

---

## **REVIEW OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS - MARGATE**

**To: Boundary and Electoral Arrangements Working Party, 3 July 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 analyses the results of the first stage consultation and seeks guidance on the proposals to form part of the second stage consultation.**

### **For decision**

---

#### **1.0 Introduction and Background**

1.1 In April 2013 Council considered a report relating to options for undertaking a District-wide electoral review of Thanet (including the future number of District Councillors) and a community governance review of the un-parished parts of the District.

1.2 Council agreed:

- i. That the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be requested to include the Council in the electoral review programme that would facilitate a whole Council electoral review commencing after the date of the Local Government elections in 2015 and with a planned implementation date of the date of the Local Government elections in 2019;
- ii. That the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be requested to conduct the electoral review with the objective of reducing the number of elected members;
- iii. That a Community Governance Review be undertaken in respect of the un-parished parts of the administrative area of the Council;
- iv. That the Boundaries & Electoral Arrangements Working Party be given delegated authority to approve and publish the terms of reference of the Community Governance Review and that the Working Party makes recommendations to full Council concerning the review within the twelve months' statutory time limit.

- 1.3 A letter was sent to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England shortly after the Council meeting, and a reply was received dated 31 July 2013 which included the following:

The Commission is currently finalising its review programme for 2014/15 and has included an electoral review of Kent in that programme. This will have an impact on any [local] review as an electoral review of the county's constituent districts, including Thanet, would only be able to start following the completion of the Kent review. This would not be before later summer of 2015 at the earliest...

The review programme for 2015/16 will be considered by the Commission next year and your council's request for a review in time for elections in 2019 will be recorded for consideration at that time. Before any decisions are taken, we would of course wish to have your Council's updated view on the desirability of a review and I will contact you at that time.

I note and welcome that your paper to Council states that it is desirable to complete a community governance review before the conduct of an electoral review. As part of the electoral review of Kent the commission will be using parish boundaries and I would therefore be grateful if you could keep both the County Council and the Commission updated with progress of the CGR."

- 1.4 On 9 January 2014 this Working Party agreed the terms of reference set out in Annex 1 of this report and the timetable for the review set out in Annex 2.
- 1.5 The origins of the request to review governance arrangements in Margate, and the general statutory basis of the review were addressed in the previous report to the Working Party. This report further addresses the statutory basis of this stage of the review.

## **2.0 Stage 1 public consultation**

- 2.1 Section 93 of the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 states that whereas it is generally for the Council to determine how to undertake a community governance review, it must:

- Consult local government electors in the area under review;
- Consult any other body (including a local authority) which appears to have an interest in the review
- When developing proposals, ensure that they reflect the identities and interests of the community and are "effective" and "convenient". Effective and convenient means that if a local council is to be recommended as a result of a community governance review, it will need to be "viable in terms of providing at least some local services" and be "easy to reach and accessible to local people".
- In deciding what recommendations to make, the Council must take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions) that have already been made or could be made.
- The Council must take into account any representations that it has received in connection with the review.

- 2.2 Shortly after the Working Party met in January 2014, formal notification of the review was sent to bodies that appeared to have an interest in the review, including Kent County Council, the parish clerks of all town/parish Councils in Thanet and the secretary of the Margate Charter Trustees. Written confirmation has been received from Kent County Council that it will not make a submission in respect of this review. No formal responses have been received from existing local town/parish councils or the Margate Charter Trustees.
- 2.3 The stage one public consultation was undertaken on schedule between 3 March and 2 June 2014. This included the activities set out in the following sections.

### **3.0 Web site**

- 3.1 A wide range of information was published on the Council's web site, outlining the nature of a community governance review, the options available and what they mean. Detailed descriptions were offered of all the governance options outlined in the Statutory Guidance, in order to ensure compliance with Section 93 of the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (i.e. that all possible administrative options are considered).
- 3.2 The powers of the existing Charter Trustees in Margate were outlined. There was also a section noting the precepts currently charged by the Charter Trustees and all of the town/parish councils in Thanet, and how a precept would be set by any new town/parish council(s).
- 3.3 Accompanying this information, an on-line questionnaire was published (see section below), seeking residents' views.

### **4.0 Letters, leaflets etc**

- 4.1 A wide range of other publicity material was issued, including:
- 160 letters and advertising "post cards" to residents' associations and other local community groups in the Margate/Westgate area
  - several messages using the Council's Twitter account
  - a letter to a random sample of 1,000 people on the electoral register explaining the review and encouraging them to complete the on-line survey (this being a common practice in recent years when the Communications Team wishes to raise the profile of a particular issue)
  - targeted publicity raising the profile of the public consultation meetings, including delivery of post-cards to shops in Margate High Street and Margate old town, and over 140 food outlets and cafes in Margate & Westgate.

### **5.0 Public meetings**

- 5.1 Two public meetings were held in the Council Chamber in Cecil Street, on Tuesday 25 March 2014 and Friday 9 May 2014. At each meeting, the Council's Democratic Services & Scrutiny Manager outlined the origins, basis and timetable of the community governance review, the main options available, and some of the implications of each of the options. No formal record of comments made was made at those meetings, because attendees were encouraged to use the

information they had received when completing responses to the formal consultation. To that end, paper copies of the questionnaire were made available, as was a laptop computer on which the on-line questionnaire could be completed. In total, around 30 people attended the meetings.

- 5.2 Officers consider that a fair summary of the meeting would be (although a good number of detailed points were made) that those attending fell into two broad groups. Some attendees were sympathetic to the idea of creating a town/parish council in Margate on either or both “community governance” and “representational” grounds (that is to say, delivery of some local services, and lobbying on behalf of the interests of the Margate area). However, other attendees were concerned about the precept that a town/parish Council might levy on residents, and were unconvinced that the additional powers of a town/parish Council (over and above Charter Trustees) would justify such a net increase in Council Tax.

## 6.0 Questionnaire

- 6.1. Alongside the information published on the Council’s web site, a key part of the stage 1 consultation process included publishing an on-line questionnaire. Whereas it had been hoped to present the draft questionnaire to a meeting of the Working Party before it commenced, other commitments prevented that. However, information on the proposed questionnaire was circulated to members of the Working Party for comment, prior to its launch. There were 75 responses to the survey from residents and the results are analysed as follows.

- 6.2 The first question asked, “Generally speaking, within your local area, how satisfied are you with....?” The results were as follows:

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not sure
Local Democracy?	3	14	5	12	37	1
How local services are currently delivered?	3	18	4	16	33	0
The existing arrangement for community engagement?	7	13	5	9	37	2

- 6.3 The second question was “open-ended” and asked how Thanet District Council could improve any or all of these. The responses are included in the survey results attached at Annex 3. A very wide range of responses were provided, some of which related to options for future governance arrangements (and were largely reflected in the preferred option chosen by the respondent), but several suggested different ways in which Thanet District Council itself could operate. Those more general comments will be fed into the ongoing “Peer Review” process being reported to Council elsewhere.

6.4 The third question was central to the review of governance arrangements and asked which form of local governance people thought would be best for Margate. The responses, ranked in order of preference, are as follows:

Governance options	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Parish or Town Council	33 <sup>1</sup>	44.6%
No change	21	28.4%
Area, neighbourhood or Community Forums	7	9.5%
Community Development Trusts	6	8.1%
Community Associations	4	5.4%
Neighbourhood management	2	2.7%
Residents' Tenants' Associations	1	1.4%
Total	74 (preferences from 75 responses)	

6.5 Thus nearly half of all respondents stated a preference for a town/ parish council, though a significant number did suggest no change (21, or 28.4%). What is notable is that of the 33 stating they wanted a town/parish council, six (or 18.2% of them) expressed a preference for a separate parish council for Westgate. It should also be noted that under the previous open-ended question, those expressing a preference for a separate parish council for Westgate offered justifications for so doing, many of which reflected the Statutory Guidance for undertaking community governance reviews.

6.6 So, for example, the following comments were made:

“I doubt that Westgate would want to come under Margate”

“Westgate has a clear centre, with it's own main line rail station. population wise it is only slightly lower than Birchington and more than Minster. It is sufficiently distinct from Margate to warrant it's own council.”

“Margate Central, Cliftonville East and West have NOTHING in common with places like Westgate and Birchington”

6.7 The comment suggesting that Westgate has an identity of its own, with a clear “centre” and a railway station, appears to reflect the legal requirement that any new form of governance should reflect the “identities and interests” of the community. So, as well as the central question the Working Party needs to

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, 32 responses selected that option from the choices offered, but a 33<sup>rd</sup> response very clearly preferred a town/parish council despite not actually selecting a response to this question. Because the narrative response to other questions clearly favoured a town/parish council, it has been added into this category.

address (regarding future governance arrangements), a related question must be whether any town or parish Council covering the Margate area should be split as between Westgate and the rest of the area.

- 6.8 Although a few other possible combinations of parishes were mentioned, each of them appears in one response only (see Annex 3).
- 6.9 The fourth question asked what role and/or services the preferred form of governance should provide. Many of the responses did not specifically address this question, but those that did picked up both “local administration” (service delivery) and “community representation” in varying degrees.
- 6.10 The fifth question enquired about any further comments about governance in Margate. By and large, the comments provided reflected the comments made elsewhere within the same responses.
- 6.11 The sixth question asked where respondents reside. Of those providing this information, fifty-two were from the un-parished area of Margate, nine from Broadstairs and St. Peters, seven were from Ramsgate, two from Birchington, one from Monkton, and one from Minster.
- 6.12 If community governance preferences are analysed in terms of where the respondents live (taking the top three areas of residence only), the following results are obtained:

Area of residence	Community Governance preference	Number	Percentage (in that area)
Margate	Parish/ town council	25	49.0%
	No change	14	27.5%
	Community development trusts	5	9.8%
	Area, neighbourhood	4	7.8%
	Neighbourhood management	2	3.9%
	Community associations	1	2.0%
Broadstairs & St. Peters	Parish/ town council	3	33.3%
	No change	2	22.2%
	Community development trusts	0	
	Area, neighbourhood	1	11.1%
	Neighbourhood management	0	
	Community associations	3	33.3%

Ramsgate	Parish/ town council	3	42.9%
	No change	3	42.9%
	Community development trusts	0	
	Area, neighbourhood	1	14.3%
	Neighbourhood management	0	
	Community associations	0	

- 6.13 This suggests that the preference for a town/parish council in Margate is stronger amongst the respondents living in the un-parished area of Margate than it is amongst those living elsewhere.
- 6.14 The remaining questions are largely contextual, showing that thirty-two respondents are members of existing community groups but forty are not. Three respondents are aged 16 to 24, eighteen are aged 25 to 40, twenty-two aged 41 to 55, thirteen aged 55 to 65 and sixteen aged over 65. Of those willing to provide the information, thirty-three respondents were male and the same number female. Seventeen respondents indicated that they considered they have a disability. Thirty-two respondents indicated a religion/belief of Christian and twenty-two stated no religion, with one from each of a very small number of the other categories. Sixty-four respondents stated their ethnic group to be white-British, with very small numbers in some of the other ethnic groups.
- 6.15 The Working Party needs to recognise that 75 responses is a very small number indeed compared to the current electorate of the un-parished area of Margate, currently around 36,000. On the other hand, a comprehensive public consultation exercise was undertaken and these results were obtained from that. It would thus be reasonable to make decisions regarding the second stage consultation taking those responses into consideration – indeed, as stated before, it is nothing less than a legal requirement under section 93 of the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act.
- 6.16 When more detailed proposals are agreed by the Working Party, there will be a second stage public consultation exercise. It is to be hoped that the response rate to the second stage consultation will be higher, when residents are presented with more detailed proposals. The responses to the second stage consultation will, of course, be reported to a future meeting of this Working Party. Detailed proposals for the second stage public consultation will be presented to a future meeting of the Working Party.

## **7.0 Electorate**

- 7.1 The Statutory Guidance does note that in order to be “effective” and “convenient” the size of a parish council is relevant. To be effective, a parish council needs to have a large enough electorate to make the possibility of providing at least a “minimum” of services viable (bearing in mind that the costs of such delivery would be divided amongst the parish Council’s “tax base”). In order to be convenient, electors need to be able to access the “assets” of the parish council (e.g. the parish council offices, allotments, etc).

- 7.2 On the other hand, the Statutory Guidance also notes that there are no ideal sizes for a parish council! The Local Government Commission for England prefers parish councils to be based upon “natural communities” and to reflect people’s expressed choices. Thus, it is perhaps unsurprising that across the country, parish councils vary in size from an electorate of around 50, to those exceeding 40,000.
- 7.3 What is clear, however, is that if a community governance review does recommend the creation of a parish, it is a legal requirement that it must also recommend that the parish has a parish council if it would contain an electorate of 1,000 or more <sup>2</sup>.
- 7.4 The Statutory Guidance concludes that the general rule should be that a parish is based upon “an area which reflects community identity and interest” rather than any rigid “rule” as to the population or electorate. It goes on to say:

“There may be cases where larger parishes would best suit the needs of the area. These might include places where the division of a cohesive area, such as a Charter Trustee town... would not reflect the sense of community that needs to lie behind all parishes; or places where there are no recognisable smaller communities”. (para. 82)

- 7.5 However, as reported to the previous meeting of the Working Party, the Statutory Guidance goes on to say:

Proposals to create a parish or parish council covering all or part of a charter trustee area need to be judged in particular against the following considerations:

- (a) The effect on the historic cohesiveness of the area;
- (b) What are the other community interests in the area? Is there a demonstrable sense of community identity encompassing the charter trustee area? Are there smaller areas within it which have a demonstrable community identity and which would be viable as administrative units?

- 7.6 The following table shows the electorate of the Margate Wards as of June 2014.

Existing Margate Ward	Current Electorate in June 2014
Cliftonville East	5,161
Cliftonville West	5,219
Dane Valley	5,468
Garlinge	3,850
Margate Central	3,411
Salmestone	4,232
Westbrook	3,298
Westgate-on-Sea	5,419

<sup>2</sup> Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, section 94 (2). If the parish would have 150 or fewer electors, the recommendation must be that it does not have a parish council - section 94(3).



- 7.7 It can be seen that each ward has a population of a few thousand, so there is little reason on the basis of population why Westgate could not have a parish separate from the remainder of Margate. Furthermore, each ward having an electorate of over 1,000, any parish based upon one or more of these divisions would need to be recommended as a parish council.
- 7.8 In terms of population projections, Thanet District Council has not yet agreed where new housing sites will be located within the Local Plan for the period up to 2031. Planning officers have therefore advised that it would be potentially misleading to attempt to predict how development-led population growth could impact upon the individual Margate Wards.
- 7.9 The advice received was to use the latest population projections from the Office for National Statistics, which cover each year from 2012 extending up to 2037. That allows an estimate to be made for the expected growth of the population aged 18 or over up to the year 2020 (an approximation to electorate which will inevitably be somewhat higher than the actual electorate). This calculation suggests that the population aged 18 or over in the Margate Wards could increase by 6.99% between 2012 and 2020. Crucially however, it does not allow any differentiation as between the Wards.
- 7.10 This again reinforces the suggestion that population/electorate is unlikely of itself to provide a determining factor in the Working Party's recommendation as to any sub-division of Margate into more than one parish.
- 7.11 In terms of electoral cycles, if the community governance review is completed according to the timetable set out in Annex 2, the first elections to any new parish council(s) would take place on 7 May 2015, the scheduled date for local government elections within the District. Any new parish councillors would thus be elected to a full four-year term ending in May 2019.

## **8.0 Number of Councillors**

- 8.1 If the Working Party is minded to recommend the creation of one or more parish councils, it will need to make a recommendation as to the number of parish councillors to serve on each.
- 8.2 Annex 4 analyses the electorate and number of councillors in the District Council area of Margate and all existing parish councils. It needs to be noted that there are no specific rules as to the number of councillors that should serve on a parish council, except for the statutory requirement that there be a minimum of five<sup>3</sup>.
- 8.3 The number serving on a Parish Council does not legally need to bear any relationship to the number serving on a principal council covering the same area. The most commonly used "benchmark" is derived from the National Association of Local Councils (NALC), which recommends the following:

Electors (up to)	No. of Councillors	Electors (up to)	No. of Councillors
900	7	10400	17
1400	8	11900	18
2000	9	13500	19
2700	10	15200	20
3500	11	17000	21
4400	12	18900	22

<sup>3</sup> Local Government Act 1972, section 16. St. Nicholas-at-Wade is combined with Sarre, thus overcoming the issue that Sarre has only two councillors.

5400	13	20900	23
6500	14	23000	24
7700	15	above	25
9000	16		

- 8.4 By that benchmark, a Margate Parish Council would have 25 councillors whether or not it included Westgate (equating to between 1,226 and 1,442 electors per councillor). A stand-alone Westgate Parish Council would have 13 councillors (equating to 417 electors per councillor). Although these are widely differing ratios, they fall within the range found in the rest of Thanet. It needs to be emphasised that these figures represent a NALC benchmark and are not mandatory, although NALC is the national advisory body to parish councils.
- 8.5 It can be seen from Annex 4 that there are 20 Councillors in the District Wards of Margate, so the above NALC ratios generate a slightly higher number of Councillors at parish level and thus a lower ratio of electors per Councillor compared to the 1,800 at District level.
- 8.6 When recommending the number of parish councillors, the Working Party may wish to bear in mind that the District Council is committed to undertaking an electoral review of the District Council after 2015, with a view to reducing the number of District Councillors from the present level. Thus the Working Party may be reluctant to agree a proposal for parishes that would exceed the current number of District Councillors in each electoral division.
- 8.7 For further reference, the Aston Business School published research in 1992 showing the following ratios in existing parish councils, which the Association of Electoral Administrators suggests is unlikely to have changed very much since then:

Electors	Councillors
Less than 500	5 to 8
501 to 2500	6 to 12
2501 to 10000	9 to 16
1001 to 20000	13 to 27
Over 20000	13 to 31

## 9.0 Warding

- 9.1 A further consideration is the warding of any proposed parish council. The legal requirement in considering whether or not a parish should be warded is whether:
- The number or distribution of the local government electors for the parish would make a single election of councillors impracticable or inconvenient, or,
  - It is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented.
- 9.2 These requirements would be satisfied by a recommendation that a Margate Parish retains the District warding, otherwise there would be a single election of around 25 Councillors, far exceeding the current maximum of 11 in Minster, and quite probably generating one of the largest ballot papers in the country! Similarly, if a separate parish of Westgate were to be recommended, that could cover the current District ward of the same name (Westgate-on-Sea).
- 9.3 Unless there are compelling reasons for doing so (in terms of community identities and interests), and bearing in mind there will be a district-wide electoral review after

the 2015 elections, it is suggested that the Working Party may wish to retain the current District-level Ward boundaries and names.

## **10.0 Parish name/style**

- 10.1 The name of a parish council refers to the geographical name or location – e.g. Margate, Westgate-on-Sea. The “style” relates to the descriptions town council, parish council, community council, neighbourhood council and village council. Under the 2007 Act, if the principal council recommends the creation of a parish council, it must recommend both the name and style to be used.
- 10.2 It is suggested that the name and style of any new parish council(s) would form an important part of the second stage consultation, but the Working Party must express a preference, in order to set the context for that consultation.
- 10.3 There are few rules governing the style to be adopted, and the Government recognises that the preferred style is likely to flow from the character and tradition of an area under review. Once created however, the style needs to be reflected in the name of the parish Council and Councillors. By way of example, a Town Council has “Town Councillors”.

## **11.0 Grouping, De-Grouping etc**

- 11.1 The 2007 Act permits the grouping and de-grouping of parish councils following a community governance review. However, such options were not included in the terms of reference of this review, nor has there been any response to the consultation suggesting that these issues ought to be addressed. By way of example, none of the respondents favouring a separate parish council for Westgate suggested that it be combined with any existing parish council.

## **12.0 Financial considerations, assets, staff and so on**

- 12.1 Prior to creating any parish council, detailed work needs to be undertaken on the transfer of assets from the Charter Trustees to any new Parish Council(s). Financial assets are typically transferred in proportion to the electorate in the newly created parishes. Physical assets typically transfer to the parish council in whose area they are located.
- 12.2 Before such work can be commenced, it is necessary for the Charter Trustees to supply the Council with a detailed asset and inventory list, including details of any staff affected by the possible dissolution of the Charter Trustees.
- 12.3 It has been stated above that one important consideration is the viability of any new parish council, and that such considerations include financial viability in terms of possible service delivery. It is therefore suggested that provided this meeting of the Working Party takes an “in principle” decision regarding the basis of the second stage consultation, that the Council’s finance department is asked to support the development of the initial precept likely to be levied in 2015/16 by any new parish council(s). That information would inform the Working Party’s final decision on the proposals to go to stage two consultation, and would feature in the consultation documents.

## **13.0 Consequential recommendations**

- 13.1 In some cases, a community governance review can result in recommendations being made that the principal council cannot itself determine. For example, when creating or

amending parish boundaries, it might make sense to adjust existing District (or County) Ward boundaries in order to ensure that all boundaries are or remain coterminous.

13.2 Changes to District and County electoral arrangements (including boundaries) must be agreed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), and any such recommendations would need to be referred to them.

13.3 At present, the terms of reference for this review do not envisage any such changes, nor do any of the options in this report, nor do any of the recommendations emerging from the public consultation.

13.4 However, the Working Party needs to bear in mind that if it is minded to recommend a proposal in relation to the un-parished area of Margate that impacts upon District or County boundaries, that a reference to the LGBCE would become necessary.

#### **14.0 Timetable**

14.1 Since the original timetable for the review was published (see Annex 2), an extraordinary meeting of Council has been set for 18 November 2014 to consider the outcome of a review of polling districts and places.

14.2 It is suggested that the Boundary & Electoral Arrangements Working Party meets sufficiently early in October 2014 that it can make its final recommendations to that extraordinary Council meeting.

14.3 That will have the advantage that any consequential electoral arrangements arising from both the community governance review and the review of polling districts and places can be built into the register due to be published on 1 December 2014.

#### **15.0 Corporate Implications**

##### **15.1 Financial and VAT**

15.1.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report however, further work will be required to identify whether or not there will be any long term implications.

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

##### **15.2 Legal**

15.2.1 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.

15.2.2 The Council is having regard to the Statutory Guidance on Community Governance Reviews issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

##### **15.3 Corporate**

15.3.1 Consulting and involving Thanet people in decisions that affect them.

## 15.4 Equity and Equalities

15.4.1 None identified.

## 16.0 Recommendations

- 16.1 The Working Party is invited to take “in principle” decisions on the following, with the detailed implications being reported to a further meeting of the Working Party within a couple of weeks, to include detailed maps and financial implications and detailed proposals for the second stage public consultation.
- 16.2 The proposals confirmed at the next meeting of the Working Party will become the subject of the second stage consultation.
- 16.3 In principle decisions are needed on the following:
- a) The governance arrangements to be proposed for the currently un-parished area of Margate,
  - b) Whether the arrangements are for the whole of the area or differ as between parts of the area,
  - c) If one or more parish councils are to be recommended, for each area:
    - the boundaries
    - names
    - styles
    - electoral divisions and
    - number of councillors for each area.
  - d) Whether any grouping or de-grouping is desired
  - e) Whether any consequential amendments to existing District or County electoral arrangements are to be recommended to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
- 16.4 The Working Party is also asked to agree that its timetable be adjusted so that it can report the final proposals emerging from this review to the extraordinary Council meeting scheduled for 18 November 2014.

## 17.0 Decision Making Process

- 17.1 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.
- 17.2 Council will be required to approve the final recommendations prior to the Community Governance Order being made.
- 17.3 This process will be undertaken in accordance with the stages and timetable set out in Annex 2 (subject to the amendment proposed above).
- 17.4 The Council is unable to make changes to District or County electoral boundaries without referral to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

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

## Background Papers

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

## Annexes

Annex 1	Terms of reference for community governance review
Annex 2	Time table for community governance review
Annex 3	Results of stage 1 consultation questionnaire
Annex 4	Electorate in review area and ratio of electorate to councillors

## Corporate Consultation Undertaken

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