

REPORT TO CABINET

Open		Would any decisions proposed :			
Any especially affected Wards	Discretionary	Be entirely within Cabinet's powers to decide		NO	
		Need to be recommendations to Council		YES	
		Is it a Key Decision		NO	
Lead Member: Cllr Alistair Beales E-mail: cllr.alistair.beales@west-norfolk.gov.uk		Other Cabinet Members consulted:			
		Other Members consulted:			
Lead Officer: Kate Blakemore E-mail: kate.blakemore@west-norfolk.gov.uk Direct Dial: 01553 616245		Other Officers consulted:			
Financial Implications	Policy/ Personnel Implications	Statutory Implications	Equal Impact Assessment	Risk Management Implications	Environmental Considerations
NO	NO	Yes	NO	NO	NO

Date of meeting: 6th December 2024

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW (BURNHAM MARKET PARISH COUNCIL)

Summary

This report presents to Council a request received from Burnham Market Parish Council to reduce councillor numbers from 11 to 8. To consider the request is it necessary to carry out a Community Governance Review of the Parish.

Recommendation

Recommendations to Full Council:

That Officers be requested to conduct a Community Governance Review in respect of Burnham Market Parish Council to potentially reduce parish councillor numbers.

Reason for Decision

The proposal to reduce councillor numbers appears to be well-reasoned, but can only be determined by a Community Governance Review rather than any other legal mechanism.

1 Background

Community Governance Reviews (CGRs) are the mechanism principal councils use to review and make changes to the community governance in their areas. The powers are bestowed under Part 4, Section 93 of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*.

CGRs provide the opportunity to address community governance where there have been changes to the number or makeup of a population, address boundary issues / anomalies following development and for local electors to address local issues of democracy.

Reviews may commence under four particular circumstances, including;

1. By decision of the principal council under statutory duty to review.
2. By decision of the principal in response to a 'reasonable request'.
i.e. from a parish council.
3. Under statutory duty in response to a valid Community Governance Application from a 'Neighbourhood Forum'.
4. Under statutory duty in response to a valid Community Governance Petition.

A decision in response to a reasonable request is discretionary. However, the request should only be refused if it is deemed to be unreasonable – where it would cause disruption to community cohesion, or the potential result would be detrimental to local governance.

Burnham Market Parish Council have requested a reduction in their numbers of parish councillors from 11 to 8 as they struggle to fill vacancies.

2 Options Considered

Proceed with CGR.

Do not proceed with CGR with justification.

3 Policy Implications

None

4 Financial Implications

None

5 Personnel Implications

None

6 Environmental Considerations

None

7 Statutory Considerations

BCKLWN must consider its discretionary decision on whether to conduct a CGR within the framework laid out in Part 4, Section 93 of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*.

8 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

(Pre screening report template attached)

None

9 Risk Management Implications

None

10 Declarations of Interest / Dispensations Granted

11 Background Papers

Letter from Burnham Market Parish Council.

Community Governance Reviews – Explanatory Notes, BCKLWN Electoral Services, October 2024.

Pre-Screening Equality Impact Assessment

Borough Council of
King's Lynn & West Norfolk



Name of policy/service/function	Community Governance Review – Burnham Market				
Is this a new or existing policy/service/function?	Existing (delete as appropriate)				
<p>Brief summary/description of the main aims of the policy/service/function being screened.</p> <p>Please state if this policy/service is rigidly constrained by statutory obligations</p>	Request to carry out CGR by Burnham Market Parish Council.				
Question	Answer				
<p>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 according to their different protected characteristic, for example, because they have particular needs, experiences, issues or priorities or in terms of ability to access the service?</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			x	
	Disability			x	
	Gender			x	
	Gender Re-assignment			x	
	Marriage/civil partnership			x	
	Pregnancy & maternity			x	
	Race			x	
	Religion or belief			x	
	Sexual orientation			x	
	Other (eg low income)			x	

Question	Answer	Comments
<p>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?</p>	No	
<p>3. Could this policy/service be perceived as impacting on communities differently?</p>	No	
<p>4. Is the policy/service specifically designed to tackle evidence of disadvantage or potential discrimination?</p>	No	
<p>5. Are any impacts identified above minor and if so, can these be eliminated or reduced by minor actions?</p> <p>If yes, please agree actions with a member of the Corporate Equalities Working Group and list agreed actions in the comments section</p>	No	<p>Actions:</p>
		<p>Actions agreed by EWG member:</p> <p>.....</p>
<p>If 'yes' to questions 2 - 4 a full impact assessment will be required unless comments are provided to explain why this is not felt necessary:</p> <p>Decision agreed by EWG member:</p>		
<p>Assessment completed by:</p> <p>Name</p>	<p>S Winter</p>	
<p>Job title</p>	<p>DSM</p>	
<p>Date</p>	<p>17.10.24</p>	