



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 8TH JULY 2021

AT 6.00 P.M.

PARKSIDE SUITE - PARKSIDE

MEMBERS: Councillors S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, M. Glass,
S. G. Hession, R. J. Hunter, M. Middleton and H. D. N. Rone-
Clarke

AGENDA

1. **Election of Chairman**
2. **Election of Vice Chairman**
3. **To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitutes**
4. **Declarations of Interest**

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.
5. **To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Electoral Matters Committee held on 2nd February 2021 (Pages 1 - 6)**
6. **Community Governance Review for Proposed Parish within the current Stoke Parish Area (Pages 7 - 12)**
7. **To consider any urgent business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting**

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

30th June 2021

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact
Jess Bayley**

**Parkside, Market Street, Bromsgrove, B61 8DA
Tel: (01527) 64252 Ext: 3268
Email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk**

GUIDANCE ON FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS

Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic Bromsgrove District Council will be holding this meeting in accordance with the relevant social distancing arrangements for holding face-to-face meetings at a local authority.

Please note that this is a public meeting.

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers, please do not hesitate to contact the officer named above.

GUIDANCE FOR ELECTED MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS IN PERSON

In advance of the Committee meeting, Members are encouraged to consider taking a lateral flow test, which can be obtained for free from the NHS website. Should the test be positive for Covid-19 then the Member should not attend the Committee meeting, should provide their apologies to the Democratic Services team and should self-isolate in accordance with national rules.

Members and officers are encouraged to wear face masks during the Committee meeting, unless exempt. Face masks should only be removed temporarily if the Councillor/ officer requires a sip of water and should be reapplied as soon as possible. Refreshments will not be provided by the venue, therefore Members and officers are encouraged to bring your own supply of water.

Hand sanitiser will be provided for Members to use throughout the meeting.

The meeting venue will be fully ventilated and Members and officers may need to consider wearing appropriate clothing in order to remain comfortable during proceedings.

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE

Members of the public can attend meetings of the Electoral Matters Committee in person to observe proceedings if they wish to do so. However, due to social distancing requirements to ensure the safety of participants during the Covid-19 pandemic there will be limited capacity and members of the public will be allowed access on a first come, first served basis. Members of the public in attendance are encouraged to wear face-masks, to use the hand sanitiser that will be provided and will be required to sit in a socially distance manner at the meetings. It should be noted that members of the public who choose to attend in person do so at their own risk.

In line with Government guidelines, any member of the public who has received a positive result in a Covid-19 test on the day of a meeting should not attend in person and should self-isolate in accordance with the national rules.

Notes:

Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when Council might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded and for any such items the live stream will be suspended and that part of the meeting will not be recorded.



INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

Access to Information

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

- You can inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- You can inspect minutes of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards for up to six years following a meeting.
- You can have access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to six years from the date of the meeting. These are listed at the end of each report.
- An electronic register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc. is available on our website.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public will be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards.
- You have access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned, as detailed in the Council's Constitution, Scheme of Delegation.

You can access the following documents:

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- The Council's Constitution

at www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE

2ND FEBRUARY 2021, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors L. C. R. Mallett (Chairman), A. J. B. Beaumont, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, S. G. Hession, J. E. King and M. Middleton

Officers: Mr D. Whitney, Ms M. Bassett and Ms. A. Scarce

10/2020 **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED that Councillor L Mallett be appointed Chairman for the purpose of this meeting.

11/2020 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Glass and R Hunter, with Councillors A Beaumont and J King attending as substitutes respectively.

12/2020 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion.

13/2020 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Electoral Matters Committee held on 29th September 2020 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Electoral Matters Committee held on 29th September 2020 be approved as a correct record.

14/2020 **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW FOR PROPOSED NEW PARISH WITHIN THE CURRENT STOKE PARISH AREA**

The Electoral Services Manager presented the report and in so doing highlighted the following:

- The results of the survey and questionnaire which went out to all households in the Stoke parish area, consultation was for 14 October, originally up to 14th December, but the Committee had agreed to extend this to 28th December 2020.

Agenda Item 5

Electoral Matters Committee
2nd February 2021

- 265 paper forms had been returned and 53 had been made via the website, that was a 15% return from households. There was also a submission from the Parish Council and a separate written response from a resident of the parish.
- The main question was “did residents want a new parish to be created from the Stoke Heath ward”. 116 residents were for the creation of a new parish and 197 against. In the Stoke Heath ward 60 were for and 61 were against.
- The Committee needed to consider whether there was due regard for community cohesion between the areas within the parish. The question was asked did the parish create a feeling of local community for and including electors in Stoke Heath. 154 thought it did create a feeling of community and 138 said there was not. In looking just at Stoke Heath 44 said there was and 68 said there was not.
- The question was then asked to the reasons why there was or was not that feeling of community cohesion (as detailed in appendices 1 and 2 of the report). The main areas highlighted appeared to be the central use of the recreation ground, the parish newsletter and events held in the parish. A number felt that the parish council concentrated on Stoke Prior and the newsletter put Stoke Prior first and in some cases, Stoke Heath residents felt ignored and that it was two areas of different environments.
- The third question was would you be interested in standing as a parish council. 277 had said no and 20 had responded yes.
- The residents were then asked if the changes were to happen, if they had any suggestions as to any different names for the parishes. The current Ward names were the most supported with 77% of the respondents said Stoke Prior and Stoke Heath. There were however a number of other suggestions including Stoke Works, Charford South and Stoke and Avoncroft and Stoke Heath.
- Consultees were finally asked to give any other comments, and these were detailed in appendix 3 to the report. There were a number of different remarks, but three in particular came up a number of times, concerns about the cost of council tax for the new parishes to be created, the area Polling District RHA (Stoke Heath ward) did not contain the whole of Stoke Heath and it was suggested that it should include Polling District AVB as well as RHA, and that the number of Councillors representing each ward should be reviewed.
- The response from the Parish Council was attached at appendix 4 and they were in support of the status quo and the response from the resident at appendix 5, was for the creation of another parish and addressed a number of areas including community identity.

The Electoral Services Manager explained that the Committee had three options in respect of the send stage of the consultation, which were

Agenda Item 5

Electoral Matters Committee
2nd February 2021

detailed within the report. That consultation would begin of 15th February and continue until 17th May 2021.

The Chairman asked whether a response had been received from either of the District Councillors in relation to the consultation, it was confirmed that they had not responded. It was questioned whether it was possible to ask them to comment and it was noted that they would automatically be consulted in the second consultation and the Chairman asked for it to be noted in the minutes that it would be helpful for them to respond to the second consultation.

Following presentation of the report, Members raised a number of points and asked a variety of questions, including:

- Whether there was a rule for the number of parish councillors needed – it was confirmed that this was a minimum of 5 seats on a parish council. It was also noted that there were a number of Members on this Committee who were or had been parish councillors.
- What the drivers had actually been for the suggested split when the petition had been put forward. It was confirmed that the petition had simply said the undersigned requested that the Council consider making the area known as Stoke Heath Ward a civil parish, independent of Stoke Parish Council. A number of areas had also been included in the covering letter, for example that people felt a disproportionate amount of the precept was being spent on Stoke Prior Ward and it would be fairer if they were able to set their own budget.
- It was commented that it would have been useful to have a map which showed the exact Wards that would be affected by the suggested changes. It was highlighted that the area had changed in recent years and now was very much rural and village type environment to one side and the other was more urban and almost a suburb of Bromsgrove itself, which was perhaps the driver for the new parish to be created.
- It was noted that details of the number of residents in each ward was included within the report and the Electoral Services Manager provided the breakdown by polling district and the number of parish councillors. The new proposed parish would cover 1,123 electors.
- Members discussed the shared facilities which appear to sit on the border.
- It was highlighted that there were also similar situations in other parishes and an example was given.
- It was questioned whether there needed to be a second consultation and it was confirmed that this was the case.
- The question was asked that, should the new parish be created what its roll would be and what facilities would it need to maintain. It was discussed that if the original parish covered the majority of amenities, then there was the possibility that it would have to “back fill” the loss of the precept from those that would be moved

Agenda Item 5

Electoral Matters Committee
2nd February 2021

to the new parish area, with those residents still in fact using the amenities.

- How the parish council would be financed, and the concerns raised in respect of any increase was discussed and it was confirmed that the precept was set by the parish itself and therefore it could drop, remain the same or increase.
- Whether the route to becoming an unparished area was first to become a parished area. This was understood to be the case and an example of this happening in another area was briefly discussed.
- The Chairman clarified that the Committee's roll was to set the question(s) that would form the basis of the second consultation.
- Members questioned what the second consultation would involve if the Committee were to suggest that the situation remained in its current position. It was clarified that this would simply be did residents think that Stoke Parish Council should remain covering its current area with a simple yes or no response.
- From the evidence provided Members did not believe that there was clear evidence to support any change. It was therefore agreed that going into the second consultation that would be the suggestion from the Committee.
- It was confirmed that the balance of Parish Councillors was based on the area of population representing those households.

The Electoral Services Manager then went on to explain that the Committee needed to consider how the draft recommendation would be carried out. The options were a letter as in the first round of consultations, with access to the website or whether the Committee wanted to suggest an alternative format. Members suggested that any further consultation should be carried out at a minimal cost to the Council as a substantial consultation had already taken place involving a large number of residents. It was suggested that the opening up of the website could be the main format, with advertising throughout the parish, but not to send out individual letters to all residents. Following discussion, it was agreed that opening up the website with the appropriate advertising was the most cost effective option available. It was confirmed that a press release could also be made and that the Parish Council would be on the consultation list as there was a number of statutory consultees who would receive a letter. It was noted that within the agenda pack a detailed letter had already been received from the Parish Council. It was suggested that Officers draw up a document which would be sent to Members outside of the meeting before it was issued.

Members took the opportunity to thank Officers for the detailed piece of work which they had carried out and the time taken to prepare it, particularly in these difficult times. The Chairman also thanked all the residents who had taken the time to respond to the consultation.

RESOLVED that

- a) **the results of the consultation undertaken as a result of a valid petition regarding a parish separate from Stoke Parish Council consisting of polling district RHA be noted;**
- b) **that no change be undertaken; and**
- c) **that the consultation be carried out through advertising and press release, with the proposed wording shared with the Committee for comment before publication.**

15/2020

POLLING STATION CHANGES - VERBAL UPDATE

The Electoral Services Manager confirmed that at the current time it was still proposed that elections would take place in May 2021, this would be combined Worcestershire County Council and Police and Crime Commissioner elections in Bromsgrove. His team had been doing work around contacting all Polling Station to ensure that they were Covid Secure. Members were reminded that this was a verbal update, as outside the mandatory Polling Places review, which was carried out in 2019, delegated authority was given to the Returning Officer in consultation with the Ward Member and the Portfolio Holder to make decision on any changes to polling places.

The Electoral Services Manager provided updates on the following Polling Stations, where different options were being considered, due to the nature of the station:

- **Rubery Sports and Social Club – Polling District RNA**
The function room at the rear was unavailable, due to building works. It was hoped that this would be available for future elections, but for May 2021 the potential to move back to Holywell School or perhaps use Rubery Community Leisure Centre. This would be visited on 5th February 2021 to see whether it was suitable.
- **Lickey End First School**
It was acknowledged that both this Committee and the Council to try and move away from the use of school wherever possible. This school had asked if it could not be used and as an alternative Lickey End Social Club had been contacted and they were happy to offer their services. It had better parking access and access for social distancing.
- **Members were reminded that, if elections had gone ahead in 2020, the School at Clent would have been used. However, Clent Parish Hall Committee were now happy for the Hall to be used again.**
- **Millfield Social Club**
The Social Club had raised concerns about Covid access and officers would be visiting the site on 3rd February to investigate further.

Agenda Item 5

Electoral Matters Committee
2nd February 2021

- Court Leet – this was currently closed, and Officers were having difficulties in contacting anyone to discuss its use.

The Electoral Services Manager confirmed that once the new venues had been assessed and deemed suitable the relevant Ward Members would be consulted.

The Chairman raised a point in respect of the area which fed into Court Leet, the Rock Hill area, for which he was County Councillor. It was felt that the Court Leet was a compromise solution and the use of a portable unit at another site might be more appropriate. It was suggested that the turnout at the polling station was traditionally quite low due to the distance outside of the boundary that some of the electorate would need to travel. Officers were asked to consider whether there was any land suitable to put a portable unit on in the estate in question. A number of areas were suggested, and the Electoral Services Manager agreed to investigate this matter further.

RESOLVED that the verbal update in respect of the Polling Station changes be noted.

The meeting closed at 6.54 p.m.

Chairman

ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE 2021

8 July

Community Governance Review for proposed new parish within the current Stoke Parish Area

Relevant Portfolio Holder		Councillor Denaro Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling
Portfolio Holder Consulted		Yes
Relevant Head of Service		Claire Felton
Report Author	Job Title: Darren Whitney Contact email: darren.whitney@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk Contact Tel: 01527 881650	
Wards Affected		Avoncroft, Rock Hill
Ward Councillor(s) consulted		Yes
Relevant Strategic Purpose(s)		N/A
Non-Key Decision		
If you have any questions about this report, please contact the report author in advance of the meeting.		

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to consider and decide the final recommendations for the review of a parish separate from Stoke Parish Council consisting of polling district RHA be either that

- 1) it is the same as the draft recommendations namely ‘that no change be undertaken’**
- 2) an alternative proposal from the Committee be adopted**

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A valid petition from Residents of the Stoke Heath Parish Ward (polling district RHA) of Stoke Parish Council was received requesting that a Community Governance Review (CGR) be carried out on ‘Making that area known as Stoke Heath Ward (RHA) a civil parish separate from Stoke Parish Council’.
- 2.2 A CGR commenced on 30 September 2020 when the terms of reference were published. Two rounds of consultation have taken place.
- 2.3 The publication of the final recommendations end the review.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 None in this report.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 On receipt of a valid petition, the Council has a responsibility to undertake a CGR in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (Part 4) and the associated Dept. of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Guidance on Community Governance Reviews, the Local Government (Parishes and Parish Councils) Regulations 2008 and the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The authority must have regard to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State (s100 (4) of the 2007 Act) and must give consideration to the views of local people in reaching its decision

4.2 Section 93 of the 2007 Act sets out the council's duties in undertaking a community governance review. In relation to deciding what recommendations to make, it provides that the council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review:

- a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
- b) is effective and convenient.

Section 93 (6) provides that the council must "take into account" any representations received in connection with the review as one element of these considerations.

4.3 Section 2 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 states that there is a duty on principal councils to promote understanding among local people, which extends to parish councils

5. STRATEGIC PURPOSES - IMPLICATIONS

Relevant Strategic Purpose

5.1 None as this report deals with statutory functions.

Climate Change Implications

ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE 2021

8 July

5.2 None in this report.

6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Equalities and Diversity Implications

6.1 None in this report.

Operational Implications

6.2 At the meeting of this Committee on 29 September 2020 a letter and questionnaire were agreed for the households within the Stoke Parish area. This questionnaire was also made available electronically via the District Council webpage dedicated to the review. In addition responses were invited from any other interested parties.

3.6 The results of the consultation were reviewed in detail at the meeting of this Committee held on 2 February 2021 and it was concluded that the majority of residents did not want a new parish to be created. From these findings the draft recommendation of the Committee regarding the review was that no change be made from the status quo.

3.7 The Terms of Reference of the review state that there must be a consultation on the draft recommendations and this was to be run from 15 February to 17 May 2021.

3.8 The consultation was publicised with interested parties being able to write in or fill in an electronic form online via the Council's website.

3.9 The MP, the County Council and relevant Councillors were also contacted for their views.

3.10 One reply was received from the second consultation which was from the Parish Council to confirm that they had no further comments to make (they had rejected the proposal of a new parish in the first consultation) but were reviewing the comments made from households in the first consultation to see how they could engage better with the residents of Stoke Heath.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

7.1 The Act requires that the CGR must be completed within 12 months of the validation of the petition. No amendments of the act have been made due to the ongoing COVID-19 situation so the CGR still needs to

**ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE
2021**

8 July

be completed within the statutory timeframe.

- 7.2 It is not anticipated that the current situation will impact on the completion of the review. Meetings of the Committee can be held remotely. All other aspects of the review will be able to take place as they would do for any other CGR, as the process is based on consultation.

8. APPENDICES and BACKGROUND PAPERS

No appendices

Background papers:

- DCLG Guidance
- Relevant Statutory provisions

ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE
2021

8 July

9. REPORT SIGN OFF

Department	Name and Job Title	Date
Portfolio Holder	Cllr G Denaro	24 June
Lead Director / Head of Service	Claire Felton	24 June
Financial Services		
Legal Services		

This page is intentionally left blank