



COUNCIL

3 December 2012

Agenda Status: Public

Directorate: Customers and
Communities

Report Title	Community Governance Review
-------------------------	------------------------------------

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To agree the outcomes of the Borough-wide Community Governance Review that commenced on 6 February 2012.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Council approves the following proposals for new Parish Councils and boundary changes to existing Parish Councils, commended to the Council by the CGR Steering Group:
- 2.1.1 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Parklands ward area of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.1.
- 2.1.2 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Rectory Farm area of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.2.
- 2.1.3 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Sunnyside and Obelisk wards of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.3.
- 2.1.4 (a) That a Parish be created in the West Hunsbury ward area of Northampton, as shown in Appendix 1.4.
- (b) That the new Parish should be represented by a Parish Council.
- (c) That the new Parish Council be known as West Hunsbury Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.
- (d) That the electoral arrangements for West Hunsbury Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.4.15 – 3.8.4.17 of this report.

- 2.1.5 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Westone ward area of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.5.
- 2.1.6 That a Parish Council should not be created in the St James ward area of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.6.
- 2.1.7 (a) That a Parish be created in the Hunsbury Meadows area of Northampton, as shown in Appendix 1.7.
- (b) That the new Parish should be represented by a Parish Council.
- (c) That the new Parish Council be known as Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.
- (d) That the electoral arrangements for Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.7.16 – 3.8.7.18 of this report.
- (e) That further consultation be carried out with the new Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council and Upton Parish Council with regard to extending the proposed Parish boundary to include the development at Pineham Village.
- 2.1.8 (a) That the Parish boundary should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.8 be agreed to move the properties in Turners Court and Turners Gardens affected by the proposal into Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish.
- (b) That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.
- (c) That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parish.
- 2.1.9 (a) That the Parish boundary should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.9 be agreed to move the properties in Belfry Lane affected by the proposal from Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish into Collingtree Parish.
- (b) That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.
- (c) That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parishes affected.
- 2.1.10 (a) That the Parish boundary for Hardingstone Parish Council should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.10 be agreed.
- (b) That the Parish boundary for Great Houghton Parish Council should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.10 be agreed, to include land to the north to be coterminous with the boundary for polling district SNRME.
- (c) That these proposals will take effect from 1 April 2013.

- (d) That these proposals do not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parishes affected.
- 2.1.11 (a) That the existing Parish of Wootton and East Hunsbury be abolished on 1 April 2015.
- (b) That a new Parish be created in the Wootton area of Northampton, the boundary for which is detailed in Appendix 1.11, with effect from 1 April 2015.
 - (c) That the new Parish in the Wootton area should be represented by a Parish Council.
 - (d) That the new Parish Council be known as Wootton, Wootton Fields and Simpson Meadows Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.
 - (e) That the electoral arrangements for Wootton, Wootton Fields and Simpson Manor Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.11.19 – 3.8.11.21 of this report.
 - (f) That a new Parish be created in the East Hunsbury area of Northampton, the boundary for which is detailed in Appendix 1.11, with effect from 1 April 2015.
 - (g) That the new Parish in the East Hunsbury area should be represented by a Parish Council.
 - (h) That the new Parish Council be known as East Hunsbury Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.
 - (i) That the electoral arrangements for East Hunsbury Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.11.19 – 3.8.11.21 of this report.
- 2.1.12(a) That the boundary for Upton Parish should be changed to that detailed in Appendix 1.12.
- (b) That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.
 - (c) That the Parish will continue to be known as Upton Parish.
 - (d) That the Parish will continue to be represented by a Parish Council and that the Parish Council be known as Upton Parish Council.
 - (e) That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parish affected.
 - (f) That governance arrangements for the Upton Parish should be reviewed by no later than 1 April 2027 to ensure that they reflect the

changing demographics and community interests within the expanded community.

3. Issues and Choices

3.1 Report Background

3.1.1 Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act) local authorities have the power to carry out a review of Community Governance arrangements and make changes to community governance in their area.

3.1.2 Government guidance states that it is good practice to conduct a full Community Governance Review at least every 10 to 15 years to ensure that community governance for the area continues to be effective and convenient and reflects the identities and interests of the local community.

3.1.3 The 2007 Act sets out the duties that the Council must comply with when undertaking a Community Governance Review:

- *The Council must consult the local government electors for the area under review and any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the principal council to have an interest in the review.*
- *The Council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review*
 - a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area,*
 - and*
 - b) is effective and convenient*
- *In deciding what recommendations to make, the Council must take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions)*
 - a) that have already been made, or*
 - b) that could be made;*

for the purposes of community representation

- *The council must also take into account any representations received in connection with the review.*

3.1.4 Relevant considerations which influence the judgements against the two principal criteria (ie. of having regard for the need to secure that any community governance reflects the identities and interests of the local community and that it is effective and convenient), include the impact on community cohesion and the size, population and boundaries of the proposed area. Recommendations made in Community Governance Reviews should therefore bring about

- improved community engagement
- better local democracy and
- result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services

- 3.1.5 At their meeting on 24 January 2012 the General Purposes Committee agreed the establishment of a Borough-wide Community Governance Review in Northampton which would respond specifically to boundary issues raised previously by the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish poll and petition submitted to Council by Upton Residents Association in 2008 and extend the opportunity to create new Parish Council arrangements to those areas of the town in which they do not currently exist.
- 3.1.6 The principle on which the review was to be conducted was that the whole of the Borough Council administrative area was in scope and that proposals would be considered for new governance arrangements and proposed changes or abolition of existing arrangements. The scope of the review was also clear in that proposals for governance arrangements were not exclusively limited to Parish proposals and that options for alternative means of community governance put forward by communities for their local areas would be given equal consideration as part of the review.
- 3.1.7 The view taken by the Council in conducting the review was that proposals for community governance arrangements should be community-led and not imposed by the principal authority. As a result a two stage process was adopted, the first of which was the opportunity for proposals to be submitted, the second being a period of consultation on those proposals to enable community views to be taken into account in determining whether or not proposals should be implemented.
- 3.1.8 The first stage of the consultation process was launched on 6 February 2012 and enabled the opportunity for community based proposals to be developed for alternative community governance arrangements in areas of the town which are currently unparished or where there was community interest in proposing changes to existing parished arrangements. The process for registering community interest in new or alternative proposals was by submission of a petition which met the recommended minimum requirements that reflected the requirements under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- 3.1.9 At the conclusion of the initial consultation phase the Council's General Purposes Committee agreed that seven new parish proposals and five boundary change proposals for existing Parish Councils would be taken forward to the next stage of the consultation. These proposals were required to demonstrate a level of community support for them at the initial stage in accordance with recommendations in the 2007 Act for Community Governance Reviews.
- 3.1.10 The second stage of the consultation process consisted of a consultation survey and a local Advisory Poll. An open consultation survey on the 12 proposals ran from 3 September to 19 October 2012 and enabled all residents within the administrative boundary of Northampton to express their views on the proposals.

- 3.1.11 The consultation survey included the opportunity for general comment on the Stage 2 proposals but also, as the consultation was open to all residents of Northampton not just those potentially affected by the proposals, the opportunity for submission of further proposals for community governance arrangements in other parts of the town which had not been proposed or submitted in the first stage of consultation.
- 3.1.12 Any new or amended proposals received during the second stage of the consultation would have been included for consideration as part of the review, acknowledging that further separate consultation may have been required before a final decision could be made. However, no further proposals or changes to the proposals being consulted on were put forward as a result of the consultation.
- 3.1.13 Local Advisory Polls were also held on 15 November 2012 to enable residents in the areas specifically affected by the proposals to vote on the proposal for their area. This was supplemented by targetted consultation to residents by letter where the proposals involved changes to a small number of households only.
- 3.1.14 The conclusions from the consultation surveys, targetted consultations and the outcomes from the Local Advisory Polls for each of the proposals have been analysed and summarised below in making recommendations to the Council for any proposed changes or new Parish Councils.

3.2 Consultation survey

- 3.2.1 The consultation survey resulted in 876 responses:
- 468 responses were received to the survey
 - 245 people submitted a petition response – 76 of these agreed with all three Wootton & East Hunsbury proposals
 - 11 letters/emails were received from individuals
- 3.2.2 People were asked about the impact of the proposals on the community. The responses recorded in the survey response form across all proposals are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	63%	34%	3%	462
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	67%	31%	2%	464
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	59%	34%	7%	463
It will provide value for money (effective)	60%	35%	5%	459
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	66%	33%	1%	463

- 3.2.3 Responses across all proposals would indicate that a majority of respondents believed that the creation of the proposed Parish Councils would have benefits for the local community in terms of effective delivery of public services, would be value for money and improve the safety and cleanliness of the local area, give more opportunity for residents to influence local decision making and reflect the interests of the local community.
- 3.2.4 Responses in relation to the individual proposals for each area are summarised below with recommendations. In addition to consultation with the public, key stakeholders including representatives from the principal authority were asked to give comments on the proposals. Comments from the principal authority are summarised below in the recommendations for individual proposals.
- 3.2.5 The following responses were received from key stakeholders:

Northamptonshire County Association of Local Councils

The Northamptonshire County Association of Local Councils (Northants CALC) is the membership organisation for the 209 parish and town councils that already exist in Northamptonshire. There are Parish Councils covering the vast majority of Northamptonshire including seven already in the Borough of Northampton, but there still remain unparished areas in the Borough of Northampton, Wellingborough, Kettering and Corby. Northants CALC believes that it is inherently unfair that some electors do not have a community level council representing their specific needs and interests and is in favour of the universal creation of Parish Councils across the whole of the county. Northants CALC welcomes the moves by government to make the creation of Parish Councils simpler and quicker and welcomes the opportunity provided by this Community Governance Review to create new Parish Councils within the Borough of Northampton. Any new councils will require a lot of support in their first year of operation and Northants CALC has the specialist knowledge and experience to assist. In years to come there will be Parish Councils for every area of England, including London where the first Parish Council is likely to be established next year. The opportunity to create new councils in Northampton may not come around again for many years and Northants CALC hopes that the people of Northampton seize the opportunity whilst they have this chance.

Northamptonshire Police

We see no real concerns regarding the geographical re-alignment of the Ward boundaries. The proposed changes are still contained within our identified policing structure across Northampton.

We consider there are clear opportunities to be had from the creation of Parish Councils, not least the autonomy they will have to set their own precept. This could prove advantageous for communities who would want to financially support Neighbourhood Wardens, Rangers or PCSOs. Conversely however we also acknowledge that this could create a post code lottery whereby one Parish may choose to raise a precept for added benefit and service whilst another may not.

Legislation and clear guidance on statutory responsibilities would also appear well documented and supported across the county to support new/ emerging Parishes. A recent example of this was evident with the creation of Grange Park and we would suggest that most newly formed Parish Councils take around 12 – 18 months to realistically become effective and conversant with the transfer of numerous assets and responsibilities.

The configuration of our Policing Model would not be hindered either way if the proposals were approved or not. We would continue to engage with the community at a local level via local Councillors, Residents Associations or indeed elected Parish Councils in addition to the Community Safety Partnership.

3.2.6 The detailed consultation survey report is attached as Appendix 3.

3.3 Local Advisory Polls

3.3.1 Local Advisory Polls were conducted on 15th November 2012 for each of the new Parish Council proposals, the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish split and the Upton Parish boundary change proposal.

3.3.2 On legal advice, Advisory Polls were conducted separately from the PCC elections being conducted on the same day. Polling stations for the Advisory Poll were selected on the basis of accessibility to the majority of the community, available buildings not being used for the PCC election and where necessary mobile units were deployed to ensure locations were accessible and convenient.

3.3.3 All households on the electoral register were advised of the Advisory Poll and the polling station details by letter in week commencing 15th October 2012. Although postal voting was not used for the conduct of the poll those who were not able to attend a polling station in person were offered the option to register for a proxy vote to enable maximum participation in the poll.

3.4 Alternative Arrangements for Community Governance

3.4.1 The 2007 Act requires principal authorities to consider other forms of community governance such as alternatives or stages towards establishing Parish Councils. These alternative options may include Area Committees, Area/ community forums, Neighbourhood Management, tenant management organisations, residents' and tenants' associations and community associations.

3.4.2 Northampton Borough Council has a history of encouraging community involvement in local governance and decision making and has reviewed the arrangements for this a number of times over the past decade. The Council's Area Partnership arrangements were superseded in 2006 following agreement to the Countywide Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS) in March 2005. The Neighbourhood Management model created six managed areas in the town which focussed on areas with highest levels of deprivation, supported by a neighbourhood management approach to join up local services and develop

agreements with service providers to jointly plan and deliver services differently. Neighbourhood Managers for each of the areas were jointly funded by the Borough Council, County Council and Police with responsibility for delivering Neighbourhood Renewal floor targets and developing strategies to respond to local neighbourhood and town-wide key targets. The remaining areas of the town, areas with less deprivation and without priority neighbourhoods, were divided into Neighbourhood Co-ordination areas where a less intensive approach was taken. In these areas a community development approach was taken to support local communities, working with local activists and service providers to develop and deliver local co-ordinated partnerships.

- 3.4.3 In 2010, following an end to Neighbourhood Renewal funding and the need for partner authorities to reduce funding support for this initiative, the Borough Council reviewed its approach to neighbourhood working and introduced a single co-ordinated model which was implemented borough-wide. The model created four areas within the town, each supported by a Neighbourhood Co-ordinator to advance the development of local area plans, an Area Board for each area and local Forum meetings which rotated between wards in each area and were open to the public for their engagement. This model was decommissioned in October 2012 as it was considered that the areas were too large for effective community engagement and did not reflect natural communities within the town.
- 3.4.4 The Council continues to have a Community Engagement function and actively supports a number of Diversity Forums, works with local residents and tenants groups where appropriate on specific local issues, the existing seven Parish councils within the town and with various Friends Of and special interest groups in relation to specific projects and community initiatives. In addition a Councillor Community Fund was introduced in 2012 which enables each ward Councillor to support specific initiatives with their local ward and applications to the fund are open to all local community groups through their local Councillor.
- 3.4.5 The consultation phases of the CGR included the option for proposals for alternative community governance arrangements to be submitted as part of the review. No alternative arrangements were submitted during the first stage of the consultation therefore all of the proposals taken forward into the second stage of the consultation related to proposals for Parish Councils. During the second stage of the consultation, whilst some comments received were not in favour of the creation of Parish Councils, there were no proposals put forward as an alternative.

3.5 Evaluation of Proposals and Consultation Outcomes

- 3.5.1 All of the proposals for new Parish Councils put forward to the second stage of the consultation were required to fulfil the petition criteria outlined in the first stage of the review. In all cases the proposals met the requirement to have a minimum of 10% support from the overall number of electors in the proposed area or, in the case of the Hunsbury Meadow proposal, the minimum requirement for 250 signatures.
- 3.5.2 The CGR allowed for minor boundary changes to be requested by the affected Parish Councils without the need for a petition to be completed. In relation to the minor boundary changes submitted the Steering Group considered the community support requirements for each proposal and were satisfied that, for those taken forward to the second stage of consultation, those requirements had been met.
- 3.5.3 Proposals in relation to Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish split and the Upton Parish Council boundary change had been initially proposed in 2008 and Council determined that they should be considered as part of a Community Governance Review. In both cases, the General Purposes Committee decided, on the balance of information received during Stage 1 of the consultation and representations made in continued support of the 2008 proposals, that these proposals should be taken forward into Stage 2 of the consultation without the need for a new petition.
- 3.5.4 In the second stage of the consultation survey responses received in relation to each proposal are detailed in the relevant part of section 3.8 below. Responses to the consultation survey were low as a proportion of potential electors, ranging on average from 0.2% to 8% of the proposed population. However, the responses do give an indication of views within the community of the Parish Council proposal and the questions asked within the survey were specifically focussed on the three criteria against which recommendations arising from a Community Governance review should be considered:
- improved community engagement
 - better local democracy and
 - result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services
- 3.5.5 The results of the Local Advisory Polls have also been considered with regard to turnout as a percentage of the local electorate for the area and the level of support for or against the proposal. The level of turnout has been considered within the context of the percentage turnout for the PCC elections which were held on the same day. National concern has been raised about the potential for low turnout for the PCC elections as they are being held at a different time of year from elections generally within England and Wales and that dark evenings and weather conditions may also influence participation in this electoral process. In addition it is noted that, where contested, turnout for Parish Councils elections is often low.
- 3.5.6 Community support for proposals has been a factor in making recommendations for individual proposals, however, recommendations have been made in consideration of the support and views expressed at all stages

of the review without a predetermined weighting on any single aspect of the process.

3.6 Electoral Arrangements

- 3.6.1 In considering the proposed electoral arrangements with regard to any new Parishes created as a result of the Community Governance Review consideration has been given to statutory guidance, legislation, previous research and the existing Parish Council electoral arrangements within Northampton to ensure that recommendations are in accordance with requirements and local precedent.
- 3.6.2 The Electoral Commission recommends that each area be considered on its own merits, having regard to population, geography and the pattern of communities. Guidance suggests that the conduct of Parish Council business does not usually require a large body of Councillors and historically many Parish Councils, especially smaller ones, have had difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to stand for election.
- 3.6.3 Research undertaken by Aston Business School Parish and Town Councils in England (HMSO, 1992) found that Parish Councils representing less than 500 people had between 5 and 8 Councillors; those between 500 and 2,500 had between 6 and 12 Councillors; and those between 2,501 and 10,000 had 9 – 16 Councillors.
- 3.6.4 The following table outlines the existing Parish Council electoral arrangements within Northampton:

Parish Council	Registered Electors	No Of Cllrs	Electors per Cllr	Warding
EXISTING				
Billing	6,319	14	451	4
Collingtree	902	7	129	2
Duston	12,560	12	1,047	2
Great Houghton	524	7	75	0
Hardingstone	1,654	11	150	0
Upton	2,737	11	249	0
Wootton & East Hunsbury	13,363	12	1,114	3

- 3.6.5 Recommendations in relation to electoral arrangements for individual Parish Council proposals have been made with consideration to the above information.

3.7 Other Proposals not included within the Community Governance Review

- 3.7.1 In addition to the seven proposals for new Parish Councils which were taken forward to stage two of the consultation the General Purposes Committee also considered a number of other proposals, but these were not successful in

meeting the minimum number of signatures required by the Terms of Reference of the review to demonstrate community support.

- 3.7.2 Two of these proposals were withdrawn before the deadline of 18 May 2012. Three of the proposals did not meet their threshold number of signatures (as outlined in the CGR Terms of Reference) before the deadline date, therefore the Steering Group did not recommend that these proposals be the subject of detailed consultation in Stage 2 of the CGR process.
- 3.7.3 Three signatures were received in support of a Parish Council being established in two other areas, but no such petition had been set-up.
- 3.7.4 In addition, the Council received a proposal for a boundary change to Duston Parish Council after the deadline for submission of initial proposals. This proposal was not supported by a petition and did not meet the requirement to demonstrate community support therefore this proposal was also not taken to the next stage.
- 3.7.5 The approach taken by the Council to the Community Governance Review was one which sought not to impose proposed arrangements on communities, rather encouraging communities to consider their own community needs and put forward proposals for consultation. Proposals submitted were required to demonstrate a minimum level of community support in order to establish a viable interest in the proposal before further consultation was undertaken.
- 3.7.6 The review was carried out across the whole of the Borough administrative area and was open to proposals for all forms of community governance as defined by the 2007 Act.
- 3.7.7 In relation to those areas of the town where community governance proposals were not put forward or where proposals did not demonstrate any community support, it was determined by the General Purposes Committee that proposals would not be actively pursued by the Local Authority in those areas within the scope of this review. However, whilst it is recommended that a full review of Community Governance should be carried out every 10 to 15 years, the Council would not defer consideration of any new proposals which are put forward outside the scope of this review until the next Borough-wide Community Governance Review, and would consider any new or subsequent proposals on merit in accordance with the provisions of the 2007 Act.
- 3.7.8 In relation to the existing Parish Council arrangements within the Borough, the review was open to proposals for changes, including abolition, of those arrangements and a number of the existing Parishes put forward proposals for changes to boundaries and administrative arrangements. Overall the Council has no concerns with the existing Parish boundaries or representation arrangements and considers that where there is no community impetus for change, in accordance with the general approach taken throughout the review process, that it will not seek to impose change where there is no evidence of community interest in doing so.

3.8 Conclusions and Recommendations on Individual Parish Council Proposals

3.8.1 Parklands – new Parish Council

Consultation

3.8.1.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 382 signatures representing 10.2% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the Parklands Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.1.

3.8.1.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Parklands Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Parklands new parish council	9	4	18

3.8.1.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - will enhance the Borough
 - will be more responsive at a local level
 - will allow more influence and control over local public services
- Against
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents
 - Additional resources will be needed to run parish councils which will be difficult in the current climate
- Process
 - Consultation process should have provided more detail

3.8.1.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community for the Parklands proposal are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	69%	31%	0%	13
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	85%	15%	0%	13
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	69%	31%	0%	13
It will provide value for money (effective)	55%	36%	9%	11
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	69%	31%	0%	13

3.8.1.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Parklands proposal resulted in a turnout of 11.06% with 149 votes in favour of the proposals and 269 against.

Boundary

3.8.1.6 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the Parklands area is determined by the borough ward boundary.

- 3.8.1.7 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusions

- 3.8.1.8 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in Parklands. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with the current Borough ward boundaries.
- 3.8.1.9 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed Parish boundary.
- 3.8.1.10 The proposal for a Parish Council in Parklands ward was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally in favour of a Parish Council in the area, however, the actual number of responses was very low and therefore not representative of the overall population of the area.
- 3.8.1.11 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 11.06% with 64% of those participating opposed to the proposal for a Parish Council in Parklands ward.
- 3.8.1.12 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.
- 3.8.1.13 Whilst the Council believes that a new Parish Council may provide enhanced community engagement and local democracy, it also acknowledges there are adequate local community governance arrangements in terms of residents associations, tenants associations, local community groups which offer alternatives to this approach. The responses from the consultation in particular do not indicate that local people feel that there is significant need for an additional mechanism through which they can be represented. In addition, it is acknowledged that there would be a cost associated with the creation of a Parish Council, and in the current economic climate, imposing an additional direct cost of a parish precept may be against the wishes of the majority of local people.
- 3.8.1.14 On this basis, it is determined that a new Parish Council in this area would not result in significantly more effective and convenient delivery of local services, or reflect the identities and interests of the community to any greater extent than the current governance arrangements.

Recommendation

- 3.8.1.15 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Parklands ward area of Northampton.

3.8.2 Rectory Farm – new Parish Council

Consultation

3.8.2.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 257 signatures representing 10.4% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the Rectory Farm Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.2.

3.8.2.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Rectory Farm Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Rectory Farm new parish council	14	5	26

3.8.2.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Will provide positive benefit
 - Residents can shape services
 - will allow local group to have more influence and control over local public services
- Against
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents

3.8.2.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	69%	26%	5%	19
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	74%	26%	0%	19
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	63%	26%	11%	19
It will provide value for money (effective)	63%	26%	11%	19
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	74%	26%	0%	19

3.8.2.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Rectory Farm proposal resulted in a turnout of 9.08% with 104 votes in favour of the proposals and 121 against.

Boundary

3.8.2.6 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the Rectory Farm area covers the majority of the Rectory Farm ward area but with the Great Billing Way (A5076) forming the boundary to the West.

3.8.2.7 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course

of the review. The proposal has the support of the Rectory Farm Residents Association.

Conclusions

- 3.8.2.8 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in Rectory Farm. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with what the local population deem as Rectory Farm, being the ward boundary to the North, East and South, and the boundary to the West that follows the natural barrier of the Great Billing Way (A5076).
- 3.8.2.9 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed parish boundary.
- 3.8.2.10 The proposal for a Parish Council in Rectory Farm was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally in favour of a Parish Council in the area, however, the actual number of responses was very low and therefore not representative of the overall population of the area.
- 3.8.2.11 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 9.08% with 54% of those participating opposed to the proposal for a Parish Council in Rectory Farm.
- 3.8.2.12 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.
- 3.8.2.13 Whilst the Council believes that a new Parish Council may provide enhanced community engagement and local democracy, it also acknowledges there are adequate local community governance arrangements in terms of residents associations, tenants associations, local community groups which offer alternatives to this approach. The responses from the consultation in particular do not indicate that local people feel that there is significant need for an additional mechanism through which they can be represented. In addition, it is acknowledged that there would be a cost associated with the creation of a Parish Council, and in the current economic climate, imposing an additional direct cost of a parish precept may be against the wishes of the majority of local people.
- 3.8.2.14 On this basis, it is determined that a new Parish Council in this area would not result in significantly more effective and convenient delivery of local services, or reflect the identities and interests of the community to any greater extent than the current governance arrangements.

Recommendation

- 3.8.2.15 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Rectory Farm area of Northampton, as detailed in Appendix 1.2.

3.8.3 Sunnyside and Obelisk – new Parish Council

Consultation

3.8.3.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 668 signatures representing 10% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the Sunnyside and Obelisk Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.3

3.8.3.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Sunnyside and Obelisk Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Sunnyside and Obelisk new parish council	43	3	18

3.8.3.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - will be good to involve the community
 - will bring the community together
- Against
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents

3.8.3.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	94%	4%	2%	46
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	94%	4%	2%	46
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	87%	7%	6%	46
It will provide value for money (effective)	87%	7%	6%	45
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	94%	4%	2%	46

3.8.3.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Sunnyside and Obelisk proposal resulted in a turnout of 2.95% with 63 votes in favour of the proposals and 130 against.

Boundary

3.8.3.6 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the Sunnyside and Obelisk area is determined by the Borough ward boundaries for the Sunnyside and Obelisk wards respectively.

3.8.3.7 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusions

- 3.8.3.8 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in Sunnyside and Obelisk. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with the current Borough ward boundaries of Sunnyside and of Obelisk wards.
- 3.8.3.9 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed Parish boundary.
- 3.8.3.10 The proposal for a Parish Council in Sunnyside and Obelisk wards was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally in favour of a Parish Council in the area, however, the actual number of responses was very low and therefore not representative of the overall population of the area.
- 3.8.3.11 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was also low with 2.95% of the population participating. However 67% of those that did participate were opposed to the proposal for a Parish Council in Sunnyside and Obelisk wards.
- 3.8.3.12 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.
- 3.8.3.13 Whilst the Council believes that a new Parish Council may provide enhanced community engagement and local democracy, it also acknowledges there are adequate local community governance arrangements in terms of residents associations, tenants associations, local community groups which offer alternatives to this approach. The responses from the consultation in particular do not indicate that local people feel that there is significant need for an additional mechanism through which they can be represented. In addition, it is acknowledged that there would be a cost associated with the creation of a Parish Council, and in the current economic climate, imposing an additional direct cost of a parish precept may be against the wishes of the majority of local people.
- 3.8.3.14 On this basis, it is determined that a new Parish Council in this area would not result in significantly more effective and convenient delivery of local services, or reflect the identities and interests of the community to any greater extent than the current governance arrangements.

Recommendation

- 3.8.3.15 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Sunnyside and Obelisk wards of Northampton.

3.8.4 West Hunsbury – new Parish Council

Consultation

3.8.4.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 374 signatures representing 10.5% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the West Hunsbury Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.4.

3.8.4.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for West Hunsbury Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
West Hunsbury new parish council	69	24	88

3.8.4.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Local issues will be dealt with by local people
 - An opportunity to improve residents' lifestyle, environment
 - Benefits will outweigh the costs
 - Will be responsive and improve communities at a local level
- Against
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents
 - Additional resources will be needed to run parish councils which will be difficult in the current climate

3.8.4.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	71%	27%	2%	89
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	74%	25%	1%	89
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	70%	27%	3%	89
It will provide value for money (effective)	63%	28%	9%	89
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	74%	26%	0%	89

3.8.4.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the West Hunsbury proposal resulted in a turnout of 11.66% with 224 votes in favour of the proposals and 189 against.

3.8.4.6 The Borough Council Planning department considered that there is unlikely to be any new residential development here in the near future. There is no impact envisaged from a Planning viewpoint, although it would make sense to be combined with the proposed Hunsbury Meadows Parish on the basis of community links, proximity and scale. West Hunsbury currently provides the

infrastructure for Hunsbury Meadows' residents ie shops, doctors, schools, community facilities, etc.; Hunsbury Meadows shares a boundary with West Hunsbury; and Hunsbury Meadows has only 643 registered electors and West Hunsbury has 3,553.

Boundary

- 3.8.4.7 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the West Hunsbury area is determined by the Borough ward boundary.
- 3.8.4.8 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusions

- 3.8.4.9 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in West Hunsbury. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with the current Borough ward boundaries.
- 3.8.4.10 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed Parish boundary.
- 3.8.4.11 The proposal for a Parish Council in West Hunsbury was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally in favour of a Parish Council in the area with a response rate of 2% of the population.
- 3.8.4.12 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 11.66% with 54% of those participating supporting the proposal for a Parish Council in West Hunsbury ward.
- 3.8.4.13 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.

Electoral arrangements

- 3.8.4.14 If it is agreed a new Parish Council would cover the area shown in the plan in Appendix 1.4 and on the Electoral Register published in October would cover 3,543 registered electors in the area. This figure has been the main consideration when looking at the number of Councillors that should make up the new Parish Council. The only legislative restriction on this is that placed by the Local Government Act 1972 which specifies that each Parish Council must have a minimum of five Councillors.
- 3.8.4.15 Based on all of the information available it is recommended that the Parish Council in West Hunsbury area be made up of 8 councillors.

3.8.4.16 Consideration has been given to warding of the Parish for the purpose of electing Councillors. As the area and the number of electors is small and there is no clear division of the community within the area it is not recommended that the area be warded. There are no planned developments in the area and there is not projected increase in the population covered by the proposal in the next five years.

3.8.4.17 Ordinary parish council elections are held once every four years with all of the councillors being elected at the same time. Ordinarily the cycle for Parish Council elections would align with that of the principal authority. The next elections for the Borough Council are not scheduled to take place until May 2015. It is proposed that if agreed the Parish Council would be created with effect from 1 April 2013 and the first elections would take place in May 2013. Councillors elected in May 2013 would be elected for an initial term of office lasting for two years with further elections taking place in May 2015 and four yearly thereafter to bring the cycle in line with that of the principal authority.

Parish Council Name

3.8.4.18 The Local Government Act 1972 allows for Parish Councils to be known as town councils. This has been amended by the 2007 Act to broaden the choice of alternative styles to include community, neighbourhood and village.

3.8.4.19 It is recommended that the new Parish Council be named West Hunsbury Parish Council allowing the parish Council, once it is established, to change its status should it wish to do so.

Recommendation

3.8.4.20 That a Parish be created in the West Hunsbury ward area of Northampton, as shown in Appendix 1.4.

3.8.4.21 That the new Parish should be represented by a Parish Council.

3.8.4.22 That the new Parish Council be known as West Hunsbury Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.

3.8.4.23 That the electoral arrangements for West Hunsbury Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.4.15 – 3.8.4.17 of this report.

3.8.5 Westone – new Parish Council

Consultation

3.8.5.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 341 signatures representing 10.2% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the Westone Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.5.

3.8.5.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Westone Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Westone new parish council	4	3	10

3.8.5.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Should improve the area
- Against
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents
- Process
 - Consultation process should have provided more detail

3.8.5.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	57%	43%	0%	7
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	72%	14%	14%	7
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	72%	14%	14%	7
It will provide value for money (effective)	57%	43%	0%	7
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	57%	29%	14%	7

3.8.5.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Westone proposal resulted in a turnout of 8.65% with 107 votes in favour of the proposals and 183 against.

Boundary

3.8.5.6 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the Westone area is determined by the Borough ward boundary.

3.8.5.7 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusions

- 3.8.5.8 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in Westone. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with the current Borough ward boundaries.
- 3.8.5.9 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed parish boundary.
- 3.8.5.10 The proposal for a Parish Council in Westone ward was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally in favour of a Parish Council in the area, however, the actual number of responses was very low and therefore not representative of the overall population of the area.
- 3.8.5.11 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 8.65% with 63% of those participating opposed to the proposal for a Parish Council in Westone ward.
- 3.8.5.12 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.
- 3.8.5.13 Whilst the Council believes that a new Parish Council may provide enhanced community engagement and local democracy, it also acknowledges there are adequate local community governance arrangements in terms of residents associations, tenants associations, local community groups which offer alternatives to this approach. The responses from the consultation in particular do not indicate that local people feel that there is significant need for an additional mechanism through which they can be represented. In addition, it is acknowledged that there would be a cost associated with the creation of a Parish Council, and in the current economic climate, imposing an additional direct cost of a parish precept may be against the wishes of the majority of local people.
- 3.8.5.14 On this basis, it is determined that a new Parish Council in this area would not result in significantly more effective and convenient delivery of local services, or reflect the identities and interests of the community to any greater extent than the current governance arrangements.

Recommendation

- 3.8.5.15 That a Parish Council should not be created in the Westone ward area of Northampton.

3.8.6 St James – new Parish Council

3.8.6.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 373 signatures representing 10% of the overall population in the area. The proposed boundaries for the St James Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.6.

3.8.6.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for St James Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
St James new parish council	32	100	78

3.8.6.3` Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Will have positive impact on the community
 - Will allow active local participation
 - Will represent the area and put funding where it is needed most
- Against
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents
 - residents can't afford it
 - cannot see who will benefit
 - cannot see how day to day life/services would be improved
 - existing arrangements are sufficient
- Process
 - Consultation process should have provided more detail

3.8.6.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	45%	51%	4%	67
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	48%	48%	4%	67
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	45%	51%	4%	67
It will provide value for money (effective)	44%	51%	5%	66
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	50%	47%	3%	66

3.8.6.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the St James proposal resulted in a turnout of 8.98% with 50 votes in favour of the proposals and 288 against.

Boundary

3.8.6.6 The boundary for the proposed new Parish Council in the St James area is determined by the Borough wardboundary.

3.8.6.7 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusions

3.8.6.8 From the Council's viewpoint, there are no issues with the proposal for a new Parish Council in St James. It would be logical from a community governance and from a community interest and cohesion position. It would also fit in with the current Borough ward boundaries.

3.8.6.9 The proposed size of the new Parish Council in terms of geographical area and numbers of registered electors both now and planned in 15 years' time is very reasonable. It would be an accurate representation of the local community in the area. It should also provide local public services that are open and accessible to all residents within the proposed Parish boundary.

3.8.6.10 The proposal for a Parish Council in St James was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was proportionally opposed to a Parish Council in the area.

3.8.6.11 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 8.98% with 85% of those participating opposed to the proposal for a parish Council in St James ward.

3.8.6.12 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.

3.8.6.13 Whilst the Council believes that a new Parish Council may provide enhanced community engagement and local democracy, it also acknowledges there are adequate local community governance arrangements in terms of residents associations, tenants associations, local community groups which offer alternatives to this approach. The responses from the consultation in particular do not indicate that local people feel that there is significant need for an additional mechanism through which they can be represented. In addition, it is acknowledged that there would be a cost associated with the creation of a Parish Council, and in the current economic climate, imposing an additional direct cost of a parish precept may be against the wishes of the majority of local people.

3.8.6.14 On this basis, it is determined that a new Parish Council in this area would not result in significantly more effective and convenient delivery of local services, or reflect the identities and interests of the community to any greater extent than the current governance arrangements.

Recommendation

3.8.6.15 That a Parish Council should not be created in the St James ward area of Northampton.

3.8.7 Hunsbury Meadows – new Parish Council

3.8.7.1 The proposal was supported by a petition comprising 255 signatures representing 39.7% of the overall population of in the area. The proposed boundaries for the Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.7.

3.8.7.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Hunsbury Meadows new parish council	42	8	54

3.8.7.3 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Will be beneficial to the residents
 - Will give the area a soul
 - The area's voice would be heard in future
- Against
 - The area is far too small and the overheads would be disproportionately high
 - Should join West Hunsbury instead as everyone uses their services eg library, shops, buses, open spaces, schools
 - will be an extra tier of local government, increased bureaucracy
 - will increase the cost of local government to residents
- Process
 - Consultation process should have provided more detail

3.8.7.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	84%	14%	2%	50
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	86%	14%	0%	51
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	83%	15%	2%	51
It will provide value for money (effective)	86%	14%	0%	50
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	84%	14%	2%	50

3.8.7.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Hunsbury Meadows proposal resulted in a turnout of 30.06% with 170 votes in favour of the proposals and 22 against.

3.8.7.6 The Borough Council Planning department identified that, in relation to the Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council proposal, there are approximately 250 houses there now and there are 180 houses in the course of construction.

This will increase the current number of registered electors from 643 to approximately 1,100. No further housing development is proposed after that as the rest of the proposed parish area is covered by the Swan Valley industrial estate. It would make sense to be combined with the proposed West Hunsbury Parish on the basis of community links, proximity and scale. West Hunsbury currently provides the infrastructure for Hunsbury Meadows' residents ie shops, doctors, schools, community facilities, etc.; Hunsbury Meadows shares a boundary with West Hunsbury; and Hunsbury Meadows has only 643 registered electors and West Hunsbury has 3,553. Even with an increase of electors in Hunsbury Meadows to 1,100, this will still only provide a total for the combined areas of approximately 4,600.

3.8.7.7 A more important consideration would be combining the planned development at Pineham Village in the far South of Upton Parish with the proposed Hunsbury Meadows Parish. Planning permission was given after the end of the CGR consultation period for 500-525 houses to be built along with schools, and community facilities at Pineham Village. The build will start in 2013 and occupations should commence from early 2014. No further development is planned in the South of Upton parish after that as the rest of the area is covered by parkland and the floodplain. This makes a natural barrier to connecting the communities of Pineham Village with the communities of the rest of Upton Parish.

3.8.7.8 The community links will be between Pineham Village and Hunsbury Meadows with the school and local facilities for both communities being located in Pineham village; they are also very close geographically. If the Pineham Village development were included in the Hunsbury Meadows parish, it would improve the scale of the parish from 643 electors to perhaps 1,400 electors. This would also make sense in terms of the size of Upton Parish Council. There are currently 2,737 registered electors in Upton Parish which would increase by a further 636 to 3,373 if the CGR boundary extension proposal is approved. However, housing developments planned over the next 5 to 15 years will increase this number substantially to over 8,000 in 2017 and over 14,000 by 2027. On this basis, it would make sense for Pineham Village to be included with Hunsbury Meadows; alternatively this could be combined with West Hunsbury giving a total electorate of approximately 4,953.

Boundary

3.8.7.9 The boundary for the proposed new parish Council in the Hunsbury Meadow area is also known as Banbury Lane, to the south of Upton Parish Council up to the Upton ward boundary.

3.8.7.10 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

3.8.7.11 Given the issues raised about the size of the current proposed Parish Council area and planned development in the future, both within the current proposed Parish boundary, the planned development at Pineham Village and the natural community links between Hunsbury Meadows, including the further planned development, and West Hunsbury, it is proposed that this proposal should be

subject to further consultation about potential revisions to the proposed boundaries to include the Pineham Village development within Upton Ward.

Conclusions

3.8.7.12 The proposal for a parish Council in Hunsbury Meadows was supported by a petition with the required number of signatures and was recommended to be taken forward into the second stage of consultation. In the consultation survey the overall consensus of views was in favour of a Parish Council in the area with a response rate of 8% of the population.

3.8.7.13 In the Local Advisory Poll the turnout was 30.06% with 88% of those participating supporting the proposal for a parish Council in the Hunsbury Meadows area.

3.8.7.14 No alternative proposals for revised Parish boundaries or alternative governance arrangements were received during the Community Governance Review.

Electoral arrangements

3.8.7.15 If it is agreed, a new Parish Council would cover the area shown in the plan in Appendix 1.7 and on the Electoral Register published in October would cover 642 registered electors in the area. This figure has been the main consideration when looking at the number of Councillors that should make up the new Parish Council. The only legislative restriction on this is that placed by the Local Government Act 1972 which specifies that each Parish Council must have a minimum of five councillors.

3.8.7.16 Based on all of the information available it is recommended that the Parish Council in Hunsbury Meadows area be made up of 8 councillors.

3.8.7.17 Consideration has been given to warding of the Parish for the purpose of electing Councillors. As the area and the number of electors is small and there is no clear division of the community within the area it is not recommended that the area be warded. The population of the area covered by the proposal is projected to increase to 1,090 by 2017; however, it is not considered that this increase would require a change to the representation or warding arrangements proposed.

3.8.7.18 Ordinary Parish Council elections are held once every four years with all of the Councillors being elected at the same time. Ordinarily the cycle for Parish Council elections would align with that of the principal authority. The next elections for the Borough Council are not scheduled to take place until May 2015. It is proposed that if agreed the Parish Council would be created with effect from 1 April 2013 and the first elections would take place in May 2013. Councillors elected in May 2013 would be elected for an initial term of office lasting for two years with further elections taking place in May 2015 and four yearly thereafter to bring the cycle in line with that of the principal authority.

Parish Council Name

3.8.7.19 The Local Government Act 1972 allows for Parish Councils to be known as town councils. This has been amended by the 2007 Act to broaden the choice of alternative styles to include community, neighbourhood and village.

3.8.7.20 It is recommended that the new Parish Council be named Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council allowing the Parish Council, once it is established, to change its status should it wish to do so.

Recommendation

3.8.7.21 That a Parish be created in the Hunsbury Meadows area of Northampton, as shown in Appendix 1.7.

3.8.7.22 That the new Parish should be represented by a Parish Council.

3.8.7.23 That the new Parish Council be known as Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.

3.8.7.24 That the electoral arrangements for Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.7.16 – 3.8.7.18 of this report.

3.8.7.25 That further consultation be carried out with the new Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council and Upton Parish Council with regard to extending the proposed Parish boundary to include the development at Pineham Village.

3.8.8 Wootton & East Hunsbury PC – boundary change (Turners)

Consultation

3.8.8.1 The CGR allows for minor boundary changes to be requested by the affected Parish Councils without the need for a petition to be completed. The boundary change proposal for inclusion of Turners Court and Turners Gardens within the Parish boundary was submitted by Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish Council, detailed in Appendix 2. The Steering Group considered the community support requirements for this proposal and was satisfied that this had been met for the Wootton and East Hunsbury PC - boundary change (Turners). Boundaries for the proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.8.

3.8.8.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Wootton & East Hunsbury PC – boundary change (Turners) are summarised below, 76 of the responses were received in the form of a petition, the remaining 11 in response to the open consultation:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Wootton & East Hunsbury PC boundary change (Turners)	87	0	3

3.8.8.3 The petition of 76 signatures were in support of all three proposals affecting Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish. Comments received and points raised in the responses to the open consultation actually related to the proposed split of the Parish into two separate parishes rather than the specific proposal for a change to the boundary. All supported the proposed split.

3.8.8.4 The responses recorded through the open consultation for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	100%	0%	0%	11
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	100%	0%	0%	11
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	91%	0%	9%	11
It will provide value for money (effective)	100%	0%	0%	11
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	100%	0%	0%	11

3.8.8.5 The responses in the open consultation indicated support for the area to be within the Parish boundary.

3.8.8.6 As the boundary change proposal was below the de-minimis stated in the Terms Of Reference, the proposal was not put to an Advisory Poll, but targeted consultation was carried out with the 232 residents directly affected in an unparished area to the north of Wootton & East Hunsbury Parish Council.

3.8.8.7 All households were sent a letter asking them two separate questions. The first, whether they were in favour of joining Wootton & East Hunsbury Parish Council, the second whether they were in favour of the proposed split of Wootton & East Hunsbury Parish Council into two separate parishes.

3.8.8.8 In relation to the first question, whether to join the Parish, 9 people responded (3.9%), with 2 in favour and 7 against the proposal to join the Parish.

3.8.8.9 The responses to the second question, whether the existing parish of Wootton and East Hunsbury should be split, resulted in 7 responses in favour and 2 against the proposal to split the parish.

Conclusions

3.8.8.10 The properties in Turners Court and Turners Gardens affected by this proposal were historically believed to be within the boundary of the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish, however, this issue was not technically addressed during the planning of the development.

3.8.8.11 The properties fall logically within the geographical boundary of the existing parish and residents of the properties affected would arguably benefit from the facilities and services which are provided by the existing Parish Council.

3.8.8.12 Consideration of possible alternative proposals for the properties affected indicates no other logical community to which these properties could otherwise belong and the area is otherwise too small to be considered for any alternative community governance proposals in its own right.

3.8.8.13 The response to the targeted consultation on the proposal to include the properties affected within the boundary of the Wootton and East Hunsbury parish was low and is not considered to demonstrate strong community feeling either towards the proposal or against it.

3.8.8.14 Having considered the proposal, the potential alternatives and the general community implications for both the existing parish Council and the properties affected in relation to access to and provision of facilities and services in the local area, it is considered that the properties affected in Turners Court and Turners Gardens should be included within the boundary of the existing Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish.

Recommendation

3.8.8.15 That the Parish boundary should be changed to move the properties in Turners Court and Turners Gardens affected by the proposal into Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish.

3.8.8.16 That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.

3.8.8.17 That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parish.

3.8.9 Wootton & East Hunsbury PC and Collingtree PC – boundary change (Belfry Lane)

Consultation

3.8.9.1 The CGR allows for minor boundary changes to be requested by the affected Parish Councils without the need for a petition to be completed. The proposal was submitted by Collingtree Parish Council and supported by Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish Council, detailed in Appendix 2. The Steering Group considered the community support requirements for this proposal and was satisfied that this had been met for the Wootton and East Hunsbury PC and Collingtree PC - boundary change (Belfry Lane). Boundaries for the proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.9.

3.8.9.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Wootton and East Hunsbury and Collingtree PCs – boundary change (Belfry Lane) are summarised below, 76 of the responses were received in the form of a petition (76 signatures were in support of all three proposals affecting Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish), the remaining 2 in response to the open consultation:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Wootton & East Hunsbury PC and Collingtree PC boundary change (Belfry Lane)	78	0	0

3.8.9.3 There were no free text comments received.

3.8.9.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	50%	0%	50%	2
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	50%	0%	50%	2
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	50%	0%	50%	2
It will provide value for money (effective)	50%	0%	50%	2
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	100%	0%	0%	2

3.3.9.5 As the boundary change proposal was below the de-minimis stated in the Terms Of Reference, the proposal was not put to an Advisory Poll but targeted consultation was carried out with residents directly affected.

3.3.9.6 A letter was sent asking them if they were in favour of their property being moved from Wootton & East Hunsbury Parish Council and into Collingtree Parish Council. The results are that 3 people responded (75%), with 3 in favour and none against the proposal to move Parishes. The only free-text comment was that they believed the move had already been agreed prior to 2000.

3.3.9.7 The proposal specifically relates to two properties in Belfry Lane which are currently within the boundary of Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish whilst the remainder of the properties in the street are within the Parish of Collingtree.

3.3.9.8 The proposed new boundaries are supported by the existing Parish Councils and would make far more sense from a geographical, community and administrative perspective.

3.3.9.9 Current residents in the properties affected are also in support of the proposal and comments received during the consultation indicated that the issue had been raised previously with the Council.

Recommendation

3.3.9.10 That the Parish boundary should be changed to move the properties in Belfry Lane affected by the proposal from Wootton and East Hunsbury parish into Collingtree Parish.

3.3.9.11 That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.

3.3.9.12 That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the parishes affected.

3.3.10 Hardingstone PC and Great Houghton PC – boundary change

Consultation

- 3.8.10.1 The CGR allows for minor boundary changes to be requested by the affected Parish Councils without the need for a petition to be completed. The proposals were submitted by Hardingstone Parish Council and Great Houghton Parish Council, detailed in Appendix 2. The Steering Group considered the proposal and was satisfied that the proposals had no implications on households in the area and that the proposal should be included in the second stage of the consultation. Boundaries for the Hardingstone PC and Great Houghton PC – boundary change proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.10.
- 3.8.10.2 There were no responses to the consultation survey.
- 3.8.10.3 The current parish boundaries for Hardingstone PC and Great Houghton PC are very historic and were established many years ago. They have not been reviewed for many years. The boundaries predominately follow old field boundaries and rights of way, that are no longer in existence, due mainly to the development of Brackmills but also to alterations in the road pattern and the diversion of watercourses, footpaths and bridleways. In some places the boundaries cut through buildings such as the Sports Hall at Northampton School for Girls on the Newport Pagnell Road and industrial buildings on Brackmills. The proposed boundaries follow the natural boundaries of 2012, new roads, new road layouts and diverted rights of way, and no longer cuts through individual buildings or sites. The proposed new boundaries make far more sense and are more easily recognisable than those that currently exist.
- 3.8.10.4 Hardingstone - There are two properties affected by the change with regard to the Hardingstone proposal; on the Bedford Road opposite the Holiday Inn, at the entrance to The Casuals Rugby Club ground. These properties would be included within Hardingstone Parish where they currently lie within an unparished area of the Borough. There do not appear to be any occupants on the electoral register. There is no cost implication in respect of the proposed boundary changes for Hardingstone Parish Council. If anything, there may be additional income for the Council if registered electors occupy the two properties on the Bedford Road that will be included within Hardingstone Parish.
- 3.8.10.5 Great Houghton - With regard to the Great Houghton Parish boundary, the proposal suggests that in the northern corner the new boundary be co-terminus with the boundary polling district SNRME. There are no households affected by the proposal as far as they relate to Great Houghton. There is no cost implication in respect of the proposed boundary changes for Great Houghton. The new boundary will define a clear boundary in relation to the old Bedford railway line and cycle way near Little Norway that may assist the Parish Council in securing a Community Asset Transfer of the old track bed.

- 3.8.10.6 The new boundaries will also enable the development and adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan, which is relative to the Parishes and the local communities which they serve.

Recommendation

- 3.8.10.7 That the Parish boundary for Hardingstone Parish Council should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.10 be agreed.
- 3.8.10.8 That the Parish boundary for Great Houghton Parish Council should be changed and the new boundary detailed in Appendix 1.10 be agreed, to include land to the north to be coterminous with the boundary for polling district SNRME.
- 3.8.10.9 That these proposals will take effect from 1 April 2013.
- 3.8.10.10 That these proposals do not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parishes affected.

3.8.11 Wootton & East Hunsbury PC – Parish split

Consultation

3.8.11.1 The proposal was initially the subject of a Parish poll carried out in 2008 and the subsequent report to Council recommended that a CGR should be undertaken. Following a meeting of the Parish Council on 21st May 2008 the Borough Council was requested to undertake a parish poll on the question:-

“That the existing Parish is split to create two new parishes each separately serving the areas of:

- Wootton, Wootton Fields & Simpson Manor
- East Hunsbury”

Consequently the parish poll was held on 19th June 2008 organised by the Borough Council in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972. The votes in favour of the proposition 381 and 85 against. This was a turnout of 3.8%.

3.8.11.2 The General Purposes Committee decided, on the balance of information received during Stage 1 of the consultation and representations made in continued support of the 2008 proposal to split the existing Parish into two separate Parishes, that the proposal should be taken forward into Stage 2 of the consultation without the need for a new petition. The proposed boundaries for the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish split proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.11.

3.8.11.3 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Wootton and East Hunsbury PC Parish split are summarised below, 180 of the responses were received in the form of a petition, 156 in response to the open consultation and 11 received by letter and e-mail:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Wootton & East Hunsbury PC Parish split	155	192	109

3.8.11.4 In addition, a petition of 39 signatures and 1 survey disagreeing with the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish split proposal arrived after the deadline and are not included in these figures.

3.8.11.5 Comments received and points raised fell into the following themes:

- In favour
 - Will localise the decision making
 - Parish precept raised will be controlled by those living in the local area and spent in the local area
 - People in East Hunsbury have no connection and a different character with people in Wootton
 - The A45 is a significant barrier between the two communities
 - Wootton has expanded and would now have enough income

- Against
 - Wootton Fields budget would be cut due to it becoming a smaller parish
 - The split would cost the taxpayers more money
 - It is a good service as it is now
 - Levels of service offered by divided parishes will deteriorate unless precept levels are increased
 - A larger community can speak with a louder more effective voice
 - Split will dilute effectiveness of each, increase costs and make organising large events more difficult
 - Set up costs would be disproportionate to any benefit
 - Large parish has advantages of economies of scale
 - Large parish has capacity/scale to develop innovative schemes
 - A divided parish would be less representative of the diverse communities
 - East Hunsbury would suffer as many community facilities are in Wootton
 - Concerned that arguments for the split are misleading and not substantiated

3.8.11.6 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	47%	50%	3%	152
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	50%	49%	1%	153
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	37%	52%	11%	151
It will provide value for money (effective)	45%	52%	3%	153
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	49%	50%	1%	153

3.8.11.7 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish split proposal resulted in a turnout of 10.13% with 670 votes in favour of the proposals and 657 against.

3.8.11.8 Targeted consultation carried out with residents affected by the Turners boundary change proposal were also asked whether the existing Parish of Wootton and East Hunsbury should be split, resulting in 7 responses in favour and 2 against the proposal to split the Parish.

3.8.11.9 The campaigners for and against the proposed split in the Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish Council have both provided different financial budget forecasts showing different levels of Parish precept if the existing Parish were divided into two separate Parishes. One shows a reduction in the Band D

Parish precept charge of 8% for Wootton residents and 20% for East Hunsbury residents; the other shows an increase of 11% across the two new Parishes. They have each made different assumptions on the costs and income expected from two separate Parishes. These figures are indicative and not fully costed, and therefore do not address in any detail issues such as the transfer and maintenance of assets.

- 3.8.11.10 Neither of these financial forecasts conclusively demonstrate that there is a financial benefit of implementing or not implementing the split proposal. However, it is acknowledged that either proposal could be made to be financially sustainable based on the number of electors in the Parish areas.

Conclusion

- 3.8.11.11 The proposal to split the existing Parish was initially put forward in a Parish poll conducted in 2008 which met the requirements for a Community Governance Review of arrangements in the Wootton and East Hunsbury areas of the town. Continued support to see the proposal considered within the 2012 Community Governance Review was received during the first consultation phase and it was agreed that it would be taken forward for further consultation as part of the second stage of the review.
- 3.8.11.12 The existing Parish comprises two Borough ward areas and geographically the areas are adjacent to each other however they are separated by the A45 which represents a significant barrier to natural interconnectivity between the two areas.
- 3.8.11.13 The existing Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish comprises a population of 13,125 registered electors and is represented by 12 Parish Councillors, 8 representing East Hunsbury residents and 4 representing Wootton residents. The existing Parish, whilst the largest in Northampton, is comparable in size to Duston Parish but significantly larger than the majority of Parishes within the town. It is therefore reasonable that the size of the Parish could be sustainable either as it is currently or as two separately Parished areas.
- 3.8.11.14 Financial arguments put forward by the existing Parish Council and the campaign lead for the Parish split do not indicate a conclusive argument either for or against the proposal. It is considered that whilst there are potential economies of scale within a larger administrative area, if the Parish were to be split, each of the proposed new Parishes would be sufficient in size to be sustainable.
- 3.8.11.15 The issue of identity and community interest put forward in relation to the proposed split, and in particular the physical separation between the two areas by the A45, have highlighted issues of natural community interest, identity and access to facilities which would support the proposal that the interests of both communities would be better served through a separation of existing arrangements. In particular it is argued that many of the facilities currently funded by the existing Parish are physically situated within the Wootton area but that the residents of East Hunsbury benefit less from these as access to them is hindered by the barrier imposed by the road network.

- 3.8.11.16 The outcome of community consultation on the proposal to split the existing parish was reasonably balanced with a small majority in favour of the proposed split. Representations made in relation to both the proposed split and retaining the existing parish were also equally balanced with reasoned arguments in favour of both alternatives.
- 3.8.11.17 The guidance on Community Governance Reviews states that as a general rule a Parish should be based on an area which reflects community identity and interest and be of a size which is viable as an administrative unit of Local Government. In the case of the proposal to split the existing Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish it is proposed that the two new Parishes would both meet that criteria and, in particular, that the community interest and identity of both areas would be better represented separately than as part of the existing Parish arrangements.

Electoral arrangements

- 3.8.11.18 If it is agreed, two new Parish Councils to be known as Wootton, Wootton Fields and Simpson Manor Parish Council and East Hunsbury Parish Council would cover the areas shown in the plan in Appendix 1.11 for Wootton and East Hunsbury respectively. Based on the Electoral Register published in October, these Councils would cover 5,905 and 7,623 registered electors in the area respectively. These figures have been the main consideration when looking at the number of Councillors that should make up the new Parish Councils. The only legislative restriction on this is that placed by the Local Government Act 1972 which specifies that each Parish Council must have a minimum of five Councillors.
- 3.8.11.19 Based on all of the information available it is recommended that each Parish Council should be made up of 8 councillors each.
- 3.8.11.20 Consideration has been given to warding of the Parishes for the purpose of electing Councillors. As the area and the number of electors is not great and there is no clear division of the community within the two areas it is not recommended that either area be warded. The population of the area covered by the proposed Wootton area is projected to increase by 90 registered electors over the next five years. The population of the area covered by the East Hunsbury proposal is projected to increase by 159 registered electors over the next five years. With respect to both proposals it is not considered that the increase in population would require a change to the representation or warding arrangements proposed.
- 3.8.11.21 It is proposed that if agreed the two new Parish Councils would be created with effect from 1 April 2015 and the first elections would take place in May 2015.
- 3.8.11.22 The existing Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish Council would continue to represent the whole area until 1 April 2015 but that shadow governance arrangements for the two new proposed Parishes would be put in place to work up the requirements to determine distribution of assets from the existing Wootton and East Hunsbury Parish to the new Parishes.

3.8.11.23 It is proposed that a detailed reorganisation order for the proposed new Parishes will be published no later than 1 April 2014.

Recommendation

3.8.11.24 That the existing Parish of Wootton and East Hunsbury be abolished on 1 April 2015.

3.8.11.25 That a new Parish be created in the Wootton area of Northampton, the boundary for which is detailed in Appendix 1.11, with effect from 1 April 2015.

3.8.11.26 That the new Parish in the Wootton area should be represented by a Parish Council.

3.8.11.27 That the new Parish Council be known as Wootton, Wootton Fields and Simpson Meadows Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.

3.8.11.28 That the electoral arrangements for Wootton, Wootton Fields and Simpson Manor Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.11.19 – 3.8.11.21 of this report.

3.8.11.29 That a new Parish be created in the East Hunsbury area of Northampton, the boundary for which is detailed in Appendix 1.11, with effect from 1 April 2015.

3.8.11.30 That the new Parish in the East Hunsbury area should be represented by a Parish Council.

3.8.11.31 That the new Parish Council be known as East Hunsbury Parish Council. An alternative style is not recommended.

3.8.11.32 That the electoral arrangements for East Hunsbury Parish Council are as contained in 3.8.11.19 – 3.8.11.21 of this report.

3.8.12 Upton PC – boundary change

Consultation

3.8.12.1 The proposal was initially proposed by Upton Grange Residents Association in 2008 when a petition was submitted comprising 250 signatures, the threshold required at the time. However, the petition included 20 signatures which were not those of registered electors and therefore the petition was considered invalid. The report to Council in 2008 concluded that a CGR should be undertaken. Following confirmation from Upton Parish Council as part of Stage 1 consultation on the CGR that they supported the change proposed by the Residents Association in 2008, it was agreed that the proposed boundary change should be taken forward to Stage 2 of the consultation. The proposed boundaries for the Upton Parish Council boundary change proposal are detailed in Appendix 1.12

3.8.12.2 In the consultation survey the number of responses and free text comments in relation to the specific proposal for Upton PC – boundary change are summarised below:

	Agreed	Disagreed	Comments
Upton PC boundary change	1	0	0

3.8.12.3 There were no free text comments received.

3.8.12.4 The responses recorded for the impact of the proposal on the community are as follows (question 4 in survey):

	Agreed	Disagreed	Don't Know	Total Responses
It will improve the way public services are delivered (effective and convenient)	100%	0%	0%	1
It is a good opportunity for residents to influence local decisions (local democracy)	100%	0%	0%	1
It will make the area safer and/or cleaner (effective)	100%	0%	0%	2
It will provide value for money (effective)	100%	0%	0%	1
It will reflect the identities and interests of the local community	100%	0%	0%	2

3.8.12.5 The results of the Local Advisory Poll for the Upton PC – boundary change proposal resulted in a turnout of 4.06% with 108 votes in favour of the proposals and 32 against.

3.8.12.6 There are currently 2,737 registered electors in Upton parish, however, housing developments planned over the next 5 to 15 years will increase this number substantially to over 8,000 in 2017 and over 14,000 by 2027.

Boundary

3.8.12.7 The proposed boundary change is to extend the existing Parish boundary of Upton Parish Council to the east to include the polling district SNUPB, currently unparished.

3.8.12.8 No alternative proposals for community governance arrangements or amendments to the boundaries proposed were submitted during the course of the review.

Conclusion

3.8.12.9 The proposed change to the boundary for Upton Parish was initially put forward in 2008 and proposes to include an area within the parish boundary which has been developed since the original Parish boundary was created.

3.8.12.10 From a community perspective the proposal is supportive of the natural community in the area and will support the interests of the community in providing facilities and services which benefit all of the residents within the area.

3.8.12.11 Responses to the consultation on the proposal overall were low but of those who responded support was significantly in favour of the proposal to amend the Parish boundary.

3.8.12.12 As the change to the proposed boundary is within the boundary of the Upton ward in Northampton it is considered that the existing Parish Council name, Upton Parish Council, is reflective of the general identity of the overall area and therefore no change is required to reflect the inclusion of the broader area covered by this proposal.

3.8.12.13 It is noted that there is significant further development planned within the proposed boundary of Upton Parish over the next 15 years and should this development go ahead the population of the proposed Parish could increase significantly to over 14,000 by 2027.

3.8.12.14 The existing Parish Council governance arrangements are sufficient in terms of representation for the current and proposed expanded population that would be affected by this proposal in 2013. The population of the Parish, including the area covered by the boundary change proposal is projected to increase to 8,420 by 2017 and with regard to this increase the proposed representation arrangements are also considered appropriate for this population increase, with a ratio of 1 councillor to 765 electors. Similarly, it is recommended that no warding arrangements are required.

3.8.12.15 However, should the planned developments resulted in the projected increase in population to 14,520 by 2027, it is recommended that governance arrangements for the Parish should be reviewed by no later than 1 April 2027 to ensure that they reflect the changing demographics and community interests within the expanded community.

3.8.12.16 Given the issues raised about the size of the proposed Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council area and planned development in the future, in particular

with regard to the planned development at Pineham Village and the natural community links between that area and Hunsbury Meadows, it is proposed that this should be subject to further consultation about potential revisions to the proposed boundaries to include the Pineham Village development, currently within Upton Ward in the Hunsbury Meadow ward in the future. Consultation would be carried out with Upton Parish Council and the new proposed Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council following creation of the Hunsbury Meadows Parish Council in April 2013.

Recommendations

- 3.8.12.17 That the boundary for Upton Parish should be changed to that detailed in Appendix 1.12.
- 3.8.12.17 That this proposal will take effect from 1 April 2013.
- 3.8.12.18 That the Parish will continue to be known as Upton Parish.
- 3.8.12.19 That the Parish will continue to be represented by a Parish Council and that the Parish Council be known as Upton Parish Council.
- 3.8.12.20 That this proposal does not require any other changes to the existing governance arrangements for the Parish.
- 3.8.12.21 That governance arrangements for the Upton Parish should be reviewed by no later than 1 April 2027 to ensure that they reflect the changing demographics and community interests within the expanded community.

3.9 Implementation of proposals which are taken forward by Council

Reorganisation Order

- 3.9.1 To be able to implement the changes and set up new Parish Councils the Council must produce and publish a reorganisation order. There will be 7 orders, one for each new or changed Parish area, and will include the details in this report. The General Purposes Committee will be asked to approve the final documents.
- 3.9.2 Copies of the reorganisation orders, with relevant plans, will be available for inspection at the Council's offices in The Guildhall and on the Council's website. The Council will also inform organisations such as the Electoral Commission and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government of the changes as required by legislation.

Interim Arrangements

- 3.9.3 The creation of any new Parish Councils on 1 April 2013 will require interim representation arrangements which can be carried out on behalf of the Parish by elected representatives of the principal authority. As such the Council will have responsibility for the governance and administration of the Parishes pending the outcome of first elections in May 2013. Once new Parish Councils are elected these interim arrangements would cease to exist.
- 3.9.4 Any decisions made by these interim arrangements would need to be ratified by the relevant committee of the principal authority, typically the General Purposes Committee. It is recommended that interim arrangements should comprise the ward Councillor or Councillors for the local Parish Council area and where appropriate lead petitioners or representatives of local organisations leading on proposals, for example Residents Associations.
- 3.9.5 At the first meeting of the interim bodies they would need to decide how often and where to meet. Arrangements that they could consider include the options for accommodation for the new Parish Council, financial arrangements, provision of a clerk and recruitment of candidates for election as Parish Councillors.

4. Implications (including financial implications)

4.1 Policy

- 4.1.1 The proposals in this report are in accordance with the Council's community engagement strategy and supportive of the administration's commitment to enhancing local democracy and local participation in community decision-making.

4.2 Resources and Risk

- 4.2.1 The cost of any elections of new Parish Councillors would normally be borne by the Parish. However, for any parish elections in May 2013 for the new parishes, the Council intends to include a budget proposal to cover any elements of the elections that may need to be funded initially by the Borough Council.

- 4.2.2 There will be a short period between the vesting date of 1 April and the Parish elections (and possibly for a short time afterwards) during which the new Parishes may require some assistance with setting up. The cost of providing this support is estimated at between £14,100 and £16,200, including on costs, assuming one member of staff full time for 4 months or equivalent. As this will be one-off short term expenditure, it is proposed that this is funded from earmarked reserves.
- 4.2.3 As a result of the tax base changes arising from the proposals in this report (the exact nature of which will depend on which proposals Council decides to implement) this may directly impact on the council tax of all residents of Northampton Borough. Moving properties from the unparished area and into a new Parish would impact on the special expenses calculations, and the council taxpayers in both the new (and rearranged) Parishes and the unparished area would be affected. It is not possible at this early stage to calculate what the effect of this would be.
- 4.2.4 Under the Local Government Finance (New Parishes) (England) Regulations 2008 the Borough Council would be responsible for anticipating the precept before Parish elections for inclusion in the calculation of its budget requirement.

4.3 Legal

- 4.3.1 The Council has conducted this Community Governance Review pursuant to powers in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- 4.3.2 A Community Governance Review is undertaken on Terms of Reference agreed by the Council. The Council's Terms of Reference framed the Review to consider the community governance needs of the whole of the local authority area of Northampton Borough Council. The Council is therefore being asked to make a decision as to the community governance needs of the whole of the Borough. The recommendations made in this Report ask the Council to make formal recommendations for the creation of new parishes and amendments to existing parishes based on proposals that were the subject of detailed consultation in the second stage of the Review. However, it should be noted that this decision as to what community governance arrangements to recommend for implementation is a matter for the Full Council.
- 4.3.3 In conducting the review, the Council must observe the statutory duties that apply when a Review is being undertaken (as outlined in paragraph 3.1.3 of the Report) and have regard to Guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and The Local Boundary Commission for England on Community Governance Reviews. In deciding what community governance arrangements should be recommended for implementation by Reorganisation Order, regard must be had to the need to secure that community governance within the borough of Northampton reflects the identities and interests of the community and is effective and convenient.
- 4.3.4 The Local Advisory Polls were conducted pursuant to the power in section 116 of the Local Government Act 2003. The conduct of Local Advisory Polls was one aspect only of the consultation of local people. Council's discretion as to what community governance arrangements to recommend for implementation

is not fettered by the outcome of the Local Advisory Polls, the results of which are only one of the considerations the Council needs to take into account when deciding on community governance arrangements that are appropriate for the town in accordance with the criteria in the 2007 Act.

4.4 Equality

- 4.4.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out at the start of the CGR process and has been reviewed and updated for the subsequent stages of the process.
- 4.4.2 The Community Governance Review has been carried out in accordance with Northampton Borough Council's legal duties and powers including the Equality Act 2010.
- 4.4.3 All consultation activities undertaken as part of the CGR process have had regard to the needs of groups with protected characteristics and consultation carried out in ways which ensured it was accessible by all groups.
- 4.4.4 In considering the proposals put forward within the review due regard was given to the implications on communities potentially affected by the proposals, including whether the proposals would potentially disadvantage any communities or residents within the areas under review. In addition the review process was carried out across the whole of the Borough administrative area and allowed opportunity for all communities to put forward proposals for community governance arrangements for their local area which represented the interests of their own local community.
- 4.4.5 There was no indication from Equality Impact analysis conducted in developing the final proposals that any individuals or groups with protected characteristics will be disadvantaged disproportionately by the proposals being recommended.
- 4.4.6 New Parish Councils will be expected to comply with equality legislation in carrying out their business as independent bodies. Where appropriate advice and guidance will be provided by the principal authority in establishing councils through the implementation phase.

4.5 Other Implications

- 4.5.1 The Community Governance Review supports the Council's commitment to demonstrating community leadership, ensuring that residents can influence local service delivery and working in partnership with the community to deliver positive outcomes for Northampton and local people. It also supports the commitment of the current administration to support the principles of localism and enhanced participation in democracy at a local level.

5. Background Papers

Background Papers

- 5.1 Guidance on community governance reviews, Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, Crown Copyright 2010.
- 5.2 Parish Councils Community Governance Review – report to Council 27 October 2008
- 5.3 Northampton Community Governance Review – Cabinet Report, 18 January 2012
- 5.4 Northampton Community Governance Review – General Purposes Committee Report, 24 January 2012
- 5.5 Northampton Community Governance Review Stage 1 Recommendations – General Purposes Committee Report, 20 June 2012
- 5.6 NBC Community Governance Review Information and Guidance, Public Consultation 3 September – 19 October 2012 document
- 5.7 Community Governance Review Equality Impact Analysis
- 5.8 Consultation Survey – Detailed Survey Responses

Nicci Marzec, Head of Partnership Support, Ext 7431