

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Monday 25 June 2018

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Report of the Performance and Governance Manager

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Administration Committee approve changes (1), (3), (4), (5) and (6) below and that these recommended changes are reported to Council for approval. That recommendation (2) is actioned immediately after this meeting of the Administration Committee; and that Recommendation (7) is noted.

- (1) **Parish boundary change between Bursledon and Hedge End, new boundary following M27.**
- (2) **Evidence is inconclusive and therefore residents of Old Netley should be given the final decision by means of a ballot to each household.**
- (3) **Parish boundary change between Hound and Hamble-le-Rice, new boundary along River Hamble**
- (4) **Parish boundary change between West End and Fair Oak and Horton Heath, the new parish boundary to be along the railway / stream.**
- (5) **Change parish wards of Bishopstoke parish, in line with proposal.**
- (6) **Change parish wards of Hedge End parish, in line with proposal and take account of additional area, as set out in recommendation (1)**
- (7) **Note proposed polling district changes in West End parish as part of a wider polling district review in the Borough in Autumn 2018.**

Purpose

This report considers the responses to the second stage of the public consultation carried out as part of the Community Governance Review having regard to the law and the guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission.

Statutory Powers

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

Strategic Implications

1. The content of this report does not directly contribute to the achievement of Corporate Plan objectives. However, given population and housing growth, it is important time is taken to review the Council's community governance arrangements and ensure they reflect the identities and interests of the community, and that they are also effective and convenient.

Introduction and Background

2. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, local authorities have the power to stimulate debate in respect of parish boundaries. Community Governance Reviews can take place for the whole, or part of, the Borough to consider one or more of the following:
 - Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes;
 - The naming of parishes and the style of new parishes;
 - The electoral arrangements for parishes (the ordinary year of election;
 - council size, the number of councillors to be elected to the Council, and
 - parish warding), and
 - Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes.

The Council is required to ensure that community governance within the area under review will be:

- Reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
 - Is effective and convenient.
 - In doing so the community governance review is required to take into account:
 - The impact of community governance arrangements on community
 - cohesion; and
 - The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.
3. At its meeting on 20 November 2017, the Administration Committee agreed to carry out a Community Governance Review within the Borough.
 4. The first consultation period took place from 6 December 2017 to 30 January 2018 with a stakeholder meeting held on 3 January 2018. Responses were received from seven parish councils. Full details can be found in the report to the meeting of this committee on 20 February 2018.

Stage two consultation

5. At its meeting on 20 February 2018, the Administration Committee agreed to carry out the stage two consultation on the recommended proposals which included four changes to parish boundaries, two changes to parish wards and one polling district change. The consultation was on these seven proposals.

6. Stage two consultation took place from 4 May to 8 June 2018. Responses could be made via an online survey or in writing. A drop in session was held on 15 May 2018 at Pilands Wood Community centre. This was aimed at those residents of Old Netley, the largest group of residents potentially affected by proposals set out in the consultation.
7. In addition around 600 households and businesses in areas potentially affected by a change in parish boundary were written to and invited to respond.
8. A general notification of the consultation was also made through Eastleigh Borough Councils 'E-News' which was sent to all 13,600 residents on this database.

Consultation responses

9. In total 212 responses to the consultation were received. Just 14 responded to all seven proposals, the majority responded to just one or two of the proposals. **This level of response does not constitute a statistically significant sample**, either when looking at the individual proposals or across the population as a whole. **All results must therefore be treated with extreme caution** as we cannot rely on them as being an accurate representation. The table below summarises the number of responses for each question and whether they supported or opposed the proposal.

Proposal	responses	support	oppose
Q1 boundary change between Bursledon and Hedge End	57	24	33
Q2 boundary change between Hound and Bursledon	127	19	108
Q3 boundary change between Hound and Hamble-le-Rice	144	127*	17
Q4 boundary change between West End and Fair Oak & Horton Heath	26	12	14
Q5 ward change within Bishopstoke parish	26	18	8
Q6 ward change within Hedge End parish	25	17	8
Q7 polling district change within West End parish	16	7	9

*supported either option one or two

10. The most significant interest was in the proposed boundary changes, in particular those between both Hound and Bursledon and Hound and Hamble-le-Rice. Below is a summary for each proposal.
11. **Parish boundary change between Bursledon and Hedge End** (area north of M27 to move from Bursledon to Hedge End Parish). See Appendix 1 for map.
12. Letters were sent to 153 households and businesses which are located in the area of Bursledon Parish, north of the M27. In total 57 responses were received of which 42% supported the proposed changed and 58% opposed it.

13. Seven comments were received in support of the proposal which stated that the motorway provided a clear boundary and that the new development north of Pylands Lane is closer to Hedge End.
14. Of those opposing the proposal, 15 made comments. Respondents felt that Hedge End was already too big and this was unnecessary bureaucracy. The area north of the M27 had a strong identity with Bursledon parish, in particular around Dodwell and the pond. Some felt that the new development would fit more naturally with Hedge End but the remaining area should stay within Bursledon parish. Concern was also raised about the rights of way, given the active group in Bursledon, which did not exist within Hedge End.
15. **Parish boundary change between Hound and Bursledon** (area of Old Netley and two new developments on Hamble Lane to move from Hound to Bursledon). See Appendix 2 for map.
16. Letters were sent to 366 households and businesses in Old Netley, 127 responses were received of which 15% agreed with the proposal and 85% opposed it.
17. Of those in support of the proposal 13 made comments. Many stated that this area felt more naturally part of the community of Bursledon and this is where residents would go for local facilities, as these are much closer than those within Hound Parish. Some already felt part of Bursledon and that the new developments would be part of the Bursledon community. A suggestion was made to consider reducing the area covered by Hound, Hamble-le-Rice and Bursledon into two parishes.
18. Of those against the proposal 18 made comments. Some felt it would not make sense for Netley and Old Netley to be in separate parishes. Several felt that things should not change due to many generations living in the parish of Hound. There was concern that the proposal was to enable Bursledon parish to gain income from households in the new developments and by reducing Hound, it could become financially unviable. Also stated was that the proposal ignored the natural divide of Hamble Lane.
19. **Boundary change between Hound and Hamble-le-Rice** (two options, either move boundary to Satchell Lane or to River Hamble). See Appendix 3 for map.
20. Letters were sent to 32 households and businesses in the area. In total 145 responses were received of which 88% supported a change and 12% did not. Of those in support the majority felt that a new boundary along the River Hamble was most appropriate. This was a particularly high number of responses in relation to the number of affected addresses.
21. Of those in support of change 10 comments were received, these stated that the change made sense, it would ensure the school was entirely within one parish and would have little impact on residents.

22. Of those against the proposed change two comments were received, stating that they saw no reason for change.
23. **Boundary change between West End and Fair Oak & Horton Heath** (area north of the railway, including the new development at Crowd Hill). See Appendix 4 for map.
24. Letters were sent to 43 households and businesses in the area. In total 26 responses were received 46% in support of the proposal and 54% against it.
25. Five comments were received all from those against the proposal. Respondents felt that Fair Oak & Horton Heath already had significant new development without including this area. They have had significant increases to their council tax but no improved facilities, why are there no benefits being realised from developer contributions?
26. **Ward change within Bishopstoke parish**
In total 26 responses were received of which 69% supported the proposal and 31% did not. Eight comments were received four from those who support the proposal and four against. Those against felt there was too much bureaucracy, the number of councillors should be reduced and that the proposals were not clear. Those in support stated that residents would be better represented with a more even amount of councillors to residents.
27. **Ward change within Hedge End parish**
In total 25 responses were received of which 68% supported the change and 32% did not. Five comments were received all from those who do not support the proposal. They said there was too much bureaucracy, changes for political reasons and they wanted to know if this changed the number of councillors?
28. **Polling district change within West End Parish**
In total 16 responses were received, 44% in support and 56% against. Five comments were received all from those against the proposal. Concern was raised that this was away from the centre which is a more convenient location for voting.

Other Evidence

29. The outcome of the stage two consultation is just one part of the evidence that must be considered as part of this review, particularly given the number of responses that cannot be considered statistically significant. In addition it is important to also consider:
 - a. Submission to the stage one consultation, including the rationale for proposals.
 - b. Criteria for change, as set out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 - i. Recognise community identity and taking account of new housing developments
 - ii. Facilitates effective and convenient local government

- iii. Use firm boundaries on the ground
- iv. Has regard for other administrative boundaries

A summary for each proposal is given below.

- 30. **Parish boundary change between Bursledon and Hedge End**
 - a. A proposed change was put forward by Bursledon Parish Council and supported by Hedge End Town Council, both agreeing that the M27 provided a permanent boundary. The new development north of Pylands Lane is primarily an extension of Hedge End.
 - b. The proposal would satisfy all criteria.

- 31. **Parish Boundary change between Hound and Bursledon**
 - a. The proposal was put forward by Bursledon Parish Council, but there is no agreement from Hound Parish Council. The rationale was that the existing community of Old Netley is an integral part of the community of Bursledon, with residents primarily using services in Bursledon.
 - b. The new developments both North and South of Old Netley are closer to facilities in Bursledon than those in Hound, as are being marketed as 'Bursledon'. Hamble Lane is a firm boundary on the ground, but it could equally be argued that neighbours living on opposite sides of the road are naturally a community but currently reside in separate parishes.

- 32. **Parish boundary change between Hound and Hamble-le-Rice**
 - a. The proposal was put forward by Hamble-Le-Rice parish council. The rationale was that the current boundary dissects Hamble School Campus, which could be more effectively served if within a single parish. The Blackthorn Surgery also sits just outside the Hamble parish boundary but most residents consider it to be in Hamble.
 - b. The proposal would satisfy all criteria.

- 33. **Parish boundary change between West End and Fair oak and Horton Heath**
 - a. Proposal put forward by Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish council, the rationale is based on the significant new development south of Horton Heath, which will naturally become part of that community. General agreement from West End parish council.
 - b. The proposal would satisfy all criteria.

- 34. **Parish ward changes within Bishopstoke Parish**
 - a. Proposal put forward by Bishopstoke parish council to improve electoral equality within the parish (i.e. more equal ratio of councillor to electors)
 - b. The proposal would satisfy all criteria.

- 35. **Parish ward changes to Hedge End Parish**
 - a. Proposal put forward by Hedge End town Council to achieve a more even distribution across the parish.
 - b. The proposal would satisfy all criteria.

36. **Polling district changes to West End Parish**
a. The proposal would satisfy criteria.

Financial Implications

37. There may be minimal one-off costs relating to the administrative changes required to amend parish boundaries as a result of this review.

Risk Assessment

38. The Borough Council has a responsibility, under its governance arrangements, to ensure that both it and the parish councils within its area are, (in electoral terms), structured and organised appropriately, in order that they can serve the public need as effectively as possible.

Equality and Diversity Implications

39. The Equality Act is not relevant to the decision in this report as the decision does not relate to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, or fostering good relations between different people. An Equality Impact Assessment has not been carried out.

Conclusions

40. The committee is asked to consider the evidence and recommendations in this report and agree the way forward. Ensuring that it will provide clarity and transparency to the areas that parish councils represent and that the electoral arrangements of parishes (specifically ward arrangements and allocations of councillors) are appropriate, equitable and readily understood by their electorate.

Helen Owens
Engagement Specialist

Date: [13 June 2018](#)
Contact Officer: Helen Owens
Tel No:
e-mail: helen.owens@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: [Appendices](#) 1-4, maps illustrating proposed parish boundary changes.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following is a list of documents which disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. This list does not include any published works or documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information: None