

---

# Democratic Renewal Working Party



*St Edmundsbury*  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Democratic Renewal Working Party** held on **Wednesday 2 December 2015** at **5.00 pm** at **West Suffolk House, Ground Floor Room 14, West Suffolk House**, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** Patricia Warby  
**Vice Chairman** Jim Thorndyke

John Burns                      David Nettleton  
Susan Glossop                 Richard Rout

**Substitutes attending:**  
Carol Bull

16. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Stamp.

17. **Substitutes**

The following substitution was declared:

Councillor Bull substituting for Councillor Stamp.

18. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

19. **Community Governance Review - Initial Consultation Results**

The Working Party considered report DEM/SE/15/003 (previously circulated) which detailed the results from the initial consultation of the Community Governance Review. Members were informed that a recommendation had to be made for each issue even if the recommendation was not to make a change.

Members then considered each issue in turn and considered the consultation results as detailed in Appendix A to DEM/SE/15/003. Maps of the proposed boundaries are attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes.

### **Issue No. 26 – The whole Borough (consequential impact of CGR)**

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the Council requests a full electoral review of the electoral arrangements for St Edmundsbury Borough Council by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England;
- (2) subject to the outcome of issue 7, the ward boundaries (and number of councillors) of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill Town Councils be left unchanged within their existing boundaries as part of this CGR, pending any electoral review of the Borough Council;
- (3) if the CGR results in the extension of either of the towns' boundaries then the new area(s) be added, on an interim basis, to an existing adjacent town council ward, with no increase in the number of town councillors. This will result in a temporary electoral imbalance, but this imbalance can also be corrected by the subsequent electoral review before any scheduled elections;
- (4) ward boundaries and other electoral arrangements for any other parishes (existing or new) be fully considered as part of this CGR, but it be explained to the parishes involved that these may be subject to later change by the LGBCE if they need to ensure electoral equality for, and coterminosity with, their own scheme for borough wards or county divisions.

### **Issue No. 1 – V2031 – North-West Bury St Edmunds**

All parties who had responded in phase 1 supported the alteration of Fornham All Saints Parish to exclude the growth side, with some consensus that it should become part of Bury St Edmunds Parish.

Members of the Working Party agreed that the boundary of Bury St Edmunds Parish should be extended to include the growth site and that the boundary should follow the north side of the new relief road (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes). The growth area should be added to the existing St Olaves Ward pending any review of town and borough council wards by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

RECOMMENDED:

The boundary of Bury St Edmunds Parish be extended to include the residential element of the "North-West Bury St Edmunds" Vision 2031 growth site.

## **Issue No. 2 – V2031 – West Bury St Edmunds**

The general response from the phase 1 consultation was that Bury St Edmunds Parish should include the new development when it is delivered. Even though there is only a concept statement at present, residential development could be reasonably anticipated to start in the next 5-10 years.

Members of the Working Party agreed that the boundary for Bury St Edmunds parish should be extended to include the residential element of the growth site (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes). This would result in 136 Newmarket Road (Issue 11) being included in Bury St Edmunds. Members felt that the new boundary may need to be reviewed when the precise detail of any development was known and that if and when any proposal for a sub-regional health campus emerged, this could also be the subject of a separate CGR if required.

### **RECOMMENDED:**

The boundary of Bury St Edmunds Parish be extended to include the residential element of the "West Bury St Edmunds" Vision 2031 growth site.

## **Issue No. 3 – V2031 – North-East Bury St Edmunds**

There was no consensus from the consultation, with the parish and town councils both feeling they were best placed to serve the new residents.

After consideration by Members of the Working Party it was proposed that the growth site be retained in Great Barton Parish within a newly created parish ward (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes). The warding arrangements would be made under delegated authority and in consultation with the Parish Council. The Working Party noted that further CGRs would be required between parish council elections to ensure electoral equality between the two parish wards as the new development grew.

### **RECOMMENDED:**

The "North-East Bury St Edmunds" Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Great Barton Parish within a newly created parish ward.

## **Issue No. 4 – V2031 – Moreton Hall**

The consultation concluded that the two affected parish councils, and borough and county councillors were in favour of the growth site being included in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish and there was strong support for Lady Miriam Way being the parish boundary.

Members agreed that the growth site should be retained in Rusbrooke with Rougham Parish. The boundary with Bury St Edmunds Parish should follow the line of Lady Miriam Way to the West and with Great Barton Parish, the railway line to the North (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes).. The warding arrangements would be made under delegated authority and in consultation with the Parish Council. The Working Party noted that further

CGRs would be required between parish council elections to ensure electoral equality between the two parish wards as the new development grew.

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the "Moreton Hall" Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Rusbrooke with Rougham Parish within a newly created parish ward;
- (2) the external boundaries between Bury St Edmunds, Great Barton and Rushbrooke with Rougham Parishes be amended as shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

### **Issue No. 5 – V2031 – South-East Bury St Edmunds**

The consensus of the consultation was that none of the growth site should be in Nowton Parish but should be in Bury St Edmunds Parish. In addition, the parish councils of Nowton and Rusbrooke with Rougham had proposed a minor change to their boundary.

Members of the Working Party concurred with the results of the consultation that the new boundary should incorporate the growth site in Bury St Edmunds Parish (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes).

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the boundary of Bury St Edmunds Parish be extended to include the whole of the "South-East Bury St Edmunds" Vision 2031 growth site
- (2) the boundary of Nowton and Rushbrooke with Rougham Parishes be amended so that it reflects the A134 and transfers Willow House, and adjacent land, from Nowton to Rushbrooke with Rougham.

### **Issue No. 6 – V2031 – Suffolk Business Park**

The town and parish councils and Members of the Working Party agreed that the Business Park should remain in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish with the existing boundary being rationalised to follow Lady Miriam Way to the A14.

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the "Suffolk Business Park" Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish; and
- (2) the boundary of Bury St Edmunds and Rushbrooke with Rougham Parishes be amended in relation to the business park to follow the southern stretch of Lady Miriam Way.

### **Issue No. 7 – Moreton Hall Area of Bury St Edmunds**

There was no consensus from the consultation on whether to create a new parish council for Moreton Hall. The County Councillor for Moreton Hall (Councillor Beckwith) was for the proposal along with a small number of electors, but Bury St Edmunds Town Council, a neighbouring parish council

and other elected representatives as well as an equal number of electors were against the proposal.

The Working Party noted the responses to the consultation but felt there was insufficient evidence to allow the Borough Council to recommend to electors that a new parish be created for Moreton Hall and that it should be the status quo position that is tested in the final consultation period. However, the Members suggested that the Council should indicate to respondents what the alternative option would be.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds remains in Bury St Edmunds Parish.

**Issue No. 8 – 29 Primack Road, Bury St Edmunds, and 67, 87, 89, 91, 93 and 95 Mortimer Road, Bury St Edmunds**

The consensus was that the boundary should be moved so that the properties were included in the Bury St Edmunds Parish.

The Working Party noted that any recommendation would apply irrespective of the outcome of issues 4, 6 and 7. Members proposed that the new boundary should follow the line of Lady Miriam Way.

RECOMMENDED:

That the properties be transferred from Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish to Bury St Edmunds Parish.

**Issue No. 9 – 71, 73 and 75 Home Farm Lane, Bury St Edmunds**

The consensus was that the boundary should be moved so that the properties are wholly in Bury St Edmunds Parish (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes). Members concurred with this proposal.

RECOMMENDED:

That the properties be transferred from Nowton Parish to Bury St Edmunds Parish.

**Issue No. 10 – School Bungalow, Hardwick Middle School, Bury St Edmunds**

Only one response had been received from the consultation and this proposed that the boundary should be moved so that the property was included in Bury St Edmunds Parish. Members of the Working Party considered whether the proposed boundary should include just the School Bungalow or the whole of the Middle School land and concluded that the latter was the preferred proposal (see map at Appendix 1 to these minutes).

RECOMMENDED: That

The whole school site (including bungalow) be transferred from Nowton Parish to Bury St Edmunds.

**Issue No. 11 – 136 Newmarket Road, Bury St Edmunds**

The consensus was that the boundary should be moved so that the property was included in Bury St Edmunds Parish. Members noted that this recommendation would apply irrespective of the outcome of issue 2 and agreed with the consensus.

RECOMMENDED:

That the property be transferred from Westley Parish to Bury St Edmunds Parish.

*The next three issues were considered by Members of the Working Party and a combined recommendation was proposed.*

**Issue No. 12 – Vision 2031 Strategic Site “North-West Haverhill”**

Haverhill Town Council and Little Wrattling Parish Council agreed on the principle that the growth site should remain in Haverhill Parish. This view was mostly supported by local electors and councillors who responded to the consultation.

**Issue No. 13 – Vision 2031 Strategic Site “North-East Haverhill”**

This issue attracted significant comment in the initial consultation. A lot of the comment also related to planning issues involved with the development itself. There was a consensus between the Town Council, Parish Council and Parish Meeting that the new homes should be built in Haverhill Parish. There was also strong consensus that the community identity of Kedington and Little Wrattling needed to be protected.

**Issue No. 14 – Vision 2031 Strategic Site “Hanchett End” (Haverhill Research Park)**

The consensus from the existing electors were to remain in Withersfield Parish but the Town Council felt that the site should be included in Haverhill Parish.

The Town Council suggested that a more coherent electoral arrangement between the Hanchett End and NW Haverhill Vision 2031 site would be provided by extending the boundary outwards to follow the river and field lines, encapsulating some existing properties by Melbourne Bridge. The Working Party proposed testing this suggestion in the final consultation but were mindful of the fact that the Parish Council and electors in Melbourne Bridge had not yet been consulted on this proposal.

RECOMMENDED: That

- (1) the boundary of Haverhill Parish be extended as indicated on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes, to incorporate the "North-East Haverhill" and "Hanchett End (Haverhill Research Park)" Vision 2031 strategic sites (alongside the "North-West" site); and
- (2) the boundary of Haverhill Parish also be extended in the vicinity of Melbourne Bridge/Meldham Washland as shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

**Issue No. 15 – County boundary between Suffolk and Essex adjacent to Haverhill**

Any proposals to change boundaries between local authorities would need to be referred to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. There was no consensus with neighbouring authorities but Haverhill Town Council did propose that the Borough Council raised this issue with the LGBCE at the next available opportunity.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be asked to carry out a principal area boundary review in respect of the historic Essex/Suffolk boundary to the south and east of Haverhill.

**Issue No. 16 – Hermitage Farmhouse, Snow Hill, Clare**

The consensus from the consultation was that the property should remain in Clare. The Working Party considered several options for the boundary and proposed the boundary as shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

RECOMMENDED:

That the area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes be transferred from Poslingford Parish to Clare Parish.

**Issue No. 17 – Oak Lodge, Mill Road, Hengrave**

The electors were of the view their property should be in Hengrave but two of the Parish Councils agreed that the property should be in Fornham St Geneveive. All respondents agreed that the property should be moved from the current parish of Culford. The Working Party agreed with the views of the electors and propose that the property should be in Hengrave.

RECOMMENDED:

The area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes be transferred from Culford Parish to Hengrave Parish.

### **Issue No. 18 – Lodge Farmhouse, Seven Hills, Ingham**

Both parish councils expressed the view that the boundary should not be changed and no response was received from the electors.

RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the current parish boundaries (i.e. the property to remain in Culford Parish.)

### **Issue No. 19 – Elm Farm and associated cottages, Assington Green, Stansfield**

There was no consensus amongst the parish councils nor electors but the Working Party felt it would be worth exploring the potential for the change through further consultation in phase 2 and therefore propose that the properties be transferred to Stansfield Parish.

RECOMMENDED:

That the area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes be transferred from Denston Parish to Stansfield Parish.

### **Issue No. 20 – Area between Fornham Lock Bridge and the Sheepwash Bridge, adjacent to the sewage works entrance, Fornham St Martin**

There was no consensus between electors in the two properties affected. However, the Working Party felt there was merit in a final recommendation to use the river as a strong natural boundary to be tested in the final consultation.

RECOMMENDED:

That the area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes be transferred from Fornham All Saints Parish to Fornham St Genevieve Parish.

### **Issue No. 21 – RAF Honington**

The Station Commander, RAF Honington had consulted with families at the Station and supported the proposal to remove the warding arrangements for Honington Parish so that there was not a separate ward for the RAF Station. There had been little support for moving the boundary between Honington and Troston.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Village and Station parish wards of Honington Parish be removed.



### **Issue No. 22 – Weathercock House, Market Weston**

The consensus from all respondents was that the boundary should be moved so that the property was wholly within Market Weston Parish. Members of the Working Party agreed.

RECOMMENDED:

That Weathercock House and the area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to these minutes be transferred from Thelnetham Parish to Market Weston Parish.

### **Issue No. 23 – Properties on Dunstall Green Road between Ousden and Dalham**

The consensus of the respondents was that the properties should be in Ousden Parish. The Working Party agreed that a request should be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to review this boundary.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be asked to examine the boundary between St Edmundsbury and Forest Het at Dunstall Green Road between Ousden and Dalham when it next carries out a principal area boundary review.

### **Issue No. 24 – Stansfield Parish Council**

RECOMMENDED:

That the number of parish councillors for Stansfield be increased from six to seven.

### **Issue No. 25 – Great and Little Thurlow**

There was no consensus amongst the respondents to the initial consultation. A wide range of views had been expressed and Members of the Working Party felt that no change should be made.

RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the community governance arrangements for Little Thurlow and Great Thurlow at the current time.

20. **Future meetings**

The Working Party proposed that a suitable date for the next meeting would be agreed by email to all Members.

The Meeting concluded at 8.42 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---