

COUNCIL MEETING – 10TH JULY 2025

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5 (4)

PROPOSAL TO START A COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

A report from the meeting of the Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee held on 2nd July 2025.

SUMMARY:

This report sets out a proposal to start a Community Governance Review in response to Local Government Reorganisation. This review aims to ensure that community governance arrangements will continue to be effective, convenient, and work in the interests of local residents in the event of the establishment of a unitary council for North Hampshire.

The report and the attached proposed Terms of Reference describes the process and schedule for a Community Governance Review to be completed by January 2026 to ensure there is sufficient time to set precepts and transfer any assets and/or services to any new parish councils that the Council may choose to establish.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Council is recommended to approve the Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report sets out the background and proposal to start a Community Governance Review in response to Local Government Reorganisation. This review aims to ensure that community governance arrangements will continue to be effective, convenient, and work in the interests of local residents in the event of the establishment of a unitary council for North Hampshire.
- 1.2 The report proposals were considered and endorsed by the Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee at its meeting on 2nd July.

2 BACKGROUND**General**

- 2.1 The Government have [invited proposals](#) for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and asked that two-tier areas, such as Hampshire, form unitary

authorities that combine all powers into a single Council. One criterion for LGR proposals is to “enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunities for neighbourhood empowerment”

- 2.2 On 20 March 2025, Cabinet approved the Council's LGR Interim Plan on 20 March 2025 (Report No. [ACE2506](#)). In line with the principles set out in the interim plan and at this stage of the process, the Council believes that both the sense of place and economic geography of the area favours a North Hampshire unitary council (comprising the areas of Rushmoor, Hart and Basingstoke and Deane).
- 2.3 Basingstoke and Hart districts are parished. Hart has 21 town and parish councils covering the entire district, Basingstoke and Deane have 41 covering part of the district. Rushmoor has no parish councils.
- 2.4 The [English Devolution White Paper](#) acknowledges that residents value community scale governance, and stated a desire to see stronger community engagement arrangements and strengthened community voice. A risk of the establishment of fewer, larger unitary councils is that residents feel less able to influence decisions affecting their local area. The white paper noted that 50% of people say it is important that they feel able to influence decisions affecting their local area, currently only 23% feel able to do so.
- 2.5 Parish and town councils can provide communities with a strong community voice, while delivering hyper-local services to their residents and offering community ownership of prized local assets. Areas without these council could stand to lose out on these benefits.
- 2.6 The [Government's feedback on interim plans](#) acknowledged the value that town and parish councils offer to local communities. They were clear that areas should think carefully about how they might be funded and implications for taxpayers and local authority finances.
- 2.7 Recent unitarisation in previously two-tier areas has resulted in the [creation of new town councils](#), including St Austell (Cornwall), Salisbury (Wiltshire), Macclesfield (Cheshire East), and Weymouth (Dorset). This has often included a community asset transfer programme to provide these communities with greater control and decision-making of prized local assets and services that may not be as valued by a larger unitary council. It is likely that other councils are planning similar activities in this round of reorganisation.
- 2.8 The proposed [Council Delivery Plan](#) (to be considered by Council on the 10 July 2025) commits the Council to achieve the best outcome for Rushmoor residents and business from LGR, to engage with residents and business, and to ensure their needs are met.

Parish Councils

- 2.9 Parish councils can offer local communities with significant benefits, such as community representation, enhanced local services, hyper-local projects,

support for community cohesion, and greater accountability and transparency of local decision making.

2.10 Parish councils have the legal powers to run:

- Allotments
- Cemeteries and Crematorium
- Community Centres
- CCTV and Community Safety
- Drainage
- Entertainment and the Arts
- Street maintenance, such as footpaths, lighting, litter bins, benches, tree care, and grass cutting.
- Car Parking
- Community Lottery
- Parks, recreation grounds, and open spaces
- Public conveniences
- Planning consultation and neighbourhood planning
- Tourism
- Taxi fare concessions and bus services grants

2.11 Parish councils have community rights to bid, challenge, and build to bring more assets and services under their control. They are statutory consultees on planning applications and can shape local development through Neighbourhood Plans.

2.12 Parish councils can be funded through grants, fees and charges, and a council tax precept. The size of precept can vary significantly depending on the assets and services offered by the council. For example, in [Hart District](#) the lowest Band D parish precept is £15.35 per year (Bramshill) and the highest is £183.03 per year (Hartley Wintney). The establishment of a parish council and the transfer of assets and services to the new council may mean that any new additional parish council precept is accompanied by a reduction in the district council precept. However, a small increase of the overall council tax paid by residents is expected to cover additional administrative costs.

3 DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

General

- 3.1 Local Government Reorganisation will have substantial implications for local community governance in the Borough of Rushmoor. Given that most of the North Hampshire area is parished, it is proposed that the Council reviews governance arrangements in the Borough to ensure that they will continue to be effective, convenient, and work in the interests of local residents in the event of unitarisation.
- 3.2 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gives district councils the powers to conduct a Community Governance Review to ensure that local governance will continue to be effective and convenient and will reflect

the identities and interests of local communities. This review can result in a recommendation to establish new parish councils.

- 3.3 To begin the review, the Council must agree a terms of reference that sets out the scope, principles, responsibilities, consultation activity, and schedule. The proposed terms of reference for this review are attached in Annex 1. Once the Council has approved the terms of reference for the review, it must complete the review within twelve months.
- 3.4 The proposed Community Governance Review will involve all wards and residents within the borough.
- 3.5 A first consultation will seek resident views on whether they think there should be a lower tier of local government in the borough, and whether this should be single ward parishes, or multi-ward parishes (i.e. town councils). The consultation will provide general information for residents to understand the possible implications of any future proposed approach, including any changes to precepts.
- 3.6 The Council will consider the results of the first consultation and recommended next steps in September 2026 to decide whether to proceed to the second consultation. This could seek residents' views on a proposed form, structure, assets, and services for parish and/or town councils. The consultation will provide specific information for residents to fully understand the implications of the proposed approach, including any changes to precepts.
- 3.7 The Council will consider a final report and draft Community Governance Reorganisation Order by January 2026 in advance of potential parish council elections in May 2026. Alternatively, the Council could decide to not make any changes to community governance having given regard to the consultation results.

Alternative Options

Neighbourhood area committees

- 3.8 The [Government have suggested](#) that neighbourhood area committees could offer a model of place-based engagement and leadership that maximises efficiencies, and strengthens localism and community participation.
- 3.9 A neighbourhood area committee is a local governance body that involves residents in decision-making processes for their community. These committees typically consist of local councillors who use their knowledge of the area to make decisions on how local funds are spent and what improvements are needed.
- 3.10 Parish councils are statutory bodies established by legislation with formal powers and responsibilities that can provide a range of services, are statutory planning consultees, can raise funds, and are elected by local residents.

- 3.11 Neighbourhood area committees consist of ward councillors and can include community representatives. These committees are established by a council to focus on specific places within the larger council area and to influence decision making. They have no formal powers other than those delegated to them, do not have to be consulted, and cannot raise funds independently.
- 3.12 Under Section 9E of the Local Government Act 2000, the Leader may delegate executive functions to area committees. Those area committees must be established for part of the area of the authority and consist of elected members for wards within that area. Those executive functions are not equivalent to the powers of a parish council.
- 3.13 An alternative option is to not conduct a community governance review with the expectation that a new unitary council will establish neighbourhood area committees. This could mean that residents will not have the opportunity to give their view on whether these governance arrangements will be effective, convenient and reflect the identities and interests of local communities.
- 3.14 Given the commitments in the proposed Council Delivery Plan to acting in the best interests of residents and engaging them on their views, this alternative option is not recommended.

Delayed Community Governance Review

- 3.15 The Council could choose to schedule a Community Governance Review to report back to Council later than January 2026. To formally establish a parish council, the Council will need to set a precept and hold parish elections in the February and May of the establishment year. A Council decision later than January 2026 would mean that parish councils could not be established any earlier than April 2027.
- 3.16 The formal establishment of unitary councils is likely to be preceded by the formation of shadow unitary councils by April 2027. At this point, it is normal practice for the financial activities of the 'legacy' councils to be restricted by the Government. This will include the powers to transfer assets and/or services to parish councils over £100,000 without the consent of the shadow authority.
- 3.17 Given this, an alternative schedule is not recommended.

Boundary changes

- 3.18 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England must give its consent to the establishment of any parish council that requires changes to district ward boundaries.
- 3.19 A parish council that consists of the whole of one or more existing district wards will not require boundary changes and therefore can be established without requiring the consent of the Boundary Commission.

- 3.20 A parish council that consists of part of any existing district wards will require boundary changes and therefore will require the consent of the Boundary Commission before the Council can lawfully make the Community Governance Reorganisation Order.
- 3.21 While the Council cannot pre-determine the outcome of the Community Governance Review, it is unlikely that the consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England will be granted within the timing constraints detailed in elsewhere in this report.

Consultation

- 3.22 This proposed includes a programme of consultation to seek the views of residents on whether the current local community governance arrangements will be effective, convenient and reflect the identities and interests of local communities after local government reorganisation.
- 3.23 The Leaders Working Group on Local Government Reorganisation and the Policy and Projects Advisory Board have been consulted on the proposal and support the recommendation to Council.

4 IMPLICATIONS (of proposed course of action)

Risks

- 4.1 If the review is delayed beyond January 2026, the Council may lose the legal authority to complete the review and/or transfer any assets and services to the new councils.
- 4.2 The Council must ensure the review follows the relevant legislation to avoid judicial review.
- 4.3 Residents may not be able to make an informed decision without sufficient information on the benefits, opportunities, risks, and implications of the establishment of parish councils in-principle and the specific proposals for the borough. This could lead to low participation in the consultation and distrust in the outcomes.
- 4.4 Poorly designed parish boundaries and governance structures may not reflect community identities, may lead to inequity, and feelings of unfairness. This could lead to resident disengagement and dissatisfaction in their community governance arrangements.
- 4.5 Asset and service transfers are complex legal, logistical, and financial changes that could result in unforeseen issues.
- 4.6 The Council will mitigate these risks through standard project management techniques, the involvement of suitably skilled and experienced council officers, prioritised resourcing, and a focus on transparent and inclusive communications and engagement activity. The project risks will be updated as

more specific proposals are developed and included in a later Community Governance Review report to Council in September.

Legal Implications

- 4.7 The legal implications of conducting a review are contained throughout this document. The committee should be aware that one consequence of not recommending the review is that a review may be commenced by way of a petition. A petition, to be valid, must meet the following thresholds:
- For an area with less than 500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 50% of them.
 - For an area with between 500 and 2,500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 250 of them.
 - For an area with more than 2,500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 10% of them.

Financial Implications

- 4.8 Each town or parish council is required to set a balanced budget for its planned activities and services each year. Town and parish councils are usually funded by a combination of grants, fees and charges and precept. The precept is the amount to be funded by council tax by residents within the town or parishes boundary. Annually, the town or parish must submit their precept amount to the billing authority, Rushmoor Borough Council, to include on the council tax bills, collect on their behalf and pass on throughout the year.
- 4.9 The timescales required to ensure sufficient time for Rushmoor to carry out this process, will require the precept to be submitted by end of January each year.
- 4.10 As of the 2025/26 financial year, where Rushmoor Borough Council is subject to a maximum council tax increase per annum of 3% or £5 (whichever is higher), parish and town council are not subject to these increase limits.
- 4.11 Rushmoor will incur some initial set up costs including;
- Interim legal support
 - Council Tax Software change costs
 - Election costs
- 4.12 Further details on the financial implications of any specific proposals for the establishment of parish councils will be included in a later Community Governance Review report to Council in September.

Resource Implications

- 4.13 There are no resource implications in relation to this report. It is anticipated that resource implications will be included in a later Community Governance Review

report to Council in September where more specific proposals are recommended.

Equalities Impact Implications

- 4.14 An equality impact check found that this proposal would have a neutral or low negative impact on people with protected characteristics. Alternative consultation methods will be considered to mitigate these impacts. Therefore, a full assessment is not required. The Equality Impact Assessment in Annex 2 will be updated as more specific proposals are developed and included in a later Community Governance Review report to Council in September.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 This report sets out a proposal to start a Community Governance Review in response to Local Government Reorganisation. This review aims to ensure that community governance arrangements will continue to be effective, convenient, and work in the interests of local residents in the event of the establishment of a unitary council for North Hampshire.
- 5.2 The report and the attached proposed Terms of Reference describes the process and schedule for a Community Governance Review to be completed by January 2026 to ensure there is sufficient time to set precepts and transfer any assets and/or services to any new parish councils that the Council may choose to establish.
- 5.3 The Leaders Working Group on Local Government Reorganisation and the Policy and Projects Advisory Board have been consulted on the proposal and support the recommendation to Council.
- 5.4 This proposal supports the proposed [Council Delivery Plan](#) commitment to achieve the best outcome for Rushmoor residents and business from LGR, to engage with residents and business, and to ensure their needs are met. It will contribute to the Council's Local Government Reorganisation submission meeting the criterion to "enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunities for neighbourhood empowerment."

CLLR BILL O'DONOVAN
CHAIRMAN OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, AUDIT
AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[House of Commons Library – Parish and town councils: recent issues](#)

[House of Commons Library - Unitary authorities: The role of parish and town councils](#)

Rushmoor Borough Council

Community Governance Review – Terms of Reference

Introduction

Rushmoor Borough Council (the Council) is carrying out a Community Governance Review (CGR) in accordance with Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIHA 2007) to consider implementation of parishes, parish ward boundaries and councillor representation throughout the local authority area.

The Council is required to have regard for the Guidance on CGRs issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. The guidance has been considered in drawing up these Terms of Reference.

What is a Community Governance Review?

A Community Governance Review is a review of the whole the Council's area to consider one or more of the following:

- Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes
- The naming of parishes and the style of new parishes
- The electoral arrangements for parishes including:
 - The ordinary year of election
 - Number of councillors to be elected
 - Warding of the parish
- Grouping parishes under a common parish council
- Other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings

A Community Governance Review is required to take into account:

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish

The Council is required to ensure that community governance within the area under review will:

- be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- be effective and convenient

If the council is satisfied that the recommendation of a Community Governance Review would ensure that community governance within the area under review will reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area, and is effective and convenient, the council can make a Community Governance Order.

Why are we carrying out a Community Governance Review?

A CGR provides an opportunity for District Councils to consider and make changes to community governance for parishes within their area. Aldershot and Farnborough currently do not have any parishes.

Annex 1: Proposed Community Governance Review Terms of Reference

Reviews are undertaken to ensure that community governance for the area is effective, convenient and reflects the interests of the local community. Any recommendations following a CGR should result in improved community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

Scope of the Review

Rushmoor Borough Council will be reviewing potential parish governance arrangements across the whole of the local authority area and will be considering the following:

- Creating parishes
- The naming of parishes and the style of any new parishes
- The electoral arrangements for the parishes, including:
 - the ordinary year of election
 - the number of councillors
 - the number and boundaries of wards (if warded)
 - the name of any ward (if warded)

Any final recommendations made on the above by Rushmoor Borough Council will have regard to Section 93 LGPIHA 2007 and will ensure that community governance within the areas under review reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area and is effective and convenient.

Consultation

The Council is required to consult the electors for the area under review and any other person or body who appears to have an interest in the review and to take the representations that are received into account.

Following the consultation under these terms of reference, the Council will determine, after consideration of the consultation responses and other statutory considerations, whether to publish draft recommendations as to the future community governance arrangements within Rushmoor.

In arriving at its final recommendations following consultation on draft proposals, the Council will take account of the views of local people and any other person or body who appears to have an interest in the review against the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and government guidance.

If any change to community governance arrangements in Rushmoor is approved, a Community Governance Reorganisation Order will be made to give effect to the changes.

Annex 1: Proposed Community Governance Review Terms of Reference

Timetable

The Community Governance Review must be completed no later than 12 months of publication of these Terms of Reference.

The timetable for the review is as follows. Depending on local circumstances some dates may be subject to change:

Key date	Actions
2nd July 2025	Terms of Reference and Timetable for Review approved by Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee.
21st July to 12 September 2025	Rushmoor Borough Council to publish approved Terms of Reference. Eight-week consultation period begins with local people and interested parties.
25th September 2025	Review of consultation responses and to determine whether to publish draft recommendations as to the future community governance arrangements.
6th October 2025 to 28th November 2025	Subject to approval above, Rushmoor Borough Council to publish draft recommendations, including proposed electoral arrangements. Further eight-week consultation period begins with local people and interested parties.
Date to be set before end Jan 2026	Subject to consultation submissions and statutory considerations, Rushmoor Borough Council to determine whether to publish final recommendations and authorise the making of a community governance reorganisation order.

Representations

The Council welcomes representations during the specified consultation stages as set out in the timetable from any person or body who may wish to comment or make proposals on any aspect of the matters included in the Review.

Representations may be made by email to policy@rushmoor.gov.uk

Equality Impact Assessment: Screening Tool

The **Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Tool** should be completed for any new proposal. It helps staff check if their proposal will positively, neutrally, or negatively affect residents, staff, or service users. If the impact is positive or neutral, a full EIA isn't needed.

A **full EIA** is required if the screening shows a negative impact on specific groups. We also advise that a full EIA should be completed when a [key decision](#) is being made. Key decisions are executive actions likely to:

- Significantly affect Council tax, budget balances, or contingencies.
- Have a major impact on communities across two or more Borough wards.
- Expenditure or savings over £100,000 qualify as significant, with a £250,000 threshold for property transactions.

Furthermore, for staff, we generally consider the impact on more than 25 people as significant, which would require a full EIA. If you're unsure, you can seek guidance from the Policy Team.

***After screening, if you identify the need for a full Equality Impact Assessment, you can use your existing answers as a foundation for the full assessment.**

Name of Project	Community Governance Review
Reference number (if applicable)	
Service Area	Legal
Date screening completed	23 June 2025
Screening author name	Martin Iyawwe
Policy Team sign off	Alex Shiell
Authorising Director/Head of Service name	Amanda Bancroft

Please provide a summary of the proposal

Please outline:

- What are the aims / objectives of this proposal?
- Will this deliver any savings?
- What benefits or change will we see from this proposal?
- Which key groups of people or areas of the borough are involved?

The proposal is to begin a Community Governance Review (CGR) to consider the creation of parish or town councils within Rushmoor. The review is in response to expected local government reorganisation and the potential establishment of a unitary council for North Hampshire. The CGR will involve borough-wide consultation with residents and stakeholders to understand their views on potential parish or town councils, with a decision by January 2026 to allow for elections in May 2026 if new councils are created.

- **Aims/Objectives:** To review and potentially establish new community governance arrangements to ensure effective, convenient local representation that reflects community identity.
- **Savings:** No direct savings. Some one-off costs will be incurred for legal advice, systems updates, and elections. Any future financial implications (e.g., precepting arrangements) would be considered in later stages.
- **Benefits/Change:** Potential for enhanced local representation, community voice, and neighbourhood control of services/assets.
- **Key groups or areas:** All Rushmoor residents. The proposal affects the entire borough.

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

Who will the proposal impact? Delete as appropriate.

Group of people	Impacted?
Residents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Businesses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Visitors to Rushmoor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Voluntary or community groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Council staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Trade unions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Other public sector Organisations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Others	Please specify:

What impact will this change have on staff? Please complete where relevant.

<p>Please outline in brief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will be impacted? For example, which services, teams, or buildings? • How many staff members? • What will the impact be? (e.g., changes to structure, staffing levels, responsibilities, relocation, or new working methods)
<p>No direct impact on staff at this stage of the CGR. Future proposals (e.g. service or asset transfer) may have implications and will be assessed later once specific proposals have been developed. There will be a slight increase in workload for staff that are part of the project team.</p>

What consultation or engagement will you be leading (with residents, staff, or other stakeholders) as part of this project?

Please outline in brief:

- Which groups will you consult (residents, staff, other stakeholders)?
- Will you collect personal data?
- How will you engage (e.g., surveys, focus groups)?
- How will you use the feedback?

If no engagement is planned, explain why.

A full borough-wide consultation will be carried out in two phases. The aim is to ask residents and community groups whether they would like a more local level of representation in their area (such as a town or parish council, or a neighbourhood area committee), and if so, how that might be set up.

The first consultation (21 July to 12 September 2025) will ask for views on whether people support the idea of local councils, how they might be set up (e.g. one for each ward or a single town council), and what they could be called.

The second consultation (6 October to 28 November 2025) will follow up with more detailed questions if there is support for new councils — such as the number of councillors, funding methods, and which services or assets they should manage.

- **Who will be consulted?** All Rushmoor residents, local voluntary and community groups, and key partners.
- **How will we consult?** The consultation will be shared through the council website, social media (Facebook, X/Twitter, Nextdoor, LinkedIn, etc.), email newsletters, local media, and partner organisations like RVS. Internal staff channels include Viva Engage, staff and member newsletters, and Rushmoor Round-Up.
- **Personal data:** We do not plan to collect any personal data as part of the consultation. It will be an anonymous survey.
- **How feedback will be used:** The findings from both consultation rounds will be reviewed and used to decide whether to propose setting up town or parish councils and to shape the details if so.

Potential consultation questions could include:

1st Consultation key points

- Would you like a lower tier of local representation government in your area?
- If yes, would you like a parish in every ward or multi-ward for towns?

2nd Consultation key points

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

- Do you agree with our proposal for Parish / Town Councils? Our first consultation demonstrated support for [town councils] [parish councils].
- Do you agree with [proposed names]
- If not, what would you like them to be called?
- We propose X number of councillors. Do you agree?
- If not, what number of councillors do you think is ideal?
- We propose to fund [organisation] in the following way – do you agree?
- If not, how do you propose we fund [organisation]
- What assets and services should be transferred to them?

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

What impact will this change have on people with protected characteristics and/or from disadvantaged groups?

For the groups identified earlier, tick the likely impact on people with protected characteristics (e.g., age, disability, race, etc.):

- **Neutral:** No impact.
- **Positive:** Benefits people with protected characteristics.
- **Negative:** Harms people with protected characteristics.
- **Not Sure:** It's unclear how this affects people with protected characteristics, or more information is needed.

Rate the negative impact as **low**, **medium**, or **high**. Also, consider whether the proposal may be seen as controversial or negative by some groups. See the guidance for help.

When completing this table, please consider both direct and indirect impacts. Indirect impacts may not be intentional but could still affect people with protected characteristics differently. For example, a gambling policy may indirectly impact men (who are more likely to experience problem gambling) and women (who are more likely to be affected by someone else's gambling).

Protected characteristic	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Negative impact	Not Sure	Description of the impact (if applicable) <i>Consider both direct and indirect impacts when completing this table</i>
Age (for example, young people under 25, older people over 65)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	The consultation will be open to everyone, with accessible formats where needed. Indirect impact that older residents or young people may be less likely to engage with online consultations. Alternative consultation methods will be

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

Protected characteristic	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Negative impact	Not Sure	Description of the impact (if applicable) <i>Consider both direct and indirect impacts when completing this table</i>
					considered to include these groups.
Disability (include people with physical disabilities, people with learning disabilities, blind and partially sighted people, Deaf or hard of hearing people, neurodiverse people. This also includes carers.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected. Information will be made available in accessible formats.
Gender reassignment and identity (Include people who identify across the trans* umbrella, not only those who have undergone gender reassignment surgery. This is inclusive of girls and or/women, men and/or boys, non-binary and genderfluid people and people who are transitioning) *Trans is an umbrella term to describe people whose gender is not the same as, or does not sit comfortably with, the sex they were assigned at birth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Pregnancy and Maternity (Include people who are pregnant in or returning to the workplace after pregnancy. Could also include working parents.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Race or ethnicity (include on the basis of colour, nationality, citizenship, ethnic or national origins)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	The council has a large Nepali community, it may

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

Protected characteristic	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Negative impact	Not Sure	Description of the impact (if applicable) <i>Consider both direct and indirect impacts when completing this table</i>
					be difficult to get their views on the formation of town/parish councils. Alternative consultation methods will be considered to include these groups.
Religion or belief (include no faith)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Sex (Under the Equality Act 2010 and following the 2025 Supreme Court ruling on 15 April 20205, a person's legal sex is defined as their biological sex as recorded at birth. Trans individuals are still protected from discrimination under the characteristic of gender reassignment.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Sexual Orientation (Include people from across the LGBTQ+ umbrella, for example, people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual or asexual.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.
Other (e.g. people on low incomes, people living in poverty, looked after children, people with care experience, people who are homeless, people with mental health problems, people who are prison	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Choose an item.	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impact expected.

Annex 2: Equality Impact Assessment

Protected characteristic	Positive impact	Neutral impact	Negative impact	Not Sure	Description of the impact (if applicable) <i>Consider both direct and indirect impacts when completing this table</i>
leavers, people affected by menopause, people affected by menstruation and/or period poverty)					

Screening Decision	Outcome
Neutral or Positive – no full EIA needed*.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Negative – Low Impact – full EIA at the service director’s discretion*.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Negative – Medium or High Impact – must complete a full EIA.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is a full EIA required? Service decision:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is a full EIA required? [Policy Team] sign off recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Flag for DPIA (will include engagement that collects personal data). [Policy Team]:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Flag for ethics (high risk / will involve engagement with vulnerable residents):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No