

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

<b>Committee</b>	EXECUTIVE	Item 12	Page 1 of 4
<b>Report Originator</b>	Sue Lyons Head of Democratic and Legal Services	<i>Fwd Plan Ref No:</i> A14/014	
<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>ALL</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> September 2014	
<b>Title</b>	COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW		

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide members with the results of the initial public consultation undertaken as part of the Community Governance Review. Members are requested to consider and formulate the final Community Governance Review proposals for recommendation to Council on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014. Comments from the meeting of the Research and Development Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> September will be presented verbally.

### 2. INFORMATION

- 2.1 At the meeting of Full Council on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013 it was resolved that a light touch Community Governance Review be undertaken following a request from Burton Latimer Town Council and interest expressed by other parish councils. The review of nine parishes was undertaken pursuant to Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (2007 Act).
- 2.2 Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review were agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2014. The Terms of Reference are included at **Appendix 1**.
- 2.3 Following the publishing of the Terms of Reference, a public consultation was undertaken seeking views on the scope of the review from interested parties. Responders were provided with the opportunity to provide their comments online, via email or in writing. The consultation was held between 6<sup>th</sup> June and 15<sup>th</sup> August 2014, details of which are included in the table below.

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Responses Received</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Barton Seagrave	Ward change	1	n/a
Broughton	Councillor numbers	1	n/a
Burton Latimer	Ward change	1	n/a
Cranford	Boundary change	2	Cranford PC wrote to 80 registered electors on Cranford Road affected by proposed boundary changes

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

COMMITTEE	Research and Development Committee	Item 12	Page 2 of 4
Cransley and Mawsley	Boundary change	1	25 households affected by the boundary issue were written to, including full details of the proposal and a consultation response form
Geddington, Newton & Little Oakley	Councillor numbers	2	n/a
Rushton and Wilbarston	Boundary change	33	Every household in both parishes was written to, including full details of the proposal and a consultation response form

2.4 A further public consultation will be undertaken in relation to the final proposals, once agreed by Full Council. This consultation will take place between 1<sup>st</sup> October and 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

### **3. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

3.1 Review consultations were undertaken in nine parishes across the District. Responses were received in relation to all nine parishes and a summary of the comments submitted is provided below, with a full copy of all the responses attached at **Appendix 2**.

#### 3.2 Barton Seagrave

One consultation response was received from a resident of Barton Seagrave requesting the retention of two wards.

#### 3.3 Broughton

One consultation response was received from Broughton Parish Council who considered a reduction in councillor numbers to be unjustified and therefore wished to remain with 11 members.

#### 3.4 Burton Latimer

One consultation response was received from a resident of Burton Latimer, requesting the dissolution of the town council.

#### 3.5 Cranford

The consultation for Cranford yielded two responses, one from the parish council; the other from a resident of the parish. The Parish Council have proposed a redrawn parish boundary that is included at **Appendix 2(i)**. The second response suggests drawing the western boundary of the parish back to align with the Alledge Brook. Cranford Parish Council are aware that with the forthcoming East Kettering Development (EKD) on the parish's western

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

COMMITTEE	Research and Development Committee	Item 12	Page 3 of 4
-----------	------------------------------------	------------	----------------

boundary, redrawing of the boundary in readiness for the 2015 local government elections would be premature given the current development timetable. Once the EKD had met a predetermined trigger point (e.g. number of occupied dwellings or registered electors), a Cranford-specific Community Governance Review may be undertaken consulting upon the possibility of redrawing of the parish boundary to reflect the needs of the community. It is suggested that the appropriate trigger point would be 200 electors (approximate to 100 occupied dwellings) or at 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018, whichever is the earlier.

### 3.6 Cransley and Mawsley

The proposal relating to the parish of Cransley also affected the parish of Mawsley. The proposal specifically sought comment on a proposal to alter to a small section of the boundary between the two parishes to take account of a housing development built in Mawsley that had encroached across the boundary and into Cransley Parish. One response was received from Cransley Parish Council who had agreed that the parish boundary should be altered to place the development within the parish of Mawsley.

### 3.7 Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley

Two review responses were received; one from a village resident and the other from Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley Parish Council. The former proposes a merger between Geddington and Newton wards, thereby reducing the number of councillors representing the parish by a factor of one. The Parish Council feel that no reduction is necessary due to them currently having a full complement of members.

### 3.8 Rushton and Wilbarston

The review undertaken for Rushton and Wilbarston parishes centres on the responsibility for the Pipewell ward, currently in Wilbarston parish, and whether it should transfer to Rushton Parish. 33 responses have been received, 23 of which state a preference for Pipewell to be transferred to Rushton parish, with the remainder against. A Rushton village petition with 23 signatories in favour of the transfer of Pipewell ward to Rushton parish Council was also supplied and is included as **Appendix 2(ii)**.

## 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None

## 5. CONSULTATION AND CUSTOMER IMPACT

5.1 An initial public consultation was undertaken as detailed in paragraph 2.3 above.

5.2 A further public consultation will be undertaken as detailed in paragraph 2.4 above.

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

COMMITTEE	Research and Development Committee	Item 12	Page 4 of 4
-----------	------------------------------------	------------	----------------

### 6. FINANCIAL RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

There will be costs relating to the final proposals consultation. These should be contained within existing budgets.

### 7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

None

### 8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Council has the responsibility for undertaking Community Governance Reviews.

8.2 The review is being undertaken in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act and the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.

### 9. RECOMMENDATION

- The Executive is requested to note and consider the comments received as part of the public consultation and from the Research and Development Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> September; and
- To formulate final proposals for recommendation to Full Council on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014

#### Background Papers:

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

#### Previous Reports/Minutes:

Ref: **13.C.08**

Date: **25<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

Ref: **13.C.53**

Date: **23<sup>rd</sup> April 2014**