

## Barton Seagrave

### **Proposal:**

Barton Seagrave Parish Council has requested a change to a single eight seat parish council. The Parish Council's governance arrangements currently consist of two wards, Seagrave and St Botolphs each of which have 4 seats. The ward boundaries are shown on the plan attached. The respective ward electorate's are 1671 (Seagrave Ward) and 1888 (St Botolphs Ward). The Barton Seagrave Town Council is now of the view that the ward boundary is no longer necessary. The original structure on which the creation of the wards was based is now no longer in force.

**Responses Received:** One response was received from Mr P Baker, a resident of Barton Seagrave

"Should still be 2 wards"

---

## Broughton

### **Proposal:**

Broughton Parish Council has not actively sought a review of its governance arrangements. The records show that it has proved difficult to attract sufficient interest to fill all the seats in recent years. The current number of seats is 11 and it is proposed that this is reduced to a lesser number. There are currently 11 seats on the Broughton Parish Council covering an electorate of 1821.

**Responses Received:** One response was received from Broughton Parish Council

"The issue was considered at the May meeting of the Parish Council and I have been waiting to see if the resolved views of the Council were likely to be revised in light of the extension allowed to the consultation since then. As I have received no further instructions, I think I can do little better than to reproduce below the text of the minute arising from the consideration of that business, which is self-explanatory:

*Arising from 13/6972, members considered how the Parish Council should respond to the pending Community Governance Review being instigated by the Borough Council, which looked to be proposing a reduction in the number of parish councillors for the parish. After some discussion, there was a strong view settled upon that the current number (11) of councillors was appropriate for a community the size of Broughton and any reduction would represent an erosion of democratic opportunity. Accordingly, when comments were submitted, these should press for current arrangements to continue unchanged.*

An additional practical factor that was in the mind of members was that even with a notional 'strength' of 11 councillors comprising the council, the existence of, say, one casual vacancy and two or three apologies for absence at any particular meeting (which is not at all unusual) can result in the potential for the meeting to become inquorate if discussion turns to a matter where any members present are subject to an unanticipated DPI and have to withdraw due to no dispensation having been sought and obtained. A reduction in numbers would, accordingly, significantly increase the likelihood of business transaction being impaired, which members would also want to avoid."

---

### **Burton Latimer**

**Proposal:**

Burton Latimer Town Council has requested that Kettering Borough Council (KBC) consider removing the ward boundary within its area thus creating a single electoral area represented by 12 members rather than two areas represented by 6 members each as is the case at present. The Burton Latimer Town Council is now of the view that the ward boundary is no longer necessary because it creates an artificial demarcation in the town that does not best serve effective and convenient local government, and does not reflect community identity given the size of the town and the lack of discernible unique areas within it.

**Responses Received:** One response was received from Mr P James, a resident of Burton Latimer

"Please get rid of the Parish / Town Council because we do not want to pay more than those at Kettering for our council tax! This is an unfair precept that I for one do not agree with."

---

### **Cranford**

**Proposal:**

Cranford Parish Council has requested a change in the parish boundary with a view to maintaining the identity of the village as a result of the potential impact of the East Kettering development on its area and governance arrangements.

**Responses Received:** Two responses were received.

1. Cranford Parish Council

“The Parish Council has conducted a consultation on possible boundary changes to the west of the parish to take into account the East Kettering development. The replies received totalled 51 out of 80 consulted. Of those, 31 wished to stay in the parish, 18 to leave with 2 undecided. The results indicated a majority wish to remain in the parish of Cranford.

With this in mind an alternative option of the boundary change was drawn up. This would take the boundary from the A14 north along the boundary of number 56 Cranford Road and down the lane to the Grange complex, navigating around to the west of the properties to join up with the existing boundary.

At its meeting on Wednesday, 13/8/14, the Parish Council supported this idea.”

**NB: A map of the proposal is included as Appendix 2(i)**

2. Mr Z Beaufort, Cranford resident

“The Parish Council I believe proposed a boundary to the confluence of the Alledge Brook to the east of Grange Farm. I am inclined to prefer this option of the westernmost boundary for Cranford Parish being as above, and keeping the rest as they are. I believe the houses on Cranford Road, would be best placed into Barton Seagrave, as they already have Barton Seagrave in their postal address.”

---

**Cransley and Mawsley**

**Proposals:**

To re-draw the boundary between Cransley and Mawsley to take account of where building in Mawsley has taken place over the existing boundary between the two parishes.

Options for the consultation are;

- a. a change in the parish boundary as indicated on plan
- b. the creation of an additional ward for the Parish of Cransley – (detail size, number of councillors etc.)

**Responses Received:** One response was received from Cransley Parish Council

“Cransley Parish councillors felt that the information needed in making a decision was not supplied by Kettering Borough Council. For example how would the addition of 25 properties in Cransley Parish affect the precept? Presumably it would mean a reduction for our current residents as the income would accrue to Cransley. Also as the 25 properties are presently in Cransley why has this parish not received the precept income this year, and why do these properties not appear on the electoral role for Cransley Parish?”

Cransley Parish Councillors discussed the financial implications if the development in question remained in Cransley parish when Cransley would obviously benefit. It also considered the geographical position of the development which has no direct access to Gt. Cransley, but is approximately 4 miles away by road, and the owners of these properties obviously feel they live in the village of Mawsley.

It was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed that the boundary should be altered so the development is transferred to the Parish of Mawsley.”

---

### **Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley**

#### **Proposals:**

The Parish Council has asked Kettering Borough Council (KBC), as part of the Community Governance Review, to give consideration to reducing the number of councillors representing the Geddington Ward from 11 to 9 due to the difficulties experienced in attracting candidates.

**Responses Received:** Two responses were received

#### **1. Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley Parish Council**

“The Council have considered the proposal and their response is that now they have a full contingent of councillors and the upcoming prospect of a large development in the village, the council would like to keep the number of councillors for the Geddington ward at 11.”

#### **2. Paul Hopkins – Geddington resident**

“It is regretful that a village such as Geddington finds difficulty attracting candidates to stand for the Parish Council, although the figures quoted are misleading. One Councillor was disqualified whilst another resigned due to family illness. The voting by the Parish Council to ask for a review was only passed by one vote, and the wording of the proposal only requested a “review” it did not ask for a specific number.

## Item 7 – Appendix A

I believe the original objectives outlined different options open to parishes, which included merging councils or reducing numbers of councillors? Geddington parish Council consists of three separate “wards”. After giving the matter serious consideration I would favour a merger of the two options, which would consist of merging the Geddington and Newton wards, basically because Newton only has an electorate of 38, leaving Little Oakley as it stands, making the total numbers as follows: Geddington with Newton: 12; Little Oakley: 1

I believe, looking through past documents that the original merger of the wards was:

Geddington: 11; Newton: 2

No mention of Little Oakley, although added in pen on later documents becoming Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley Parish Council. My understanding of this legal document assumes that Geddington ward is represented by 11 councillors and Newton with Little Oakley is represented by 2 councillors. I can find no additional documents that change this, but that does not mean other alterations have not been made after 1975.

I would like to the total to remain at 13 councillors. We have just had a co-option of two councillors bringing our total to 13 with the possibility of others returning due to change of circumstances.”

---

### Rushton and Wilbarston

#### **Proposals:**

Rushton Parish Council has requested that Kettering Borough Council consider that the whole of Pipewell Ward be transferred to Rushton Parish Council.

Options for consideration as part of the consultation are:

- a. Remain as a ward of Wilbarston Parish Council with no change.
- b. The Pipewell Ward, currently in the Parish of Wilbarston be transferred to Rushton Parish Council
- c. It is not considered that the village itself is large enough or geographically discrete enough for it to have its own Parish Council

**Responses Received:** 33 responses were received. Additionally a Rushton village petition with 23 signatories in favour of the transfer of Pipewell ward to Rushton parish Council was submitted. This is included as **Appendix 2(ii)**.

**Responses favouring Option A**

1. Wilbarston Parish Council

“Currently most of the settlement of Pipewell lies within the parish of Wilbarston, wherein it forms an electoral ward. Since the last review, which determined the existing boundary, there have been no significant residential developments or shifts in communications or infrastructure, or indeed history, which might have created a need for change. Being mindful of this and not having noted any clear wish for a review from residents our response to the initial consultation was not to recommend any change. This remains our stance. It is probably true to say that views within Pipewell are split, which is not surprising given its location in relation to the villages of Rushton and Wilbarston, but in practical terms the boundary is clear cut and the existing arrangements work well. We are pleased to note, for instance, that two households within Pipewell have taken plots in the new Wilbarston Parish Allotments. For the reasons summarized above we do not agree with the proposal from Rushton Parish Council and we support Option A, no change.”

2. Rosalind Willatts – Wilbarston Parish resident

“Option A desired Historical: Pipewell has always had a position astride the Harpers Brook in two parishes and in two historic hundreds. The Harpers Brook was the dividing line between Rothwell Hundred and , Stoke ( Corby) Hundred and until the late 20C was the dividing line between Wilbarston and Rushton Parishes. Pipewell today (as it has done for centuries) lies almost equidistant between the larger settlements of Rushton 3.8km and Wilbarston 4.8 km. At the 1086 survey there were three manors of land at Pipewell, two in Rothwell Hundred, south of the Harpers brook, and one in Stoke Hundred to its north. The monastery was founded in 1143 to the north of the Harpers brook, presumably depopulating the existing settlements. Deserted Village remains are found both to the north near Pipewell church, and to the south of the brook. After the dissolution of the Abbey in 1538, the abbey buildings were robbed of everything including the stone. The Abbey lands granted to Sir William Parre were given over to sheep. At some time in the late 20thC the parish boundary between Rushton and Pipewell was moved from the ancient line of the Harpers brook to the present east-west road. The historic settlement area of Pipewell south of the Brook was thus moved into Wilbarston Parish to join the other historic settlement. Recent dwellings to the south of the east-west road remained in Rushton CP. Historically Pipewell was astride the Harpers Brook in two parishes. The brook gave a good line for the boundary; the boundary line is now the road which is also easily determined. There is no good reason to change the established (for over 900 years) nature of the land division. RCHME Northamptonshire, An Archaeological Atlas of 1980 RCHME An inventory of the historical monuments in the county of Northampton Vol II Central Northamptonshire,1979 Northamptonshire Domesday Survey 1086 (1783 edition reproduced by Phillimore 1979) Allison, Beresford & Hurst Deserted Villages of Northamptonshire 1966 Victoria County History Vol II 1086 Values Rushton 86/- Wilbarston 34/- Pipewell (3 manors) 5/- I understand that it was in the early 1980s that a Boundary Commission change was made to move the boundary south from the Harpers Brook to the east/west road. This gives a clear boundary easily seen and understood. Pipewell Hall and associated dwellings as well as all the other dwellings between the brook and the road thus joined the rest of Pipewell. Only three or four dwellings remained in Rushton CP. I understand that at about the same time Pipewell was given the status of being made a separate ward within Wilbarston CP, thus acknowledging its distinctiveness. I note that the

## Item 7 – Appendix A

background notes supplied by KBC state that there is a bridle path between Pipewell and Rushton. Please note that there is footpath between Pipewell and the Rushton Road in Wilbarston which is used. To extend the boundary further to the south to transfer the four or so dwellings now in Rushton CP to be with the rest of Pipewell is a possibility and could have reason, but that would not give a clear boundary; this is not an option now being considered. The boundary is clear; there is no justification for over-ruling the recent Boundary Commission changes. There have always been historic associations with the Wilbarston side. Let sleeping dogs lie.”

### 3. Mr J Snelling – Wilbarston Parish resident

“The present arrangement for Pipewell to be part of Wilbarston has proved satisfactory and therefore I cannot see any need to change to another PC. There are a small number of Pipewell dwellings covered by Rushton and it would make sense for these few to belong to Pipewell as a whole and get covered by Wilbarston PC.”

### 4. Anonymous Responder

“a) Remain as is as we have allotments in Wilbarston, I see no reason why we should change.”

### 5. Mrs C Church – Wilbarston Parish resident

“I would like Pipewell to remain as a ward of Wilbarston Parish Council with no change, as a resident of the village for the past twenty years I have always been more than happy with the representation that Wilbarston Parish Council has given Pipewell and have found them to be supportive to issues affecting the village”

### 6. Mr Ross – Wilbarston Parish resident

“The argument for the above transfer (*Option A*) does seem to be very historical, St Mary’s, Pipewell was only built in the early part of last century. In recent years the vast majority of christenings, weddings and funerals of Pipewellians have taken place in our own church.

Although Pipewell is in the catchment area for Rushton School, I am not aware of any Pipewell children attending in recent years, whilst a number have been educated in Wilbarston. There is also a historical footpath link to Wilbarston from Pipewell.

We have been well informed of local issues via the Wilbarston Chronical and contacts from parish councillors.

Looking at the local map the ground area covered by both councils is very similar and the majority of Pipewell village falls into Wilbarston Parish, it would be interesting to see where the proposed new boundary would be drawn”

### 7. Ms S Wylie – Wilbarston Parish resident

“Following on from a letter received regarding the Community Governance Review Consultation I would like to put forward that Pipewell remains as a ward of Wilbarston Parish Council with no change (*Option A*).”

### 8. Mr G Jones – Wilbarston Parish resident

“Option A – remain as a ward of Wilbarston Parish Council with no change”

9. Mrs H Jones – Wilbarston Parish resident

“Option A – remain as a ward of Wilbarston Parish Council with no change”

10. Councillor Allan Matthews – Northamptonshire County Council

“The current arrangement whereby Pipewell receives a service as a ward of Wilbarston PC works very well. I am not convinced that the majority of parishioners in Pipewell want, or need, a change – they appear to be happy with the current arrangements.

The bid to encompass Pipewell within the parish of Rushton is unnecessary and is not the preferred option of all Rushton Parish Councillors”

**Responses favouring Option B**

1. Mr & Mrs R J Kilduff – Wilbarston Parish residents

“We support the request by Rushton Parish Council to incorporate the whole of Pipewell in the Rushton Parish. Geographically, Pipewell is nearer to Rushton than it is to Wilbarston, so the request that the whole of Pipewell be transferred to Rushton Parish Council makes sense. We do not consider the village of Pipewell needs to have its own parish council.”

2. Anonymous – Pipewell resident

“Having lived in Pipewell for a few years there has been a few changes. I think at one time everybody went to Wilbarston to vote. Then it changed again, one half of Pipewell went to Wilbarston and the other half came to Rushton, and then it changed again, those living near the main road, which was not many houses came to Rushton to vote, so I think it would be better for Pipewell to go with Rushton Parish. I know Pipewell is not big enough to have its own Parish Council, but think it would be nice to have its own Councillor if anybody would like to stand.”

3. Anonymous Respondent

“I think Option B is the only sensible option.”

4. Mrs M Bailey – Rushton Parish resident

“I feel that Option B is preferable as we, as a village community, have always had many links with Pipewell via the church and school”

5. Mrs and Mrs Hill – Rushton Parish residents

“We consider Option B to be the most appropriate due to the closeness to Rushton, both geographically and socially.”



6. Anonymous – Rushton resident

“Geographically Wilbarston is on the other side of a major watershed and is part of the Welland Valley. Pipewell’s stream ends up in the Nene. The Rushton Community Minibus already serves Pipewell when required, which used to be regularly. The Church has links with Rushton and Rothwell not Wilbarston. “The Triangle” – Rushton’s local magazine already has a Pipewell contribution. It seems logical that all of Pipewell should be in one ward and that should be linked with Rushton. I am a resident in Rushton.”

7. Mr Kenneth Jack – Wilbarston Parish resident

“Pipewell has leanings (mostly church matters) directed from Rushton rather than Wilbarston and Stoke Albany with whom the village has little contact, though electorally most of the village is in that ward. Of course the residents of Pipewell always may have a voice, so I would not favour an additional councillor. On balance I would favour Option B that the parish be changed to Rushton”

8. Mrs M Mudditt – Rushton Parish resident

“Option B seems to be the best solution for all. Resident of Rushton.”

9. Mr G Mudditt – Rushton Parish resident

“Option B, this seems a sensible and practical move”

10. Mr and Mrs King - Rushton Parish residents

“We are fully supportive of Option B for the following reasons:

- The current position of some properties being in Rushton PC and some in Wilbarston PC seems administrationally (sic) a nonsense. It would be preferable for all the properties to be in the same parish
- Pipewell is much nearer to Rushton than it is to Wilbarston
- Pipewell has close ties with Rushton – e.g. Church and Women’s Institute
- Pipewell and Rushton being geographically close have shared problems e.g. New Albion Wind Farm and the Landfill Site so it makes sense for one Parish Council to address the issues rather than two

For these reasons we would prefer all the houses in Pipewell Ward to be in Rushton Parish Council.”

11. Mr L Mackley - Rushton Parish resident

“I think Pipewell Ward should be transferred to Rushton as we are currently in Rushton but the rest of the village is in the Wilbarston ward which is ridiculous! We are only a small village but we should be united.”

12. Mrs C Mackley – Rushton Parish resident

“I believe Pipewell should be joined in one Parish, in the ward of Rushton.”

13. Ms A Vesty - Wilbarston Parish resident

“I am a resident of Pipewell. I support the proposal for the Pipewell Ward to be transferred to Rushton PC. We have no associated with Wilbarston, no links and feel better served by the village we have the most connection and association with, namely, Rushton. Wilbarston seem to have little interest in Pipewell.”

14. Mr C Spickett – Wilbarston Parish resident

“As churchwarden for St Mary’s church in Pipewell, I feel it would be beneficial to both the church and the village as a whole to be in the parish of Rushton. At present, our church is supported in all of our events by Rushton, and similarly we support Rushton events. I am also on the current PCC committee, and that is for Rushton, Pipewell and Glendon. I have lived in Pipewell since 2000 and to my knowledge; nobody from Wilbarston has ever attended any village event.”

15. Mr and Mrs Miles – Wilbarston Parish residents

“We are in favour of Pipewell Ward, currently in the parish of Wilbarston, being transferred to Rushton Parish Council.”

16. Mr and Mrs Conde – Rushton Parish residents

“We have lived on Oakley Road Pipewell for 14 years and fortunately because of the side of the road we live we come under Rushton Parish Council and we would like to state that we do not wish to change.

We feel that the bond with Rushton is far superior than with Wilbarston, Rushton and Pipewell have historical ties which go back centuries in births deaths and marriages, indeed the footpath between the two was used by monks from Pipewell Abbey to attend the church in Rushton. We have ecclesiastical ties in both belonging to the same diocese and also share the WI with Rushton ladies.

Two major issues that has affected Pipewell over the last few years have highlighted for us the difference in the Two councils, the much discussed New Albion Wind Farm and speed and heavy load restrictions on Oakley Road. Rushton were very understanding in listening to our grievances Wilbarston not so we got the distinct impression they wouldn’t see or hear the Wind Farm so it was not high on their list. Oakley Road has a 7.5 ton maximum load restriction and is an accident waiting to happen because of the horrendous speed people drive at, when the village speed restriction was extended to Oakley Road it did not extend to our part of Oakley Road Rushton took up our cause and had the speed restriction extended.

The law-breaking of the weight limit is scandalous with as many as 50 lorries a day using Oakley Road, Wilbarston were not interested Rushton are currently again fighting our corner.

We have no confidence in Wilbarston council at all, we also feel they are not particularly bothered whether they keep Pipewell or not, we would like to request that Pipewell be allowed to move into the parish of Rushton and at the very worst we be allowed to stay in the parish of Rushton.”

17. Mr and Mrs J Squire – Rushton Parish residents

“Option B – We would like Pipewell Ward to be transferred to Rushton parish Council. The two villages already work together on local issues and support each

others churches. It makes obvious sense for them to be together under Rushton Parish Council, and historically the correct thing to do.”

18. Mrs D Hefford - Rushton Parish resident

“I would prefer Pipewell to be returned to the parish of Rushton as it has affiliation with the local churches.”

19. Mr J Hefford – Rushton Parish resident

“Reference the question of the above Pipewell ward either remaining in the Wilbarston Parish or returning to the Rushton Parish. It is my wish that Pipewell is returned to the Rushton Parish where it had been for many years.”

20. Mr and Mrs N Carter – Wilbarston Parish residents

“We would like the option B to be consulted to join Rushton Parish Council. We are already involved with the Church of Rushton and part of the village are already in the parish of Rushton ie Town Close Farm.”

21. Mrs D Silverstone – Wilbarston Parish resident and Treasurer of Pipewell Village Committee

“I have lived in Pipewell for 12 years; for the past 10 years I have been the Treasurer of Pipewell Village Committee and Parish Councillor for the Ward of Pipewell. The situation in Pipewell is complicated as the village is split between two parish councils and yet it is a community in itself as can be seen from the Pipewell Village Committee. This is due to the discrete nature of its geography and the type of people who live in Pipewell who are intelligent and sociable. Plus the special features that mark it apart from other villages: Conservation Area, Scheduled Ancient Monument and 2 SSSI Woods. Villagers take pride in these features which gives us a sense of living within a very special environment! As Parish Councillor I have sought to help parishioners from all parts of the village: getting the speed limits extended at the south end of the village, campaigning on lorry’s using the roads around all the village which are above the weight limits. For many years due to this closeness of feelings associated between Rushton and Pipewell villages, I have written articles for Rushton Parish Magazine ‘The Triangle’. Villagers have helped out at Rushton Fetes and Rushton villagers have long helped out at Pipewell fetes and Church Flower Festivals. In fact we plan another Flower Festival in September this year at which again villagers from Rushton will help out. We have belonged to the Church Benefice of Tresham, Rothwell, since 1989 and we are very happy with the arrangement. Additionally as may be seen from the letter from Pipewell Church Committee the churches within the Tresham Benefice of Rothwell, Rushton and Pipewell – a daughter chapel of Rushton – are very closely involved with each other’s services and general events; as indeed are all the churches in the benefice generally. It was decided by Pipewell Village Committee it would undertake a survey with the village to find out what the views of the villagers were as it has long been a community group under the Local Government and Public Involvement and Health Act 2007 terms and thus very representative of the village as a whole. The boundary in Pipewell appears to be *medieval anomaly*. Before the last boundary change from Harpers Brook to Oakley Road 50% of the village lay in Wilbarston Parish Council and 50% in Rushton Parish Council. The move of the boundary did not help matters in fact it if anything it has increased the fracturing of the community in the sense of local council governance so that a sense of limbo exists. Something as old as boundaries are not

easy to alter but based as it is upon something so long ago it is no longer relevant to the modern situation of the village. The village needs to be united into one local authority governance as this will provide the final step to its inclusivity. The majority of people in Pipewell wish to join Rushton Parish Council. The last/present government has given a great deal of emphasis on respect of local people's opinions under the Act of 2007. Therefore the democratic principal should be adhered to or Pipewell villagers may lose confidence in the local governance principle itself. Written from the perspective of Treasurer of Pipewell Village Committee/an individual person not as parish councillor."

### 22. Pipewell Church Committee

Pipewell Church Committee is writing to Kettering Borough Council with regard to the community governance review it is currently undertaking. In this review Rushton Parish Council has requested that the whole village of Pipewell be included within its governance as a ward. Pipewell Church Committee has been established since it came under the Benefice of Rothwell Church in 1989. Since that time the church at Pipewell has been joined in worship and other activities with both the church at Rothwell and the church at Rushton. These activities include acts of collective worship such as united benefice services and the church fellowship. Christmas Carol Services, Easter services, Harvest Festival Services and Flower Festivals. In fact there is another flower festival planned at Pipewell Church with the help of fellow churchgoers at Rothwell and Rushton Church in September 2014. Pipewell Church is actually a daughter chapel of Rushton Church.

It is because of these close ties with Rushton Church that the Pipewell Church Committee decided to discuss this issue at the Church AGM Meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2014. After conducting all the normal business of an AGM the Committee discussed Rushton Parish Council request for the whole of the village of Pipewell to be brought under its governance. After a full and very considered discussion the committee agreed that the joining of the whole of the village of Pipewell as a ward to Rushton Parish Council would be a very good idea in that it would enable the church at Rushton to give even more support to its daughter chapel at Pipewell.

Like all rural churches the church at Pipewell struggles to maintain its position but overall the village of Pipewell really wants to retain the church as the centre of village life. Any action that could enhance this process would be beneficial to the village. Pipewell Church Committee realise that the present state of civil affairs has existed for a very long time but together with Pipewell Village Committee, another very long established community group, it considers that this is a unique opportunity to help create a more inclusive community grouping. Therefore it is to be hoped that Kettering Borough Council will give this appeal by Pipewell Church Committee (together with Pipewell Village Committee) its close and serious consideration and recommend the transfer of the Ward of Pipewell to Rushton Parish Council. Thank you for your help in this matter."

### 23. Pipewell Village Committee

"This is a representation from Pipewell Village Committee in respect of the Community Governance Review being carried by Kettering Borough Council. Pipewell Village Committee is a community forum in respect of the Local Government and Public Involvement and Health Act 2007. Rushton Parish Council has requested that Pipewell Ward is brought under its governance. Presently it is split by Oakley Road between Rushton and Wilbarston Parish Councils. Both Rushton Parish

## Item 7 – Appendix A

Council and Wilbarston Parish Council will comment on this review but from February 2008\* when district councils have the power to undertake community governance reviews, they also have to take into account the views of local people too. Pipewell Village Committee take this to mean the actual villagers of Pipewell itself and it believes that the village itself is best placed to put before Kettering Borough Council the true state of affairs within the village.

Pipewell Village Committee has a Chair, Treasurer and a Secretary, plus several other members. It has organised village events dating back at least 30 years such as village fetes and church flower festivals. Most recently it organised a very successful Queens 60<sup>th</sup> Jubilee Party. As such Pipewell Village Committee is a long established Community Forum as defined by community governance guidance issued by the government. (35) In 2006 Pipewell Village Committee undertook the project of obtaining a village sign. This involved a great deal of negotiation with Kettering Borough Council Planning Department, NCC Highways Department and various Utilities Companies. Wilbarston Parish Council were involved with putting forward the planning application to obtain a reduced planning fee but after an initial discussion it was made clear, despite their opposition, that as the village committee had raised the funds it would be the main driving force for the commission/design of the sign which it subsequently did. The village sign project was a complex organisational project involving a great deal of administration and yet it took us only one year to complete this project unlike other villages which took on average 3-5 years.

The latest project undertaken by Pipewell Village Committee is the Pipewell Facebook Community page. This once again covers the whole village and is a result of Wilbarston refusing to allow Pipewell its own section on the parish council webpage despite repeated requests. We are also organising a heating oil delivery group too.

Under the Local Government & Public Involvement Act 2007 during community governance reviews principal authorities should reflect the *identities & interests of the local community* and ensure community governance is effective and convenient too. This includes impact on community cohesion, size, population & boundaries of the proposed area. (33) The guidance states that in many cases making changes to boundaries to existing parishes will be sufficient to ensure that community governance arrangements continue to reflect local identities and facilitate effective/convenient local government.

Pipewell village has, probably since the dissolution of Cistercian monastery, been under two civil authorities. The most recent change being the switch from Harpers Brook to Oakley Road as the boundary between Rushton and Wilbarston Parish Councils. Both parish councils are reasonably effective in the administration of their duties but this is not to say that for Pipewell this has been the best state of affairs for the village. In fact a good example of when the village felt the effects of being a divided community along parish council lines was when the wind farm currently being built between Pipewell and Rushton was being processed as a planning application. After this the Wilbarston Parish Plan stated that Pipewell wanted to be under one parish council too.

**A Sense of Place:** ‘ a place with a ‘positive’ feeling for people and local distinctiveness’

One concept in the community governance guidance which is given great stress is the concept of a place. Pipewell Village Committee can state categorically that Pipewell has a very well defined sense of place and overwhelmingly a ‘positive’

## Item 7 – Appendix A

feeling in the village due to a wide variety of factors which give it a very distinct sense of local distinctiveness. These factors are: Scheduled Ancient Monument relating to a Cistercian Abbey, Conservation Area with many Grade II Listed Buildings and two SSSI Woods. This in itself would confer a unique sense of place as it is unusual to have one SSSI wood in a locality. Pipewell village is a beautiful village which has survived relatively unchanged for a very long time and hopes to remain this way despite development occurring in towns around it. It is populated by people from a wide diversity of backgrounds with many professional people so it is therefore well able to participate in the determination of its future local governance status.

### Pipewell Village Committee Actions Taken with Regard to the Community Governance Review

Pipewell Village Committee undertook a survey of villagers with regard to the proposed governance changes. This survey established an overall majority in favour of being governed by one parish council and the parish council of choice is Rushton. This is due to several factors:

1. Historical links with Rushton Parish Council as outlined in the community governance review already.
2. In the past and currently many social events have been held in conjunction with Rushton.
3. Pipewell church is a daughter chapel of Rushton and linked to Tresham Benefice. This would allow a much greater degree of support for Pipewell Church in the future.
4. The village of Pipewell is nearer geographically to the village of Rushton. (Wilbarston 3 miles/Rushton 1.5 miles). This is a real factor in the interaction between the villages.

As there are no clear or strong linkages with Wilbarston village the committee do not feel altering the parish boundary would break any linkages (162) and that an easily identifiable boundary/coterminosity would also be maintained too. (264/179) The committee also feel that due to these factors that a move to Rushton Parish Council would enhance social cohesion within the village by enhancing a naturally co-joined community. (126) In addition governance would remain equally effective and convenient as both parish councils are equally efficient in their administration. The committee also believes this would be a parish that reflects better an area of community identity. (80) Two new residents have taken allotments in Wilbarston but there are allotments in Rushton village they could transfer to and it is more established residents who wish to move to Rushton.

### Summary of Pipewell Village Committee Representation

Pipewell Village Committee petition Kettering Borough Council to recommend that the parish ward of Pipewell be transferred to Rushton Parish Council. All criteria for a change in community governance guidance have been addressed successfully in this petition too:

- Pipewell has a well-defined sense of place which Pipewell Village Committee represents. It wishes to remain a separate ward with its own parish councillor. The whole village should be enclosed in the ward.
- A change to Rushton Parish will remain efficient and convenient as Rushton Parish Council is as efficient and convenient as Wilbarston Parish Council.

## Item 7 – Appendix A

- The boundary will not be difficult to relocate and result in a continued highly recognisable co-terminal boundary.
- The historical linkage between Pipewell and Wilbarston is definitely not outweighed by the historical links between Pipewell and Rushton. In fact those with Rushton are greater which will result in increased community cohesion and democratic involvement.

Further clarification can be obtained from Pipewell Village Committee if required both in writing before the issue is discussed at the Kettering Borough Council Executive Council and also at the meeting itself. Pipewell Village Committee believe that this is a unique opportunity to unite the whole of the village of Pipewell in a *local government fora* that would in fact legitimise the natural sense of place of the village.

(\*Local Government Boundary Commission for England: guidance on community governance reviews March 2010) Numbers in brackets in this document refer to points made within this guidance.”