

5.1.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from the report for Thanet District Council. However, if the Working Party makes a recommendation to create a new town/parish council, consideration will need to be given to the impact on the Margate Charter Trustees, especially if the recommendation is to establish a Westgate Parish Council and retain the Charter Trustees in the remainder of the currently un-parished area of Margate.

5.1.2 As identified in previous reports, there would be a need to split the assets with any newly parished area, including but not limited to reserves, assets, accommodation and mayors regalia. This would need to be addressed through the legal process as part of creating the Community Governance Order, which could then potentially impact on any precept assumptions that had previously been made.

5.1.3 There are no VAT implications arising directly from this report.

5.2 Legal

- 5.2.1 Thanet District Council is conducting the review of community governance arrangements in the Margate area in accordance with Part 4 Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- 5.2.2 The Council is having regard to the Statutory Guidance on Community Governance Reviews issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
- 5.2.3 In light of the responses to the stage two consultation, external legal advice is currently being sought on the possibility that the Working Party may wish to recommend the creation of a Westgate Parish Council and the retention of the Charter Trustees in the remainder of the currently un-parished area of Margate. The Council is also seeking external legal advice on the process for taking any recommendations forward (including creating any Community Governance Order).
- 5.2.4 It is hoped that the external legal advice will be received no later than Friday 17 October 2014, and when received, it will be circulated as a supplementary agenda.

5.3 Corporate

- 5.3.1 Consulting and involving Thanet people in decisions that affect them.

5.4 Equity and Equalities

- 5.4.1 None identified.

6.0 Recommendations

- 6.1 On 3 July 2014, the Working Party made the following proposals which formed the subject of this consultation.
- 6.2 The Working Party is invited to consider whether and how those proposals ought to be amended in light of the stage two consultation responses, prior to submission to Council:

	Westgate-on-Sea	Remainder of currently un-parished area of Margate
Governance	Town/Parish Council to replace Charter Trustees	Town/Parish Council to replace Charter Trustees
Boundaries	Same as for current District Ward of Westgate-on-Sea	Same as for currently un-parished area of Margate except for Ward of Westgate-on-Sea
Names	Westgate	Margate
Styles	Parish Council	Town Council

	Westgate-on-Sea	Remainder of currently un-parished area of Margate
Electoral divisions	Same as current District Ward of Westgate-on-Sea	Retain current District Ward boundaries of: Cliftonville East, Cliftonville West, Dane Valley, Garlinge, Margate Central, Salmestone, and Westbrook.
Number of councillors	10	17
Whether any grouping or de-grouping is desired	No	No
Whether any consequential amendments to existing District or County electoral arrangements are to be recommended to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.	No	No
Date of first election	7 May 2015	7 May 2015

7.0 Decision Making Process

- 7.1 The District Council is responsible for conducting a review within its electoral area. The Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party has delegated authority to develop proposals to be the subject of public consultation, to consider the response to that consultation and to make final recommendations to Council.
- 7.2 Council will be required to approve the final recommendations prior to the Community Governance Order being made.
- 7.3 This process will be undertaken in accordance with the stages and timetable agreed at the previous meeting of the Working Party, with the outcome reported to an extraordinary meeting of Council on 18 November 2014.

Contact Officer:	Glenn Back, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager, x7187
Reporting to:	Paul Cook, Interim Director of Corporate Resources

Future decisions

Council	18 November 2014
---------	------------------

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007	<i>Via internet</i>

Annexes

None	
------	--

Corporate Consultation Undertaken

Finance	Matt Sanham, Finance Manager (Service Support)
Legal	Steven Boyle, Interim Legal Services Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES 2014

To: **Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party – 22 October 2014**

By: **Glenn Back, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Ward: **All wards**

Summary: This report summarises the work undertaken by the Democratic Services Department on the review of polling districts and polling places 2014 which incorporates representations received during the public consultation

For decision

1.0 Introduction and Background

1.1 On 9 January 2014, the Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party received a report from the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager outlining the need for a polling district and polling places review, notice of the review and consultation arrangements and timetable of the review.

2.0 Work to date

2.1 The Council gave public notice of the review and consulted the Returning Officer and any such persons it thought would have particular expertise in relation to access to premises or facilities for persons who have different forms of disability. Such persons were given the opportunity to make representations and to comment on representations made to the Council by the Returning Officer.

2.2 The Council gave public notice of the review in a local newspaper and on the Council's website on 1 July 2014. In addition, the following parties were invited to submit representations including suggestions for the identification of polling districts and alternative polling places and polling stations:

- All district councillors;
- Town and Parish Councils;
- Kent County Council
- Local political party groups; and
- Local organisations with expertise in matters concerning access to premises.

2.3 Following this initial consultation period, the Returning Officer made representations to the Council which included information as to the location of both existing and proposed polling places and polling stations. Interested parties were able to make comments on the Returning Officer's representations.

3.0 The review process

- 3.1 All existing polling stations were evaluated by Officers at the European Parliamentary Election using the evaluation checklist used by the Electoral Commission. Upon completion, Officers analysed each individual polling station checklist to ascertain the suitability of the existing polling stations.
- 3.2 Furthermore, feedback generated from the European Parliamentary Election (electors, staff, candidates, agents, elected representatives, etc) was analysed and incorporated into the review. This was in addition to the public consultation as part of the statutory review.

4.0 Inappropriate polling stations

- 4.1 The Democratic Services Department has identified two polling stations which, at the time of the last review, were the most suitable on offer despite minor drawbacks, but Officers are now recommending alternative polling stations.

Bradstowe (BSD)

- 4.2 The current polling place for the Bradstowe (BSD) polling district is the Youth and Leisure Centre, Retort House, Albion Street, Broadstairs.
- 4.3 Feedback from polling station staff following the European Parliamentary Election was that the polling station itself was relatively small and that there was no natural light within the polling station.
- 4.4 As an alternative, Officers re-visited the Holy Trinity Church Hall in Church Road, Broadstairs. The Holy Trinity Church Hall had been used before as a polling station but due to access restrictions it was decided not to use it again.
- 4.5 Since the last review, the Church Hall has undergone renovation work to make the building more accessible. There were no longer any internal steps or obstructions/hazards. The flooring was now non slip and the disabled access had been improved.
- 4.6 There remained a problem with a slight step to the front of the building but this could be eased with the use of a temporary ramp.
- 4.7 See **Annex 1** for the location of the proposed polling station.

Salmestone (MP2)

- 4.8 The current polling place for the Salmestone (MP2) polling district is the Global Generation Church, Unit 2-4 Westwood Business Park, Margate.
- 4.9 Feedback from both polling station staff and electors following the European Parliamentary Election was that the polling place was too remote and that unless electors drove, it was not easily accessible and some of the elderly population would not be able to walk from the main road.
- 4.10 As an alternative, Officers re-visited the Orb Public House on Margate Road, Margate. The Orb Public House had been used before as a polling station but due to the lack of lighting with the room used it was decided not to use it again.

4.11 Since the last review, the Orb has a new owner who has undertaken extensive improvement/renovation works. The room available now has good lighting with doormats level with the floor with a non-slip floor covering.

4.12 See **Annex 2** for the location of the proposed polling place.

5.0 Representations received

5.1 During the consultation stages a total of three representations were received regarding the proposed polling places/stations

Resident of Linley Road – Beacon Road Ward (BSB) – Westover Free Church Hall, Linley Road

5.2 A resident submitted representation on the need for two ramps; one inside near the outer door entrance and the other on the outside over the step. This would prevent people tripping when entering/exiting the building.

5.3 Due to an incident at the European Parliamentary Election, Officers tried to seek alternative premises within the polling district but were unsuccessful. Officers highlighted to the owner of the Church Hall the trip hazard created by the metal door frame and it was decided that ramps would be provided by the Council.

Councillor Alan Poole – Sir Moses Montefiore Ward (RC and RD)

5.4 Councillor Alan Poole submitted representation stating that he was happy with the two polling district/places with the Sir Moses Montefiore Ward.

Resident of Hockeredge Gardens, Westgate-on-Sea

5.5 A resident submitted representation on why their address is Westgate yet they are asked to vote in the Westbrook Ward.

5.6 Unfortunately, this review of polling districts and polling places can only look at wards already in existence and cannot change ward boundaries. Ward boundaries will be considered at the next periodic electoral review that will be undertaken after the 2015 elections but prior to the 2019 District wide elections.

6.0 Next Steps

6.1 It is now up to the Electoral Matters Working Party to make any comments on the proposed polling places and polling stations and recommend a scheme to Council.

6.2 The proposed scheme can be found at **Annex 3**.

7.0 Recommendations

Option 1

- 7.1 The Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party recommend to Council that it adopts the proposed revised polling district and polling places scheme for implementation on 1 December 2014.

Option 2

- 7.2 The Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party recommends an alternative scheme of polling districts and polling places that officers would need to consider.
- 7.3 Officers would then report their findings to an additional meeting of the Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party for further consideration before being resubmitted to an extraordinary meeting of Council prior to 1 December 2014.
- 7.4 Members need to be aware that if there is not a revised scheme in place by 1 December 2014 (when the revised electoral register is published) then any changes Council make to the polling districts will need to be incorporated into a revised electoral register which would then need to be republished at an additional cost (i.e. costs of re-printing, re-distributing and re-advertising the revised register).

8.0 Corporate implications

Financial

- 8.1 There will be some financial implications due to the increase in signage and ramps proposed. These costs will be met by the Ministry of Justice for Parliamentary and European Parliamentary Elections, by Kent County Council for County Elections, by the District Council for District elections and by Town/Parish Councils for Town/Parish Council Elections. No additional budget needs to be set aside for the District election in 2015 because provision for that election has already been made within the budget.

Legal

- 8.2 It is a legal requirement to undertake the review before the end of the year. Failure to carry out the review could result in representations being made to the Electoral Commission because the Council failed to carry out the review, which could result in the Electoral Commission directing the Council to amend its current polling districts and polling places.

Corporate

- 8.3 Through the polling district and polling places review Thanet people have been consulted.

Equity and Equalities

- 8.4 The subject of equalities has been considered during the review and detailed findings were included in the briefing note previously circulated to all Members and the reports presented to the Working Party and circulated to others.

9.0 Decision Making Process

- 9.1 The Council delegated the review of the polling districts and polling places to the Boundary and Electoral Matters Working Party. Upon completion of the review the Boundary and Electoral Matters Working Party must recommend to Council a revised scheme of polling districts and polling places for its determination. That report is scheduled to be made to an extraordinary meeting of Council on 18 November 2014.
- 9.2 Council is the decision making body.

Contact Officer:	Glenn Back, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Manager
Reporting to:	Paul Cook, Interim Director of Corporate & Regulatory Services & Deputy 151 Officer

Annex List

Annex 1	Proposed Polling Place – Bradstow (BSD)
Annex 2	Proposed Polling Places – Salmestone (MP2)
Annex 3	Proposed Polling District and Polling Places Scheme

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
Existing Polling District and Polling Places Scheme	<i>Available from Electoral Services</i>
Proposed Polling District and Polling Places Scheme	<i>Available from Electoral Services</i>

This page is intentionally left blank

Title: Annex 1

Agenda Item 5

Project name: Proposed polling place - Bradstowe (BSD)

Annex 1

Notes:

Scale: 1:1,250

Author: Electoral Services



(c) Crown copyright and database rights 2014 Ordnance Survey 10001826

Legend

This page is intentionally left blank

Title: Annex 2

Project name: Proposed polling place - Salmestone (MP2)

Notes:

Scale: 1:3,750

Author: Electoral Services



Legend

This page is intentionally left blank

Thanet District Council

Review of polling districts and polling places (Parliamentary Elections) Regulations 2006

Proposed Scheme

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
Beacon Road Ward	BSB	Westover Free Church Hall, Linley Road, Broadstairs	2180	One adverse comment received – ramps required to prevent people tripping over the door step/ledge	Ramps need to be provided on polling day however accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	BSC	St Andrews Church Hall, Reading Street, Broadstairs	1306	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Birchington North Ward	BTA	Kearns Memorial Hall, Grenham Bay Avenue, Birchington	2034	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change

Annex 3

Agenda Item 5

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
	BTB	Birchington Bowls Club, Bowls Pavilion, Beach Avenue	1246	None	Ramp needs to be provided on polling day however accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Birchington South Ward	BTC	Church House, Kent Gardens, Birchington	2898	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	BTD	Birchington Village Centre, Alpha Road, Birchington	2364	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Bradstowe Ward	BSD	Youth and Leisure Centre, Retort House, Albion Street	3239	None	Polling station area relatively small	Change to: Holy Trinity Church Hall, Church Road, Broadstairs
Central Harbour Ward	RG	Ramsgate Youth Centre, High Street, St Lawrence	2697	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RH	The Elms Club (Ramsgate) Ltd, Elms	2938	None	Accessible and appropriate for	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
		Avenue, Ramsgate			electorate	
Cliffsend and Pegwell Ward	RL	Cliffsend Village Hall, Foads Lane, Cliffsend	1527	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RM	Sunflower Suite - Christ Church C.E. School, London Road, Ramsgate	2366	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Cliftonville East Ward	MK	St Annes Hall, Devonshire Gardens, Margate	1841	None	Poor lighting outside polling place however accessible and appropriate for electorate Plans to redevelop church may affect polling station	No change however keep a watching brief on plans for redevelopment
	ML	St Philips Church, Summerfield Road, Margate	2397	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MM	Cliftonville Library, Northdown Road, Margate	877	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
Cliftonville West Ward	MI	Quarterdeck Youth Centre, Zion Place, Margate	1545	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MJ1	Cliftonville Community Centre, St Pauls Road, Margate	1723	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MJ2	Margate Bowls Club, Northdown Avenue, Margate	1513	None	Ramp provided however accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Dane Valley Ward	MN	St Johns Scout Hall, Durban Road, Margate	2031	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MO1	Lounge Room, Trinity Resource Centre, Holy Trinity Church	994	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MO2	Surestart, Millmead Children`s Centre, Dane Valley Road	2373	Complaints about change of entrance at 6pm despite use of	Due to layout of centre electors have to open doors and walk through corridors to reach station. Therefore,	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
				additional signage	suggest more signage for both internal corridors and outside. Accessible and appropriate for electorate	
Eastcliff Ward	RE1	St Lawrence College, College Road, Ramsgate	2345	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RE2	Brunswick Hall, Belmont Street, Ramsgate	778	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RF	Echo Shop, Plains of Waterloo, Ramsgate	2052	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Garlinge Ward	ME	Methodist Church Hall, High Street, Garlinge	2467	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MF	All Saints Church Hall, All Saints Avenue, Margate	1353	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
Kingsgate Ward	BSA	Botany Bay Hotel, Marine Drive, Broadstairs	1760	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Margate Central Ward	MG	Union Church, Union Row, Margate	1735	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MH	St Johns Community Centre, Victoria Road, Margate	1523	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Nethercourt Ward	RJ	St Laurence Parish Hall, High Street, St Lawrence, Ramsgate	1874	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RK	Ramsgate Football Club, Southwood Stadium, Prices Avenue	1691	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Newington Ward	RI	Newington Community Centre, Princess Margaret Avenue, Ramsgate	3737	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Northwood Ward	RA	St Marks Church Hall, Pysons Road, Ramsgate	2755	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
	RB	Windmill Public House, 45 Newington Road, Ramsgate	2308	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Salmestone Ward	MP1	Lesters, 162 Ramsgate Road, Margate	3577	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MP2	Global Generation Church, Unit 2-4, Westwood Business Park, Margate	586	Not easily accessible unless you drive. A long walk from the main road	Not easy to find with no good public transport links.	Change to: The Orb Public House, Ramsgate Road, Margate
Sir Moses Montefiore Ward	RC	Newlands School Dining Hall Building, Newlands Primary School, West Dumpton Lane, Ramsgate	1287	None	"A" frame required to identify building however accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	RD	Racing Greyhound, 227 Hereson Road, Ramsgate	2434	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
St Peters Ward	BSE	Mulberry Room, Portland Centre, Hopeville	2811	None	Accessible and appropriate for	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
		Avenue, Broadstairs			electorate	
	BSF	Kent Innovation Centre, Thanet Reach Business Park, Millennium Way, Broadstairs	2762	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Thanet Villages Ward	VAC	Acol Village Hall, The Street, Acol	235	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	VMA	Manston Village Hall, Preston Road, Manston	731	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	VMI	Minster Village Hall, High Street, Minster	2895	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	VMK	Monkton Village Hall, 120 Monkton Street, Monkton	544	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	VSA	Wansum Room, The Crown Inn, Ramsgate Road, Sarre	165	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	VSN	Village Hall (St Nicholas at Wade), The Street, St	660	None	Accessible and appropriate for	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
		Nicholas-At-Wade			electorate	
Viking Ward	BSG	Crampton Function Hall, The Broadway, Broadstairs	2765	None	Not clear to find provide clearer signage however accessible and appropriate for electorate.	No change
	BSH	Council Chamber, Pierremont Park, Pierremont Avenue, Broadstairs	2812	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Westbrook Ward	MC	Westbrook Bowls Pavilion, Westcliff Gardens, Margate, Kent	2266	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
	MD	Methodist Church Hall, High Street, Garlinge	965	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change
Westgate Ward	MA	Christ Church Hall, Westgate Bay Avenue, Westgate-on-Sea	2673	None	Trip hazard at entrance to polling place and then again into polling station	No change

Ward	Polling District Letters	Polling Place	Electorate	Comments received	Returning Officers comments	Returning Officers recommendations
					Ramps need to be provided on polling day however accessible and appropriate for electorate	
	MB	Westgate Community Centre, Lymington Road, Westgate-on-Sea	2707	None	Accessible and appropriate for electorate	No change

THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL DECLARATION OF INTEREST FORM

Do I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and if so what action should I take?

Your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI) are those interests that are, or should be, listed on your Register of Interest Form.

If you are at a meeting and the subject relating to one of your DPIs is to be discussed, in so far as you are aware of the DPI, you **must** declare the existence **and** explain the nature of the DPI during the declarations of interest agenda item, at the commencement of the item under discussion, or when the interest has become apparent

Once you have declared that you have a DPI (unless you have been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee or the Monitoring Officer, for which you will have applied to the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting) you **must:-**

1. Not speak or vote on the matter;
2. Withdraw from the meeting room during the consideration of the matter;
3. Not seek to improperly influence the decision on the matter.

Do I have a significant interest and if so what action should I take?

A significant interest is an interest (other than a DPI or an interest in an Authority Function) which:

1. Affects the financial position of yourself and/or an associated person; or Relates to the determination of your application for any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration made by, or on your behalf of, you and/or an associated person;
2. And which, in either case, a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interest.

An associated person is defined as:

- A family member or any other person with whom you have a close association, including your spouse, civil partner, or somebody with whom you are living as a husband or wife, or as if you are civil partners; or
- Any person or body who employs or has appointed such persons, any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are directors; or
- Any person or body in whom such persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000;
- Any body of which you are in a position of general control or management and to which you are appointed or nominated by the Authority; or
- any body in respect of which you are in a position of general control or management and which:
 - exercises functions of a public nature; or
 - is directed to charitable purposes; or
 - has as its principal purpose or one of its principal purposes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)

An Authority Function is defined as: -

- Housing - where you are a tenant of the Council provided that those functions do not relate particularly to your tenancy or lease; or
- Any allowance, payment or indemnity given to members of the Council;
- Any ceremonial honour given to members of the Council
- Setting the Council Tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992

If you are at a meeting and you think that you have a significant interest then you **must** declare the existence **and** nature of the significant interest at the commencement of the

matter, or when the interest has become apparent, or the declarations of interest agenda item.

Once you have declared that you have a significant interest (unless you have been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee or the Monitoring Officer, for which you will have applied to the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting) you **must**:-

1. Not speak or vote (unless the public have speaking rights, or you are present to make representations, answer questions or to give evidence relating to the business being discussed in which case you can speak only)
2. Withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the matter or immediately after speaking.
3. Not seek to improperly influence the decision.

Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality

Councillors must declare at meetings any gift, benefit or hospitality with an estimated value (or cumulative value if a series of gifts etc.) of £100 or more. You **must**, at the commencement of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, disclose the existence and nature of the gift, benefit or hospitality, the identity of the donor and how the business under consideration relates to that person or body. However you can stay in the meeting unless it constitutes a significant interest, in which case it should be declared as outlined above.

What if I am unsure?

If you are in any doubt, Members are strongly advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager well in advance of the meeting.

DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, SIGNIFICANT INTERESTS AND GIFTS, BENEFITS AND HOSPITALITY

MEETING.....

DATE..... **AGENDA ITEM**

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

SIGNIFICANT INTEREST

GIFTS, BENEFITS AND HOSPITALITY

THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST, GIFT, BENEFITS OR HOSPITALITY:

.....
.....
.....

NAME (PRINT):

SIGNATURE:

Please detach and hand this form to the Democratic Services Officer when you are asked to declare any interests.

