

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	1st July, 2009
3.	Title:	Parish Review/Community Governance Review
4.	Directorate:	Chief Executives Directorate

5. Summary

The report informs Cabinet of the outcome of phase two of the review and sets out the process for issuing the draft recommendations for final public consultation and concluding the review through recommendations to Council and the Electoral Commission.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

6.1 Recommend that the Council agrees the draft recommendations proposed by the Officer and Member Working Group as set out and explained in Appendix 1 to this report.

6.2 Recommend that the Council agrees to the issuing of the draft recommendations for public consultation and specific consultation with all those affected by the recommendations.

6.3 Agree to refer the report to Scrutiny for comment.

6.4 Receive the final review recommendations in September 2009 prior to submission to Council and the Electoral Commission.

7. Proposals and Details

The report sets out the context, scope, arrangements, timescales, and phase two outcomes for the review of Parish boundaries and makes proposals for concluding the review.

7.1 Background - reasons for the review

The review is of the whole borough which comprises both parished and unparished areas. There are 29 parishes with 26 parish councils.

The Council has a duty to keep under review the arrangements of its parishes. The last review was undertaken over 20 years ago and since then there has been significant new development and population movement across the borough which may mean that local identities have changed.

Also as part of the periodic electoral review concluded in 2004 there were changes made to parish wards where parts of the parish were included in more than one of the Borough wards. This has created anomalies in parish boundaries and a review was necessary to address these. Additionally the Council has received on a reasonably regular basis requests from parish councils and other interested bodies to undertake such a review.

The main aim of the review was to ensure that parish boundaries continue to reflect the identities and interests of the communities they serve, are meaningful, and facilitate the delivery of effective and convenient services. The review covered the whole of the borough, whether currently parished or not. However, it was intended that the review should also cover more fundamental issues such as whether parishes should be created in parts of the borough which do not presently have them, whether current parish boundaries should be altered other than merely to address anomalies, whether existing parishes might be amalgamated, or whether new parishes might be created from within existing parishes.

7.2 The Council's legal position and decision making powers

The Parish review took place under the provisions of section 9 of the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 (the 1997 Act). Since the review started in September 2007 the 1997 Act has been repealed by Part 4 Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act). The 2007 Act contains a revised set of provisions for what are known as "Community Governance Reviews". These will replace the current provisions in the 1997 Act for carrying out Parish Reviews.

The 2007 Act devolves the Secretary of State's and the Electoral Commission's decision-making powers to principal councils for community governance (parish) review and petition cases which were previously made under the 1997 Act. This means that the power to make changes to parish boundaries is now vested in the Council. The Council will no longer be

required submit proposals to the Secretary of State; instead the Council would be able to make an order bringing the proposals into force, although the Electoral Commission would still have to be consulted about changes to electoral arrangements.

The Council can recommend the creation of new parish councils under the 2007 Act. Government guidance suggests that a parish should reflect a distinctive and recognisable community of interest with its own sense of identity. Any proposals must also have regard to the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and to secure effective and convenient local government.

It should be noted that the following parish councils have protected electoral arrangements which were put in place by SI 2004 No. 123 "Local Government, England. The Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2004." And changes may not be made without the approval of the Electoral Commission for a period of 5 years from 15 October 2006. Any recommendations which affect these councils must first receive approval from the Electoral Commission.

- Aston-cum-Aughton
- Bramley
- Dalton
- Maltby
- Thrybergh
- Thurcroft
- Wickersley

If the review determines that a consequential change to any borough ward boundary should be recommended, a case would have to be made to the Electoral Commission who would consider whether or not to make the change but would require reasoned arguments and evidence of the need for change.

The Electoral Commission has said that a minimum period of 2-3 months is required for its response to any such requests.

7.3 Summary of phase one

Preliminary consultation began in October 2007 with a view to completing the review within 18 months/two years. The initial consultation period was to end by 31 January 2008 but this was extended to allow additional responses and to await confirmation of the legal situation as there was a transition period between the repeal of the 1997 Act and the vesting of powers on the Council under the 2007 Act. Phase one was thus effectively concluded prior to the May 2008 Council elections.

A significant number of responses were received comprising emails, phone calls, letters, petitions, surveys, and minutes of public and parish meetings. Responses have included proposals to create parishes in parts of the borough which are presently unparished (e.g. in Thorpe Hesley and Scholes), and also

to remove areas from existing parishes, either so as to become unparished (e.g. Hooper extracted from Brampton Brierlow Parish), or to create a wholly new parish (e.g. New Laughton Common splitting from Thurcroft Parish and Hellaby from Bramley Parish).

There were other less significant proposals, to amend boundaries or rectify anomalies. For example Treeton Parish Council is proposing its boundary is aligned to follow the River Rother to give a more natural definition to the parish. Similarly Catcliffe Parish Council is proposing changes that will not affect residential property but aligns the boundary with permanent features like rivers, roads, and railway lines.

A number of parishes requested that no changes were made within their boundaries, for example, the parishes of Harthill with Woodall Parish, and Aston-cum-Aughton.

7.4 Phase two consultation

Following receipt of the above initial submissions the Member and Officer Working Group sought clarification of these proposals.

The Member and Officer Working Group met on a number of occasions to consider various proposals on the future make up of parish boundaries across the Borough. This has included consideration of the electoral arrangements and the practicalities of making changes in a timely manner that corresponds with Electoral Commission and Local Taxation requirements. Interviews have taken place with the proposer and letters sent out to parishes where potential changes were proposed. Where proposals were unclear separate meetings between officers and community representatives have also taken place to clarify matters, for example, where boundaries should be drawn. Additionally, where necessary Area Partnership managers have brought parties together with a view to determining boundary changes through agreement and consensus.

In order to move matters forward the Member and Officer Working Group recommends that final consultation proposals are drawn up based on the information currently available and these be issued as the outcome of phase two. The purpose of this approach is to put the issues in the public domain, to draw out any and all opinions for and against the proposals, and allow the Council to carry out the final consultation necessary to draw up a draft order by autumn 2009. Lead in time of at least 6 months is needed to enable Local Taxation to alter the Council Tax register and a period of 2/3 months is required by the Electoral Commission to comment on any consequential change to any borough ward boundary.

7.5 Phase 3 - Concluding the review and implementation of recommendations

At the end of phase three the Council must produce a final report with recommendations and again copies must be deposited and persons interested notified.

The timetable for concluding the review is as follows:

June 2009	Report submitted to CMT and Cabinet
July 2009	Draft recommendations issued for final public consultation (to include notice to: Electoral Commission, Scrutiny, all Borough Councillors, all Parish Councils, all proposers and those who made submissions at either phase 1 or 2 and others who are affected by the recommendations).
September 2009	End of phase 3.
October 2009	Submission of final report to Cabinet and Council for decision, and Electoral Commission outlining final proposals.

The recommendations which the Council could make following the review are for:

- (a) The constitution of new parishes. This might include the establishment as a parish of any area which is presently not a parish or part of one. It could also include the aggregation of such an area with one or more existing parishes or parts of parishes, the amalgamation of two or more parishes or the separation of part of any parish;
- (b) The abolition of a parish, with or without the distribution of its area among other parishes; or
- (c) The alteration of the area of a parish.

If the Council makes any recommendation for the constitution of a new parish, they must include recommendations for the establishment of a new parish council. However, if the population of the new parish recommended would include fewer than 200 local government electors, the Council is not obliged to recommend the creation of a new parish council for that area, although it may do so.

If the Council makes a recommendation for the alteration of the area of a parish which has a parish council, they may make proposals to the Electoral Commission for changes to the electoral arrangements for that parish council.

8. Finance

No specific financial implications arise from this report. However there may be implications arising from the aggregation and disaggregation of assets (finance and property) where the boundary of a parish changes resulting in the transfer, or disposal of assets. Further guidance and advice will be sought from DCLG and Yorkshire Local Councils Association and the Electoral Commission.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The phase one submissions indicate a number of parishes where the proposals are in conflict or contradictory and so there is risk that a local amicable solution will not be possible and the Council will have to reach a decision. There is always a risk that any newly created parish may not be sustainable or be able to attract local people to serve as councillors. To mitigate and manage these risks support and guidance is available from Yorkshire Local Councils Association, the Council, and the local Parish Network.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Parish councils play an important part in engaging with local people and providing local leadership. The Local Government White Paper includes proposals aimed at extending and deepening parish governance, including a presumption in favour of creating parishes where communities requested them.

At a local level, supporting and enhancing the role and function of parish councils is a high priority for the Borough Council, as reflected in key plans and strategies such as the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan and the RMBC/Parish Charter.

An equality impact assessment will be completed as part of the finalisation of any recommendations arising from the review.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Review of Parish Boundaries, Report to CMT – 30 June 2008

Parish Boundary/Community Governance Review Phase Two –

- Recommendations, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009.
- Parish Warding, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009.
- Guidance on Community Governance Reviews, Report to Member Working Party – 04 March 2009

The Local Government and Rating Act 1997.

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

DCLG guidance and circulars available at www.communities.gov.uk

Contact Name/s:

Tim Mumford, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services),
RMBC, ext 3500, tim.mumford@rotherham.gov.uk

Zafar Saleem, Community Engagement & Cohesion Manager, RMBC, ext.
2757 and email, zafar.saleem@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1**All Parish Councils - Recommendations by the Member and Officer Working Party****1. Anston Parish Council**

No proposals affecting Anston Parish Council have been received except that at the request of the working group, Electoral Services reported on Parish Council warding arrangements in a report dated 4 March 2009 and this resulted in a recommendation for the warding of Anston Parish Council.

Anston Parish Council's current arrangement:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters Per Member
Anston	AA, AB, AC, AD, AE	7376	15	491

Proposal:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters Per Member
Anston North	AA, AB, AC	5400	11	490
Anston South	AD, AE	1976	4	494

2. Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council

The Parish Council submitted a proposal that no changes be made to their boundaries or electoral arrangements. A proposal from Orgreave Parish Council which is supported in this report makes a slight amendment to the western boundary but affects no residential properties. Aston-cum-Aughton PC has not responded to requests for comments on the Orgreave proposal.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

It is recommended that the western boundary be redrawn in line with the Orgreave proposal at

3. Bramley Parish Council

It is recommended that the boundary of Bramley Parish is enlarged through the transfer of properties from the area known as The Lings (off Flash lane) together with all of the adjoining roads, i.e. Sexton Drive, Temple Crescent, Wood Lane etc.

Wadsworth Road would also be included in the transfer to avoid the few voters at these properties making a lengthy and inconvenient trip to the polling station.

As a result in the polling district Wickersley (EA) the following properties would be transferred to polling district Bramley (EB): 46 – 52 Holmes Road; Sexton Drive; 15 – 35 Temple Crescent; 20 – 38 Temple Crescent; 113 – 119; Wadsworth Road; 90 – 96 Wadsworth Road; 85 – 105 Wood Lane; and 76 – 106 Wood Lane.

It is further recommended that as a result of the recommendation at to create a Hellaby Parish Council, the representation level of the South Ward be reduced by two seats.

Other proposals made by Bramley Parish Council are not supported because they would require changes by the Electoral Commission to Borough Ward boundaries and no evidence supporting the need for change has been submitted.

4. Brampton Bierlow Parish Council

Conflicting proposals were submitted but effective consultation has not been demonstrated. Some consultation on a suggestion to remove Hooper polling district from the Parish Council was carried out but did not appear to address the question of whether the area should become part of Wentworth Parish Council or become unparished.

Government guidance on Community Governance reviews states that a trend in creation rather than abolition of parish councils is expected and the working group is not able to support a proposal that would leave residents without a parish council if they had previously been represented by one.

Consequently, it is recommended that current boundaries be maintained unless in response to a specific, targeted consultation exercise; overwhelming support is demonstrated for an alternative recommendation i.e. to re-draw the Brampton Bierlow southern boundary along the northern boundary of Hooper (GB) polling district so that the whole of that polling district becomes part of Wentworth Parish Council.

It is further recommended that such targeted and specific consultation be undertaken by RMBC to include Wentworth Parish Council, Brampton Bierlow Parish Council and all households in Hooper polling district.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change as a result of either recommendation.

5. Brinsworth Parish Council

It is recommended that current boundaries are maintained. Brinsworth Parish Council submitted proposals for change which cannot be supported. Proposals involve transferring a currently unparished area into Brinsworth Parish but with no evidence of public support or of the need for the change and taking properties currently within Sheffield City Council boundary over which Rotherham MBC has no jurisdiction.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

6. Catcliffe Parish Council

It is recommended that current boundaries are maintained.

Catcliffe Parish Council submitted proposals for change which cannot be supported because they would require Electoral Commission changes to Borough Ward boundaries with no apparent reason, involve Sheffield City Council's boundaries and conflict with Brinsworth Parish Council and the two Parish Councils have been unable to reach agreement.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements at present.

However, it is noted that the Waverley Development is proposed in this area and significant change will take place over the mid to long term.

It is further recommended that the area be kept under review as the scheme develops and that a local governance review for this area be conducted after a period of five years.

7. Dalton Parish Council

It is recommended that the following changes are made to the boundary of Dalton Parish.

- Polling District QA (Whinney Hill) – the transfer of properties at: 1 – 47 Chesterhill Avenue; 2 – 22 Chesterhill Avenue; and 132 – 146 Oldgate Lane from Thrybergh Parish to Dalton Parish.

Comments received from Thrybergh Parish Council do not support this proposal but the working group considers that the proposal accords with the desired outcomes of the review.

- Polling Districts TA (Marcliffe) and TB (Flanderwell) – this would involve transferring areas of Dalton Parish to Wickersley Parish. Polling districts TA and TB would be transferred into Polling District TE (Northfield) which

forms the North Ward of the Wickersley Parish. All properties in Polling District TA would be transferred together with Aireton Close; 2 – 76 Fleming Way; 77 – 103 Green Lane; 82 – 104 Green Lane; 2 – 14 Markfield Drive; 119 – 137 Northfield Lane; 106 – 128 Northfield Lane; and Riding Close.

Comments received from Wickersley Parish Council indicate that this proposal is supported by them.

Dalton Parish Council also proposed a change which involves taking in a previously unparished area of East Herringthorpe. The council has since submitted the result of a consultation exercise but without details of what information was provided to householders and with apparently only one question being asked of residents.

The working group does not consider the response rate of 6.2% of which 61% appear to be in support to be sufficient evidence to recommend this change.

8. Dinnington St. John's Town Council

The council has not submitted any proposals for change but supported proposals at Woodsetts and Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Councils will result in minimal changes to its boundaries. The town council has supported these.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

9. Firbeck Parish Council

No proposals affecting Firbeck Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

10. Harthill with Woodall Parish Council

No proposals affecting Harthill-with-Woodall Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

11. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Hellaby

It is recommended that a new parish for the area of Hellaby is created through disaggregation of the existing polling district EC (Hellaby) from Bramley Parish Council. The boundary would be the existing polling district EC with one modification to enable the properties at Sandy Lane Farm and Brandon in polling district EB (Flash Lane) to remain in Bramley Parish as this is more convenient for the voters.

Evidence of popular support for a new parish council for Hellaby has been demonstrated and no response to requests for comment has been received from Bramley Parish Council.

The new parish council would take approximately 700 electors from Bramley Parish Council (South Ward). There are currently 6 members of the South Ward representing the current electorate of 1900; a representation level of 1 member for 316 electors.

It is further recommended that membership of Bramley South Ward is reduced to 4 and that the new Hellaby Parish Council has the legal minimum membership level of 5 seats.

12. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Laughton Common

Evidence of popular support for a new parish council for Laughton Common has been demonstrated and appears to outweigh the subsequent support for the opposite view.

It is recommended that a new parish for Laughton Common is created through the disaggregation of South Ward from Thurcroft Parish. The boundary would encompass the whole of the South Ward. The South Ward of Thurcroft Parish Council currently has 3 seats and approximately 1000 electors and the North Ward has 3900 electors and 15 seats.

It is further recommended that Thurcroft Parish Council becomes an unwarded Parish Council with 15 members and that the new Laughton Common Parish Council has the minimum legal membership level of 5 seats.

13. Laughton-en-le- Morthen Parish Council

It is recommended that the following change, which was suggested by Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Council and agreed by Dinnington St John's Town Council, is made to the parish boundaries:

In polling district DD (Lordens) the following properties Sunnyside Cottage, The Annexe Sunnyside Cottage, The Barn and St John's Cottage on St. John's Road be transferred from Dinnington Parish to Laughton en le Morthen Parish.

The Parish Council also submitted two proposals which cannot be supported because they would require Electoral Commission changes to Borough Ward Boundaries and no evidence of need or of support for change was included.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for changes to electoral arrangements.

14. Letwell Parish Council

No proposals affecting Letwell Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

15. Maltby Town Council

No proposals were received affecting Maltby Town Council during Phase 1 and 2 but Electoral Services recommended changes to warding arrangements in the report dated 4 March 2009.

The following changes to warding arrangements are recommended:

Maltby Town Council's current arrangement:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters per Member
Maltby East	IA, IB, IC, ID, IE, IF, IG	8989	13	691
Maltby West	ED	3726	5	745

Proposal:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters per Member
Maltby North	IA, IC	3167	5	633
Maltby East	IE, IF, IG	3993	5	798
Maltby South	IB, ID	1829	3	609
Maltby West	ED	3726	5	745

It should be noted, however, that a document signed by 30 electors of the Town Council and dated 1 June 2009 has been submitted to Tim Mumford, Head of Legal & Democratic Services. The document commits to provision of the "necessary petition within the next month so that RMBC can promptly

organise a Community Governance Review”. The aim of the correspondents appears to be the eventual dissolution of the Town Council.

16. Orgreave Parish Council

It is recommended that the boundary between Orgreave Parish and Treeton Parish is realigned along the Orgreave side of the River Rother so that the river forms the natural boundary between the two parishes; no residential properties are affected and it is wholly contained within the Rother Vale Borough Ward.

The proposal was submitted by Orgreave and is supported by Treeton Parish Council. It would also affect a boundary of Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council and no response has been received to a request for Aston-cum-Aughton to comment.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels and no need for change to electoral arrangements.

17. Ravenfield Parish Council

No proposals affecting Ravenfield Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

18. Proposal for a New Parish Council for Thorpe Hesley

It is recommended that detailed and targeted consultation be carried out with the residents of Thorpe Hesley as to the level of support for a parish council since there appears to be anecdotal evidence of support following public meetings but no documented evidence.

Subject to the outcome of this consultation, it is recommended that a new parish for Thorpe Hesley is created with proposed boundary comprising polling district HA (Thorpe Hesley) and part polling district HF (Keppel).

Proposed electoral arrangements for a newly created (unwarded) parish:

	Number of Electors	Members	Voters per member
Polling District HA (Thorpe Hesley)	2795	11	329
Part of Polling District HF (Keppel)	832		
Total	3627	11	329

19. Thorpe Salvin Parish Council

No proposals affecting Thorpe Salvin Parish Council have been received. Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

20. Thrybergh Parish Council

It is recommended that the following changes as suggested by Dalton Parish Council (see 7 above) be made

- Polling District QA (Whinney Hill) – the transfer of properties at: 1 – 47 Chesterhill Avenue; 2 – 22 Chesterhill Avenue; and 132 – 146 Oldgate Lane from Thrybergh Parish to Dalton Parish.

Comments received from Thrybergh Parish Council do not support this proposal but the working group considers that it does accord with the desired outcomes of the review.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

21. Thurcroft Parish Council

Thurcroft Parish Council did not submit any proposals for change but opposed the suggestion of a new Laughton Common Parish Council.

Recommendations are as at 12 above.

22. Todwick Parish Council

No proposals affecting Todwick Parish Council have been received although an early telephone call from the Parish Clerk indicated that proposals would follow. These were never received and no comment has since been made.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

23. Treeton Parish Council

It is recommended to make a series of minor changes to the Treeton/Orgreave Parish boundary to give more defined lines around the

village and which do not affect any residential properties. The proposed boundary of the parish to follow the River Rother more naturally rather than cross it forwards and backwards which is the case currently.

Other proposals submitted by Treeton Parish Council cannot be supported because they would require changes to Borough Ward Boundaries by the Electoral Commission and no evidence of need or support for the changes has been submitted.

In June 2006 Treeton Parish Council requested an increase of membership from 9 to 10. The request was submitted to Cabinet on 7 June 2006 with a recommendation that it be considered as part of the general review of parishes.

The request has been considered by the group but is not supported since Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels which accord with guidance issued by the National Association of Local Councils. The request was submitted in 2006 but not reiterated as part of the Council's proposals for change submitted to this review.

24. Ulley Parish Council

No proposals affecting Ulley Parish Council have been received.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

25. Wales Parish Council

No proposals for change affecting Wales Parish Council have been received but as a result of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 the following warding arrangements are recommended:

Wales Parish Council's current arrangement:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters per member
Wales	RD, RE, RF	5286	15	352

Proposal:

	Polling Districts	Number of Electors	Number of Members	Voters Per Member
Wales (Kiveton) Park	RE	2304	7	329
Wales (Wales)	RD, RF	2982	8	372

It should be noted that a poll was demanded and held on 18 June 2009 on the question: "Should the Wales Parish Council be dissolved".

The result of the poll was 205 votes for "Yes" and 296 votes for "No". The motion was not carried. Turnout was 9.53%

26. Wentworth Parish Council

Wentworth Parish Council did not submit any proposals for change but one of the alternatives suggested for change to Brampton Bierlow Parish Council at 4 above would see Hooper polling district transferred into Wentworth Parish Council.

See recommendation at 4 above with regard to specific and targeted consultation with Wentworth Parish Council on this issue.

27. Whiston Parish Council

No proposals affecting Whiston Parish Council have been received.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding Report dated 4 March 2009 shows adequate representation levels.

It is recommended that no changes are made to boundaries or electoral arrangements.

28. Wickersley Parish Council

It is recommended that all the following changes are made to the Wickersley parish boundary.

A. The polling district TA (Marcliff) being transferred from Dalton Parish into Wickersley PC; the area is within the Wickersley borough ward and the properties would be transferred to the North ward of Wickersley Parish which is also within the Wickersley borough ward.

B. A number of properties are transferred from Dalton Parish to Wickersley Parish by extending the boundary to encompass Green Lane and Aireton Close then south along Northfield Lane, east along Fleming Way and south along Markfield Drive to join the present boundary with Polling District TE (Northfield). The area is already within the Wickersley borough ward and it would transfer into the North ward of Wickersley PC.

C. The boundary is realigned from a point at number 27 Sycamore Avenue south along Sycamore Avenue, easterly along Blackthorn Avenue, south along Acacia Avenue and east along Pear Tree Avenue to a point adjacent to number 47 Pear Tree Avenue. The proposal would see properties transferred between Wickersley and Bramley Parishes as described below.

- Wickersley (TE) to Bramley Central Ward (TD): properties at 2 – 12 Acacia Avenue; 1 – 11 Blackthorn Avenue; 19 – 31 Linden Avenue; 14 – 28 Linden Avenue; 29 – 47 Pear Tree Avenue; and 86 – 104 Sycamore Avenue.
- Bramley (TD) to Wickersley North Ward (TE): properties at 21 – 35 Acacia Avenue; 38 – 62 Blackthorn Avenue; 1 – 27 Greenwood Crescent; 1 – 7 Rowan Drive; and 2 – 8 Rowan Drive.

D. The boundary is realigned between Wickersley and Bramley parish councils south of Bawtry Road. It is proposed that the boundary from Bawtry Road be continued in a straight line to the rear of properties on Wadsworth Road and then east for a short distance to connect with the present boundary. The boundary would then be drawn to the rear of properties 46 to 52 Holmes Road and then following the western perimeter of properties on Sexton Drive, Temple Crescent and Wood Lane such that these properties would be transferred to Bramley Parish and Polling District (Flash Lane). The changes are wholly within the Hellaby borough ward. Not included in the proposal are properties at the top of Wadsworth Road numbered 90 to 96 and 113 to 119. These properties should also be transferred into Bramley Parish to avoid those electors making a lengthy journey to the polling station in Wickersley. The proposal would see properties transferred between Wickersley and Bramley Parishes as described below.

- Wickersley (EA) to Bramley (EB): properties at: 46 – 52 Holmes Road; Sexton Drive; 15 – 35 Temple Crescent; 20 – 38 Temple Crescent; 113–119 Wadsworth Road; 90 – 96 Wadsworth Road; 85 – 105 Wood Lane; and 76 – 106 Wood Lane.

These suggestions were submitted by Wickersley Parish Council and are supported by Bramley Parish Council.

An additional proposal from Wickersley Parish Council to transfer the Brecks area from Dalton Parish Council to Wickersley Parish Council is not supported as there is no evidence of any consultation or support or need for a change and Dalton Parish Council are opposed to the proposal.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding report dated 4 March 2009 indicates no need for change in membership levels even in the light of the above amendments.

29. Woodsetts Parish Council

It is recommended that the hamlet of California in polling district Dinnington (DE) be transferred to Woodsetts Parish polling district AF which would involve 3 properties on part of Gildingwells Road.

Although this would require an amendment to Borough Ward Boundaries (Anston & Woodsetts and Dinnington) unlike other proposals which would require such amendments, this is likely to meet with Electoral Commission

approval. Comments submitted with the proposal demonstrate good reasons for the change and when viewed on a map, it is evident that the hamlet should form part of the community of Woodsetts and has no apparent connection with the community of Dinnington.

Appendix 1 of the Parish Warding report dated 4 March 2009 indicates no need for change in membership levels even in the light of the above amendments.