

## REPORT TO CABINET

<b>Open</b>		Would any decisions proposed :		
<b>Any especially affected Wards</b>	Mandatory/	Be entirely within Cabinet's powers to decide	NO	
	Discretionary /	Need to be recommendations to Council	YES	
<b>Dersingham/ Upwell and Delph</b>	Operational	Is it a Key Decision	NO	
Lead Member: Brian Long E-mail: <a href="mailto:clr.brian.long@west-norfolk.gov.uk">clr.brian.long@west-norfolk.gov.uk</a>		Other Cabinet Members consulted:		
		Other Members consulted: Councillor Anthony Bubb Councillor Mrs Judith Collingham Councillor David Pope Councillor Mrs Vivienne Spikings		
Lead Officer: Mary Colangelo E-mail: <a href="mailto:mary.colangelo@west-norfolk.gov.uk">mary.colangelo@west-norfolk.gov.uk</a> Direct Dial: 01553 616281		Other Officers consulted:		
Financial Implications NO	Policy/Personnel Implications NO	Statutory Implications NO	Equal Impact Assessment NO If YES: Pre-screening/ Full Assessment	Risk Management Implications NO

Date of meeting: 29 May 2018

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN HEALTH ACT 2007 – REQUESTS FOR VARIATION OF NUMBER OF PARISH COUNCILLORS

#### **Summary**

This report seeks to address the requests by Dersingham and Nordelph Parish Councils to vary their number of Parish Councillors.

#### **Recommendations**

- (1) That the variation for Dersingham not be approved.
- (2) That the variation for Nordelph be approved.

#### **Reason for Decision**

To ensure that the Council meets its statutory obligation, whilst maintaining the scale previously set by the Council.

## 1 Background

Under Schedule 5 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Section 4, 3A(b) the number of Parish Councillors for each Parish is fixed from time to time by the Borough Council. The last occasion this matter was reviewed was in 1991, when the following scale was agreed:

<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Number of Parish Councillors</u>
Up to 300	7
For every additional 300 or part thereof	1

Variations in numbers have been dealt with on an ad hoc basis since then but have been very limited in number.

## 2 Options Considered

### 2.1 Dersingham

Dersingham Parish Council is requesting a reduction in the number of Parish Councillors by 2 or 3.

The last time the number of Parish Councillors was reviewed the following applied:

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Existing Number of Councillors</b>	<b>Scale Allowance</b>	<b>Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Number</b>
3,402	16	18	18	18

(current electorate – 4,013 and scale allowance would therefore be 19, suggest reduction not agreed to).

Most recent Parish Council Elections produced the following:

May 2015	-	15 Nominations received (3 filled by co-option)
May 2011	-	14 Nominations received (4 filled by co-option)
May 2007	-	9 Nominations received (9 filled by co-option)

#### Casual Vacancies since last Election:

24/11/16	-	1 vacancy (filled by co-option)
1/6/17	-	1 vacancy (filled by co-option)
27/6/17	-	1 vacancy – awaiting co-option
30//8/17	-	1 vacancy – awaiting co-option
9/10/17	-	1 vacancy – awaiting co-option

## 2.2 Nordelph

Nordelph Parish Council is requesting a reduction in the number of Parish Councillors by 1.

The last time the number of Parish Councillors was reviewed the following applied:

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Existing Number of Councillors</b>	<b>Scale Allowance</b>	<b>Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Number</b>
290	9	7	9	9

(current electorate – 347 and scale allowance would therefore be 8, suggest reduction agreed to).

Most recent Parish Council Elections produced the following:

May 2015	-	4 Nominations received (4 filled by co-option) (1 outstanding, awaiting co-option)
May 2011	-	9 Nominations received
May 2007	-	6 Nominations received (3 filled by co-option)

### Casual Vacancies since last Election:

There have been no casual vacancies since the last election in May 2015.

## 3 Policy Implications

No policy implications if the scale is adhered to.

## 4 Financial Implications

There are no financial implications.

## 5 Personnel Implications

There are no personnel implications.

## 6 Statutory Considerations

The Borough Council has a statutory obligation to keep the number of Parish Councillors under review.

## 7 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

There are no Equality Impact Assessment implications.

## 8 Risk Management Implications

There are no immediate risks identified in the proposal.

## **9 Declarations of Interest / Dispensations Granted**

None identified.

## **10 Background Papers**

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007  
Minutes of Dersingham Parish Council Meeting – 12 January 2015  
Minutes of Nordelph Parish Council Meeting – 12 March 2018



**Pre-Screening Equality Impact  
Assessment**

Name of policy/service/function					
Is this a new or existing policy/ service/function?		New / Existing (delete as appropriate)			
Brief summary/description of the main aims of the policy/service/function being screened.  Please state if this policy/service rigidly constrained by statutory obligations					
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>				
<p><b>1. Is there any reason to believe that the policy/service/function could have a specific impact on people from one or more of the following groups <b>according to their different protected characteristic</b>, for example, because they have particular needs, experiences, issues or priorities or in terms of ability to access the service?</b></p> <p>Please tick the relevant box for each group.</p> <p>NB. Equality neutral means no negative impact on any group.</p>		Positive	Negative	Neutral	Unsure
	Age				
	Disability				
	Gender				
	Gender Re-assignment				
	Marriage/civil partnership				
	Pregnancy & maternity				
	Race				
	Religion or belief				
	Sexual orientation				
	Other (eg low income)				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Comments</b>			
<b>2. Is the proposed policy/service likely to affect relations between certain equality communities or to damage relations between the equality communities and the Council, for example because it is seen as favouring a particular community or denying opportunities to another?</b>	Yes / No				
<b>3. Could this policy/service be perceived as impacting on communities differently?</b>	Yes / No				
<b>4. Is the policy/service specifically designed to tackle evidence of disadvantage or potential discrimination?</b>	Yes / No				
<p><b>5. Are any impacts identified above minor and if so, can these be eliminated or reduced by minor actions?</b> If yes, please agree actions with a member of the Corporate Equalities Working Group and list agreed actions in the comments section</p>	Yes / No	<b>Actions:</b>			
		<b>Actions agreed by EWG member:</b> .....			
<b>Assessment completed by:</b> <b>Name</b>					
<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>				

**Please Note: If there are any positive or negative impacts identified in question 1, or there any 'yes' responses to questions 2 – 4 a full impact assessment will be required.**