

## REPORT TO ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

<b>Open/Exempt</b>				
Lead Member Cllr Alistair Beales Email: cllr.alistair.beales@west-norfolk.gov.uk				
Lead Officer: Andrew Barrett E-mail: andrew.barrett@west-norfolk.gov.uk			Other Officers consulted: Emma Hodds, James Arrandale, Rebecca Parker, Anthony Drown.	
Financial Implications NO	Policy/Personnel Implications NO	Statutory Implications YES	Equality Impact Assessment req'd NO	Risk Management Implications NO

Date of Meeting: 12<sup>th</sup> March 2026

### HILGAY COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – NEXT STEPS

#### **RECOMMENDED:**

1. To review the response(s) to the second consultation carried out in accordance with the terms of reference for the Hilgay Parish Community Governance Review (attached as Appendix 1 and titled: 'Hilgay CGR 2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation Results and Analysis')
2. To agree and approve an EAC recommendation to Full Council based upon two options:

**(Option 1):** Hilgay Parish and Hilgay Parish Council to remain unchanged and continue to be a warded Parish Council, comprising of:

- Hilgay Ward &
- Ten Mile Bank Ward

This will formally close the Community Governance Review.

#### **(Option 2):**

- (A) That Hilgay Parish is abolished, and Hilgay Parish Council is dissolved
- (B) That a new civil Parish be formed using the ward boundary of Ten Mile Bank ward, and that the civil Parish be named 'Ten Mile Bank'
- (C) That Ten Mile Bank should have a Parish Council, consisting of 5 members, and that it is not warded
- (D) That a new civil Parish be formed using the ward boundary of Hilgay ward, and that the civil Parish be named 'Hilgay'
- (E) That Hilgay should have a Parish Council, consisting of 9 members, and that it is not warded

- (F) Fixed assets (such as buildings and fields) will be allocated to the Council, according to the proposed boundaries
- (G) Non-fixed assets to be divided proportionately between both Councils, where it is possible to do so
- (H) The initial Parish Precepts would be based on the 72/28 split and would be approximately £25,100 for Hilgay and £9,800 for Ten Mile Bank

Should 'Option 2' be recommended and subsequently agreed at Full Council, the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk will draw up the Reorganisation Order to be submitted to the Local Boundary Commission for England and to the Secretary of State.

If the Reorganisation Order is approved by early 2027, elections for the new Parish Councils would be held in May 2027.

These options / recommendations fulfil the Committee's Constitutional Terms of Reference:

- Reviewing responses received following consultation exercises
- Formulating recommendations to Full Council on governance changes

## 1 Background

1.1 Community Governance Reviews (CGRs) are the procedures in which governance arrangements for parish councils and areas are reviewed and changes can be proposed

1.2 The powers to carry out CGRs are exercised by principal councils (in this case, the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk), hereafter the Borough Council under Part 4, Chapter 3 of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*

1.3 CGRs enable citizens and community groups the opportunity to address issues of democracy in community governance, for example where there have been changes to the number or makeup of a population, or to review boundary issues / anomalies following development.

1.4 The outcomes to CGRs can include:

- Changes to parish or area boundaries
- Merging or splitting parishes/areas
- Changing the number of councillors

1.5 Reviews may commence under four particular circumstances;

1. At the discretion of the Borough Council.

2. By decision of the Borough Council in response to a 'reasonable request'.  
i.e. from a parish council.
3. In response to a valid Community Governance Application from a 'Neighbourhood Forum' (in which case a CGR is mandatory per Section 83(2) of the 2007 Act) or
4. In response to a valid Community Governance Petition (in which case a CGR is mandatory per Section 83(2) of the 2007 Act).

1.6 The Borough Council received a valid Community Governance Petition from the electors of Ten Mile Bank Ward of Hilgay Parish on 14 November 2024.

1.7 The change suggested in the petition requests that Hilgay Parish and its existing wards of Hilgay and Ten Mile Bank are reorganised into two separate parishes with respective councils, split along existing parish and ward boundaries.

1.8 The borough council have a statutory duty to conduct a review to assess and make a decision in response to this request.

Terms of Reference and a timetable for the review were duly agreed upon and published, inclusive of a consultation. BCKLWN must comply with the terms once agreed and published.

## **2 Options Considered**

### **Reason for Decision / Giving EAC Options to consider:**

2.1 Based on the current electorate (Hilgay Ward: 708 and Ten Mile Bank: 344) both meet requirements to form separate Parish Councils.

2.2 Other Parish Councils with an electorate of approx. 350 include: Thornham, Old Hunstanton, Syderstone, Bircham, Wretton, West Dereham and Nordelph.

2.3 There is no 'officer recommendation' as such, because both options meet the criteria required. It purely comes down to local feeling and what works best for both localities.

2.4 Potential advantages if the Parish were to split could include: Greater independence (prioritising local needs), greater control of localised finances and improved localised levels of democratic representation.

2.5 Potential disadvantages could include: concerns at perceived increase of costs/finance and potential increase in council tax precepts, added division amongst the community, added duplication of running costs and loss of heritage.

2.6 Please read the 'Consultation Results and Analysis' for responses in full.

## **3 Policy Implications**

None

#### **4 Financial Implications**

None

#### **5 Personnel Implications**

None

#### **6 Environmental Considerations**

None

#### **7 Statutory Considerations**

7.1 Section 83(2) *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007* – BCKLWN must proceed with a Community Governance Review upon receipt of a valid Community Governance Petition.

7.2 BCKLWN must comply with the Terms of Reference once agreed and published, per Section 79 (2) of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*.

7.3 BCKLWN must consult the local government electors for the area under review and any other person or body that may have an interest in the review, per Section 93 (3) of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*.

7.4 BCKLWN in deciding what recommendations to make must take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions) that have already been made, or that could be made, for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review, per Section 93 (5) of the *Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007*.

7.5 BCKLWN must take into account any representations received in connection with the review, per Section 93 (6) 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**

## Stage 1 - Pre-Screening Equality Impact Assessment

For equalities profile information please visit [Norfolk Insight - Demographics and Statistics - Data Observatory](#)

Name of policy/service/function	Community Governance Review – Hilgay Parish Council				
Is this a new or existing policy/service/function? ( <i>tick as appropriate</i> )	<b>New</b>		<b>Existing</b>		
Brief summary/description of the main aims of the policy/service/function being screened.  Please state if this policy/service is rigidly constrained by statutory obligations, and identify relevant legislation.	To carry out a Community Governance Review (CGR) as requested by the electorate of Hilgay Parish (after receiving the statutory number of requests) and agree Terms of Reference.  The Review will determine whether to split the existing Parish Council and create two separate Parish Councils (Hilgay and Ten Mile Bank). Or whether to keep the status quo with no changes.				
Who has been consulted as part of the development of the policy/service/function? – new only ( <i>identify stakeholders consulted with</i> )	Emma Hodds, James Arrandale, Hilgay Parish Council, Hilgay and Ten Mile Bank Parishioners.				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>				
<p><b>1.</b> 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, 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. NB. Equality neutral means no negative impact on any group.</p> <p><b><i>If potential adverse impacts are identified, then a full Equality Impact Assessment (Stage 2) will be required.</i></b></p> <p><i>*For more information on health inequalities please visit <a href="#">The King's Fund</a></i></p>		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
	Age			x	
	Disability			x	
	Sex			x	
	Gender Re-assignment			x	
	Marriage/civil partnership			x	
	Pregnancy & maternity			x	
	Race			x	
	Religion or belief			x	
	Sexual orientation			x	
	Armed forces community			x	
	Care leavers			x	
	Health inequalities*			x	
Other (eg low income, caring responsibilities)			x		
<b>Please provide a brief explanation of the answers above:</b>					
Everything at this stage is 'neutral' as we've merely conducted the 2 <sup>nd</sup> stage of a consultation. No decisions or changes have yet been made as we are formulating recommendations/options to take to Full Council.					
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Comments</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?	No	No change		
3. Could this policy/service be perceived as impacting on communities differently?	No	No change		
<p><b>If 'yes' to questions 2 - 3 a full impact assessment will be required unless comments are provided to explain why this is not felt necessary:</b></p> <p><b>Decision agreed by EWG member: .....</b></p>				
4. Are any impacts identified above minor and if so, can these be eliminated or reduced by minor actions? If yes, please agree actions with a member of the Corporate Equalities Working Group and list agreed actions in the comments section	No	<b>Actions:</b>		
		<b>Actions agreed by EWG member:</b> .....		
5. Is the policy/service specifically designed to tackle evidence of disadvantage or potential discrimination?	No	<b>Please provide brief summary:</b>		
<b>Assessment completed by:</b> <b>Name</b>	<b>A Barrett</b>			
<b>Job title</b>	<b>Electoral Services Manager</b>			
<b>Date completed</b>	<b>04.03.26</b>			
<b>Reviewed by EWG member</b>	<b>Alison Demonty</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1109 1601 1252 1671"><b>Date</b></td> <td data-bbox="1252 1601 1493 1671"><b>04.03.26</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Date</b>	<b>04.03.26</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>04.03.26</b>			

✓ Please tick to confirm completed EIA Pre-screening Form has been shared with Corporate Policy ([corporate.policy@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:corporate.policy@west-norfolk.gov.uk))