

# Community Governance Review

Date: 28 September 2022  
Agenda Item: 7  
Contact Officer: Mark Hooper, Governance Manager  
Tel Number: 01543 308064  
Email: [Mark.hooper@lichfielddc.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.hooper@lichfielddc.gov.uk)  
Key Decision? NO  
Local Ward All  
Members



## Regulatory & Licensing Committee

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 A community governance review (CGR) is a legal process that provides an opportunity for principal councils to review and make changes to community governance within their areas.
- 1.2 On 14 December 2021 the District Council resolved to undertake a review of the District and launched a consultation exercise (1 February - 25 April 2022).
- 1.3 Draft recommendations, informed by the consultation, were considered by Regulatory and Licensing Committee in June and approved by Full Council on 12 July 2022. These were then subject to a second stage consultation (25 July - 9 September 2022).
- 1.4 The report summarises key issues identified in the second stage consultation with a view to determining the final recommendations.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That consideration be given to the draft Community Governance Review recommendations as set out in section 3.11 below.
- 2.2 That the Committee determine the final recommendations to be submitted to Council for approval.

## 3. Review

- 3.1 On 14 December the District Council agreed that a Community Governance Review (CGR) be conducted for the whole of the district in accordance with Part 4 Chapter 3 of the Local Government Public Involvement and Health (LGPIH) Act 2007.
- 3.2 A community governance review can 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 and parish warding)
  - Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes
  - Other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings

### Consultation (stage 1).

3.3 Between 1 February and 25 April 2022 the Council invited residents and interested organisations to submit their views on existing arrangements and suggest proposals for change.

3.4 A total of 98 Submissions were received together with a 67 signature petition.

### Determining the Draft Recommendations

3.5 An initial assessment identified:

- proposals for change that indicated a degree of community consensus i.e. a critical mass
- proposals for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of existing arrangements.

(subject to the statutory guidance tests outlined at 3.6 and 3.7).

3.6 In arriving at recommendations a 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

3.7 Governance arrangements should also aim to be:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- effective and convenient

3.8 Any other factors, such as council tax precept such levels, cannot be considered.

### The Draft Recommendations & Stage 2 Consultation

3.9 Following consideration by Regulatory & Licensing Committee Draft Recommendations were approved by Council on 12 July 2022. These were then subject to a stage 2 consultation.

### Final Recommendations

3.11 The tables below set out the draft recommendations, an overview of the stage 2 consultation response and draft final recommendations for consideration by the Committee.

#### A. Fradley & Streethay Parish Council

| Draft Recommendation  | Consultation overview  | Final Recommendation (changes in bold)  |
|---|--|---|
| <b>A1.</b> Fradley and Streethay Parish be split into:<br><br>(i) Fradley Parish<br><br>(ii) Streethay Parish | There was support for splitting the Parish into two separate parishes.<br><br>Therefore it is proposed that this recommendation be made final. | <b>A1.</b> Fradley and Streethay Parish be split into:<br><br>(i) Fradley Parish<br><br>(ii) Streethay Parish |

| Draft Recommendation   | Consultation overview  | Final Recommendation<br>(changes in bold)  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>A2.</b> That the following governance arrangements be put in place:</p> <p>(i) Fradley Parish Council comprising 9 councillors</p> <p>(ii) Streethay Parish Council comprising 5 councillors</p> | <p>Comments centred on the most appropriate size of the respective Councils.</p> <p><u>Streethay</u><br/>Concern was raised that five councillors is not sufficient for Streethay Parish Council given that a minimum quorum of 3 is required (therefore if there are 3 or more apologies for absence a meeting cannot proceed).</p> <p><u>Fradley</u><br/>The Parish Clerk advised that at current levels of activity and involvement, Fradley Parish Council would function better with 10 Councillors.<br/>Two other consultation responses suggested an increased level or representation. One response questioned the ability to find enough suitable candidates.</p> | <p><b>A2.</b> That the following governance arrangements be put in place:</p> <p>(i) Fradley Parish Council comprising <b>10 councillors</b>.</p> <p>(ii) Streethay Parish Council comprising <b>7 councillors</b></p> |

Further details are given at **Appendix B**.

## **B. LICHFIELD CITY**

| Draft Recommendation  | Consultation overview          | Final Recommendation<br>(changes in bold)   |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>B1.</b> Garrick Road Ward be incorporated into Chadsmead Ward.<br/>Chadsmead Ward to comprise 4 Councillors<br/>(-1 councillor)</p> | <p>No objections received.</p> | <p><b>B1.</b> Garrick Road Ward be incorporated into Chadsmead Ward.<br/>Chadsmead Ward to comprise 4 Councillors</p> |
| <p><b>B2.</b> Burton Old Road Ward be incorporated into Stowe Ward.<br/>Stowe Ward to comprise 5 Councillors<br/>(-)</p>                  | <p>No objections received</p>  | <p><b>B2.</b> Burton Old Road Ward be incorporated into Stowe Ward.<br/>Stowe Ward to comprise 5 Councillors</p>      |

|  |                        |   |
|--|------------------------|---|
| <b>B3.</b> Pentire Road Ward be incorporated into Boley Park Ward.<br>Boley Park Ward to comprise 4 Councillors<br>(-) | No objections received | <b>B3.</b> Pentire Road Ward be incorporated into Boley Park Ward.<br>Boley Park Ward to comprise 4 Councillors |
|--|------------------------|---|

In line with the recommendations of Council on 12 July 2022 views were also sought on expanding the above recommendations to further address the variation in the ratio of electors to councillors in the remaining three wards in Lichfield city:

| <b>Additional Proposal</b>   | <b>Consultation overview</b>   | <b>Final Recommendation (changes in bold)</b>             |
|--|--|---|
| <b>B4.</b> Curborough ward be increased to 4 councillors.<br>(+1 councillor) | This proposal was formerly supported by Lichfield City Council   | <b>B4.</b> Curborough ward be increased to 4 councillors. |
| <b>B5.</b> St Johns ward be decreased to 5 councillors<br>(-1 councillor)    | Lichfield City Council requested the retention of 6 members in St Johns ward due to the ongoing development in that ward.<br><br>One respondent favoured the option for 5 members. | <b>B5. St Johns ward to remain at 6 councillors.</b>      |
| <b>B6.</b> Leomansley ward be increased to 6 councillors<br>(+1 councillor)  | This proposal was formerly supported by Lichfield City Council   | <b>B6.</b> Leomansley ward be increased to 6 councillors  |

The final recommendations as set out above **would increase the overall membership of the City Council from 28 to 29 members** (the original proposal reduced it to 27 and the expanded proposal would have kept it the same).

Although the original recommendations sought to avoid increasing councillor numbers there is currently no difficulty in filling vacancies on the Council.

Given that the City Council is best placed to determine the governance arrangements that will work for itself the recommendation has been amended accordingly. Details of the proposal are given at **Appendix B**.

## C. LONGDON PARISH

| Additional Proposal  | Consultation overview   | Final Recommendation   |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| C1. That Longdon Parish Council be reduced from 11 councillors to 9 councillors. | No objections received. | C2. That Longdon Parish Council be reduced from 11 councillors to 9 councillors. |

## D. Shenstone Parish Council

Regulatory and Licensing Committee and Council have previously recommended that Shenstone remain unchanged. The four consultation responses received on the subject supported the decision.

### Next Steps/Review Timetable

- 3.12 The final recommendations will be submitted to Council in October 2022 with a view to publishing an Order by December 2022.
- 3.13 It is intended that changes will take effect in time for the elections in May 2023.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Alternative Options                                | A community governance review is a statutory obligation of the district Council, we can delay undertaking one, however there are advantages in undertaking this review before the next District and Parish elections in 2023 or before one is invoked by request from the electorate. |
| Consultation                                       | The Community Governance Review is discussed extensively with key stakeholders and residents during 2 cycles of consultation.   |
| Financial Implications                             | None arising from this report. A one off reserve has been provided to support any advertising, bookings or other costs associated with the review.  |
| Approved by Section 151 Officer                    | Yes   |
| Legal Implications                                 | The process is detailed in Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and advice on best practice and training has been sought from Association of Electoral Administrators to support this project.  |
| Approved by Monitoring Officer                     | Yes   |
| Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan | This project supports the development of strong, sustainable communities with participation in decision making in respect of the governance arrangements of parish councils.  |
| Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications  | None identified at this stage.  |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Crime & Safety Issues            | None identified at this stage.               |
| Environmental Impact             | None identified at this stage.               |
| GDPR / Privacy Impact Assessment | Residents' names and addresses are redacted. |

|   | Risk Description & Risk Owner  | Original Score (RYG)             | How We Manage It   | Current Score (RYG)              |
|---|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| A | Consultation is not undertaken in line with requirements of Act - HOS              | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY | Training and advice sought from AEA  | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY |
| B | There is a negative reaction to the draft recommendations in one or more parishes. | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY | Messaging will make it clear that the recommendations are draft proposals and no decision has been taken. The second stage consultation will consider representations for and against the draft recommendations. | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY |
| C | That review creates additional work across council services                        | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY | That a project team is established to feed in and manage the work generated by the review and any decision.  | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY |
| D | Insufficient capacity to support level of consultation and considerations.         | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY | Additional temporary resources have been put in place - risks around project team member availability due to other projects are managed  | LIKELIHOOD<br>IMPACT<br>SEVERITY |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b>Background documents &amp; Relevant web links</b></p> <p>Report to Regulatory &amp; Licensing Committee (including Consultation Stage 1 Responses) on 20 June 2022:<br/> <a href="https://democracy.lichfielddc.gov.uk/documents/s13058/Draft%20RL%20Report%20-%20Community%20Governance%20Review.pdf">https://democracy.lichfielddc.gov.uk/documents/s13058/Draft%20RL%20Report%20-%20Community%20Governance%20Review.pdf</a></p> <p>Report to Council 12 July 2022 on the Draft Recommendations -<br/> <a href="https://democracy.lichfielddc.gov.uk/documents/s12970/Community%20Governance%20Report.pdf">https://democracy.lichfielddc.gov.uk/documents/s12970/Community%20Governance%20Report.pdf</a></p> |
|--|--|

# Community Governance Review

| Reference                 | Parish                | Consultation Response  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 308265                    | Fradley and Streethay | "As a fairly new Fradley resident (since October last year), I think the proposal that the "village" has its own parish makes absolute sense - perhaps this will lead in the creation of better facilities for the ever-increasing local population, eg our own pub and/or restaurant. My main concern, after attending a very poorly-attended combined parish meeting earlier this year, would be the ability to find 9 suitable councillors."  |
| 309276                    | Fradley and Streethay | "I wholly support separating Fradley and Streethay into two separate parishes. Fradley is becoming a very large village and should have its own Parish Council. Fradley and Streethay are two separate, distinct settlements, and should no longer have one Parish Council representing both. In terms of the number of councillors for Fradley, please note that Fradley is growing rapidly with new houses being built by the day. Therefore, the number of councillors allocated to Fradley should look towards the future size of Fradley and reflect how large Fradley will soon become."   |
| Email response<br>31/7/22 | Fradley and Streethay | <p>"I support the proposed creation of a new Streethay Parish Council.</p> <p>However, I would suggest that the new parish council should have at least 6 (and preferably 7) members. With the exception of Clifton Campville, every other parish unit in Lichfield District has more than 5 members. Several parish councils in the District have 6 or 7 members, but those all have significantly lower populations than Streethay – and the population of Streethay is set to increase still further with new development. 5 members would provide too little representation for the population of the Streethay parish.</p> <p>If there were only 5 members, this would also present practical difficulties in achieving a quorum for meetings. The quorum for a parish council is one third of the members, but with a minimum quorum of 3 [LGA 1972 Sch. 12 Part II para. 12]. So if the new council has only 5 members it will not be quorate if more than 2 members are absent, and it will require a 60% attendance to be quorate. The likelihood of having at least 3 members present will increase if the council has more than 5 members.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposal for 5 members is because it provides a similar member/elector ratio to the proposed new Fradley Parish Council, but that is irrelevant. Once the current parish is split into two new parishes then each will be independent, and the main consideration must be the viability of each new council on its own – which will best be achieved for Streethay by having more than 5 members."</p> |
| 314497                    | Fradley and Streethay | "Agree with the proposed. HS2 will effectively separate Streethay from Fradley providing a clear demarcation of the two entities. Streethay has more affinity with the City of Lichfield particularly having a chancel provision in the title deeds. It also needs to remain within Lichfield for parliamentary boundaries in future (not Tamworth!)"  |

|   |                       |  |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| <b>317437</b>   | Fradley and Streethay | "I support the recommendation to split the parishes of Fradley and Streethay, so that Fradley has its own separate parish. However, I would ask that you consider increasing the number of councillors for Fradley, given its current and future expansion. Proportionate representation is important and compared to some other areas in the Lichfield District Fradley will be under-represented."   |
| <b>312681</b><br><b>Tony Briggs,</b><br><b>Lichfield City</b><br><b>Council Clerk</b> | Lichfield City        | "At its July meeting, the City Council resolved to support 'option b' in relation to arrangements for Lichfield City BUT with the retention of 6 Councillors in St John's Ward due to the ongoing development in that ward. The City Council's preferred arrangements are shown below, with changes to number of Councillors shown in brackets. If you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me. • Boley Park incorporating Pentire Road: 4 Councillors (0) • Chadsmead incorporating Garrick Road: 4 Councillors (-1) • Curborough: 4 Councillors (+1) • Leomansley: 6 councillors (+1) • St John's: 6 Councillors (0) • Stowe incorporating Burton Old Road: 5 Councillors (0)" |
| <b>317480</b>   | Lichfield City        | "I think it a pity that the response does not address the issue of whether the best interests of the people of Lichfield City would not be better served by the total abolition of the Parish Council. There are three tiers of local government here, and they all demand money from the residents. To me, it is often difficult to understand what purpose is served by the "lowest" tier in a concentrated urban area well served by District Councillors and their staff."   |
| <b>318411</b>   | Lichfield City        | "I agree with 4 City Councillors for the Curborough Ward, 5 for St. John's, but would support 6 for Leomansley. I agree with all the other proposals "   |
| <b>318611</b>   | Lichfield City        | "I would like to support your additional recommendations for varying the numbers of Councillors in Curborough, St John's and Leomansley to create more equal ratios of voters to Councillors across the city. I feel this is a democratic priority and also helps prepare for the impact of the new housing developments in south Lichfield."  |
| <b>318488</b>   | Shenstone             | "There will be no benefit to Stonnall not being part of Shenstone Parish Council. The present arrangement works well for us."  |



|        |           |   |
|--------|-----------|---|
| 319499 | Shenstone | <p>"The consultation mentions a petition. I was not aware of any such petition (at the time) and can only deduce that it was circulated within one or more of the village interest groups. Assuming, of course, that all signatories were from the village. I understand the petition was topped with a header suggesting that the Parish Council was the source, thereby giving a false impression that they would be in favour. The header also went on to say that "For some time, many residents have felt the time has come . . ." which is a wholly subjective phrase. Did all 67 signatories have the exact same feelings? It is one thing to sit down and compose an individually written submission via the LDC submission portal, and quite another to sign a petition that is put in front of you. I think it's unfair that these two things should be given equal standing. There is nothing quite as divisive than a petition of this sort being circulated amongst a closed group in order to affect the whole. I hope and trust you will look into this for future consultations I am glad, and somewhat relieved, that the recommendation by LDC is that the Parish Council remains unchanged."</p> |
| 320571 | Shenstone | <p>"In my opinion there would be too great a financial penalty to pay if Stonnall and Lyn were to become an independent council. Shenstone parish should remain unchanged."</p>   |
| 320868 | Shenstone | <p>"I would like Shenstone Parish to remain unchanged. Any possible, potential financial and organisational benefits to Stonnall and Lynn becoming independent, would, I feel, be far outweighed by the increased costs in many areas and services."</p>  |

**APPENDIX B**

**Fradley & Streethay**

| <b>Polling Districts</b> | <b>Councillors</b> | <b>Electors - 2026</b> | <b>Electors per Councillor</b> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Fradley</b>           | 10                 |                        | 289                            |
| AB                       |                    | 1984                   |                                |
| AC                       |                    | 909                    |                                |
|                          |                    |                        |                                |
|                          | Total              | <b>2893</b>            |                                |
|                          |                    |                        |                                |
|                          |                    |                        |                                |
| <b>Streethay</b>         | 7                  |                        | 239                            |
| AD                       |                    | 1676                   |                                |
|                          |                    |                        |                                |
|                          | Total              | <b>1676</b>            |                                |

Lichfield City Council

PROPOSED

| Ward (& polling Districts)                 | Councillors | Electors     | Electors per Councillor |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Boley Park</b> (including Pentire Road) | 4           |              | 849                     |
| RA   |             | 1318         |                         |
| RB   |             | 980          |                         |
| RC   |             | 603          |                         |
| RB1  |             | 497          |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             | <b>3398</b>  |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
| <b>Chadsmead</b> (including Garrick)       | 4           |              | 825                     |
| RE   |             | 1,108        |                         |
| RF   |             | 889          |                         |
| RG   |             | 534          |                         |
| RK   |             | 467          |                         |
| RG1  |             | 302          |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             | <b>3,300</b> |                         |
| <b>Curborough</b>                          | 4           |              | 835                     |
| RH   |             | 1426         |                         |
| RJ   |             | 1915         |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             | <b>3341</b>  |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
| <b>Leamonsley</b>                          | 6           |              | 937                     |
| RL   |             | 1203         |                         |
| RM1  |             | 941          |                         |
| RM2  |             | 1156         |                         |
| RN1  |             | 1097         |                         |
| RN2  |             | 1224         |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             | <b>5621</b>  |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
| <b>St John's</b>                           | 6           |              | 782                     |
| RP   |             | 1040         |                         |
| RQ   |             | 2304         |                         |
| RR   |             | 1350         |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |
|  |             | <b>4694</b>  |                         |
|  |             |              |                         |

|  |   |             |     |
|--|---|-------------|-----|
| <b>Stowe</b> (including Burton Old Road) | 5 |             | 985 |
| RS                                       |   | 844         |     |
| RT                                       |   | 1156        |     |
| RU                                       |   | 214         |     |
| RW                                       |   | 414         |     |
| RX                                       |   | 1439        |     |
| RD                                       |   | 860         |     |
|  |   |             |     |
|  |   | <b>4927</b> |     |