

David Pope

To: Colin Spickett
Subject: RE: Community governance review

Sent: 22 October 2014 14:42
To: Democracy
Subject: Community governance review

Ref. Rushton and Wilbarston(Pipewell)

As a long term resident of Pipewell, and current churchwarden of St Mary's Church, I am very much in favour of Pipewell transferring to Rushton Parish Council. The church is part of the Tresham Benefice, and has strong links with Rushton, who support us in our regular services and events. I think that if we become part of Rushton parish, we can develop our link still further, to the benefit of both the church and the village.

Colin Spickett
2, Rose Cottage
Pipewell
NN14 1QZ

KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL
COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – SECOND & FINAL CONSULTATION
PIPEWELL VILLAGE COMMITTEE

Local Government Boundary Commission: Guidance on community governance reviews:
(Dept Communities & Local Government 2010) Petitions:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 40: | Alterations of boundaries to existing parishes, sense of place, community cohesion |
| 48: | Central to the concept of sustainable communities is community cohesion |
| 50: | Views of local communities and inhabitants are of central importance |

Pipewell Petition

Petition: This is a petition by the villagers of Pipewell in support of Pipewell Village Committee to ask Kettering Borough Council to bring the Ward of Pipewell under the governance of Rushton Parish Council for the reasons given by Rushton Parish Council in the community governance review. Signed:

This is the second/final response to the consultation from Pipewell Village Committee. The petition in Pipewell was undertaken because of Wilbarston Parish Councils reluctance to undertake one. In May 2014 Pipewell Village Committee researched the Local Government Act of 2007 and community associations the right to petition their local councils. Pipewell Village Committee is an autonomous community association organisation so there is no requirement to inform Wilbarston and it is more than happy for any person who has signed the petition to be approached by KBC Councillors to confirm they have signed it. Wilbarston could have researched this issue, gone to the Research & Development Committee and the full KBC Committee too. The fact that they only produced a *half page initial response* gives an indication of the importance they attached to this issue.

Pipewell Village Committee surveyed the whole general curtilage of the village (Local Government Act 2007) and obtained 50 out of 70 villagers in favour of moving to Rushton. Initially 10 people expressed a wish to stay with Wilbarston Parish Council but 4 of those did so to retain their allotments which was agreed leaving only 6 out of 70 villagers surveyed who wish to remain with Wilbarston.

This means 71.5% of the whole village wish to move to Rushton Parish Council.

Transfer of Pipewell Ward to Rushton Parish Council

At present KBC Democratic Services Department propose that the present area of the Ward of Pipewell be transferred to Rushton Parish Council as it constituted. But Pipewell Village Committee, which represents the whole village, would like to propose the following area be transferred and incorporated into a ward based upon its own *extensive local knowledge* of the area.

North Boundary Up to & including Woodlands Farm and the 2 SSSI Woods at the north end of the village.

West Boundary Pipewell Upper Lodge & Farm.

East Boundary Lower Lodge Farm.

South Boundary All the houses on the south side of Oakley Road up to Lower Lodge Farm.

This has been agreed with the Chair of Rushton Parish Council by email.

But also including: White Lodge Farm Mrs & Mrs Desborough.

The two barn conversions: Mrs & Mrs Barnett and Mr & Mrs Hii.

Towns Lodge Close Farm – Mrs & Mrs Vaughan – whose parents farm within the ward at Upper Lodge Farm. All these people regularly join in all our village activities.

The people living in these areas have always considered themselves to be part of the village of Pipewell. Pipewell Village Committee would submit that it makes overall sense to place all these dwellings into the Ward of Pipewell in a formal arrangement within one ward.

Conclusion

In conclusion Pipewell Village Committee has presented a credible, well argued, legal case for the transfer of the Ward of Pipewell to Rushton Parish Council and for the whole village to be incorporated into one ward area. Pipewell is made up of professional, intelligent people and it is patronising for Wilbarston Parish Council to assume that the villagers of Pipewell are unable to make their own choices. This is not about competence; it is about the wishes of a clearly established community artificially divided by the anomaly of a medieval boundary and if the recommendation to transfer the Ward of Pipewell is not ratified then Pipewell Village Committee fears for the future of community cohesion within Pipewell. Community cohesion is the most important concept of reviews.

Pipewell village is determined to have a voice in its future. Another option we would consider if not successful this time would be to petition to be a parish meeting like the village of Orton which has been one successfully for many years. The composition of the village of Pipewell certainly lends itself to this format of local government. But in recognising the advantages of being part of a parish council we are choosing Rushton Parish Council.

Pipewell Village Committee humbly petitions KBC to accede to our request.
Thank you.

Local Government Act 2007: Petitions (40) :

With areas less than 150 registered voters 50% of registered voters must petition:

Pipewell Petition in Pipewell Ward: 35/54: 64% in favour: 6/54: 10% against.
13/54: 26%
No opinion composed mainly of newer residents.

Whole Village of Pipewell: 50/70: 71.5%

Composed mainly of residents who have lived in the village for a very long time.

Thanks from Pipewell Village Committee

Councillor Howes:

for all his advice and guidance.

Research & Development Committee:
Chair

Recognising the issues here especially that a medieval boundary can be an anomaly.

Democratic Services David Pope:

for all his advice and guidance.

KBC Full Council:

For recognising the issues here and recommending the transfer of Pipewell Ward to Rushton Parish Council. We may not be Scotland or the unfortunate Ukraine but the issue is the same here: democracy.

David Pope

Subject: RE: Community Governance - Rushton & Wilbarston

Sent: 16 November 2014 19:50

To: Democracy

Cc: Jim Hakewill-Forwarder

Subject: Community Governance - Rushton & Wilbarston

Dear Sue,

I have noted that the parishioners in Pipewell appear to favour a transfer to Rushton Parish Council. Of the two options now available re: governance arrangements, my preference will be to adopt option B. This would be the cleanest option for both County Councillors and I believe that Cllr Hakewill shares this view in the Rothwell & Mawsley Division.

Regards,

Cllr Allan Matthews
Desborough Division

amatthews@northamptonshire.gov.uk

D SILVERSTONE RESPONSE TO WILBARSTON FINAL RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**Local Government Boundary Commission: Guidance on community governance reviews: (Dept Communities & Local Government 2010) Petitions:**

- 40: Alterations of boundaries to existing parishes, sense of place, community cohesion
 48: Central to the concept of sustainable communities is community cohesion
 50: Views of local communities and inhabitants are of central importance

UK Electoral Ward: Local government area created to reflect the unique characteristics of an area like Pipewell. The parish councillor elected to represent these areas like these are part of a parish council but in general it is recognised they are there to represent the views of the parishioners in their wards.

Initial Light Touch Review:

At the review beginning there was no preference for either parish council but once it was known Rushton had requested Pipewell ward many parishioners asked me if it could be transferred there so I arranged to do the survey.

The First Consultation

To say nothing has changed from 30 years ago is like saying nothing has changed since medieval days really. If that was so we wouldn't have gone through the industrial revolution or be using iphones! At the May parish council meeting I reported I was finding a slight majority in favour of moving to Rushton but these views were dismissed as unimportant – the villagers views that it!

In May, Pipewell Village Committee found out about the Local Government Act 2007 and decided to carry out their own petition in Pipewell. At the same time Rushton Village carried out a similar petition to support us. Pipewell Village Committee is an autonomous community association of the whole village so doesn't need to report back to Wilbarston or for it to negotiate for it. In June I was on holiday abroad but later emailed the Chair to ask for an extension to consult more villagers as the deadline was extended until August but this was denied. All actions have been carried out by Pipewell Village Committee therefore there is no conflict of role.

Outcome of the First Consultation

I disseminate parish council information all the time: Group village emails which I set up.

Rushton/Wilbarston parish magazine.

Some villagers would say that I disseminate too much information! When I offered to help with Wilbarston Jubilee celebrations, etc this was rejected completely. But we are welcome to help at Rushton.

Wilbarston Parish Council continue to believe that this is about competency and while they has done a great deal for Pipewell but this is about local democracy. While both parish councils are in general equally efficient there have been occasions when I have had to insist on action to protect my parishioners interests.

There is a clear majority within the present Ward of Pipewell/whole village in favour of moving to Rushton Parish Council. Community cohesion is the most important concept of the Local Government Act 2007 and states this should not be damaged. If this petition was rejected now the village committee has fears about this. The situation in Pipewell may be somewhat unique but what is eminently clear is that this village wants to be joined together in one whole union and that the parish council of choice is Rushton!

Conclusion

Unfortunately Wilbarston did not consider this issue fully as it supposed Pipewell would not have clear views on it but Pipewell is made up of intelligent, professional people who know their own minds. The Local Government Act 2007 has given the opportunity for ordinary people to express their own wishes and the villagers of Pipewell have taken this opportunity. I have to say I am really proud of them as their parish councillor. We would therefore submit that the case for transferring Pipewell Ward to Rushton Parish Council has been very well made and humbly ask KBC Full Committee.to ratify their initial decision. Any further clarification from Pipewell Village Committee/myself will be willingly supplied. Thank you.

Delyse Silverstone M Sc
1 Rose Cottage. Pipewell

David Pope

To: Paul Vesty
Subject: RE: Rushton and Wilbarston (Pipewell)

Sent: 28 October 2014 21:45
To: Democracy
Subject: Rushton and Wilbarston (Pipewell)

Dear Sirs,

We refer to the above and your letter of 29th September seeking comments.

We are wholly in favour of the proposal for Pipewell parish to be transferred to Rushton Ciuncil, with whom we have the closest relationship.

We are also in favour of increasing the membership on transfer such that Rushton has 10 Council members.

Trust our comments will be taken into account.

Many thanks.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Paul Vesty
Mrs Amanda Vesty

Mr Eric Pickersgill
Mrs Christine Pickersgill

All at:
The Pheantry
Pipewell
Northants
NN14 1QZ

Paul R Vesty BSc FRICS MAPM

28 NOV 2014

Row haw Wood
Pipewell
Nr Kettering
NN14 1QZ
26. 11. 14.

Sue Lyons
Head of Democratic + Legal Services
Monitoring Officer
Kettering Borough Council

Dear Sue Lyons.

Community Governance Review
Rushton and Wilbarston (Pipewell).

We disagree with the final proposal as outlined on the map enclosed with your last communication, and that existing boundaries should be retained.

We feel that we have been well served by Wilbarston P.C., although information relating to council activities has not been communicated by our parish councillor. We would also take issue with the way that the petition was conducted, essentially by a parish councillor with her own agenda.

It would also seem that when counting populations even if Pipewell were to come under the governance of Rushton P.C. that proposal 'A' would be a sensible choice.

Yours sincerely



HUGH ROSS



CAROLYN CHURCH

Wilbarston Parish Council

21 NOV 2014

Chairman
Councillor Nick Richards
3 Weinahr Close
Wilbarston
Leicestershire
LE16 8QX

Clerk
Mr James McKechnie
22 Bramblewood Road
Weldon
Northamptonshire
NN17 3ED

Tel 01536 770351

Tel 01536 400563

wilbarston.clerk@yahoo.co.uk

Community Governance Review
c/o Democratic Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Kettering
NN15 7QX

19 November 2014

Dear Sir

Kettering Borough Council Community Governance Review - Pipewell

Response of Wilbarston Parish Council to consultation on the Preferred Option that Pipewell should be transferred into the Parish of Rushton.

The response of Wilbarston Parish Council to the earlier consultation was based on our recollection of the previous review of this boundary together with our understanding of the current situation in Pipewell. From information since received it seems likely that there are other points which, had we been aware of them, we would have addressed. This submission puts our earlier response into context and sets out our view on the preferred option.

Background

In 2013 we were advised of a 'light touch' review of parish boundaries in the borough, defining this as a review only in cases where a request was received for a parish boundary to be re-considered.

Prior to the previous review, 30 years ago, the village of Pipewell had been shared

between the parishes of Wilbarston and Rushton, the boundary being the relatively central line of Harper's Brook, and did not constitute a separate ward in either. As a consequence of that review, which was at the instigation of Rushton Parish Council, the Boundaries Commission expressed a preference for the village to be largely in one parish. As a practical matter Oakley Road was established as the new boundary, placing 28 dwellings in Wilbarston Parish and leaving 5 in Rushton Parish.

Subsequently, at the instigation of Wilbarston Parish Council, Pipewell was established as a separate ward in the parish, giving the residents the option to elect a member of the parish council and so ensure that they had representation of their interests by one of their own number.

The initial 'light touch' review

At the instigation of the ward councillor Wilbarston Parish Council had from time to time considered the possibility of seeking the transfer of the remaining five properties from Rushton to Wilbarston, to establish the village as a single unit, but had not proceeded as it was understood from the previous review that 'significant' boundaries, such as a road or watercourse, were preferred and no such option existed.

Nevertheless, when the light touch review was announced the question was again considered and the ward councillor was asked to sound out opinion in Pipewell. At our Parish Council Meeting in November she advised that 'she saw no overwhelming need to change the boundaries within Pipewell' and the parish council agreed that no issues would be raised in respect of the review.

Had we decided otherwise our next step would have been to initiate a discussion with Rushton Parish Council on the subject.

The first consultation

Having heard nothing on the subject we were surprised to learn in April 2014 that Rushton Parish Council had requested that Pipewell be consolidated into their parish. They had not made any mention of this to us, although we have subsequently learnt that an informal conversation had taken place with the ward councillor but this had not been relayed to the rest of the council. All the reasons cited by Rushton Parish Council were taken into account thirty years ago. There was nothing new in the submission. When the final decision had been made to move the boundary from the brook to the road there had been no opposition to that move.

In April the ward councillor was again asked to assess opinion in Pipewell ahead of our meeting in May. No report was made available to that meeting so it was agreed that the ward councillor would undertake a survey of residents of Pipewell to ascertain their

views on a potential boundary change, reporting to the June meeting.

The ward councillor was unable to attend the June meeting but had advised the Chair and Vice Chair, on separate occasions, that her survey had found a majority in favour of moving to Rushton Parish. She was asked to make available ahead of the meeting the detail of her findings and a note of how the survey had been conducted. No such information was provided, nor has been to date.

Not wishing to delay further we acknowledged that opinion in Pipewell was divided and agreed our response to the consultation. This was framed in the light of Rushton Parish's concise request, citing historic links, and of the views previously expressed by the Boundaries Commission. We also believed that Pipewell residents would feel that we took our responsibilities for them seriously and that we endeavoured to act at all times in their best interests. At that time we were not aware that our communications links with Pipewell residents were not as they should have been (see below) and that the ward councillor was actively engaged in a campaign in favour of a move to Rushton Parish. The latter created a clear conflict of interest, which was never declared. We were extremely disappointed when the facts emerged as had we been aware of these this would have significantly changed the manner in which we dealt with the first consultation.

Outcome of the first consultation

It has never been our intention to stand in the way of the wishes of the residents of Pipewell and at first glance the responses to the first consultation indicate a majority in favour of change. However many of these are from outside the target area, ie that part of Pipewell which is within Wilbarston, and in particular many are from Rushton. They include representations said to be on behalf of other residents, although details of how support was established are not given. The 'vote' which we had been told established a clear majority in favour of change does not appear to be included and we have still not received details of this despite it having originated from our request for information to be gathered on behalf of the parish council.

Some responses are anonymous and locations are not always clear, but we believe there are ten submissions from residents in the target area, of which five favour change whilst five do not.

Overall we were disappointed with certain comments about inactivity on the part of Wilbarston Parish Council. Based on feedback gained from residents with whom we had direct contact we formed the view that information about the parish council activities was not being disseminated. Our usual communications media are:

Quarterly distribution of the Wilbarston Chronicle to all households - this is the primary means by which residents are advised of what the parish council is doing and thinking. Distribution is undertaken by parish councillors and in the case of Pipewell this is the ward councillor

Representation of local issues to the parish council and of the parish council to local residents by the ward councillor.

Publication of parish council meeting minutes on a notice board in Pipewell provided by the parish council for that purpose, as well as for church and general use.

Feedback suggests that, at least in recent months, all of these have been compromised.

Supported by councillors the Chair wrote and hand delivered a letter to all Pipewell residents in Wilbarston Parish in response to some of the comments in the first consultation, referring to possible communications difficulties and outlining actions which the parish council has taken on behalf of Pipewell. The letter went on to say that the parish council would support the wishes of the residents of Pipewell but asked them to respond individually to the further consultation so that there would be no doubt what those wishes are. A copy of the letter is attached (Appendix A) and forms a part of this submission as it summarises where the parish council currently stands.

In conclusion, Wilbarston Parish Council has done its best to represent the interests of its Pipewell residents for the past thirty years and to make them feel an integrated part of the parish. Indeed the previous ward councillor was an active Vice Chair of the council. Through our own recent formal and informal contacts we have not found any significant wish for change, despite the impression which might have been gained from the full range of responses to the first consultation, and we do not agree with the preferred option now on the table. We continue to recommend no change.

This response was agreed by the parish council at its meeting on 13 November 2014.

Yours sincerely



Nick Richards
Chair, Wilbarston Parish Council

**Wilbarston Parish Council response to further consultation, Community
Governance Review, Pipewell:**

Appendix A

Wilbarston Parish Council

3 Weinahr Close
Wilbarston
Market Harborough
LE16 8QX

01536 770351
bramhallnick@yahoo.co.uk

1 October 2014

Dear Pipewell Resident(s)

Community Governance Review - Pipewell

I'm writing to you because I have seen the comments made to Kettering Borough Council as a part of this review so far and am saddened and shocked by the negative perception which some have of Wilbarston Parish Council, particularly because I had thought that we were doing a pretty good job of representing your interests. As you probably know, the Borough Council's preferred option now is to place Pipewell as a whole within the Parish of Rushton and they are starting a consultation period on that today. As a council we do not meet again for another week and therefore I am writing this in a sole capacity, although I have spoken with most members of the Parish Council and they fully support what I say.

Usually the council relies on the Wilbarston Chronicle, distributed free of charge quarterly, to spread news about what it is thinking and doing. This includes not just actions but items about developments outside the parish which we think might become of interest. In addition, as a separate ward you elect your own member of the council, who lives in Pipewell and can act as a conduit to make sure the concerns in the village are understood and in turn can reflect the position of the council back to the parishioners.

I have reason to believe that there have been problems with those lines of communication, in recent months at least, and am therefore writing to set out some of the things which I believe demonstrate that Wilbarston Parish Council takes its responsibilities for Pipewell seriously.

A major issue for some time has been the proposed wind farm between Pipewell and Rushton. As a whole the parish is in favour of renewable energy, as noted in the Parish Plan, but when this application originally arose we made a decision that we should be guided by the views of Pipewell, the closest part of the parish to the site. We held an open meeting in your church, listened to what was said and voted to oppose the application. We liaised with the Rushton based opposition group and I spoke against the proposal at the Borough Planning Committee Meeting when it was considered.

Once planning permission was given for the wind farm we turned our attention to discussions with the developers, at that time jointly with Rushton Parish Council, regarding the Community Fund, a means whereby the local community is able to benefit financially from an adjacent and probably unwelcome development of this nature. From the outset we took the view that within our parish the greater share of the benefits should go to Pipewell and this remains our stance. Discussions stalled for a couple of years because the developers were unable to secure the grid capacity necessary for the wind farm to operate, but that is now resolved and we are back in contact. The funds available will not be substantial, particularly if spread thinly, and we have indicated that we shall be willing to talk further about a proposal which will offer those in the affected area who wish to do so the opportunity to benefit from green energy at no greater cost than that from traditional suppliers, with possibly a small discount. The balance of the fund will be available for community projects and activities such as newsletters, allotments, sports areas, etc. We feel this is a more meaningful use of the fund than would be a small distribution per household per annum but at the moment I don't think this view is shared by our colleagues in Rushton and we would of course reconsider our own stance if your feedback to us was similar.

Possibly slightly lower profile, for the moment, is the proposal for a substantial housing development on the west side of Corby. We have kept an eye on this because the site will extend towards Pipewell and we are worried that the new residents, looking for routes other than the A427 towards the west, might develop a 'rat run' through your village. We cited this as a reason when objecting to the initial consultation.

Staying with highways matters, we supported your ward councillor in the work she did to extend weight limits beyond the boundaries of the village so that overweight vehicles had an early opportunity to reroute and were less likely to 'go for it anyway' on reaching the restriction at the entrance to Pipewell. Unfortunately, enforcement is another matter but the council will always take this up when it is made aware of infringements.

We are also aware of the concerns regarding speeding and speed limits. We played our part in the establishment of the new restrictions and earlier this year we offered one of Wilbarston's Community Speed Watch 'slots' to Pipewell as a means of enforcement. The organisers of this scheme deal with settlements rather than parishes and it is a requirement that the volunteers to carry out the checks should come from the local residents. The ward councillor, to date, has not felt able to proceed but if the volunteers are there we'll happily take this forward.

The Parish Plan, which incorporates Pipewell whilst also recognising its separate character in its own chapter, was published in 2010. At that time it was heartening to see the involvement of Pipewell residents at the open events and through completion of questionnaires. We are now updating it and because it is important that it is framed by the community I have suggested to the ward councillor that we could hold an open meeting in Pipewell, which I would attend with one or two other members of the Parish Plan Group, so that residents can put forward their thoughts. She does not think this would necessarily be of value, but if Pipewell remains in our parish I think it is something we'll pursue.

In the same area as the Parish Plan, Neighbourhood Planning has been introduced nationally as an incentive to local communities to take more control of their own 'shapes'. At the outset it seemed that this might be something which Pipewell could use to reinforce its own identity within the parish. Unfortunately it was ascertained that where a parish already exists that is a 'neighbourhood' for the purposes of the act. Advice has also been received that where the Borough or District Council has a detailed local plan in place, and Kettering is in the process of completing this, the existence of a Neighbourhood Plan will confer no further protection against unwanted development. Given also questions of cost and other restrictions it was decided not, at least for the time being, to proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan for Pipewell or for the parish as a whole.

All the above are parish council related matters which you should have been kept aware of through The Chronicle, the ward representation system or through minutes of the council meetings on a notice board. If you have not I apologise and in the short term will ensure that future issues of The Chronicle are delivered to all properties in Pipewell as they should be. The other issues will also be tackled.

Aside from when events, proposals etc. demand attention the feedback to the council has been that Pipewell relishes its own identity and, day-to-day, prefers to be left alone. Having said that we carry out all the required activities, trying to respond constructively to any planning proposals, including taking the advice of the ward councillor where offered, making sure that the parish as a whole is represented at local forums and presentations, and making sure all the administration is as it should be, including for instance insurance of assets such as the village sign. We have also purchased the red phone box in the village, which we understood the residents wanted us to do, and have put in place a system of regular recorded checks for Health & Safety and maintenance purposes.

I'm not going to go on any longer. The above is not exhaustive but I hope demonstrates that Wilbarston Parish Council is fully aware of its duty towards Pipewell. Following the consultation to date Kettering Borough Council is inclined to incorporate Pipewell into Rushton Parish. Many of the responses so far appear to have come from outside the village or to be other parties' representations of what residents are said to think, there are not that many from the part of Pipewell which actually faces change. If it is the case that the majority of you in Pipewell now feel a closer affinity with Rushton and wish for this

change I will obviously understand and support that but I should not like it to happen because, possibly due to some missing communication, there is a perception that Wilbarston Parish Council has not and does not do its best for Pipewell or that for some reason Pipewell residents are not welcome to use the services and/or take part in activities in the parish. I'll be very happy if anybody wants to contact me (all details above) to discuss any of this further.

The most honest outcome to this final consultation will, I think, be achieved if everybody qualified to do so responds personally direct to the borough and the purpose of this letter, as well as providing information, is to ask you to do just that. What you say is entirely your own business.

Details of how to respond should have been distributed by Kettering Borough Council in the last couple of days. One route is to go on-line to kettering.gov.uk, find 'Community Governance Review' which is currently one of the front page items but will come up anyway if searched, and then follow the link to the online form.

Many thanks for reading this.

Yours faithfully

Nick Richards
Chair, Wilbarston Parish Council