

STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

**AGENDA
ITEM NO**

COUNCIL

18 JULY 2019

6

Report Title	COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
Purpose of Report	To make final recommendations to parish arrangements in the district in relation to the Community Governance Review.
Decision(s)	<p>Council RESOLVES to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. approve the final recommendations in relation to each Parish/Town Council within the Stroud District; 2. authorise the Democratic Services and Elections Manager to request the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to make related alteration orders to change district wards and county divisions to reflect the changes made to parish boundaries; and 3. authorise the Interim Head of Legal Services to make a reorganisation of community governance order to implement the changes agreed by Council, subject to receiving the necessary consents from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
Consultation and Feedback	The Community governance review process was undertaken in accordance with the published guidance and included two periods of consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties. Links to the responses received during the consultation period can be found in the appendices below.
Financial Implications and Risk Assessment	<p>There are no financial implications directly from this report.</p> <p>The creation of a new Parish does create obligations for the Council to support the new organisation but this is expected to be achieved through existing officer time.</p> <p>Andrew Cummings, Interim Director of Resources and Section 151 Officer Tel: 01453 754115 Email: andrew.cummings@stroud.gov.uk</p>
Legal Implications	<p>All legal implications are set out within the body of the report.</p> <p>Patrick Arran, Interim Head of Legal & Monitoring Officer Tel: 01453 754369 Email: patrick.arran@stroud.gov.uk</p>

Report Author	Hannah Emery Democratic Services and Elections Manager Tel: 001453 754383 Email: hannah.emery@stroud.gov.uk
Options	There is no statutory duty placed on the council to undertake community governance reviews so it has the option at any time to cease work. However, given the stage now reached there is a legitimate expectation the review will be taken to its natural conclusion. Therefore, there is not feasible alternative option.
Background Papers/ Appendices	Report to Council on 19 July 2018 Terms of Reference First stage consultation responses Community Governance Review of the Stroud District – Draft Recommendations Second stage consultation responses Guidance on Community Governance Reviews Communities & Local Government, and The Local Government Boundary Commission for England Appendices CGR Final Recommendations Maps 1 -10

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council at its meeting on the 19 July 2018 resolved to undertake a Community Governance Review (CGR) for the whole of the Stroud District. After the first consultation period closed, a CGR Working Group was established to oversee the review and to make draft and then final recommendations. The Councillors on the Working Group were Councillors Brine, Davies, McKeown, Miles, Mossman, Oxley, Ross and Townley.
- 1.2 The process for carrying out a Review is set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and associated guidance. Appropriate consultation has been carried out, the views of electors and others in the area have been sought and this report represents the final element of the Review that the Council commenced in 2018.
- 1.3 If the Council agrees the recommendations, work will commence immediately to make the necessary Reorganisation Order to bring the changes into effect in time for the May 2020 district and parish council elections. Members will note that, for some of the proposals, the final position is dependent on the agreement of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

2. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW CRITERIA

- 2.1 A Community Governance Review offers the opportunity to put in place stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services. It can consider one or more of the following:

- a) Creating, merging, altering, or abolishing parishes;
- b) The name of parishes and the style of new parishes;
- c) The electoral arrangements for parishes (the ordinary year of election; council size; the number of councillors to be elected to the council, and parish warding); and
- d) Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes.

2.2 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 is effective and convenient.

2.3 In doing so, the Review is required to take into account:

- a) The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- b) The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

2.4 The Council may not alter the external boundary of the Stroud District or any other principal council. However, the review may make consequential electoral arrangement recommendations to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) regarding the Electoral Wards of the District and the Electoral Divisions of Gloucestershire County Council where there is sufficient evidence that this would be desirable and result in more convenient electoral arrangements.

3. DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 During the first stage consultation period held between the 3 September 2018 and the 26 November 2018, we invited town and parish councillors, parish meetings, residents and any other interested parties to make proposals for changes to parish boundaries or other issues relating to parish arrangements, such as the number of councillors, parish warding or grouping of parishes.

3.2 120 submissions were received in relation to 31 parish/town councils out of 52 and the majority of submissions were largely supportive of the current electoral arrangements. The submissions were reviewed and considered by the CGR Working Group and the draft recommendations were then formulated on the basis of the evidence submitted whilst having regard to the extent to which the submissions received met the statutory criteria.

3.3 The draft recommendations were published on the 18 February 2019 commencing the second stage consultation period which closed on the 6 May 2019. As part of the second stage consultation, letters were sent to all town/parish councils and parish meetings and households that were directly affected by the draft recommendations, giving the recipients the opportunity to comment.

4. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The Working Group has carefully considered all of the 171 responses to the second stage consultation. In the majority of cases the Working Group proposes that Council confirms its draft recommendation. This reflects the fact that in relation to a lot of the proposals there was no response to the consultation or the only responses received were supportive. In a few cases, the Working Group proposes moving away from the draft recommendation in light of the consultation responses. In such cases it proposes an amendment that takes on board the views expressed.
- 4.2 The following sections of this report detail the first stage consultation responses, draft recommendations (which were subject to consultation), a summary of representations received and the Working Group's conclusions and final recommendations for each parish. It is recommended that the draft recommendations are read alongside these final recommendations for a fuller picture of the decision making of the Working Group.
- 4.3 Except as set out below, the Working Group recommends that no new parishes or parish councils should be constituted, no existing parishes or parish councils should be abolished, no other areas of existing parishes should be altered, no parishes should be renamed and no other changes to existing parish arrangements should be made as part of this Review.

5. BISLEY-WITH-LYPIATT AND CHALFORD PARISH BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

5.1 First stage consultation

- 5.1.1 Chalford Parish Council made a submission recommending a boundary change to the northern boundary of Bussage Ward to address three anomalies; the current boundary passes through the buildings of Aberlink, Thomas Keble playing field and separates parts of Stonecote Ridge and Manor Farm.

5.2 Draft recommendations

- 5.2.1 It was recommended that the boundary between Chalford (Bussage Ward) Parish Council and Bisley-with-Lypiatt (Eastcombe Ward) Parish Council be realigned so that some properties in Stonecote Ridge, The Ridge and New Homestead are transferred into Chalford Parish Council and some properties at Manor Farm are transferred into Bisley-with-Lypiatt Parish Council.

5.3 Second stage consultation

- 5.3.1 Chalford parish supported the draft recommendations.
- 5.3.2 Bisley-with-Lypiatt parish supported the amendment to Stonecote Ridge and Manor Farm but proposed that the three properties on The Ridge are retained in Bisley-with-Lypiatt including the building of Aberlink. It was also proposed that the boundary amendment around the playing field is extended to the road to transfer four properties into Bisley-with-Lypiatt.
- 5.3.3 Out of the 41 properties sent a survey, 14 responses were received; 12 in support and 2 against. Those in support commented that the proposal is a logical change and would take away the current confusion, those against were concerned about the increase in council tax.

5.4 Final recommendations

- 5.4.1 The Working Group considered Bisley-with-Lypiatt's amendments to the boundary change and thought the proposal to extend the boundary from the playing field to the road to transfer four properties to Bisley-with-Lypiatt was a sensible and logical extension of the boundary. The proposed amendments to the boundary next to Aberlink and The Ridge were rejected because Aberlink and a property in The Ridge had responded to the consultation stating they were supportive of the proposed change to Chalford Parish Council.
- 5.4.2 The consultation responses demonstrated that the proposed boundary change is more logical and reflective of the identities and interests of the community and would make community governance more effective and convenient.

- 5.4.3 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-**
- a) the boundary of the parish of Bisley-with-Lypiatt is redrawn to transfer 36 properties in Stonecote Ridge and 3 properties on The Ridge to Chalford parish, and the transfer of 4 properties on Middle Hill to Bisley-with-Lypiatt as shown on Map 1.**
 - b) a request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of:**
 - i. Bisley and Chalford District Wards; and**
 - ii. Bisley and Painswick and Minchinhampton County Divisions.**

6. BRIMSCOMBE & THRUPP PARISH AND STROUD TOWN BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

6.1 First stage consultation

- 6.1.1 Brimscombe and Thrupp Parish Council made a submission to propose the amendment of the boundary with Stroud Town Council to transfer the properties of Gunhouse Lane into Brimscombe and Thrupp Parish because the residents feel more affiliated with Brimscombe and Thrupp than Stroud Town.
- 6.1.2 Brimscombe and Thrupp also proposed an amendment to the boundary with Minchinhampton Parish.

6.2 Draft recommendations

- 6.2.1 The Working Group were satisfied that the boundary amendment with Stroud Town better reflects the identities and interests of the community and proposed that the boundary of Brimscombe and Thrupp is redrawn where it adjoins Stroud Town.
- 6.2.2 The Working Group recommended no change to the boundary between Brimscombe and Thrupp and Minchinhampton as there was insufficient evidence to support the amendment and Minchinhampton Parish were strongly opposed.

6.3 Second stage consultation

- 6.3.1 No response was received from Brimscombe and Thrupp Parish or Stroud Town Council.
- 6.3.2 Out of the 47 properties in Gunhouse Lane sent a survey, 26 responses were received; 24 were in support of the amended boundary and 2 were against. Those in support commented that they have always felt part of Thrupp and that

the rural community will benefit from the proposal. Those against felt there was no rationale for the change and they actively support Stroud Town and the facilities it provides.

6.3.3 Minchinhampton Parish were in support of no change to the Minchinhampton and Brimscombe and Thrupp Parish Boundary.

6.4 Final recommendations

6.4.1 The consultation responses demonstrated that the proposed boundary change was reflective of the identities and interests of the community.

6.4.2 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a. the boundary of the Parish of Brimscombe and Thrupp is redrawn where it adjoins the Town of Stroud (Trinity Ward) to transfer the properties in Gunhouse Lane to the Parish of Brimscombe and Thrupp as shown on Map 2;**
- b. no change be made to the boundary between Brimscombe and Thrupp and Minchinhampton parish; and**
- c. a request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of**
 - i. Stroud Trinity and Thrupp District Wards; and**
 - ii. Stroud Central and Minchinhampton County Divisions.**

7. CAINSCROSS PARISH AND STONEHOUSE TOWN BOUNDARY AMENDMENT AND STONEHOUSE TOWN WARD NAME AMENDMENT

7.1 First stage consultation

7.1.1 Cainscross Parish Council requested a name change of the parish council to reflect the four wards that make up the parish.

7.2 Draft recommendations

7.2.1 The review was seen as an opportune time to address a boundary anomaly made during the LGBCE review of the district ward boundaries in 2015 which resulted in the parish and district ward boundaries no longer being coterminous.

7.2.2 In relation to the suggested boundary amendment, Cainscross parish indicated that the residents of Renards Rise are more affiliated with Cainscross but Stonehouse Town Council would prefer to retain Ryeford within its boundary.

7.2.3 The Working Group considered the responses from the parishes but felt that it may divide a community if Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) is split at this stage.

7.2.4 It was therefore recommended that the whole of Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) is transferred to Cainscross parish and merged with Cainscross (Ebley Ward).

7.2.5 When reviewing the parish councillor allocations against the National Association of Local Council's (NALC) guidelines it was recommended that the number of parish councillors for Cainscross is increased to 13 and that there would be no change to the name of Cainscross parish council as the parish council were currently undertaking their own consultation of this.

7.3 Second stage consultation

7.3.1 Cainscross Parish Council supported the transfer of Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) and no suggestions were made for the name of the Parish Council.

- 7.3.2 Stonehouse Town Council objected to the loss of Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) due to the historic connections between Ryeford and Stonehouse.
- 7.3.3 Out of the 166 properties in Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) sent a survey, 38 responses were received. 15 were in support of the transfer and 22 were against. Those in support felt that they were more affiliated with Cainscross and that where they lived was currently in 'no man's land' between Stonehouse and Cainscross. Those against felt strongly connected to Stonehouse and use the Town's facilities frequently.

7.4 Final recommendations

- 7.4.1 The Working Group has considered the proposed boundary changes in the light of the comments made by Stonehouse Town Council and the residents affected. The survey results when plotted on a map showed that those who were in support of the change were closer to the Cainscross parish boundary and those that were against were close to the Stonehouse town boundary.
- 7.4.2 The aim of a CGR is to ensure that community governance is reflective of the identities and interests of the community and given the divide shown in the responses the Working Group recommended revising the draft proposals and splitting Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) between Stonehouse and Cainscross as shown on Map 3. Members of the Working Group met with Cainscross Parish Council and Stonehouse Town Council and both were in support of this proposal because it reflects the views of the majority of residents.
- 7.4.3 Stonehouse Town Council suggested that the name of the ward that would remain in Stonehouse should be changed to Stonehouse (Ryeford Ward) to reflect the location of the ward.
- 7.4.4 In making this proposal for change we must, if agreed at Council, request that the LGBCE changes the district ward boundary between Cainscross and Stonehouse and the county division of Stonehouse and Rodborough in order for the properties to be transferred and absorbed into Cainscross (Ebley Ward).
- 7.4.5 If the LGBCE does not agree to make those changes, those electors in Stonehouse (Ryeford Ward) would remain in Stonehouse Town Council and Cainscross District Ward. However, as shown in the table below, when looking at the changes to the electorate, this transfer would actually have little effect on electoral equality at the district and county level and so we are hopeful that the LGBCE will recognise this and make the related alterations.
- 7.4.6 Electoral equality based on current boundaries and proposed amendments

Ward or division	No. of electors and % variance from avg no. of electors per cllr based on current boundaries	No. of electors and % variance from avg no. of electors per cllr based on proposed boundaries
Cainscross district ward	5951 7.9%	5836 5.8%
Stonehouse district ward	5779 4.8%	5894 6.9%
Stonehouse county division	9370 -0.9%	9125 -3.5%
Rodborough county division	8538 -9.7%	8783 -7.1%

7.4.7 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) The boundary between the Parish of Cainscross and the Town of Stonehouse is redrawn as shown on Map 3;**
- b) The number of Parish Councillors for Cainscross (Ebley Ward) is increased to FIVE. This will increase the number of Parish Councillors for Cainscross to THIRTEEN;**
- c) Stonehouse (Ebley Ward) is to be renamed Stonehouse (Ryeford Ward) and would return ONE Councillor**
- d) A request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of;**
 - i. Cainscross and Stonehouse District Wards to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries; and**
 - ii. Stonehouse and Rodborough County Divisions**

8. CRANHAM & UPTON ST LEONARDS PARISH BOUNDARY MINOR AMENDMENT

8.1 First stage consultation

8.1.1 A submission from a resident requested that the boundary with Cranham and Upton-St-Leonards Parish Council is amended to transfer one property into Cranham Parish. The submission outlined that the property is very close to the boundary and the access to the property is actually within Cranham parish. The resident stated that they felt much more affiliated with Cranham parish than with Upton-St-Leonards Parish.

8.2 Draft recommendations

8.2.1 The Working Group could see no reason not to make this amendment as it meets the CGR criteria and it was recommended that the boundary is amended.

8.3 Second stage consultation

8.3.1 No responses to the consultation were received.

8.4 Final recommendations

8.4.1 The Working Group agreed that the proposed boundary change is reflective of the identities and interests of the community.

8.4.2 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) The boundary between the Parishes of Cranham and Upton-St-Leonards is redrawn to transfer one property into Cranham parish as shown on Map 4.**
- b) The boundary change does not impact the district wards or county divisions.**

9. EASTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL INCREASE IN COUNCILLORS AND FUTURE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

9.1 First stage consultation

9.1.1 The consultation produced some strong responses and lengthy submissions from members of the community as well as Eastington Parish and Stonehouse Town Council and Keep Eastington Rural Residents Association. The submissions varied in their proposals and the following options were put forward to the CGR Working Group:

- a) The boundary between the parishes of Eastington and Stonehouse is amended so that the development area of Great Oldbury is transferred to Stonehouse;
- b) The development of Great Oldbury becomes a new parish;
- c) The boundary between the parishes of Eastington and Stonehouse is amended so that the development of Great Oldbury is split between Eastington and Stonehouse; and
- d) No change to the boundary and let the residents of Great Oldbury decide in the future

9.2 Draft recommendations

9.2.1 The option to leave the Parish boundaries as they are was the preferred option of the Working Group as it was concluded that the development of Great Oldbury has only recently begun and the number of properties completed is not large enough for a community to have established.

9.2.2 It was recommended that the number of Parish Councillors for Eastington is increased to 10.

9.3 Second stage consultation

9.3.1 During the second consultation stage, Eastington Parish Council requested that the number of parish councillors is increased to 11 and for another Community Governance Review to be conducted in Eastington in 2022. Keep Eastington Rural Residents Association submitted a similar response to Eastington with a further request that the development of Great Oldbury is warded now.

9.3.2 Stonehouse Town Council repeated their request that Great Oldbury becomes part of Stonehouse Parish, the justification for this being that Stroud District Council's Local Plan states that "Land west of Stonehouse is identified as a sustainable urban extension to Storehouse" (para. 3.20, p.58).

9.4 Final recommendations

9.4.1 The Working Group maintains that time should be allowed for a community to develop so future residents can decide on the future electoral arrangements of their parish. Any decision made now would be premature and may not reflect the identity of a community which is yet to have established. Due to this, the Working Group agrees that it is not appropriate to ward the parish at this time but that a time period for a further Community Governance is set within the final recommendations.

9.4.2 The Working Group agreed that due to the significant development taking place within the parish that the number of parish councillors should be increased.

9.4.3 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) The number of parish councillors for Eastington is increased to ELEVEN;**
- b) A Community Governance Review for the parishes which contain the Great Oldbury development (Eastington, Standish and Stonehouse) is held between 2022 and 2023.**

10. CREATION OF HUNTS GROVE PARISH COUNCIL AND AMENDMENTS TO HARDWICKE AND HARESFIELD PARISH BOUNDARY

10.1 First stage consultation

- 10.1.1 Hardwicke Parish Council submitted a proposal to modify the parish boundary between Hardwicke and Haresfield so that the development of Hunts Grove is within a single parish. The parish could then be warded to give each area representation and financial separation. It was also proposed that the parish is renamed Hardwicke and Hunts Grove Parish.
- 10.1.2 Hunts Grove Residents Association proposed that a separate parish is created for the Hunts Grove community. The area of Hunts Grove has its own identity and by the end of 2019 will have a population of over 1,900.
- 10.1.3 A large number of submissions from residents in favour of a separate parish for Hunts Grove were also received.

10.2 Draft recommendations

- 10.2.1 It was agreed by all members of the Working Group that the submission from Hardwicke did provide a suitable option for Hunts Grove to remain within Hardwicke Parish by allowing the residents to retain community identity and address some of the financial concerns.
- 10.2.2 However, the submissions received from residents and Hunts Grove Residents Association demonstrated that the Hunts Grove community were strongly in support of establishing a new parish. This would give the electorate an independent voice and a structure for taking community action for its environment and facilities and independence in its own tax raising powers.
- 10.2.3 Section 93 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 identified three 'tests' which would need to apply when considering the creation of a new parish council.
 - a) Community Identity – this was demonstrated in the large number of submissions received in support of a new parish as well as support from all three district ward councillors.
 - b) Effective and convenient local government – the current boundary results in Hunts Grove being split between two parishes, the creation of a new parish would establish more effective and convenient local government and does not alter the district ward or county division boundary. There are also parish councillors from the Hunts Grove area on Hardwicke Parish Council indicating a level of democratic engagement.
 - c) Adequate infrastructure or meeting points – A school is due to be built by September 2019 but there will be no other meeting venues built by 1

April 2020 although a community centre is due to be built within the next 18 months. On balance, this element is satisfied.

10.3 Second stage consultation

- 10.3.1 Hardwicke Parish Council, Haresfield Parish Council and Hunts Grove Residents Association are supportive of the proposal of a new parish council for Hunts Grove. Whilst Hardwicke Parish Council had proposed a different option initially they made it clear that they wish to support the majority opinion and recognised the strong views expressed by residents in the first stage consultation.
- 10.3.2 69 submissions were received from residents of Hardwicke and Hunts Grove, 65 were in support of the creation of a new parish and 4 were against. Those in support felt that it was in the residents interests for Hunts Grove to have its own identity as a parish council and those against felt that the parish should not be divided as the split would reduce Hardwicke's size and ability to thrive and develop.

10.4 Final recommendations

- 10.4.1 The creation of Hunts Grove Parish has received support from both parish councils and a large number of residents. The proposal has passed the three 'tests' and the balance of evidence indicates that the community has sufficient grounds to progress Hunts Grove to formally becoming a parish council.
- 10.4.2 The creation of the parish council is the best way of recognising and developing community cohesion and identity within the area. It will offer strong and accountable local government and community leadership, with the opportunity to take the lead locally on specific issues and represent the local community.

10.4.3 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) A new parish of Hunts Grove will be created and the parish should be called Hunts Grove Parish Council;**
- b) The effective date for the new parish council will be the 1 April 2020, with elections for the parish council to take place in May 2020;**
- c) Hunts Grove Parish Council should return FIVE parish councillors;**
- d) The parish should not be divided into wards;**
- e) Changes are made to boundaries of the existing parishes of Hardwicke and Haresfield as shown on Map 5; and**
- f) No changes are made to the councillor allocations for Hardwicke and Haresfield Parish Council.**

11. KINGSWOOD PARISH & WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE TOWN BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

11.1 First stage consultation

- 11.1.1 Kingswood Parish Council proposed an amendment to the boundary shared with Wotton-under-Edge Town Council to make the parish and district ward boundaries coterminous. Currently, electors in Wotton-under-Edge South Ward are part of Wotton-under-Edge Town Council but Kingswood District Ward. The Parish Council commented that the current boundary splits a

community and there have been occasions where residents have not known which parish meeting to attend. The boundary is very close to the settlement of Kingswood and although they are directly affected by planning applications close to the boundary they are not consulted on.

- 11.1.2 Kingswood Parish Council also requested an increase in councillors to 9 due to issues with remaining quorate with the number of interests held by councillors.
- 11.1.3 Wotton-under-Edge Town Council proposed that the warding arrangements were abolished and that there was no desire to merge boundaries with adjacent parishes.

11.2 Draft recommendations

- 11.2.1 The Working Group agreed that the CGR is an suitable time to adjust the anomaly so that the area becomes coterminous with the district ward arrangements. However, Wotton-under-Edge Town Council raised objection to the move of the South Ward into Kingswood Parish as it would split the hamlet of Wortley and the Town Council leases a Community Sports Facility within the South Ward.
- 11.2.2 After much consideration, the Working Group concluded that it was not the aim of the Review to split communities and accepted that leasing a property within another parish could cause the Town Council some difficulties.
- 11.2.3 It was recommended that the South Ward is transferred to Kingswood with the exception of the hamlet of Wortley, the Community Sports Facility and Katherine Lady Berkeley School.
- 11.2.4 When reviewing the parish councillor allocations against the NALC guidelines, it was recommended that the number of parish councillors for Kingswood is increased to 8.

11.3 Second stage consultation

- 11.3.1 Kingswood Parish Council objected to the draft recommendation and requested that the whole of South Ward is transferred to Kingswood Parish Council for the reasons laid out in their first stage consultation response. The increase of parish councillors to 8 was accepted.
- 11.3.2 Wotton-under-Edge supported the draft recommendations in part and commented that whilst it had been taken into account that the Wotton Community Sports Foundation would remain in Wotton-under-Edge Town Council, they were concerned that the hamlet of Wortley would be split. The preference was to adjust the boundary and return the whole of the South Ward into Wotton-under-Edge.
- 11.3.3 The County Councillor and also Town Councillor commented that all of the South Ward should remain in Wotton-under-Edge with the exception of a small number of properties close to the Kingswood boundary.
- 11.3.4 A survey was sent to the 11 properties that were proposed to move to Kingswood Parish Council, one response was received against the proposal. The response outlined that there was no need to make the boundary coterminous as it has not been causing any issues.

11.4 Final recommendations

- 11.4.1 The Working Group spent a considerable amount of time reviewing all of the information provided by both councils relating to the potential boundary

change. Considering the potential impact on both parishes made this a very difficult decision. For this reason a meeting was held with both councils in an attempt to fully understand the issues and to see if a solution could be reached that was supported by both councils. Unfortunately, although the parishes attempted to work together to find a solution, one could not be found.

11.4.2 The area of dispute is the area that includes Penn Wood Lodge, Kathryn Lady Berkeley School and Wotton Community Sports Foundation. Wotton-under-Edge Town Council have maintained that the School is predominantly for pupils from Wotton-under-Edge and the Town Council has also provided a considerable amount of funding to the Wotton Community Sports Foundation. The Town Council strongly object to the transfer of these facilities to Kingswood Parish Council.

11.4.3 Kingswood Parish Council maintain the School includes pupils from many of the surrounding villages not just Wotton-under-Edge and the location of the School so close to the Kingswood parish boundary has a direct impact on the parish of Kingswood in a way that it does not have on Wotton-under-Edge. With regard to the Community Sports Foundation, Kingswood Parish argue that there is no legal reason as to why the Town Council could not still own and lease this property. At present, Kingswood Parish Council have no automatic right to be notified or consulted on any planning applications in the South Ward even though the impact of the applications are felt directly by Kingswood parish community and Kingswood district ward.

11.4.4 Given that the parish councils could not reach a suitable solution for both parishes, the Working Group has made a recommendation based on the evidence put forward and the main criteria of the review. An important aim of a community governance review is to ensure that community governance will be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area and is effective and convenient. The information provided by both parish councils demonstrated that leaving the boundary as it is or transferring the South Ward to Kingswood Parish would both be reflective of the identities and interests of the community for different reasons. However, leaving the boundary as it is does not provide effective and convenient governance for the electors currently living in the South Ward as they would still belong to Wotton-under-Edge Town Council and Kingswood District Ward.

11.4.5 It was also supported by both parishes that the hamlet of Wortley should be within in a single parish if this is possible and both parishes agreed that it is more affiliated with Wotton-under-Edge than with Kingswood.

11.4.6 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) An amendment is made to the boundary of Kingswood Parish Council and Wotton-under-Edge Town Council to transfer Wotton-under-Edge South Ward into Kingswood Parish with the exception of the hamlet of Wortley as shown on Map 6;**
- b) Wotton-under-Edge South Ward is absorbed in to Kingswood Parish and the parish would not be warded;**
- c) The number of Parish Councillors for Kingswood Parish is increased to EIGHT;**

- d) **Wotton-under-Edge Town Council retains THIRTEEN Councillors and there are no longer any warding arrangements in place for the Town Council; and**
- e) **The Council will make a consequential recommendation to the LGBCE for related alterations to the district ward boundary between Kingswood and Wotton-under-Edge so that the hamlet of Wortley is transferred to Wotton-under-Edge district ward.**

12. MINCHINHAMPTON PARISH AND NAILSWORTH TOWN BOUNDARY MINOR AMENDMENT

12.1 First stage consultation

12.1.1 Minchinhampton Parish Council made a submission to state they were very happy with the boundary and current electoral arrangements. Subsequent discussions resulted in an additional amendment being proposed to Minchinhampton (Box Ward) and Nailsworth Town boundary to transfer one property on the basis that it is more affiliated with the Box Ward of Minchinhampton.

12.2 Draft recommendations

12.2.1 The Working Group supported this boundary change as it met the CGR criteria.

12.2.2 It was recommended that the boundary between Minchinhampton and Nailsworth be realigned to transfer the property of 'Limecroft' into Minchinhampton (Box Ward).

12.3 Second stage consultation

12.3.1 No responses were received in relation to this draft recommendation

12.4 Final recommendations

12.4.1 The Working Group agreed that the proposed boundary change is reflective of the identities and interests of the community

12.4.1 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) **The boundary between the Parish of Minchinhampton and the Town of Nailsworth is redrawn as shown on Map 7; and**
- b) **A request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of;**
 - i. **Minchinhampton and Nailsworth District Wards to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries; and**
 - ii. **Minchinhampton and Nailsworth County Divisions**

13. MINCHINHAMPTON PARISH AND RODBOROUGH PARISH BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

13.1 First stage consultation

13.1.1 Whilst no submission proposing an amendment to this boundary was received, it was brought to the Working Group's attention by a Ward Councillor that there are a small number of properties next to the Bear of Rodborough which may be more affiliated with Minchinhampton (Amberley Ward) than with Rodborough as the parish boundary crosses through a group of properties.

13.2 Draft recommendations

13.2.1 The Working Group considered that the current boundary did appear to separate a community and recommended that the boundary be amended. However, it was important that the Bear of Rodborough remains in Rodborough Parish.

13.3 Second stage consultation

13.3.1 Minchinhampton Parish Council supported the proposed boundary amendment.

13.3.2 The 16 properties were sent a survey and out of the 10 responses received, 7 were in support and 3 were against. Those that were in support commented that they identify strongly with Amberley and that the current boundary had always appeared to be an anomaly. Those that were against were members of Rodborough community groups and therefore felt less affiliated with Minchinhampton.

13.3.3 No response was received from Rodborough Parish Council.

13.4 Final recommendations

13.4.1 Whilst there were objections to the proposed boundary amendment, the Working Group agreed that the proposal would increase community cohesion and identity.

13.4.2 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

a) The boundary between the Parish of Rodborough (South Ward) and the Parish of Minchinhampton (Amberley Ward) is amended to transfer 16 properties into Minchinhampton (Amberley Ward) as shown on Map 8; and

b) A request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of;

- i. Amberley and Woodchester district ward and Rodborough district ward**
- ii. Nailsworth and Rodborough County division**

14. RANDWICK & WESTRIP PARISH WARDING ARRANGEMENTS

14.1 First stage consultation

14.1.1 A submission received from Randwick and Westrip Parish Council referred to an error made by the LGBCE when undertaking the electoral review of the district ward boundaries in 2015. The error was made to the warding arrangements which proposed there should be three parish wards but the councillor allocations for each ward were calculated incorrectly and were not proportionate to the electorate for each ward.

14.2 Draft recommendations

14.2.1 The Working Group agreed that the warding arrangements needed to be corrected and proposed new warding arrangements for the parish council.

14.3 Second stage consultation

14.3.1 No responses were received in relation to this draft recommendation

14.4 Final recommendations

14.4.1 The proposed warding arrangements are necessary for the effective and convenient local governance in the area.

14.4.2 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

a) The warding arrangements of Randwick and Westrip Parish Councils to be as follows and as shown on Map 9

<u>Parish Wards</u>	<u>No. of Cllrs</u>
Randwick Ward	4
Randwick South East Ward	2
Randwick South West Ward	3

15. STONEHOUSE TOWN, EASTINGTON & STANDISH PARISH BOUNDARY MINOR AMENDMENT

15.1 First stage consultation

15.1.1 During the initial consultation, Stonehouse Town Council requested that their boundary be amended between Eastington and Standish to include land to the north of Oldends Lane Recreation Ground and land to the West of the Oldends Lane industrial site. Neither boundary amendment affects any residential properties or residents.

15.1.2 Eastington Parish Council supported the minor boundary change.

15.1.3 Standish Parish Council supported the extension to the recreation ground (the portion of land that lies between the two railway lines) but opposed the section of land to the west of the railway line.

15.2 Draft recommendations

15.2.1 The Working Group approved the boundary change between Eastington and Stonehouse as this corrects the boundary anomaly at present. Due to Standish Parish Council's objection to part of the amendment, the Working

Group did not support the boundary change for the section to the west of the railway line.

15.3 Second stage consultation

15.3.1 Standish Parish Council commented that they were happy that their objection had been considered and supported the proposed boundary change.

15.4 Final recommendations

15.4.1 Whilst the boundary changes do not directly affect any residential properties or electors, the amendment address two boundary anomalies and contribute to a more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

15.4.2 It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved;-

- a) The boundary between Eastington Parish and Stonehouse (Stonehouse Ward) Town Council is amended to transfer the area of Oldends Industrial Estate into Stonehouse as shown on Map 10;**
- b) The boundary between Stonehouse and Standish parish is amended to incorporate the extension to the recreation ground (the portion of land that lies between the two railway lines) as shown on Map 10; and**
- c) A request to the LGBCE is made to amend the boundaries of;**
 - i. Stonehouse and Severn District Wards to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries; and**
 - ii. Stonehouse and Hardwicke and Severn County Divisions**

16. PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED

16.1 During the second stage consultation, Nailsworth Town Council made a submission that proposed multiple changes to the Town Council boundary. There was no evidence of consultation with any residents or neighbouring parishes and no other justification of the boundary changes. The Working Group agreed that the proposed amendments would not be considered as there were no further consultation periods and there was lack of evidence to support the amendments.

17. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

17.1 This has proved to be a major exercise but a very worthwhile one addressing a number of parish matters that have been under discussion for many years. By formally considering the issues and reaching decisions in line with the Guidance, the council has met the expectations of it laid down in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

17.2 Once the final recommendations have been approved, there are a number of steps that the Council must take in order to implement the recommendations. These include depositing copies of the reorganisation order which we need to draw up to give effect to the decisions. We must also publish maps and set out the reasons for the decisions taken as part of the review.

We must also inform the following organisations that the order has been made:

- a) The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

- b) The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE)
- c) The Office for National Statistics
- d) The Director General of Ordnance Survey
- e) Any other principal council whose area the order relates to (in this case, Gloucestershire County Council)
- f) The Audit Commission

17.3 All residents whose property has been affected by a parish boundary change will be notified in writing.

17.4 If the consequential alterations are agreed by the LGBCE, the new parish boundaries will come into force at the May 2020 district and parish council elections and will apply to the electoral register published on the 1 December 2019.