

Council



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Referral of Recommendations from Cabinet and Democratic Renewal Working Party	
Report No:	COU/SE/15/036	
Report to and date:	Council	15 December 2015
Documents attached in connection with (D) Referral from Democratic Renewal Working Party:	Appendix A:	Final Recommendations for the Community Governance Review Proposals from Democratic Renewal Working Party
	Appendix B:	Modified Terms of Reference for Community Governance Review
	Appendix C:	Issue 26 Consequential Reviews: borough and county electoral arrangements

(A) Referrals from Cabinet: 20 October 2015

1. Delivering a Sustainable Budget 2016/2017

Cabinet Member:
Cllr Ian Houlder

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/062](#)
(Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee Report No:
[PAS/SE/15/026](#))

RECOMMENDED:

That the proposals, as detailed in Section 5 and Table 2 at paragraph 5.1 of Report No: PAS/SE/15/026, be included, in securing a balanced budget for 2016/2017.

St Edmundsbury Borough Council continues to face considerable financial challenges as a result of increased cost and demand pressures and

constraints on public sector spending. In this context, and like many other councils, St Edmundsbury has to make difficult financial decisions.

The following proposals were scrutinised by the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee and are now subsequently recommended for approval by Cabinet for inclusion in the budget setting process, in order to progress securing a balanced budget for 2016/2017.

Extract from Report No: PAS/SE/15/026

5. *Budget proposals for 2016-2017*

5.1 *The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee is asked to support and recommend to Cabinet the **inclusion of the following proposals**, as detailed in Table 2 below, in order to progress securing a balanced budget for 2016-2017.*

Table 2: Budget proposals for 2016/17

Description	2016/17 £'000 Pressure/ (Saving)
Budget gap	1,903
Budget saving proposals	
<i>Income generation - ARP Bailiffs and trading company services</i>	(36)
<i>Income generation - Asset lease for Nowton Park (Cottage)</i>	(14)
<i>Income generation - Catering and events at West Stow</i>	(30)
<i>Income generation - Street Cleansing</i>	(7)
<i>Income generation - Tree Maintenance</i>	(10)
<i>Income generation - Vehicle Workshop</i>	(45)
<i>Income generation - Waste Services</i>	(98)
<i>Income generation and reduction in bed and breakfast costs linked to investment</i>	(105)
<i>Income generation - Internal Audit</i>	(10)
<i>Income generation/efficiencies - Apex</i>	(30)
<i>Budget assumption change - 1% for pay inflation</i>	(70)
<i>Budget assumption change for car parking to reflect current volumes</i>	(100)
<i>Business Process Re-Engineering - release of staffing capacity following efficiencies created through process redesign</i>	(163)
<i>Contract efficiencies including ICT supplies and services</i>	(98)
<i>Contract efficiencies through Facilities Management joint venture - part year savings</i>	(32)
<i>Further staffing changes including service changes and vacancy management</i>	(147)
<i>Mitigate Building Control overspend/reduction income through increasing market share, changes in fee levels</i>	(85)
<i>Reduction in Legal professional fees</i>	(7)
<i>Reduction in Leisure Trust Management fee - subject to negotiations with Abbeycroft Leisure</i>	(25)

Description	2016/17 £'000 Pressure/ (Saving)
<i>Reduction in Victory Ground grant in line with previous committee report</i>	(8)
<i>Remaining community centre transfers as identified in previous Cabinet report B12</i>	(50)
<i>Increased occupancy and share running costs of Haverhill Office</i>	(20)
<i>Supplies and services savings, including around 5% reduction on all supplies and services budgets</i>	(209)
<i>Continue with the Local Council Tax Support Grant level - phasing out by April 2017 (25% for 2016/17) - no financial impact as already budgeted - see paragraph 5.2 below.</i>	-
Remaining Budget Gap *	504

* *Proposals for the remaining balance will be presented to this committee in November 2015 as an update report. Meanwhile we believe there is still a considerable amount of work required for the 2016/17 budget to be achievable, as such a number of additional budget saving proposals will be considered as separate reports over the coming months through full council.*

5.2 Councillors will recall that back in September 2013 (Report E52) St Edmundsbury Borough Council agreed to continue to support the Borough's town and parish councils in respect of the Council Tax Support Grant, introduced by the Government to help offset money towns and parishes could lose through council tax benefit changes. The Council Tax Support Grant is included but not ring fenced in the Government's overall funding to borough and district councils who must then decide whether, and how much, to pass on to town and parish councils.

The Committee had further considered proposals for continuing the current scheme of gradually phasing out the Local Council Tax Support Grant by April 2017, and the continuation of the Rural Initiative Grant Scheme for the four year period 2016-2020, through reallocating the underspend of the previous Rural Action Plan, and these were also endorsed by Cabinet.

(B) Referrals from Cabinet: 24 November 2015

1. West Suffolk Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Policy 2016 to 2019

Cabinet Member: Cllr Alaric Pugh

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/072](#)

**(Licensing and
Regulatory Committee
Report No:**
[LIC/SE/15/003](#))

RECOMMENDED:

That the Gambling Act 2005: West Suffolk Joint Statement of Policy for the period 2016 to 2019, as contained in Appendix 3 to Report No: LIC/SE/15/003, be adopted.

Report No: LIC/SE/15/003 sets out the results of public consultation and seeks approval of the West Suffolk: Gambling Act 2005: Statement of Policy for the period 2016 to 2019. The Statement of Policy sets out how St Edmundsbury Borough and Forest Heath District Councils (the West Suffolk councils), in their roles as Licensing Authorities, will carry out functions under the Act. It recognises the importance of responsible gambling within the entertainment industry whilst seeking to balance this with the key objectives of the Act as follows:

- (a) preventing gambling from being a source of crime and disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime;
- (b) ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
- (c) protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

The objective of the Statement of Policy is to provide a vision for the local area and a statement of intent that guides practice.

The current Statement of Policy will expire in January 2016. Prior to and during the consultation on the version which would apply to the period 2016 to 2019, no evidence has been presented to support an assertion that any part of West Suffolk has or was experiencing problems from gambling activities. This position will, however, be kept under review and in the event of change further research will be undertaken to discover the extent of problems and an Area Profile will be prepared accordingly.

Since initial consideration by the Licensing and Regulatory Committee, some minor amendments have been made to the Statement of Policy under delegated authority, as set out in Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/15/072.

2. Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2016/2017

Cabinet Member: Cllr Ian Houlder

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/074](#)

RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the current Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme or Council Tax Technical Changes levels for 2016/2017, as detailed in Sections 5 and 6 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/074.

The Cabinet was provided with background to the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTRS) which was introduced from 1 April 2013, together with a summary of the second year review (2014/2015) in respect of the behavioural, administrative and financial impacts of the LCTRS and council tax technical changes levels.

The above recommendations are provided by the Cabinet on the 2016/2017 LCTRS and the technical changes from 1 April 2016.

The recommended continuation of the current schemes covered in Report No: CAB/SE/15/074, is intended to continue to deliver a 'cost neutral scheme' against the original 10% Government grant reduction. This is in order to maintain collection rates and avoid additional administrative costs. The impact of the 2016/2017 24% reduction in Central Government grant is therefore required to be addressed elsewhere and will form part of the Council's wider Medium Term Financial Strategy review and 2016/2017 budget setting process.

Based on the overall findings of the second year review outlined in Sections 2 and 3 of the Cabinet report, the Cabinet's recommendation is to continue the LCTRS in its current form, including applying the current 2015/2016 level of applicable amounts # within the LCTRS, for 2016/2017 (as detailed in Section 5 of the Cabinet report.)

An applicable amount is the amount that the Government says that a family needs to live on each week. When your applicable amount has been calculated it is then compared with your income to work out the council tax reduction entitlement for which you are eligible.

Due to the fact that the LCTRS is not changing this year there is no requirement to undertake specific consultation.

In respect of the technical changes, based on the overall findings of the second year review outlined in Sections 2 and 3 of the Cabinet report, the recommendation is to continue with the 2015/2016 levels, as shown below in Table 2 of Section 6 of the Cabinet report:

Table 2

Discounts/exemptions	2016/2017
Class A, empty, unfurnished and undergoing major repairs to render habitable (formally exempt Class A)	10% discount for a twelve month period
Empty, substantially unfurnished properties, which have been so for less than one week since the property was last occupied. For the purposes of determining when the property was last occupied, any period of less than 6 weeks within which the property was occupied will be disregarded. (formally exempt Class C)	1 week exemption followed by a 100% charge (Conditions detailed to the left)
Second homes	No discount – charge 100%
Empty homes premium (property empty for more than 2 years)	Pay 150%

3. Council Tax Base for Tax Setting Purposes 2016/2017

Cabinet Member: Cllr Ian Houlder

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/075](#)

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the tax base for 2016/2017, for the whole of St Edmundsbury is 35,737.08 equivalent Band 'D' dwellings, as detailed in paragraph 1.4 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/075; and**
- (2) the tax base for 2016/2017 for the different parts of its area, as defined by parish or special expense area boundaries, are as shown in Appendix 2 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/075.**

The Council Tax Base of the Council is the total taxable value at a point in time of all the domestic properties in its area, projected changes in the property base and the estimated collection rate.

The total taxable value referred to above is arrived at by each dwelling being placed in an appropriate valuation band determined by the Valuation Office, with a fraction as set by statute being applied in order to convert it to a Band 'D' equivalent figure. These Band 'D' equivalent numbers are then aggregated at a district wide level and are also sub totalled for parishes. This has to be done by the council responsible for sending the bills out and collecting the Council Tax ('the billing authority'). In two tier areas, district councils fulfil this function.

The Council Tax Base is used in the calculation of Council Tax. Each authority divides its total Council Tax required to meet its budget

requirements by the Tax Base of its area to arrive at a Band 'D' Council Tax.

The Band 'D' Properties figure as at 5 October 2015 of 36,017.3 as quoted in the CTB1 Tax Base Return form attached at [Appendix 1 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/075](#), has been updated as at 4 November 2015 to allow for:

- (a) technical changes outlined in Report No: [CAB/SE/15/074](#); and
- (b) potential growth in the property base during 2016/2017 taken from an average of the housing delivery numbers for those sites within the local plan and those that have planning permission, adjusted for an assumed level of discounts/exemptions within that growth of property base.

An allowance is then made for losses on collection, which assumes that overall collection rates will be maintained at approximately 98%. In addition to this collection rate change, an adjustment has been made to allow for the collectability of the council tax arising from the Local Council Tax Support scheme, which has been assessed at 90%. The resulting Tax Base for Council Tax collection purposes has been calculated as 35,737.08 which is an increase of 679 on the previous year.

The tax base figures provided within [Appendix 2](#) of the report have been communicated to town and parish councils so they can start to factor these into their budget setting process.

(C) Referrals from Cabinet: 8 December 2015

(These referrals have been compiled before the meeting of Cabinet on 8 December 2015 and are based on the recommendations contained within Report No: CAB/SE/15/082. Any amendments made by Cabinet to the recommendations will be notified prior to the meeting of Council.)

1. Land East of Barrow Hill, Barrow: Development Brief

Cabinet Member: Cllr Alaric Pugh

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/082](#)
**(Sustainable
Development Working
Party Report No:
[SDW/SE/15/014](#))**

RECOMMENDED:

That the Development Brief for Land East of Barrow Hill, Barrow, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/15/014, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance.

The draft Development Brief for Land East of Barrow Hill, Barrow, incorporating post-public consultation amendments and attached as [Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/15/014](#), has been prepared by consultants acting on behalf of the owner, but not in strict accordance with the Council's Protocol for Preparing Development Briefs. In this instance the consultants had several positive meetings with officers and statutory stake holders prior to approval from the Council being obtained to carry out public consultation on the draft brief. The consultants contacted the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth who agreed that consultation could proceed without this approval but that it would be at their own risk. Consultation took place between 14 September and 11 October 2015. A request was made subsequently for the Council to adopt the draft brief as non-statutory planning guidance.

The Statement of Community Involvement prepared by the Consultants was attached as [Appendix B](#) to the report. The following changes, which are annotated in the document, were made after public consultation: (i) amendment to the configuration of the layout to create a more meaningful area of open space; (ii) the highlighting of sensitive boundaries where loss of amenity could occur; (iii) creation of clearer linkages to Public Rights of Way to enable better access to the countryside; and (iv) provision of further explanatory text surrounding Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUD) and the viable options available.

The report further advised that currently there was an undetermined planning application, reference DC/15/1653/FUL, before the Council which was for (i) the erection of a single storey rear and side extension, and (ii) the re-design of the parking layout at the Barrow Doctor's Surgery. The proposed extension incorporated two more consulting rooms and a large room for a dentist. The details contained within the draft Development brief accord with those of the planning application.

Sustainable Urban Drainage was important for this site because of a perched water table. The draft brief sets out that an outfall strategy to the local watercourse network would be employed and this would involve the creation of culverts and swales. The Working Party along with the Ward Member, Councillor Ian Houlder, had expressed concerns about flooding issues in the village and officers advised that precise details of the outfall system to be utilised would be assessed at the planning application stage.

Officers had also responded to other matters raised by the Working Party as follows: (a) education (it was acknowledged that the village's Primary School was at capacity); (b) waste management; (c) sustainable travel; and (d) archaeology; and advised that the draft Development Brief would require all these issues to be addressed in connection with the submission of a planning application. These issues had been the subject of initial discussion in correspondence with statutory stake holders, copies of which had been included in the Statement of Community involvement.

The Cabinet considers the Development Brief is acceptable and should be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance..

2. Development Brief for the Allocated Housing Site at Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham

Cabinet Member: Cllr Alaric Pugh

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/082](#)
**(Sustainable
Development Working
Party Report No:**
[SDW/SE/15/015](#))

RECOMMENDED:

That the Development Brief for the allocated housing site at Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/15/015, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance subject to an amendment whereby an indication is given to the developers that there will be a requirement to investigate road safety aspect and improvements to the junction of the A143 with Stanningfield Road as part of the Transport Assessment to be submitted in support of a planning application.

The Council first received a request to adopt a development brief for this site in 2014. At the meeting of the Working Party on 28 November 2014, it was recommended that this development brief be not adopted. This recommendation was accepted by Cabinet on 10 February 2015 and by Council on 24 February 2015. Concerns about the first version of the brief were as follows: (i) amount of development (density and potential number of dwellings too high); (ii) potential increased risk of surface water flooding; (iii) landscape/countryside impact; (iv) impact on sewage treatment plant; and (v) no indication of siting of electricity sub-station.

The site promoters have since amended the draft brief and carried out further public consultation between September and October 2015. The draft brief incorporating post-public consultation amendments is attached as [Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/015](#), the Statement of Community Consultation is attached as [Appendix B](#) and the list of Statutory consultee feedback is attached as [Appendix C](#).

Councillor Terry Clements, as the Ward Member, reiterated his previously expressed reservations about the flooding potential of the site and that if the brief was approved in the form submitted it would result in a proposal coming forward for around 60 dwellings (based on the average density of 30 dwellings per hectare) which was a figure in excess of the 20 identified as being required to meet the village's housing need at the time when the Rural Vision 2031 document was being formulated. The developers had addressed this concern by illustrating how the site could be developed in two separate phases. At the Working Party meeting, officers drew attention to paragraphs 4.6 to 4.11 of the report which dealt with the issue of the amount of development and which explained that the constraints identified in the brief that would be imposed upon any development of the site, i.e. the Conservation Area, the setting of Listed Buildings, flood plain, protection of existing dwellings, impact on the countryside/landscape and the 'cordon sanitaire' around the sewage

treatment works, may render parts of the site undevelopable or only appropriate for 'low density' development e.g. single storey. These constraints may lead to planning applications that, in total, involve less than the 60 or so dwellings envisaged. Officers had also advised that there would be a full assessment of flooding potential at the planning application stage.

The Working Party in discussing the draft brief referred to the proximity of the site to the junction of the A143 with Stanningfield Road, a location in respect of which there were existing road safety concerns. It was agreed therefore that the potential for this situation to be aggravated by the development and the scope for carrying out highway improvements should be recommended to be a requirement of the brief.

The Cabinet considers the Development Brief is acceptable with the recommended amendment, as set out in the recommendation above, and should be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance.

3. The Meadows, Wickhambook: Development Brief

Cabinet Member: Cllr Alaric Pugh

Report No:
[CAB/SE/15/082](#)
**(Sustainable
Development Working
Party Report No:
[SDW/SE/15/016](#))**

RECOMMENDED:

That the Development Brief for The Meadows, Wickhambook, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/15/016, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance.

The Development Brief for The Meadows, Wickhambook has been prepared by agents in accordance with the Council's adopted protocol. Public consultation took place between 1 and 30 September 2015. A copy of the Statement of Community involvement is attached as [Appendix B](#) to Report No: SDW/SE/15/016.

Policy RV25a of Rural Vision 2031, which relates to this site, requires that the impact of development on health care capacity should be assessed and mitigation measures determined through liaison with NHS England. Furthermore it stipulates that proposals should incorporate protection of the hedgerow separating parts of the site and measures to ensure the continued management of parts of the site which contain notable botanical species.

Changes made post-public consultation are annotated in the document, attached as [Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/15/016](#). The changes related to: (a) the tenure mix of affordable housing; (b) Highways – a greater length of footway to link to existing footway south of the Community Centre; (c) additional work on Drainage and Flood Risk

Assessment; (d) updating requirement for Botanical Mitigation Plan; and (e) new section setting out Section 106 contributions.

Councillor Clive Pollington, as Ward Member, referred at the Working Party meeting to an existing proposal to extend the doctor's surgery in the village and expressed a concern that he understood that this may have been withdrawn. He also asked how the costs of the maintenance of the conserved areas within the development would be maintained. Officers advised that NHS England had objected to the allocation of a site for a new surgery within the area the subject of the Development Brief and this allocation was subsequently removed. The situation remained that NHS England would be required to assess health care provision in the light of development of The Meadows site. Further advice was given that a revised Botanical Mitigation Plan would be submitted with a planning application and that future maintenance of the areas involved would be by way of a capital payment to the Council by the developers.

**See overleaf for Referrals
from Democratic Renewal Working Party**

(D) Referrals from Democratic Renewal Working Party:
2 December 2015

1. Community Governance Review (CGR)

Chairman of the Working Party:
Cllr Patsy Warby

Report No:
DEM/SE/15/003

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the proposals of the Working Party, as set out in Appendix A to this report, be approved as the basis of the final recommendations for the next stage of the Community Governance Review;**
- (2) the Service Manager (Democratic Services and Elections) be authorised to prepare the final recommendations for consultation on each of these issues, in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and, where applicable, the further delegated actions indicated in Appendix A;**
- (3) the updated provisional timetable for the remainder of the review be approved and published as part of modified terms of reference for the review, set out in Appendix B to this report;**
- (4) the approach to consultation for the review, agreed by Council in December 2014, be confirmed for the remainder of the review (as set out in Appendix B to this report); and**
- (5) the Chief Executive be authorised to write to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to request an Electoral Review of the Borough Council's own electoral arrangements prior to the 2019 elections, and also to highlight the issues being examined in this Community Governance Review which affect the principal area boundary of St Edmundsbury.**

The above recommendations and appendices to this report reflect the deliberations of the Working Party at its meeting on 2 December 2015. The papers for that meeting set out the extensive evidence received by the Council during consultation on phase 1 of the review, which were considered in detail by the Working Party. The covering report and summary of responses is over 150 pages long, so it is not reprinted in this agenda. However, the papers constitute background papers for this item and can be found at:

<https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/documents/g3155/Public%20reports%20pack%20Wednesday%2002-Dec-2015%2017.00%20St%20Edmundsbury%20Democratic%20Renewal%20Working%20Party.pdf?T=10>

The covering report for the Working Party explains the background to the review, the process being followed (including consultation) and next steps. It also addresses some of the general issues which were raised about the review by consultees, such as the relationship between a Community Governance Review (CGR) and planning processes.

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 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.

A CGR should create the conditions, at parish level, to:

- (a) improve community engagement;
- (b) provide for more cohesive communities;
- (c) provide better local democracy; and
- (d) result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

The last Borough-wide CGR was carried out in 2010. The Borough Council agreed in December 2014 to carry out a CGR in 2015/2016 so that consideration could be given as to whether or not major strategic growth sites arising from Vision 2031 in and around Haverhill and Bury St Edmunds should lead to changes in the external boundaries of those two town councils. 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. Following consultation with parish and town councils in early 2015, and the May 2015 elections, several other issues for examination through the CGR were also included in the final terms of reference, approved by full Council in July 2015.

The first phase of the review, initial evidence gathering, took place between September and November, to inform the Council's recommendations. Phase 2, and the final consultation stage, is the publication of those recommendations, which will be based on decisions taken at this meeting of the Council. The Council will make its final decision in summer 2016.

The Working Party's proposals in relation to each of the 26 issues in the review are set out in **Appendix A**. Issue 26 affects all of the issues, so is listed first.

The Working Party has recognised, in making these proposals to Council, that there is not currently a consensus among stakeholders in relation to some of the issues. Any recommendation made in these cases is likely to divide opinion. Nonetheless, the legislation requires that the Council must make a final recommendation in respect of each of the issues listed in the terms of reference for the CGR. The recommendation must also be definite i.e. it must be a recommendation whether or not to make one of the permitted statutory changes. However, as well as being the final recommendation, it is also 'draft' insofar as it is still subject to testing through genuine consultation; the final decision by Council in summer

2016 may be different to the recommendation agreed at this meeting if new or stronger evidence emerges during phase 2.

It is also worth noting that there are two statutory recommendations that the Council must make in relation to every existing parish which is the subject of the CGR, namely whether its name will stay the same or not, and whether or not it will continue to have a parish council/meeting (as applicable). As they are implicit in the proposals, these obligatory recommendations are not listed in Appendix A. Instead, they will be added by officers to the publication versions of the final recommendations, under delegated authority.

The Working Party has also considered a clarification to the original timetable for the review. This is reflected in the modified terms of reference for the review which are attached as **Appendix B** to this report for approval.

Those modified terms of reference also reflect the recommendation of the Working Party that the means of consultation agreed by Council in December 2014 for the CGR be retained for consultation on the final recommendations. This proposed approach means that the small numbers of electors or businesses whose *existing* properties are directly affected by proposed boundary changes receive letters about the review (fewer than 200 in phase 1). Letters or emails will also be sent to local organisations affected by the review and to key stakeholders such as elected representatives, neighbouring councils and relevant partner organisations.

However, in relation to Vision 2031 growth sites or to proposals which affect the electoral arrangements of whole parishes (which involve over 50,000 electors in the case of this CGR), the proposal of the Working Party is that the Council continues to enlist the assistance of the media, parish and town councils, other partners and stakeholders to publicise the review through their own communication channels (newsletters, online bulletins, noticeboards, social media, meetings, word of mouth, etc). During phase 1, parish councils have adopted a variety of approaches to promoting the review. Some have held meetings and organised surveys of their own, others have written directly to electors and others have publicised it in newsletters and websites.

The Council will also publish details on its own website and via social media. Respondents will again be able to respond to the consultation via the Council's website, letter, email, telephone or their own local petitions or surveys.

This approach is felt to be equitable and proportionate and also, hopefully, will engage parishes and community groups more in promoting the review and debating their own governance arrangements locally. Particularly in those cases where it was a parish council or a community group itself which had suggested the CGR issue.

The Working Party also considered the matter of consequential changes to borough and county council electoral arrangements arising from the CGR. Given the significance of this matter, and its relevance to the final recommendation above, the information provided to the Working Party is re-provided in this report as **Appendix C**.