

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION FROM PARISHES		
Parish	Originator	Comments
Allextton	Parish Clerk	<p>At Allextton Parish Meeting on Wednesday 15th January, the Community Governance Review of Parishes was discussed.</p> <p>We are happy with the current arrangements and would like things to stay as they are, and have no comments to make.</p>
Ashby Magna	Parish Clerk	No comments.
Ashby Parva	Chairman	The purpose and terms of the CGR were discussed at Ashby Parva Parish Meeting on 23 October. The view of the meeting was that the present arrangement where Ashby Parva has parish meeting rather than a parish council met the village's needs and should continue. It did not wish to convert to a parish council.
Bruntingthorpe	Parish Clerk	No comments.
Broughton Astley	Public Comment	It's a pity we couldn't review the districts, maybe Broughton Astley would be better served then by Blaby or Hinckley & Bosworth and our council officers know where we were.
Broughton Astley	Parish Manager	<p>Further to Broughton Astley Parish Council's meeting held on Thursday 16 January 2020, the Members would like to submit the following submissions as part of the Community Governance Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broughton Astley Parish Council feels that it is adequately represented by the current four District Councillors. • Broughton Astley Parish Council feels that its current compliment of sixteen councillors provides the Parish with good representation and has a healthy number of applicants when either vacancies arise or at election time. • Considering the Parish boundaries, the Parish Council believe that there would be a logic to extend the current boundary eastwards to include the area commonly referred to as the 'layby' opposite Charlie Brown Nurseries and surrounding fields on Dunton Road. This would provide and protect a clear area of separation between the two parishes which would be included in Broughton Astley's Neighbourhood Plan. This settlement is adjoining Broughton Astley and is remote from its current Parish of Dunton Bassett.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broughton Astley as the third largest settlement and Lutterworth being the second largest settlement operate on a Tier 1 Governance structure. It is felt that it would be more appropriate if a common model across the District, including Market Harborough is adopted. This would provide greater transparency for all residents within the District on where Precept is in fact spent.
Burton Overy	Parish Clerk	<p>This was considered at the meeting of Burton Overy Parish Council on 10th December 2019.</p> <p>It was agreed that the existing electoral arrangements and the boundary were satisfactory and no change was needed.</p>
Claybrooke Magna	Public Comment	<p>I am a resident of Claybrooke Magna. I publish the Parish/Church Newsletter for both Claybrooke Magna and Claybrooke Parva and work closely with the Parish Councils of both parishes in many ways. I am therefore aware that both Parish Councils provide an efficient and effective service to Parishioners. Problems that affected the Parva PC have been dealt with and the new set up is very effective. Although very close in terms of distance between the villages there are differences and these are best dealt with by those who reside in the respective Parishes.</p> <p>I believe that no advantage would be gained by re-grouping the Parishes into one and therefore propose that the status quo is allowed to stay.</p>
Claybrooke Magna	Public Comment	<p>I STRONGLY object to this merger happening! Claybrooke Magna Parish Council have successfully run separately in this Parish for as long as I can remember! We haven't had any cause for complaint, they do their work without any problems. They have had a succession of councillors over the years without arguments or problems.</p> <p>Claybrooke Parva on the other hand are notorious for making unpopular decisions, also for falling out amongst themselves.</p> <p>A merger would be research knell for Magna's hard working officers,</p> <p>Listen to the people who know.</p> <p>I cannot think of ONE good reason to have a joint Parish Council!!</p> <p>Why try to fix what isn't broken????</p>
Claybrooke Magna	Parish Councillor	<p>In several areas the Terms of Reference states that the review should “ reflect the identity and interests “ of the locality but talks about re-grouping of Parishes, however I can see no rational why re-grouping can in any way reflect local identity. If the Parish Council exists to</p>

		<p>represent community interests I can see no justification in joining two or more Parishes together as quite obviously the present and future community interests sit within the existing Parish boundaries.</p> <p>Here in Claybrooke Magna there is an efficient and effective Parish Council who provide a robust local voice to address local concerns. If the review is indeed to actually reflect the separation between settlements then the existing separation between Magna and Parva should be respected, as there are many differences in how the two Parish Councils operate and communicate with their residents which reflect the make up of the two communities.</p> <p>There is no advantage to be gained from re-grouping the exiting Parishes either from a financial point of view or from an efficiency point of view, the present set up is ideally placed to meet future challenges in a highly effective, democratic and accountable manor to the citizens of the Parishes.</p> <p>I therefore suggest that no change is made to the present Parish boundaries which would take away the strong local voice the people of Claybrooke Magna enjoy.</p>
Claybrooke Magna	Parish Councillor	<p><u>Response 1</u> Claybrooke Magna Parish Council asked me at our October meeting to submit our comments for the review</p> <p>We can see there may be a financial benefit in merging Claybrooke Magna and Parva Parish Councils in that there is potential to make some small saving in clerk salary.</p> <p>However, we are of the firm view that the imperative is to recognise the separate and distinct nature of these two historic communities and, therefore, we would oppose any such proposal. Informal soundings with residents have also shown strong support for this view.</p> <p>The (locally) contentious decision by HDC to merge the Claybrookes to create an SRV within the Local Plan has served to create much disquiet and has firmed up considerably local opinion about the need to maintain separate Councils.</p> <p><u>Response 2:</u> Please consider this email as our formal request to increase to 6 Parish Councillors for Claybrooke Magna.</p> <p>Our registered electorate is shown as 466. We have 38 houses currently under construction with more allocated within the HDC Local Plan. This will take us over the 500 number for which your guidance shows 6 to 12 Councillors as the suggested size.</p>

		<p>We are keen to open up the opportunity for new residents to join us and broaden representation on the Council.</p>
Cotesbach	Parish Clerk	<p>Cotesbach Parish Council is a very active one serving a small but vibrant community meeting 5 times per year. There are currently 3 Councillors, having had 1 recent resignation, due to moving from the area, and another deciding not to stand for re-election. The council plans to co-opt 2 more early in the New Year.</p> <p>The Chairman and Councillors play an active role within the village and regularly encourage groups to join in events or activities to improve the village, e.g. Developing a Pond Management Plan, decorating the original phone box, linking with Cotesbach Village Hall and keeping the village tidy. There are also a number of village business owners who also attend the meetings and welcome the opportunity to host community events for all the village to join in, e.g. Christmas events and shop, summer events etc.</p> <p>The Parish Boundary has not altered although there continues to be a number of planning concerns in the area from the major industrial developments of the Tarmac quarry, Shawell Quarry and Landfill, Magna Park and Lutterworth East. These require ongoing and frequent Councillor presence at regular meetings, in particular with the Tarmac management team to ensure that the safe environment and character of the village is maintained.</p> <p>It is a very active Parish Council, and integral to the village community, with meetings regularly attended by at least 10 parishioners. The Council already works with adjoining Parish and Town Councils including Shawell, Churchover and Lutterworth Town, to align on planning and policy positions and operate efficiently for ourselves, residents and other stakeholders. Cotesbach Parish Council has also recently worked hard to apply improved governance to its operations, ensuring it has reviewed, agreed and better publicised necessary policies and procedures. The style and name of the function of a Parish Council, therefore, is still appropriate and it would actively oppose any merger with other parishes or being made a Parish meeting only.</p>
East Langton	Parish Clerk	<p>Please could the following comments from East Langton Parish Council be taken into account in the Governance Review:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council would like the parish to be warded, with at least two councillors from Church Langton and two from East Langton • The council would like consideration of the Parish Boundary being redrawn slightly to include the properties on the west side of the B6047, which are currently in the village of Church Langton but part of the parish of West Langton (these are included in the Neighbourhood Plan area designated by HDC) <p>With reference to the second bullet point, the Parish Council has not consulted the houses in question in West Langton parish meeting area regarding this suggestion</p>
Fleckney	Parish Clerk	<p>Thank you for the opportunity for Fleckney Parish Council to comment on the review of the community governance arrangements within the district.</p> <p>The only matter which the Parish Council would wish to considered as part of the review is the impact of new development on the parish boundary. Whilst there is no forecast development that will directly impact on the parish boundary the Persimmon Homes development of 290 dwellings on land west of Fleckney Road, Saddington (Ref 16/01355/FUL), which was granted on appeal in March 2018 and is now under construction, will have an impact. This development straddles the boundary between the parishes of Fleckney and Saddington and therefore has implications for the parish boundary.</p> <p>The Parish Council's view is that the parish boundary should be extended to encompass the whole of the Persimmon Homes development within the Parish of Fleckney.</p> <p>This is justified on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development as a whole is being built adjacent to the existing built development of Fleckney along Saddington Road. • The part of the development situated in Saddington Parish is separated from Saddington Village by an area of separation and will have no connection with the village or its community. • A redefined boundary would make the two settlements easily recognisable. • Occupants of the new estate are very likely to consider the estate as a whole to be part of

		<p>Fleckney and this should be reflected by a change to the boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupants of the new estate will, by and large, be using facilities in Fleckney provided in part by the Parish Council and as such should contribute through their council tax towards the costs. Saddington has few facilities that are likely to benefit the occupants of the new estate. • The number of new residents would have a disproportionate impact on the overall population of Saddington Parish.
Foxton	Parish Clerk	Foxton Parish Council has no further comments to make on the Community Governance Review.
Gilmorton	Parish Clerk	No comments.
Great Glen	Parish Clerk	<p>Great Glen Parish Council reviewed the information sent and at their meeting on Tuesday 14th January proposed that there were no amendments necessary.</p> <p>I hope that this is sufficient for your purposes but please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.</p>
Great Easton	Parish Clerk	<p>Great Easton PC has looked at the Governance Review and does not have any significant comments -however hard we try!</p> <p>We currently have 6 Councillors with no vacancies and this seems a good balance. We have recently completed a Neighbourhood Plan and included Bringhurst School within the planning. The school is located adjacent to the parish boundary within walking distance from Great Easton and is regarded as the "local" school. There was some talk of incorporating the small hamlet of Bringhurst with Great Easton -I am not sure where this suggestion came from - but we are not aware of any local pressures to do so. I expect the reverse would be the case.</p> <p>We are firmly of the opinion that the designation for Great Easton as a "Selected Rural Village" for planning purposes is appropriate and this was confirmed in HDC's Local Plan. The village continues to grow and assimilate additional housing fairly easily and the "gradual and phased development" is currently working well. Having a local school is also helping attract younger families.</p>
Hallaton	Parish Clerk	On behalf of Hallaton Parish Council please see their comments below, as discussed at the Parish Council

		<p>meeting on the 13th January:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Status (Parish Meeting or Parish Council) Happy with 'Parish Council' • Parish Council Size (number of parish councillors) Happy with 6 Cllrs • Parish Boundary (Is this still appropriate?) Hallaton Parish Boundary still appropriate • Parish Name/Style (Is this still appropriate?) Hallaton Parish still appropriate
Houghton on the Hill	Parish Clerk	The Parish Council considered the review at its meeting last night and I have been asked to let you know that it will not be providing a substantive response as it is satisfied with the existing arrangements.
Husbands Bosworth	Parish Clerk	<p>Following the receipt of information relating to the Community Governance Review, Husbands Bosworth Parish Council have considered its response at the meeting held on 5th November 2019. The relevant portion of the signed Minutes of that meeting read as follows:</p> <p>6. Community Governance Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parish status – The Council agreed that the present status of Parish Council remains appropriate. Proposed by Cllr Hobson, seconded by Cllr. Bolter. Agreed by all. 2. Parish name – The Council agreed that the present name of Husbands Bosworth parish remains appropriate. Proposed by Cllr Fletcher, seconded by Cllr. Bolter. Agreed by all. 3. Parish boundary – The Council agreed that the present boundary remains appropriate. Proposed by Cllr Bolter, seconded by Cllr. Hobson. Agreed by all. 4. Parish council size – The Council noted that the current Parish Council size of 6 Councillors has remained unchanged for the past 30+ years, despite the size of the village increasing by over 20% in the same period. Following a proposal by Cllr. Hobson, the Council agreed that an increase in its size would be appropriate to allow it to fulfil commitments to prevent stagnation, to offer increased support for local groups and improve provision of services. Taking into account the increase in delegated responsibilities such as mowing of verges; the opening of the Parish office; and the increase in the Clerk's hours which provides a more effective and responsive provision to parishioners, an

		<p>increase in the size of the Council would allow further tasks and duties to be taken on without unduly burdening Council members . The Council proposed a request for an increase in the number of Councillors from 6 to 8 to Harborough District Council.</p> <p>Proposed by Cllr Hobson, seconded by Cllr. Bolter. Agreed by all.</p>
Kibwoth Harcourt & Kibworth Beauchamp	Chair KHPC	<p>I attach a proposal and map that has been approved by both Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council and Kibworth Harcourt Parish Council at their recent public meetings (appended to this document)</p> <p>In summary, the proposal is to alter the parish boundary between the two parishes such that all of the houses in the David Wilson Homes estate (Kibworth Meadows) would lie within Kibworth Harcourt parish. This proposal would remove the anomaly whereby houses lying in Beauchamp currently on part of Barnards Way, and all of Longbreach and Bush Road already have Kibworth Harcourt postal codes and a Royal Mail locality of Kibworth Harcourt, because, when these were finalised by Royal Mail, they assumed all houses in the estate north of the railway line were within Kibworth Harcourt.</p> <p>The new parish boundary, if agreed, would run along the western edge of the Warwick Road Recreation land to the railway line at the Tin bridge, and then back west along the railway line to join the existing parish boundary at the Warwick Road railway bridge.</p> <p>This proposal has precedent because during the 2012 Community Governance Review, houses on the southern loop of Dairy Way on the Kibworth Meadows estate, and originally lying in Beauchamp, were transferred to be within Harcourt by a slight change in the parish boundary.</p> <p>Both parish councils did have a brief discussion of a suggestion by Richard Ellis about the location of the primary school and whether the new boundary should be moved to include the school within Harcourt, but we didn't agree as this would have no benefit and would mean quite a number of houses on Hillcrest Avenue would also need to be included, which would mean this boundary suggestion left some houses on Hillcrest Avenue in Beauchamp and others in Harcourt.</p> <p>If there are any further questions about our joint proposal, please contact me or the two parish clerks.</p>
Leire	Public Comment	<p>It seems a nonsense that living in Leire, our council is Harborough, 16 miles away, whilst Blaby is 8.5 miles away and Hinckley is less than 10 miles away.</p>

		Also, we are looking at moving to Marston Trussell, which although having a Harborough post code is deemed to come under Daventry council, 19 miles away, and Harborough is less than 4 miles away.
Lowesby and Cold Newton	Parish Clerk	<p>Thank you for the information and maps regarding the upcoming Community Governance Review. There are some issues for the parishes of Lowesby and Cold Newton, which I set out below.</p> <p>The Post Office appears to have renamed a no. of our local roads on its database, without ever having consulted anyone This is causing some confusion for delivery drivers; they can arrive at a designated post code, but finding that the address does not match that on their parcel, they do not deliver. This has resulted in a no. of missed and lost deliveries.</p> <p>The changes the Post Office have made, with reference to the maps you supplied are:-</p> <p>In LOWESBY The road from the B6047 through Lowesby village is LOWESBY LANE, going into CHURCH HILL, then SKEG HILL into Cold Newton village. The Post Office database calls all of it Lowesby Road.</p> <p>In COLD NEWTON The road from Tilton Lane is SLUDGE HALL HILL, turning into ENDERBYS LANE, turning R into the village and becoming MAIN STREET, leading into Skeg Hill and on to Lowesby. Where it meets the S end of Main Street, Enderbys Lane becomes HUNGARTON ROAD, which then continues on to Hungarton. Whites Barn marks the start of PARK ROAD, which continues to the B6047. The Post Office is calling all of these roads Cold Newton Road.</p>
Lubenham	Parish Clerk	<p>The Council discussed the Community Governance review and agreed the following:</p> <p>a) Lubenham Parish Council should remain as a Parish Council, and should not become a Parish Meeting – Agreed by all</p> <p>b) Lubenham Parish is appropriately named – Agreed by all</p> <p>c) Lubenham Parish boundary contains the Airfield Farm site where an additional 1400 homes are planned for development. Lubenham Parish Council proposes that the parish boundary be changed so that the Airfield Farm development becomes a part of Market Harborough – Agreed by all</p> <p>d) Lubenham Parish Council is currently made up of 6</p>

		<p>Councillors. This number will continue to be appropriate if the parish boundary is changed as proposed above – Agreed by all</p> <p>An email from Richard Ellis was received on 9th December 2019 which provided the additional information relating to the likely increase in the electorate of Lubenham parish from 968 to between 1,700 and 3,000 following the construction of additional houses within the Parish. Although these figures were not available at the Parish Council Meeting where the Community Governance Review was discussed, Lubenham Parish Council's proposal that the boundary of the parish be altered so that the Airfield Farm development does not fall within the parish boundary for Lubenham addresses the potential dramatic increase in the electorate numbers whilst retaining the present Parish Council size.</p>
Lutterworth	Acting Clerk	<p>Lutterworth Town Council have considered the Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review and have the following comments to make.</p> <p>1. Creating, Merging, Altering or Abolishing Parishes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lutterworth Town Council note the proposed creation of the East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area on land immediately adjacent to existing Lutterworth Town Council Wards 2. The clear statement of the Planning Inspector who approved this Policy within the Local Plan was that there should be no line of separation between the new development and the existing Lutterworth town, and that indeed the new development must be considered as an extension to the existing town rather than the creation of a new entity. 3. Discussions at the November 2019 meeting of the East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area Community Partnership Group, attended by members of local councils, Harborough District Council and Leicestershire County Council, agreed that the new development should be part of Lutterworth, and indeed should be called Lutterworth. 4. For these reasons, Lutterworth Town Council would propose that the entire SDA is included within the boundary of Lutterworth Town and therefore falls within the boundaries of Lutterworth Town Council

		<p>2. The Naming of Parishes, and the style of Any New Parishes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lutterworth Town Council proposes that the extended boundary that includes the SDA is known under the current name of Lutterworth 2. The naming and geographic delineation of Wards could be reserved until after the proposals are accepted in principle. <p>3. The Electoral Arrangements for Parishes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lutterworth Town Council proposes that the new, extended parish is divided in to five wards, rather than the four wards that cover the existing parish. 2. We propose that each new ward would have 3 Town Councillors representing the ward, rather than the four councillors per ward in the existing parish 3. This would give a total of 15 Town Councillors for the extended parish, rather than the 16 Town Councillors for the existing parish 4. This would mean that Lutterworth falls within the bounds of 13 to 27 councillors for electorates of between 10,000 and 20,000 5. Finally, we propose that each new ward has a District Councillor, giving a total of 5 District Councillors. The current parish is split in to two, Lutterworth East and Lutterworth West, with each District Ward having two District Councillors, giving a total of four District Councillors for the current parish. <p>4. Grouping of Parishes Under a Common Parish Council</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lutterworth Town Council do not believe that this applies to us at this time. <p>The key aim of Lutterworth Town Council is to re-enforce the identity of Lutterworth, and to ensure that the new development of Lutterworth East becomes, and is seen to become, part of the existing town as required by the Planning Inspector. We believe that this fits well with the statement within the Terms of Reference that:</p> <p>"A CGR must reflect the identities and interests of communities and should take account of the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion and the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish".</p>
--	--	---

		Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.
Market Harborough	MH Civic Society	<p><u>Parish Boundaries</u> The Market Harborough Civic Society considers that the boundary of the Parishes of Lubenham and Market Harborough should be amended to include the area of development in the SD, at Airfield Farm and adjoining land, within the boundaries of Market Harborough.</p> <p>The allocation for development of this strategic area was mainly to meet the needs of Leicester and the major towns and villages. It comprises over 1400 dwellings and industrial premises. The character of the area will be urban, with high densities. The occupants will look to Market Harborough for basic facilities and services. It is right that the development area should be included within Market Harborough so that the residents can contribute to services in the Town.</p> <p><u>Market Harborough Town Council</u> The Market Harborough Civic Society considers that a Town Council should be created to oversee local matters in Market Harborough. Harborough District Council is requested to carry out the appropriate Community Governance Review.</p> <p>As the District Council will be aware, Market Harborough is the only parish in the District without a local council. The Civic Society considers that now is an appropriate time for services to be provided and managed at a local level. This is necessary because of the cutbacks in services at County and District level, particularly the non-statutory services. It is also important that the Town has its own governing body in view of the likely changes to Local Government, with a move to unitary authorities.</p> <p>The Town does not have an elected body which can speak for the Town as a whole. A Town Council would be in a position to provide a comprehensive response to the many consultations on strategies and policy which will affect the wellbeing of the residents of the Town. The Civic Society has attempted to undertake some of the responsibility but it has become too much for a voluntary body. A Town Council would respond to Reviews of the Local Plan and be able to prepare a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Civic Society would appreciate further discussion with elected members and officers of the District Council regarding both these matters.</p>
Medbourne	Parish Clerk	With regard to the considerations being given to future local governance matters within the local authority's area, please note the following responses from Medbourne Parish Council:

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Parish Council is currently formally constituted as a Parish Council within the local government sector, and wishes to remain as a Parish Council for the parish of Medbourne. 2. There is a requirement for Medbourne Parish Council to have 5 (five) elected Councillors - currently there are 5 in post, with no vacancies. 3. The current boundary of the Parish Council's jurisdiction is co-terminous with the civil parish boundary . The Parish Council wishes this to remain the boundary of the parish and of the Council's responsibility in the future, and does not require amendment. 4. Medbourne Parish Council does not wish to be grouped with other parishes under any future terms of a larger Parish Council entity. 5. Members of the Parish Council wish the name 'Medbourne Parish Council' to be retained. 6. The Parish Council has no desires to change the current governance arrangements.
Misterton with Walcote	Parish Clerk	<p>Misterton with Walcote Parish Council can see no reason to amend our parish boundaries and considers the existing boundaries should continue unaltered following this review. The reasons for this opinion are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council is well advanced in the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. If the parish were to be expanded, part of the parish would fall outside the Neighbourhood Plan area. Similarly, if land were removed from the Parish and added to the adjacent parish of Lutterworth, it would either be excluded from the plan or would be the only part of that parish with Neighbourhood Plan coverage – an anomalous position for the area in question; • Parish boundaries usually relate either to the existing settlement or reflect the historical relationship of settlements to one another. On the ground, nothing significant has happened since the last boundary review. The Parish Council acknowledges that land within Misterton with Walcote has been included in a Strategic Development Allocation of land for residential development. However, at present, no planning application has been approved and no development has started. We consider it premature to redraw parish boundaries at this time. Whilst there is a strong likelihood that Lutterworth will expand eastwards, currently there is no change to our Parish. If boundaries were redefined at this point, they may need to be

		<p>adjusted once again when the proposed development has been completed. Therefore, we consider they should remain unchanged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harborough District Council, Lutterworth Town Council and Misterton with Walcote Parish Council have worked together constructively at each stage of the planning process. Even if the boundaries were amended, we would still be involved in the planning process, so no administrative case can be made for change. • The Parish Council has maintained and improved footpaths throughout the entire parish, funding the work both through use of the Parish precept and by obtaining a variety of grants. Our parishioners identify strongly with land between Misterton, Walcote and Lutterworth, using it for informal recreation and to access the town of Lutterworth and do not wish to lose this part of the historical parish of Misterton with Walcote. <p>Whilst acknowledging that a case may be made in the future to amend our parish boundaries, we consider that this is not the time for change and strongly recommend the existing boundaries of Misterton with Walcote remain unchanged.</p>
Saddington	PM Chairman	<p>The Parish Meeting (held on 15th January) confirmed that we would like the following comments to be taken into consideration by HDC during the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saddington Parish Meeting wants to keep a Parish Meeting as the local form of governance for Saddington Parish. We believe that a Parish Meeting is appropriate for Saddington Parish, and that a Parish Meeting provides an effective forum for all local electors in Saddington Parish to have their say on local matters at Saddington. • Saddington Parish Meeting does not, currently, want there to be a Parish Council for Saddington Parish. We do not currently see the need or benefit of creating a Parish Council at Saddington. • Saddington Parish Meeting does not want to join up with any adjacent parish council. We do not see any need or benefit in joining up with any adjacent parish council. • Saddington Parish Meeting did not agree with the construction and unilateral imposition of 150 new houses in Saddington Parish and in the Saddington Neighbourhood Area adjacent to the parish boundary with Fleckney parish. We would have preferred not to have such an imposition which clearly has challenged the identity and civic association of those houses, and as we predicted during the planning process now retrospectively raises a question as to the

		<p>appropriate route of the parish boundary. Recognising that we cannot change the past, Saddington Parish Meeting's pragmatic position is that, if the Persimmon estate houses are to be considered part of Fleckney settlement, then while Saddington parish Meeting may not request such a change ourselves, Saddington Parish Meeting would not object if the Saddington/Fleckney parish boundary is moved to tightly envelope those houses, and only those houses that are currently located in Saddington Parish. To be clear, Saddington Parish Meeting would object to the Saddington/Fleckney parish boundary being moved at any location other than that which is directly contiguous with the Persimmon estate outline. If a change is made to the parish boundary to envelope the Persimmon housing estate then we would also need to consider if the Persimmon houses remain in the Saddington Neighbourhood Area and therefore continue to be subject to Saddington planning policies, or if the Saddington Neighbourhood Plan Area and the Fleckney Neighbourhood Plan Area are both modified to align with the revised parish boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saddington parish Meeting believes that 'Saddington Parish' correctly describes the parish name and style.
Scraptoft	Parish Clerk	<p>Scraptoft Parish Council have discussed this matter and it was agreed at the last meeting on the 4th of December 2019 that the Parish boundary should remain as it is now. The new development, Scraptoft North SDA was taken into consideration and it was agreed that it should remain encompassed within the Parish Council Boundary.</p>
Shangton	PM Chair	<p>For our small Parish Meeting the current arrangement suits us well.</p> <p>We have no local services (street lights, recreation facilities, access to public transport, etc) as a consequence, we have no budget and no supplementary charges to our residents. This latter factor is appreciated by all..... Governance is on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>My Job, as Chairman of the Parish Meeting is to monitor what may have an impact upon our residents.</p> <p>To this effect the main interaction on a day to day basis is with the County Council, for such road issues (pot holes, safety and grass cutting). Largely this has been effective with the singular exception of safety and</p>

		<p>County Highways Authority. In this respect there seems an ongoing tension between District and County authorities to take responsibility that translates into action. Much has been written on this subject (within our Parish), with regard to a particular issue. It appears: what our local concerns maybe, what value local knowledge has, in highlighting serious issues, has little influence or indeed forceful support from higher authorities. There is an incident waiting to happen in our Parish.</p> <p>District contact is mainly for planning and there are measures in place to keep me abreast and allow any wider concerns to be incorporated Parish wide or indeed actioned upon. Allied to this are the side effects of growth and benefits of any section 106 funds. It is this point where remote voluntary interaction could be at risk if local volunteers may not be alive to potential benefits in their Parish and may not fully understand the potential for positiver impact via section 106 funding.</p> <p>Finally there is a purpose to the embodiment of our 'Village Meeting': as a vehicle accumulate 'community Funding' in Special sectors i.e. Broadband. The Parish Meeting has led a movement to acquire Government funding to, directly, connect fibre optic cabling into each household. Working with 'Openreach' Community Grants have been acquired for this purpose. No local, District, or County help or advice for this is available!</p> <p>To be 'integrated' into something bigger that supposedly espouses 'efficiency' and 'improved' communication will, in reality, add nothing to our position except, possibly, additional cost but no additional benefit.</p>
Slawston	Parish Clerk	Slawston Parish Meeting would like to confirm that it is happy with the Council Status (Parish Meeting), the number of Parish Meeting Officers, the current Parish Boundary and the Parish Name.
Thurnby and Bushby	Parish Clerk	<p>It was noted that the Parish Council gave initial consideration to the Community Governance Review at the meeting held on 11 November 2019 (minute 19/285 refers). Subsequently, residents were alerted to the review and the PC's proposed response in the PC's article in the Winter TABS newsletter. The PC received no comments from residents on the Council's proposed response. It was therefore proposed by Mr J King and seconded by Mrs S Johnstone that the following be submitted to HDC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the current parish boundaries are appropriate; • the current allocation of a total of 10 Cllrs for the

		<p>parish is appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the division into two wards and the balance of Cllrs (7 in Thurnby and 3 in Bushby) is no longer reflective of the electorate in the light of new housing development; the two wards should be merged with the 10 Cllr positions representing the parish as a whole.
Tur Langton	Parish Clerk	<p>Tur Langton Parish Council has the following response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tur Langton wishes to continue to be a Parish Council No suggestion of a change in the number of councillors There is one property on the boundary with East Langton Parish Council area, Barn Owl Hollow, LE16 7SZ, which may be more appropriate to be in East Langton Parish Council area. We have not consulted with that property.
Wistow cum Newton Harcourt	Parish Clerk	<p>At our Parish Meeting on the 28th October it was agreed that we did not wish to see any changes to the makeup of this particular Parish Meeting.</p>

Kibworth

