



*Working for a brighter future together*

## Corporate Policy Committee

---

**Date of Meeting:** 14 April 2022

**Report Title:** Community Governance Review of Town and Parish Council Governance

**Report of:** Monitoring Officer

**Report Reference No:** CP/63/21-22

**Wards Affected:** All Wards

---

### 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1. To secure a resolution of Council which will finalise the governance arrangements of the town and parish councils within Cheshire East Borough.

### 2. Executive Summary

- 2.1. The attached report seeks resolutions of the Community Governance Review Sub Committee, Corporate Policy Committee, and finally Council, following a Community Governance Review (CGR) of Town and Parish Council Governance.

- 2.2. The report was considered by the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The Sub-Committee resolved as follows:

*That*

1. *the Sub-Committee recommends to the Corporate Policy Committee that the recommendations made in the review of Community Governance, contained in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 to the report, will ensure that:*
  - A. *The proposed community governance arrangements reflect the identities and interests of the community in the Borough of Cheshire East; and*

- B. The proposed community governance arrangements are effective and convenient; and*
2. *in order to minimise unnecessary printing of agenda papers, it will be assumed that all Members of the Corporate Policy Committee, and Council, will rely upon the electronic link to the appendices of the report, and that the appendices will therefore not be printed for each Member; further, that if any Member has a specific need for any part or parts of the appendices to be printed, they will make their own arrangements to print limited sections of the appendices, or request such printed sections to be provided by officers.*

Note: At the Sub-Committee's meeting, Councillor S Edgar, on behalf of the parish councils, asked that the style of the new Weston and Crewe Green council be changed to from 'Community' to 'Parish'. With the agreement of the Sub-Committee, the officers undertook to change the recommendation to Council accordingly.

A number of public speakers and visiting members attended the Sub-Committee's meeting to speak on behalf of parish councils in relation to the recommendations in the report. A summary of the issues raised is appended to this covering report.

In accordance with resolution 2 above, the appendices to the report have not been circulated with this agenda but are available on the agenda web page for this meeting and may be accessed via the links in the report.

### **3. Recommendations**

**It is recommended that the Corporate Policy Committee**

- 1. approve the recommendations of the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee; and**
- 2. approve paragraph 2 of the recommendations in the attached Council report.**

**Summary of the issues raised under public and member speaking at the meeting of the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2022:**

The following is a brief summary of the submissions made.

Councillor Ken Edwards, Bollington Town Council, began by congratulating the officers on what he said was a clear and well organised report. He went on to express his council's disappointment that the report did not recommend the Town Council's proposal that the boundary between Bollington and Rainow be amended to include the settlement at Ingersley Vale within Bollington. He asked that the matter be reviewed as part of the next Cheshire East ward boundary review.

Mr Brian Jones, Tytherington Lane, Bollington, objected to properties in Bollington being transferred to Macclesfield.

Councillor Fiona Wilson, Deputy Mayor of Macclesfield, welcomed the revised recommendations for Macclesfield that the current seating allocation worked well and that a community governance review of the Town Council would be premature.

Councillor Chris Jackson, Chair of Holmes Chapel Parish Council, expressed the council's disappointment that the area comprising the Bluebell Green and Dunkirk Farm residential developments was not to be transferred from Brereton to Holmes Chapel.

Mr Peter Turner, Town Clerk of Crewe Town Council, expressed the council's disappointment that the proposals for Crewe did not address issues of underrepresentation within Crewe or the significant residential developments that had taken place on the outskirts of Crewe outside the town's boundary.

Councillor Roger Dawson, Vice-Chair of Alpraham Parish Council, expressed his council's disappointment that the proposed merger of Alpraham and Calveley did not include the parish of Wardle.

Councillor Andy Lindsay, Chair of Brereton Parish Council, congratulated the Council's officers on what had been a difficult task in dealing with so many consultation inputs. He indicated his council's support for the proposals for Brereton, including the retention of Bluebell Green and Dunkirk Farm within the parish of Brereton and the adjustment of the boundary with Somerford to align with Holmes Chapel Road.

Councillor L Smetham, expressed her support, and that of parishes and residents, for the recommendations relating to parishes within the Gawsworth ward and asked that the Sub-Committee support them. She also asked Democratic Services to consider bringing Dainty Hall back into availability as a polling station for North Rode.

Councillor L Gilbert, disagreed with the proposal not to transfer the area of Bluebell Green and Dunkirk Farm from Brereton to Holmes Chapel and asked the Sub-Committee to support the transfer for reasons of community identity.

Councillor D Murphy, speaking as the Mayor of Congleton, expressed the Town Council's view that all housing and business development on land contained within the new link road should be included within the area of Congleton Town, the link road forming a natural boundary.

Councillor J Clowes began by thanking the Sub-Committee and the officers for their work on the review. She then indicated that with regard to Doddington and District, Hatherton and Walgherton, and Hough and Chorlton parish councils she was satisfied with the recommendations in the report. With regard to the boundary between the parishes of Wybunbury and Shavington, she urged the Sub-Committee to revert to its original proposal that Newcastle Road form the boundary between the two parishes.

Councillor P Findlow supported the proposal to retain the two separate parishes of Over Alderley and Mottram St Andrew. He also asked that the proposal to include the whole of Dumbah Lane within the parish of Prestbury, which was not recommended in the report, be supported for reasons of community cohesion and that the electoral risk referred to in the report as the reason for not supporting the proposal be mitigated.

The Head of Democratic Services and Governance read out a written statement on behalf of Councillor D Marren who was unable to attend the meeting. Councillor Marren had been impressed with the way in which the Sub-Committee and officers had listened to the views of the residents of Shavington cum Gresty and as a result had altered the original proposals as set out in the pre-consultation survey. He felt that the revised proposals now before the Sub-Committee addressed most of his concerns and he felt confident that they would address the concerns of most residents of Shavington cum Gresty Parish. It was therefore his intention to support the recommendations without amendment.

At the conclusion of public and member speaking, officers advised that it was for the Sub-Committee to consider the comments made when considering the report. Officers also advised the Sub-Committee that there were risks in changing recommendations that had already been carefully developed after taking into consideration the guidance, the law and responses to the consultation.

In response to issues raised under public speaking, officers advised that the recommendation for the boundary between Bollington and Macclesfield was to make no changes. With regard to the merger of Alpraham and Calveley, the officers advised that Wardle Parish Council had objected to being included in that merger.