

**STAPLEFORD TOWN COUNCIL
COUNCIL MEETING – 17 SEPTEMBER 2019**

Report title	COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Purpose of report	To consider the recommendations of the Community Governance Review Working Party and determine the Council's response to the Borough Council's Consultation.
Recommendations	That the Council select an option to present back to the Borough Council as its response to the Community Governance Review.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Borough Council has commenced a Community Governance Review in relation to Parish Boundaries within the Borough.
- 1.2 In Early June 2021 an online briefing was held with officers of the Borough Council and Town Councillors, to inform Councillors of the reasons behind the review and to set out the Borough Council's preliminary recommendations for alterations to the Town Council's administrative boundary.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 23 July 2021 the Town Council resolved to set up a Working Party (CGRWP) to look at the review in detail and draft the Town Council's response for approval at the September meeting. The deadline for the Town Council's response to be issued to the Borough Council is 30 September 2021.

2.0 Options Appraisal

- 2.1 The CGRWP reviewed the preliminary recommendations of the Borough Council and examined both current and historical maps of the parish, alongside anecdotal evidence of feedback from residents. This led to the creation of 4 options for the Council to consider as set out below. Maps showing the options are attached as appendices to the report.
- 2.2 Option 1 – Expand the eastern boundary to include the residential area caught between Ilkeston Road and the A52.
- 2.2.1 There are anomalies on this boundary already in that one side of Ewe Lamb Lane is within the Parish boundary but the other side is not, which leads to confusion. Councillors have reported that residents of that area feel like they are part of the Stapleford community here and have requested visits from the Town Mayor for anniversaries and been disappointed to find out that he could not attend as it was not part of the Town Council's area. Residents in this area also make use of the Town Council's allotment sites. Geographically it would make sense that this area is incorporated into the Town Council's boundary.
- 2.2.2 The CGRWP originally wanted to include Bramcote Hills Park within the boundary but the Borough Officers have advised that there is no sustainable

boundary achievable as it merges into the schools/leisure centre. This has therefore been removed from the proposals.

2.2.3 The impact of this option on the Town Council would be a net increase in properties of 726 and 1239 electors.

2.3 Option 2 – Extension of the South/South Eastern boundary to follow the historical line of the Parish Boundary with the alteration on the south western edge of that historical line to follow the man-made ‘barrier’ of the railway line.

2.3.1 This proposal does not impact any residential properties at this time and so would not require an increase in Councillors. It follows the line of the footpath starting at Baulk Lane where it meets the A52 and skirting the outside of Toton to the railway line. Historically this land was part of the Stapleford Parish and there is a road sign which marks the start of the Parish within that area. Members will recall that there was disappointment amongst councillors that this boundary was not used to form the southern boundary for the Neighbourhood plan area. There was also disappointment that the boundary between the Ecclesiastical Parishes of Toton and of Stapleford were changed in February 2020 to not include this area in Stapleford.

2.3.2 There is a small difficulty with this proposal in that the boundary takes in part of the Toton Masterplan development and at present it is unknown where the housing will be placed. This will potentially mean that the boundary will run through properties which is something that the review is trying to correct elsewhere.

2.3.3 The impact of this option on the Town Council would be a net decrease in properties of 27 and 60 electors.

2.4 Option 3 – Propose all of the above, with minor amendments to the Borough’s proposals where this relates to streets which would be subsumed by the expansion of the eastern boundary.

2.4.1 The impact of this option on the Town Council would be a net increase in properties of 730 and 1245 electors.

2.5 Option 4 – Accept the Borough Council’s Preliminary proposals with no changes.

2.5.1 The impact of this option on the Town Council would be a net decrease in properties of 31 and 66 electors.

3.0 CGRWP Recommendations

3.1 The Working Party has recommended that option 3 be the preferred response which would restore the historical boundaries at the south of the parish but also expand to include the community to the east of the parish which resolves the

anomaly of Ewe Lamb Lane, and allows the residents of that area to access the Town Mayor.

4.0 Council is ask to discuss the proposals and select an option for submission to the Borough Council.