

Democratic Renewal Working Party



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title:	Agenda		
Date:	Wednesday 17 June 2015		
Time:	5.00 pm		
Venue:	Ground Floor Room 13 West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds		
Full Members:	<p style="text-align: center;">Chairman To be elected Vice Chairman To be elected</p> <p><u>Conservative Members (5)</u> Susan Glossop Jim Thorndyke Richard Rout Patricia Warby Sarah Stamp</p> <p><u>Charter Group Member (1)</u> David Nettleton</p> <p><u>UKIP Group Member (1)</u> John Burns</p>		
Substitutes:	<p><u>Conservative Members (2)</u> Andrew Speed Peter Stevens</p> <p><u>Charter Group Member (1)</u> Diane Hind</p> <p><u>UKIP Group Member (1)</u> Tony Brown</p>		
Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.		
Quorum:	Three Members		
Committee administrator:	Fiona Osman Service Manager (Democratic Services) Tel: 01284 757105 Email: fiona.osman@westsuffolk.gov.uk		

Agenda

Procedural Matters

	<i>Page No</i>
1. Election of Chairman	
2. Election of Vice-Chairman	
3. Apologies for Absence	
4. Substitutes	
5. Minutes	1 - 6
To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2014 (copy attached).	

Part 1 - Public

6. Community Governance Review - Terms of Reference	7 - 24
Report No: DEM/SE/15/001 Lead Officer: Alex Wilson	
7. Members' Allowance Scheme and Independent Remuneration Panel	25 - 28
Report No: DEM/SE/15/002 Cabinet Member: Ian Houlder Lead Officer: Fiona Osman	

Part 2 - Exempt

NONE

Democratic Renewal Working Party



Minutes of a meeting of the **Democratic Renewal Working Party St Edmundsbury Democratic Renewal Working Party** held on **Tuesday 18 November 2014 at 5.00 pm** at the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House**, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds

Present:

Chairman to be elected

Patrick Chung
Robert Clifton-Brown
Paul Farmer
Helen Levack

Derek Redhead
Jim Thorndyke
Patricia Warby

1. **Election of Chairman**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:-

That Councillor Mrs P A Warby be elected Chairman of the Working Party for 2014/2015.

2. **Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

3. **Substitutes**

No substitutions were declared.

4. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. **Appointment of Vice Chairman**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:-

That Councillor J Thorndyke be elected Vice-Chairman of the Working Party for 2014/2015.

6. **Members' Attendance Statistics**

With the permission of the Chairman, the Democratic Services Manager presented a written briefing note on members' attendance statistics for the information of the Working Party given recent media coverage and freedom of information requests. Members were reminded that, at a meeting of the Working Party on 2 May 2013, they had resolved to not compile members' attendance statistics in future years due to the scope of the report not covering the full duties and responsibilities of Councillors.

In April 2014, cabinet members had suggested informally that attendance statistics could be recorded and published online as part of the implementation of a new Committee Management System that was due to be launched later that year provided that an explanation was provided that the figures were not an accurate reflection of all the meetings attended and duties undertaken by Councillors.

The Democratic Services Manager informed members that the new system had been implemented on 12 November 2014 and attendance would be recorded and published on the website from this date. To respond to freedom of information requests, statistics were being compiled for the period from May 2013 until 12 November 2014 and would also be published on the new website in due course. The Working Party requested that this briefing be shared with all councillors and noted the update.

7. **Polling District Review**

The Electoral Services Manager introduced this report which reviewed the designation of polling districts in the borough. The report described the consultation process and gave details of the responses received. Two of the responses regarding ward and borough boundaries had not been included in the report as they fell outside of the remit of this review which was only able to consider polling district boundaries.

The report highlighted two main areas where further representations had been received and these had been investigated further as follows.

St Olaves Ward consisted of one polling district and one polling station located at the New Bury Community Centre. The proposals received both suggested splitting this ward into two polling districts and having a second polling station at a variety of different locations. Officers were minded not to recommend this proposal as the current polling station was already located centrally in the polling district.

Risbygate Ward consisted of two polling districts and two polling stations. The first proposal was to create a new polling district called Risbygate Part Three and move electors in Station Hill, part of Tayfen Road and Tayfen Terrace from Risbygate Part Two into this new area. The electors in this new area

would poll with those in Risbygate Part One at the Seventh Day Adventist Church.

The current polling station in Risbygate Part Two (the Quaker Meeting House) was often required to hold two polling stations due to the number of electors and there had previously been concerns regarding access and parking. A further proposal was therefore to split Risbygate Part Two into two polling districts, creating a new polling district, Risbygate Part Four. The only cost implication would be room hire for an additional polling station. Officers recommended these proposals.

In considering both areas, members supported the proposals in respect of Risbygate Ward. In relation to St Olaves Ward, the Working Party noted that, while they recommended different solutions, both representations received had highlighted the need for two polling stations. Since at most elections the polling station at the Newbury Community Centre was split into two stations, with two sets of staff, members therefore felt that, as with Risbygate Ward, there would only be a small cost implication of splitting the polling district into two. Councillor Nettleton had suggested that the dividing line should follow the line of Northumberland Avenue, including properties on both sides of the road. He had previously had discussions with local residents and was confident that his proposal would receive their approval since it reflected a reasonable boundary between the Mildenhall Hall Road and Howard Estates. However, he offered to contact the two residents' associations before the matter was considered at full Council in December.

The Working Party noted that the new electoral register would be published in accordance with their recommendations pending ratification by full Council.

RECOMMENDED:-

That the Schedule of Polling Districts be amended to reflect the following changes:

- (1) Move electors from Station Hill, Tayfen Road (part of) and Tayfen Terrace from Risbygate Part Two to Risbygate Part One.**
- (2) Split Risbygate Part Two into two polling districts with the dividing line being Spring Lane and the Nature Reserve between Spring Lane and Beetons Way.**
- (3) Split St Olaves into two polling districts, with the dividing line to include all properties along Northumberland Avenue.**

8. Community Governance Review

(Councillor Farmer declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Bury St Edmunds Town Council during the consideration of this item.)

The Legal Services Manager introduced this report which sought to provide a comprehensive set of options regarding a Community Governance Review in

the borough. The last review had been conducted in 2010-2011 when minor changes had been made and there had been a proposal to create a new parish at Moreton Hall although this had not been taken further by the Working Party at the time.

Councillor Beckwith had submitted a Motion on Notice to the Council meeting on 30 June 2014 which had been referred for further consideration to this Working Party. Haverhill Town Council had also asked the council to look at parish boundaries in reference to growth in and around Haverhill under Vision 2031, and a number of requests had been received from parish councils affected by future growth.

This report asked the Working Party to recommend to Council that a review be undertaken, that a budget be allocated to conduct such a review, with the Working Party indicating their preferences for the method of consultation, and that an indicative timetable be approved.

Although the purpose of a review would be to consider the areas that had already put forward, there would be opportunity for interested parties to propose other areas for consideration. The Working Party would then consider all proposals and set the scope for the review.

Members of the Working Party considered a number of options for the method of consultation and unanimously agreed that the review should be web-based and widely publicised, with appropriate organisations and representatives being targeted for involvement, and parish and town councils being encouraged to publicise it to their own electors. Individual letters would not be sent to every household. Responses from electors would primarily be made online and collated electronically. However residents would be able to respond by post and communities would also to organise collective means of responding if they wished. It was clarified that, if an online survey was used, respondents would be asked to identify which parish or part of a town they currently lived in, so that top level (but anonymous) information could be provided to the Working Party on what proportion of residents in a certain area had responded and how.

In response to member questions, it was clarified that officer recommendation (d) was linked to the advice in paragraph 2.10.3 of the report which indicated that changes to parish arrangements could not be made in time for the 2015 elections and "*would be most likely to be brought in for the 2019 elections.*" However, the Legal Services Manager clarified that, while the normal practice was indeed to link implementation to the usual date of elections (on the four yearly cycle), the report should have made it clear that, under the regulations, there may also be scope for the Borough Council to consider whether there was justification for implementing changes at an earlier date, with a shorter than normal first period of office for any parish councillors elected under them (since elections would also then be needed in 2019 as well). This could incur the cost of stand-alone elections for the Borough Council where a new parish council was being created. Noting this clarification, the Working Party felt that this would be a matter that the Borough Council should address at a later stage of any review, when it was clearer what changes, if any, were required. Accordingly, it was felt that recommendation (d) was not relevant at the current time.

The Recommendations were taken separately:

Councillor Farmer moved the recommendation which was seconded and approved.

RECOMMENDED

- (1) The Council undertakes a Community Governance Review; and for that purpose:**
- a. Council confirms that initial consideration and targeted consultation with Borough Councillors, parish and town councils, the County Council, neighbouring councils, Members of Parliament and other community organisations (e.g. residents' associations) be undertaken to inform the preparation of Terms of Reference for the Review, taking into account the requests already received and the advice contained in Report COU/SE/14/001 about future growth areas.**

Councillor Mrs Levack moved the recommendation which was seconded and approved.

RECOMMENDED

- b. Council requests this Working Party to consider the outcome of that consultation and report back to Council at its scheduled meeting in June/July 2015.**

Councillor Chung moved the recommendation which was seconded and approved.

RECOMMENDED

- c. Council allocates a budget for the review (this sum to be determined and identified to full Council once the Working Party's preferences for consultation are known). Council agrees the review timetable set out in Appendix A of Report COU/SE/14/001 recognising that it will commence in 2015 and will not conclude before the May 2015 election.**

The Meeting concluded at 7.08 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Democratic Renewal Working Party



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Community Governance Review – Terms of Reference	
Report No:	DRW/SE/15/001 [to be completed by Democratic Services]	
Report to and date/s:	Democratic Renewal Working Party	17 June 2015
Portfolio holder:	Not applicable – Electoral matters are not an executive function	
Lead officer:	Alex Wilson Director Tel: 01284 757695 Email: alex.wilson@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	As recommendation.	
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the Working Party considers further proposals for matters to be included in the agreed Community Governance Review for St Edmundsbury so that final terms of reference can be proposed to full Council in July	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial terms of reference and the process for conducting the review were agreed by full Council in December 2014. As agreed, 'light touch' consultation was carried out between January and March 2015 on additional matters to be included in the review via letter to stakeholders (elected representatives, other councils and agencies, residents' organisations, etc) whom were encouraged to publicise the consultation as they saw fit in their areas – see http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/community/upload/CGR-letter-2.pdf. The main consultation for the review will be carried out in two phases after the terms of reference are agreed during the remainder of 2015/16. 		
Alternative option(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has already agreed to carry out the review. Not carrying out a CGR at this time would mean that the chance to examine the impact of new growth on parish governance before the construction of new homes was missed. A CGR is also a crucial first stage for any future reviews of the Borough or County Council's governance arrangements. 		
Implications:			
Are there any new financial implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any new staffing implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council is following statutory process. 		
Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Risk/opportunity assessment:			
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
Matters which local communities want included in the CGR are missed	Medium	Consult on terms of reference	Low
Ward(s) affected:	All Wards		
Background papers: (all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)	DRWP Report November 2014 https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=180&MeetingId=510 Council Report December 2014 https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/documents/s4994/Schedule%20of%20Referrals%20from%20Cabinet%20and%20Democratic%20Renewal%20Working%20Party.pdf		
Documents attached:	Appendix A - Agreed or Potential matters for inclusion in terms of reference of CGR		

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Community governance reviews (CGRs) provide the opportunity for principal councils to review and make changes to community governance within their areas. It can be helpful to undertake community governance reviews in circumstances such as where there have been or will be changes in population, or in reaction to specific or local new issues. Changes can range from the creation of new parishes through to minor boundary adjustments or alteration of the number of parish councillors.
- 1.1.2 The Borough Council agreed in December 2014 to carry out a CGR in 2015/16 so that consideration can be given as to whether or not major strategic growth sites arising from Vision 2031 in Haverhill and Bury St Edmunds should lead to changes in the *external* boundaries of those two town councils. The issues in relation to this matter were set out in the paper to the last meeting of the Working Party (see Background papers above). In conjunction with this issue, the Council also agreed to carry out a CGR formally proposed by Cllr Beckwith, namely whether or not a new parish should be created for Moreton Hall in Bury St Edmunds.
- 1.1.3 Ahead of the review, which will not start until the late summer/autumn, the Borough Council has no adopted position on any of these issues, since each specific matter must be considered on its own merits in accordance with the guidance of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. At this stage of the process, the only matter under consideration is the *terms of reference* of the review, which is the subject of this report.
- 1.1.4 The last Borough-wide CGR was carried out in 2010. However, since a CGR would already be taking place to consider the above issues, this Working Party also proposed (and full Council agreed) that all parishes in the Borough be given the chance to identify new issues in their local area which might benefit from a CGR, and should be included within the terms of reference. Accordingly, a targeted consultation with stakeholders was carried out in the first quarter of 2015, as detailed at the start of this report.

1.2 Terms of reference for community governance reviews

- 1.2.1 Under the legislation, the Borough Council must determine the terms of reference under which a CGR is to be undertaken. The terms of reference must be published and specify both the area under review and the matters on which the CGR will focus. If any modifications are made to the terms of reference later, these must also be published.
- 1.2.2 Ultimately, the recommendations made in a CGR ought to bring about improved community engagement, better local democracy and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services. The Borough Council is therefore expected to use its own local knowledge to frame suitable terms of reference, which should be appropriate to local people and their circumstances, and reflect the specific needs of their communities. However, the national guidance is also clear that the views of local people should be reflected in the terms of reference where these are known, particularly where they may have already expressed views about what form of community governance they would like for their area.

1.2.3 On the basis of the above, it is suggested that the terms of reference for this CGR be framed using the following sources of information:

- (a) The Borough Council's own local knowledge, specifically:
 - i. matters raised with it by Borough Councillors;
 - ii. major changes in population it anticipates through Vision 2031;
 - iii. issues it has identified through the compilation of the electoral register and/or administration of the 2015 local elections; and
- (b) matters raised directly by the local community or partners during the recent consultation on the terms of reference.

1.3 **Results of Consultation and Draft Terms of Reference**

1.3.1 Agreed or potential items for inclusion in the terms of reference are summarised in Appendix A to this report. In relation to growth sites, these are described using the adopted Vision 2031 title to avoid ambiguity, although it should be stressed that this convention does not pre-suppose any view on the outcome of the CGR.

1.3.2 Where applicable, maps will be displayed at the meeting to assist the Working Party. For most of the new issues raised, the affected areas and boundaries can also be identified on the ward maps on the Borough Council's website at http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Voting_and_Elections/wardmaps.cfm.

1.3.3 The Working Party must consider whether, based on the information in Appendix A, and its own local knowledge, the Council has sufficient reason to believe that a CGR is justified in relation to each additional issue raised. If the Working Party does not believe a review is justified then it should provide reasons accordingly.

1.3.4 As the building blocks for Borough Council wards and County Council divisions, changes to parishes and parish/town council wards can have an impact on other tiers of local representation. Therefore, the Borough Council will need to give consideration to any consequential effects in carrying out the CGR, particularly in relation to wards within Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. It may also be that the detail of the warding arrangements for both the town councils and, if applicable, some rural parishes will need to be considered subsequently as part of a review of the Borough Council's own electoral arrangements, so that the two matters can be looked at concurrently. This matter is referenced in items 26-28 of Appendix A.

1.4 **Next steps**

1.4.1 The recommendations of the Working Party will be referred to full Council in July and, if adopted, the terms of reference will be published and initial consultation will take place over the late summer and into autumn, in the manner agreed by the Working Party and full Council in 2014. Based on the outcome of that process, draft recommendations will be developed for final consultation in 2016.

Appendix A – Agreed or Potential matters for inclusion in terms of reference of CGR

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Boundary of Bury St Edmunds with adjoining Parishes						
1	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-West Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Fornham All Saints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham •St Olaves 	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site. If amendments are needed, this could be through changes to existing parish boundaries or wards and/or the creation of new parish(es).	Not applicable – already considered by the Working Party in November 2014 and adopted for inclusion in the CGR by full Council in December 2014.	Yes – already agreed
2	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "West Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Westley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Barrow •Minden 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
3	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Great Barton •Moreton Hall 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
4	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Moreton Hall" <i>(See para 1.3.1 of report regarding description)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Great Barton •Moreton Hall •Rougham 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
5	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "South-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Nowton •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Horringer and Whelnetham •Rougham •Southgate 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
6	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Suffolk Business Park"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Moreton Hall •Rougham 	As per 1. above	<p>For completeness, it may also make sense, as part of the review of issue 4 above, to consider the adjoining strategic employment growth site which will extend the Suffolk Business Park. The current parish boundary divides this site.</p> <p>The Town Council concurs that all growth sites should be reviewed.</p>	
7	Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eastgate •Great Barton •Moreton Hall •Rougham 	The CGR will look at the proposal of Cllr Beckwith to create an entirely new parish of Moreton Hall (by removing these properties from existing parished areas). The initial consultation for the review will seek views on potential boundaries as well as electoral	Not applicable – already considered by the Working Party in November 2014 and adopted for inclusion in the CGR by full Council in December 2014.	Yes – already agreed

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
				arrangements. Since this element of the review will need to link with issues 4, 6 and 8, it will potentially affect Great Barton and/or Rushbrooke with Rougham parishes.		
8	29 Primack Road 67 Mortimer Road 87 Mortimer Road 89 Mortimer Road 91 Mortimer Road 93 Mortimer Road 95 Mortimer Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Moreton Hall •Rougham 	<p>The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Rushbrooke with Rougham in the vicinity of Mortimer and Primack Roads.</p> <p>This matter will be considered alongside issues 4, 6 and 7.</p>	<p>The current boundary, dating back to 2001 (and a CGR starting in 1999), was intended to incorporate all of the new properties in Moreton Hall envisaged in the 1998 Local Plan.</p> <p>The precise location of the final stages of this development mean that 7 properties in the new Moreton Hall development are technically still in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish. The completion of this development also means that there is now the ability to use a physical feature (e.g. a road) to define a boundary (if applicable).</p> <p>The Electoral Registration</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
					Officer strongly recommends that this matter is included in the CGR. This view is supported by feedback received from affected residents and local councillors at the recent elections. It is also supported by the Town Council.	
9	71, 73 and 75 Home Farm Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Nowton 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Southgate •Horringer and Whelnetham 	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Nowton to the rear of 71, 73 and 75 Home Farm Lane	<p>Although the three properties are all included in the Southgate electoral register (so the CGR would not result in any change to representation), the current historical boundary dissects their rear gardens, which has caused confusion. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to completely encompass the curtilages of these three properties.</p> <p>This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
10	School Bungalow, Hardwick Middle School, Mayfield Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Nowton 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Southgate •Horringer and Whelnetnam 	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Nowton in relation to Hardwick Middle School.	This property (currently in Nowton parish) can only be accessed through the school site, off Mayfield Road i.e. Bury St Edmunds. The Electoral Registration Officer believes this is anomalous and could be examined in the CGR if desired. This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.	
11	136 Newmarket Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Westley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Minden •Barrow 	<p>The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Westley</p> <p>This matter will be considered alongside issue 2.</p>	It has recently been identified that this single property, the last on Newmarket Road as you leave Bury St Edmunds, is technically within Westley Parish. This appears anomalous and the Electoral Registration Officer suggests it is considered as part of the CGR irrespective of the outcome of issue 2. This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
12	Properties on Thetford Road, Barton Hill, Russell Baron Road, Ord Road, Manners Road, Gilstrap Road and Kytson Road in the south of Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve Parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham •Eastgate •Northgate •Risbygate 	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve	<p>This is a request received from Bury St Edmunds Town Council.</p> <p>The CGR in 1999/2000 consulted the parish council and residents on this issue and it was concluded at that time that no change was needed or desired. The Town Council, which did not exist until 2003, believes that, after 15 years, another consultation may be in order.</p>	
Boundary of Haverhill with adjoining Parishes and Essex						
13	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-West Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Little Wratting •Withersfield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill North •Withersfield 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
14	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Kedington •Little Wratting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill East •Haverhill North •Kedington •Withersfield 	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
15	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Hanchett End" (Haverhill Research Park) <i>(All of the area bounded by the</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Withersfield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill West •Withersfield 	As per 1. above	For completeness, it may also make sense, as part of this CGR, to consider the Haverhill Research Park so that all nine Vision 2031 strategic sites are examined.	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	A1017, A1307 and Hanchett End)				The Town Council has also requested that this matter be included in the CGR. Its view (applicable to this issue and all others in this section) is that the changes proposed rationalise existing boundaries, have marginal impact on existing residents and businesses, are easily identifiable natural boundaries and ensure appropriate provision of local services and facilities.	
16	County boundary between Suffolk and Essex adjacent to Haverhill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Withersfield •Kedington 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill East •Haverhill South •Haverhill West •Kedington •Withersfield 	The boundary between Essex and Suffolk around Haverhill. <i>The Borough Council does not have the ability to make changes to county boundaries as part of this CGR but could consult on this issue and raise these concerns with the Local Government Boundary Commission and ask them to carry out a Principal Area Boundary Review.</i>	<p>The Town Council believes that the county boundary should be adjusted to follow the route of the A1017 from the "Spirit of Enterprise" roundabout to the "Sturmer Village" roundabout.</p> <p>Specifically it highlights businesses in the area bounded by A1017, Bumpstead Road and Helions Bumpstead Road.</p> <p>It may also be sensible to consult on the boundary in the vicinity of the Haverhill Golf Club and East Town Park for completeness.</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Boundary of Clare and Poslingford						
17	Hermitage Farmhouse, Snow Hill, Clare (CO10 8QE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Clare •Poslingford 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Cavendish •Clare 	Boundary between Clare and Poslingford in vicinity of Hermitage Farm	The current boundary dissects the property, which has caused confusion. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to ensure that the farm buildings are completely in one parish or the other.	
Boundary of Culford, Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve and Hengrave						
18	Oak Lodge, Mill Road, Hengrave (IP28 6LP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Culford •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve •Hengrave 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham •Risby 	Boundary between Culford, Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve and Hengrave in vicinity of Mill Road	Oak Lodge is currently registered in Culford Parish but the boundary with Fornham St Genevieve dissects the curtilage of this outlying property. To avoid future confusion the Electoral Registration Officer suggests that the boundary be reviewed.	
Boundary of Culford and Ingham						
19	Lodge Farmhouse, Lodge Farm, Seven Hills, Ingham (IP31 1PT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Culford •Ingham 	Risby	Boundary between Culford and Ingham Parish in vicinity of Lodge Farm	This property is technically in Culford Parish but has previously been associated with Ingham Parish. It is accessed from Ingham and electors would be likely to drive through Ingham to get to Culford. The ERO suggests	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
					that the situation could be clarified through the CGR.	
Boundary of Denston and Stansfield						
20	Elm Farm and associated cottages, Assington Green, Stansfield (CO10 8LY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denston •Stansfield 	Cavendish	Boundary between the parishes of Denston and Stansfield in vicinity of Elm Farm	Stansfield Parish Council believe these four properties in Denston Parish are closer to Stansfield geographically and in terms of community identity	
Boundary of Fornham All Saints and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve						
21	Area between Fornham Lock Bridge and the Sheepwash Bridge, adjacent to the sewage works entrance, Fornham St Martin.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham All Saints •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve 	Fornham	Boundary between the parishes of Fornham All Saints and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve along the B1106.	This issue has been identified by a parish councillor who identifies that there are two detached properties between the two bridges, which are officially in Fornham All Saints parish, and that it appears that the boundary between the two parishes follows the old course of the River Lark, prior to its canalisation around 1700. Consequently the councillor has suggested this area be included in the CGR so both parish councils and the residents can consider if a change is needed or not.	
Representation of electors at RAF Honington						
22	RAF Honington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Honington cum Sapiston •Troston 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bardwell •Pakenham 	Parish boundaries and ward arrangements in respect of RAF Honington (and their	This issue has been raised by a parish councillor. Unlike in Troston (which also contains parts of RAF Honington),	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
				<p>consequential impact upon Borough, County and Parliamentary representation).</p> <p><i>At present, the Village Ward of Honington Parish is within:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the Borough Council's Bardwell Ward;</i> • <i>Suffolk County Council's Blackbourn Division; and</i> • <i>West Suffolk Parliamentary Constituency.</i> <p><i>The Station Ward is within:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the Borough Council's Pakenham Ward;</i> • <i>Suffolk County Council's Thingoe North Division; and</i> • <i>Bury St Edmunds Parliamentary Constituency.</i> 	<p>electors from the RAF station have been in their own parish ward since a Principal Area review by the Boundary Commission in 2001 (to achieve the required electoral equality between Borough wards).</p> <p>Given the transitory nature of the base's population, the Parish Council finds it is almost impossible to find anyone to stand for election. In consequence the station is always represented from someone from Honington or Sapiston, and the problem becomes finding someone from the station to propose and second them. In consequence, the councillor feels this warding arrangement should be removed.</p> <p>In addition to this specific request, the Working Party may wish to consider whether to look more widely at how the RAF station is represented at all tiers of local government, and in terms of parliamentary</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
					constituencies, so this can inform subsequent boundary reviews if necessary.	
Boundary of Market Weston and Thelnetham						
23	Weathercock House, New Common Road, Market Weston (IP22 2PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Market Weston •Thelnetham 	Barningham	Boundary between Market Weston and Thelnetham in the vicinity of Weathercock House.	The current boundary dissects the property. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to resolve this.	
Boundary of Ousden (St Edmundsbury) and Dalham (Forest Heath District)						
24	Properties on Dunstall Green Road between Ousden and Dalham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Dalham (FHDC) •Ousden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Wickham-brook •South Ward (FHDC) 	The boundary between St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Districts in the vicinity of Dalham and Ousden. <i>The Borough Council does not have the ability to make changes to district boundaries as part of this CGR but could consult on this issue and raise these concerns with the Local Government Boundary Commission and ask them to carry out a Principal Area Boundary Review.</i>	<p>Ousden Parish Council would like a review of Dunstall Green Road with a view to removing what it sees as the anomaly that Evered on Pound Green is in Dalham, along with the properties from Lilac Cottage to the Barn and Hill House, whilst Matthew's Rest is in Ousden.</p> <p>The Council feels it would make more sense for the properties along Dunstall Green Road which geographically are already in Ousden to become part of the parish of Ousden.</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Size of Stansfield Parish Council						
25	Stansfield Parish Council	Stansfield	Cavendish	Number of councillors for Stansfield Parish Council	Stansfield Parish Council has asked if it might have seven councillors instead of six in common with other nearby villages of the same size to assist in effective governance.	
Size of town councils and consequential changes to Borough wards and County Council divisions						
26	Bury St Edmunds parish and surrounding villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •All surrounding parishes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All Bury St Edmunds Wards •Barrow •Fornham •Great Barton •Rougham •Horringer and Whelnetham 	Consequential impacts and changes to the Borough wards and County divisions representing Bury St Edmunds and surrounding villages associated with any proposed changes to parish boundaries or wards. Changes may be in the form of boundaries and numbers of councillors.	<p>Borough and County Councillor Nettleton has requested that any proposed changes to the external and ward boundaries of Bury St Edmunds parish (i.e. town council) should also be considered in the context of their consequential impact upon Borough Council wards and County Council divisions. Similarly, he believes it is important that the review of the proposal to create a new parish for Moreton Hall is looked at in the same context.</p> <p>This view is supported by the Electoral Registration Officer.</p>	Yes – this is an implicit requirement under the guidance
27	Haverhill and surrounding villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •All surrounding parishes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All Haverhill wards •Withersfield •Kedington 	Consequential impacts and changes to the Borough wards and County divisions representing Haverhill and surrounding	The Town Council believes that, as development of substantial housing and associated infrastructure progresses, there will be a requirement to consider either	Yes – this is an implicit requirement under the guidance

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
				villages associated with any changes to parish boundaries or wards. Changes may be in the form of boundaries and numbers of councillors.	additional wards or adjusting existing ward boundaries. This view is supported by the Electoral Registration Officer.	
28	Haverhill Town Council	Haverhill	All Haverhill Wards	The number of Haverhill town councillors.	A resident has written to indicate that he believes that 16 town councillors is too many for a town the size of Haverhill, and that 10 would be more appropriate, thereby cutting down on the workload of the Clerk and costs.	
Great and Little Thurlow Parish Councils						
29	Great and Little Thurlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Great Thurlow •Little Thurlow 	Withersfield	Whether or not to combine the parish councils of Great and Little Thurlow.	Little Thurlow Parish Council has asked that an independent review be carried out into the need for two parish councils for Thurlow.	

This page is intentionally left blank

Democratic Renewal Working Party



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Review of Members' Allowance Scheme and Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel	
Report No:	DEM/SE/15/002 [to be completed by Democratic Services]	
Report to and date/s:	Democratic Renewal Working Party	17 June 2015
	Council	7 July 2015
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 0n1284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Fiona Osman Service Manager (Democratic Services) Tel: 01284 757105 Email: fiona.osman@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To outline the process for reviewing the Members' Allowance Scheme and to consider the process for appointing a Joint Independent Remuneration Panel to review the Schemes for both Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough councils.	
Recommendation:	<p>Democratic Renewal Working Party:</p> <p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that:</p> <p>(1) the Council undertake a recruitment process as outlined in Section 2 of Report DRW/SE/15/002</p> <p>(2) the Council appoint a Selection Panel of three Members, plus a substitute Member, to advise the Service Manager (Legal Services) on the appointment of Members of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) and the terms and conditions of</p>	

	<p>appointment.</p> <p>(3) the Service Manager (Legal Services) be authorised to seek candidates for an Independent Remuneration Panel to determine its terms and conditions.</p> <p><i>(If Forest Heath District Council, at their meeting on 15 July 2015, agree to end their Members' Allowance Scheme on 30 November 2015, the Selection Panel in Recommendation (2) and the Independent Remuneration Panel in Recommendation (3) would both be joint.)</i></p>		
<p>Key Decision:</p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
<p><i>The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within 48 hours and cannot be actioned until five clear working days of the publication of the decision have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.</i></p>			
Consultation:	None		
Alternative option(s):	The current scheme expires on 30 November 2015 and therefore must be reviewed.		
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> The Independent Remuneration Panel may recommend that allowances be increased.	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		None	
Documents attached:		<i>(Please list any appendices.)</i> None	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The current Members' Allowance Scheme for St Edmundsbury Borough Council expires on 30 November 2015. Members of an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) must be appointed in order to review the current scheme and make any recommendations for change.
- 1.1.2 The equivalent scheme for Forest Heath District Council expires on 30 March 2017. At their Council meeting on 15 July 2015, Members of Forest Heath will be asked to consider ending their Allowance Scheme early to allow a review of both authorities' schemes to be carried out by a Joint Independent Remuneration Panel.
- 1.1.3 If Forest Heath District Council decide not to end their Scheme early, the appointed IRP will review only the St Edmundsbury scheme for a period to expire on 30 March 2017, at which time a Joint Independent Remuneration Panel would be appointed to review both schemes.

2. Process for appointing an Independent Remuneration Panel

- 2.1 In appointing the current Independent Remuneration Panel the council undertook the following process:
 - (a) Appointed a three Member Selection Panel;
 - (b) Advertised in the Bury Free Press and Haverhill Echo;
 - (c) Contacted local representative groups for nominations, e.g. Chamber of Commerce;
 - (d) Candidates completed an application form; and
 - (e) Selection Panel called candidates for interview.
- 2.2 The Council should actively seek to recruit Members to the Independent Remuneration Panel, as outlined in Section 2.1 above. If Forest Heath Council agrees to end their Members' Allowance Scheme early, the Selection Panel and the Independent Remuneration Panel would be Joint Panels.
- 2.3 The reappointment of the existing Panel Members, if making an application, will be determined by the Selection Panel as part of the appointment process.

This page is intentionally left blank