

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
AGREED BY CHARNWOOD BOROUGH COUNCIL AT THE FULL COUNCIL
MEETING ON 22ND JANUARY 2018**

The following recommendations were agreed at the Council meeting on 22nd January 2018.

The next stage is for a community governance order or orders to be implemented to bring the recommendations into effect for the next parish council elections in May 2019.

AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS & REASONS

Recommendation 1: New Parish of Hamilton Lea (Development off Hamilton Lane, Barkby Thorpe)

That a new parish be established by separating the area outlined in orange on Map 1 in Appendix A from the parish of Barkby & Barkby Thorpe, that it be named Hamilton Lea, and that it should not have a parish council (ie. it will be a parish meeting).

Reason: The development has no significant geographical or road connections with Barkby or Barkby Thorpe, and therefore establishing a separate parish meeting would be the best way of recognising and developing community cohesion and identity within the development. The development is being marketed by two developers under the names of 'Hamilton Gardens' and 'Hambleton Lea', and therefore 'Hamilton Lea' appears to be suitable name for the new parish.

Recommendation 2: Broadnook SUE

That the initial proposal to establish a new parish meeting for the proposed Broadnook development not be progressed at this time due to the lack of approved outline planning permission for the site, but that a Community Governance Review to specifically consider the development should be initiated by the Head of Strategic Support if outline planning permission is approved.

Reason: Due to the absence of outline planning permission for the site it is unlikely that the development will be significantly progressed by the time any recommendations arising from the Community Governance Review come into effect, and it is therefore not recommended to establish a new parish for the Broadnook development at this point in time. However, in light of the general

support for the development to be covered by a new parish, a further Community Governance Review should be initiated if an outline planning application is approved, which could then reconsider establishing a new parish for the development at that time. It is envisaged that this review could be completed before development commences on the site.

Recommendation 3: Boundary Between Burton on the Wolds and Prestwold

That the boundary between the parish of Burton on the Wolds and the parish of Prestwold be amended to move the following properties from Prestwold to Burton on the Wolds: number 29, 31, 33, and 35 Seymour Road and Seymour House (highlighted in yellow on Map 2 in Appendix A).

Reason: To implement the suggestion of Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council that these properties would appear to be more logically part of Burton on the Wolds rather than Prestwold.

Recommendation 4: Boundary Between Cotes, Prestwold and Loughborough

That the boundary between the parishes of Cotes and Prestwold, and unparished area of Loughborough be amended to follow the line as shown in blue on Map 3 in Appendix A, with blue arrows showing where the boundary of Cotes parish will move to.

Reason: To ensure that all the properties in the settlement of Cotes fall within the parish of Cotes in the interests of improving community cohesion and identity.

Recommendation 5: Reduction in Number of Hoton Parish Councillors

That the number of parish councillors for Hoton Parish Council be reduced from seven to six.

Reason: To implement the suggestion of Hoton Parish Council that their number of parish councillors be reduced by one.

Recommendation 6: North East of Leicester SUE to Become Part of Thurmaston

That the boundary of the parish of Thurmaston be amended to include the whole area of the proposed North East of Leicester development, being the area shown

within the blue boundary on Map 4 in Appendix A, and that initially the area should become part of the Thurmaston East ward of the parish with no changes to the current numbers of parish councillors.

Reason: Thurmaston Parish Council have indicated their support for the new development becoming part of the existing settlement due to there being little or no area of separation, and the extended village will be reliant on and benefit from facilities, services and support from the Parish Council.

Recommendation 7: Increase in Number of Queniborough Parish Councillors

That the number of parish councillors for Queniborough Parish Council be increased from nine to 10.

Reason: To implement the suggestion of Queniborough Parish Council that their number of parish councillors be increased by one.

Recommendation 8: Increase in Number of Quorn Parish Councillors

That the number of parish councillors for Quorn Parish Council be increased from 11 to 13.

Reason: To implement the suggestion of Quorn Parish Council that their number of parish councillors be increased by two.

Recommendation 9: Increase in Number of Shepshed Town Councillors: **THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS NOT APPROVED**

Recommendation 10: Boundary Between Thurcaston & Cropston and Birstall

That the boundary between Thurcaston & Cropston and Birstall parishes be amended so that the current part of Thurcaston & Cropston on the south side of the A46, being the area highlighted in yellow on Map 5 in Appendix A, becomes part of the parish of Birstall within the Greengate ward.

Reason: To reflect the nature of the A46 as being the obvious geographical boundary between the two parishes.

Recommendation 11: Boundary Between Thurcaston & Cropston and Newtown Linford

That the boundary between Thurcaston & Cropston and Newtown Linford parishes be amended as per Map 6 in Appendix A, so that the boundary becomes the eastern shore of the Cropston Reservoir.

Reason: To move the whole of the Cropston Reservoir into Newtown Linford and to introduce a more logical boundary between the two parishes based on the significant geographical feature formed by the reservoir shore.

Recommendation 12: New Parish of Stonebow Village (West of Loughborough SUE)

That a new parish be established with the boundary as shown in blue on Map 7 in Appendix A, by amalgamating the indicated areas of the parishes of Shepshed and Hathern and of the unparished area of Loughborough, that it be named Stonebow Village, and that it should not have a parish council (ie. it will be a parish meeting).

Reason: The development will eventually be of a size to potentially warrant its own parish council, but it is unlikely that there will be enough residents living there by May 2019 to make a parish council viable. The creation of a parish meeting will allow the development to establish its own community identity, and a further community governance review can be undertaken in the future if it is felt that the parish meeting should become a parish council. The further boundary changes in Areas A and B are to utilise existing roads and lanes as clear geographical boundaries, and in the case of Area B to also prevent an existing area of Loughborough becoming separated.

Recommendation 13: Boundary Between Woodhouse and Loughborough

That the boundary between the parish of Woodhouse and the unparished area of Loughborough be amended to follow the line shown in yellow on Map 8 in Appendix A.

Reason: To ensure that the properties within the Woodthorpe / Grange Park development all fall within Loughborough, in the interests of community cohesion.

Recommendation 14: Parish Ward Boundary Between Thurcaston and Cropston

That the parish ward boundary between Thurcaston and Cropston be amended to follow the natural boundary formed by the Rothley Brook as shown on Map 9 in Appendix A, with no changes to the number of parish councillors for either ward.

Reason: To implement the suggestion of Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council and to reflect the natural boundary formed by the Rothley Brook.

Recommendation 15: Boundary Between Mountsorrel and Rothley (Primrose Hill)

That the boundary of the parish of Mountsorrel be amended to include the area of the Primrose Hill development within the blue boundary shown on Map 10 in Appendix A, which is currently within the parish of Rothley, and that the area should become part of the Mountsorrel ward.

Reason: To correct an anomalous parish boundary issue which has been created by the new Primrose Hill development, which appears to be a natural extension to the settlement of Mountsorrel, by creating a strong boundary reflecting the area of separation between the settlements of Mountsorrel and Rothley, and to facilitate effective and convenient local government.

Recommendation 16: Request for a Local Government Boundary Commission Review

That the Council should request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a full review of the current Borough ward boundaries.

Reason: Such a review has not been undertaken for several years, and there are several proposed changes to parish council boundaries arising from the Community Governance Review that could impact upon the relevant principal council electoral areas.

Recommendation 17: Parish Council Areas with no Changes

That, in the case of each of the following parishes, they should not be abolished, their areas should not be altered, their names should not be changed and they should continue to have parish or town councils, as may be the case: Anstey, Barrow upon Soar, Cossington, East Goscote, Hoton, Queniborough, Quorn,

Ratcliffe on the Wreake, Rearsby, Seagrave, Sileby, South Croxton, Syston, Thrussington, Walton on the Wolds, and Wymeswold.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 18: Parish Meeting Areas with no Changes

That, in the case of each of the following parishes, they should not be abolished, their areas should not be altered, their names should not be changed and they should continue not to have a parish council (ie. remain as parish meetings): Beeby, Swithland, Wanlip and Ulverscroft.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 19: Barkby & Barkby Thorpe – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendations 1 and 6, the parish of Barkby & Barkby Thorpe should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 20: Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alterations to their areas as set out in recommendations 3 and 4, the grouped parishes of Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold should not be abolished, that their names should not be changed, and they should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 21: Thurmaston – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 6, the parish of Thurmaston should not be abolished, that its name should not be changed, and that it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 22: Birstall – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 10, the parish of Birstall should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 23: Thurcaston and Cropston – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendations 10 and 11, and to its ward boundaries as set out in recommendation 14, the parish of Thurcaston & Cropston should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council, with no other changes to its wards or number of councillors.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 24: Newtown Linford – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 11, the parish of Newtown Linford should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council with no changes to the number of councillors.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 25: Hathern – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 12, the parish of Hathern should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 26: Shepshed – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 12, the parish of Shepshed should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 27: Woodhouse – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of its area as set out in recommendation 13, the parish of Woodhouse should not be abolished, its name should not be changed, and it should continue to have a parish council.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 28: Mountsorrel and Rothley – no other Changes

That otherwise than for the alteration of their areas as set out in recommendation 15, the parishes of Mountsorrel and Rothley should not be abolished, their names should not be changed, and they should continue to have parish councils.

Reason: To confirm areas where no other recommendations for changes have arisen from the Community Governance Review.

Recommendation 29: Delegated Authority to Implement the Agreed Changes

That delegated authority is given to the Head of Strategic Support to undertake the required steps to implement the recommendations arising from the Community Governance Review and agreed by Council, including the making of any Community Governance Orders which may be required.

Reason: To allow for the implementation of the agreed recommendations in an efficient and timely manner.