

Appendix B

Final recommendations in respect of which there was not a consensus in the phase 2 consultation

Original Issue No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected
3	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton
4	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Moreton Hall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham
6	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Suffolk Business Park"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Rushbrooke with Rougham
7	Moreton Hall area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham
13	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Kedington •Little Wratting
14*	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Hanchett End" (Haverhill Research Park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Withersfield
17	Oak Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Culford •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve •Hengrave
19*	Assington Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denston •Stansfield
20	Fornham Lock/ Sheepwash Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham All Saints •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve
25	Great and Little Thurlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Great Thurlow •Little Thurlow

* *The Working Party has recommended a change to the final recommendation for these issues in the light of consultation evidence.*

No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
3	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton 	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site.

Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party

Adopt final recommendation below subject to the amendment of the name of one of the proposed parish wards from "South" to "Barton Severalls".

Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation

The "North-East Bury St Edmunds" Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Great Barton Parish within a newly created parish ward. The electoral arrangements of the Parish would be changed as follows:

- a. the growth site would be represented by 2 parish councillors elected to a "South" parish ward with a boundary as shown on consultation map C; and**
- b. the remaining electors in the Parish would be represented by 9 councillors elected to a "North" parish ward.**

The proposed new boundary for consultation, which is shown on consultation map C, reflects the masterplan for the growth site in Vision 2031 as well as existing field lines and strong natural boundaries provided by the existing roads and the railway. Electoral arrangements proposed reflect a five year electorate forecast below.

This recommendation does not increase the overall number of parish councillors for Great Barton from 11. However, if it is adopted, further CGRs may be required between future parish council elections to ensure continued electoral equality between the two parish wards as the new development grows.

The reasons for the recommendation include:


- 1. local preference** (*while there were alternative proposals and views, this option was supported by Great Barton Parish (council and electors) in phase 1. Local electors in Cattishall also felt strongly that that their homes were part of Great Barton Parish*);
- 2. it potentially provides parish boundaries to reflect the identities and interests of local residents (current and future) and offers them more effective and convenient local government** (*Great Barton felt that being an integrated part of their Parish would allow the new community to develop with strong and focused democratic representation and reflect shared interests and needs with the rest of the Parish (which already has several distinct but strongly connected communities i.e. village, Cattishall and East Barton). The Parish Council also felt that this option would provide the new residents the chance to develop their own community identity and local services while development is taking place, and then decide their own future at a later CGR after building is complete*); and

3. it reflects, in community identity terms, the barrier created by the railway.

Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation

The Parish Council supported the recommendation but proposed changing the name of one of the new parish wards from "South" to "Barton Severalls". The Town Council remained of the view that the new homes should be in Bury St Edmunds Parish.

Consultation map C – Issue 3



No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
4	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Moreton Hall" This issue should be read in conjunction with issues 6, 7 and 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site.

Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party

Adopt final recommendation below.

Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation

- (1) The areas of Bury St Edmunds, Great Barton and Rushbrooke with Rougham Parishes be amended as shown on consultation map D.**
- (2) The electoral arrangements of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish be amended as follows:**
 - (a) the "Moreton Hall" Vision 2031 growth site (and other existing properties) be represented by 2 parish councillors elected to a "North" parish ward, with a boundary shown on consultation map D; and**
 - (b) the remaining electors in the Parish be represented by 9 councillors elected to a "South" parish ward.**

The proposed new external parish boundaries for consultation, which are shown on the map overleaf, reflect a recent planning consent for the growth site as well as the strong boundaries provided by the existing roads (including Lady Miriam Way) and the railway.

This recommendation does not increase the overall number of parish councillors for Rushbrooke with Rougham from 11. However, if it is adopted, further CGRs may be required between future parish council elections to ensure continued electoral equality between the two parish wards as the new development grows, reflecting the latest electorate forecasts.

The reasons for the recommendation include:

- 1. **local preference** (*while there were alternative proposals and views, this option was supported by both Great Barton and Rushbrooke with Rougham Parishes (councils and electors) and by many stakeholders (including the Rougham Tower Association and the new Academy in phase 1. Both rural parishes also wished to see a change in their common boundary);*
- 2. **it potentially provides parish boundaries to reflect the identities and interests of local residents (current and future) and offers them more effective and convenient local government** (*respondents supporting the option in phase 1 felt that: the identity and history of Rushbrooke with Rougham (particularly its airfield) could be lost if there is any further movement of the boundary with Bury St Edmunds; and creating a new parish ward would allow the new community to develop with a distinct local identity,*

appropriate local services and strong and focused democratic representation, as well as being an integrated part of the existing parish (which already has several distinct communities); and


- 3. it reflects, in community identity terms, the barrier created by the railway.**

Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation

Generally speaking, respondents associated with the two rural parishes supported the recommendation. This included: the two parish councils; 72% of the 82 local residents who commented; the Rougham Estate; and the Rougham Tower Association.

In contrast, those associated with Bury St Edmunds/Moreton Hall (including the Town Council and Moreton Hall Residents' Association) opposed it, and believed the new homes should be in Bury St Edmunds or a new Moreton Hall Parish.

Consultation map D – Issues 4, 6, 7 and 8



No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
6	<p>Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Suffolk Business Park"</p> <p>This issue should be read in conjunction with issues 4, 7 and 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	<p>Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site.</p>
Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party			
Adopt final recommendation below.			
Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation			
<p>(1) The "Suffolk Business Park" Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish; and</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Consultation map D illustrates this proposal and is contained in the summary for issue 4. The reasons for the recommendation include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. local preference (<i>the principle of the proposal was supported by the Parish and Town Councils in phase 1</i>); 2. it potentially provides more appropriate parish boundaries to reflect the interests and identity of local electors and businesses (current and future) and offers them more effective and convenient local government (<i>respondents in phase 1 commented on the need to preserve the community and historic identity of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council</i>); 3. it reflects the strong boundary of Lady Miriam Way. 			
Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation			
<p>The Moreton Hall Residents' Association and some residents of Moreton Hall (5 in total) suggested the business park should all be in Bury St Edmunds or a new Moreton Hall Parish. However, there was support for the recommendation from both the Parish and Town Councils, as well as from some residents/businesses of Rougham (7 in total) and their councillors.</p>			

No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
7	Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds <i>This issue should be read in conjunction with issues 4, 6 and 8</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bury St Edmunds •Great Barton •Rushbrooke with Rougham 	The proposal of Cllr Beckwith to create an entirely new parish of Moreton Hall (by removing these properties from existing parished areas). Since this element of the review will need to link with issues 4, 6 and 8, it will potentially affect Great Barton and/or Rushbrooke with Rougham parishes.

Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party

Adopt final recommendation below.

Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation

That the Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds remains in Bury St Edmunds Parish, and no new parish be created.

The Council noted that the small number of local electors responding to the phase 1 (fact-finding) consultation were split fairly evenly on whether creating a new parish council would be appropriate (7 in favour of a parish council and 6 in favour of the status quo). On balance, therefore, the Council felt that there was currently insufficient evidence to allow it 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 stage of the review.

However, in consulting on such a final recommendation, the Council agreed to make it clear to respondents what the alternative option and implications would be, since the Council can change its recommendation in the light of evidence received. The alternative option, as suggested by Cllr Beckwith, would be to create an entirely new and separate Parish for the Moreton Hall area, served by its own parish council.

Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation

Opinion remained divided, albeit a large majority (over 86%) of the 194 electors who responded to the consultation opposed the recommendation, and wished to see it changed so that a new Parish Council is formed. As all of these 194 respondents were from the affected area, this represented the views of 3.6% of the December 2015 electorate of the Moreton Hall Ward of Bury St Edmunds Parish of Bury St Edmunds Parish.

The Town Council supported the final recommendation, whereas Cllr Beckwith and the Moreton Hall Residents' Association opposed it (favouring the creation of the new parish council).

A majority of the Working Party felt that awareness of the review had been high and, in that context, the low response rate meant that there was still not sufficient evidence of support to justify such a significant change to the current arrangements. Hence its recommendation to Council.

If, however, the recommendation is changed, and a new parish council is formed, then the Borough Council will need to determine:

- (a) the name of the new parish council;
- (b) the new parish boundary;
- (c) the number of councillors;
- (d) whether the new parish will be warded; and
- (e) an implementation date and election timetable thereafter (see covering report).

In this regard, only one comment was received to disagree with the consultation suggestion that any new parish could be coterminous with the Borough Council's Moreton Hall Ward, with 11 councillors (subject to the outcomes for CGR issues 4, 6 and 8). This was from Cllr Nettleton and is outlined in the main covering report. The Working Party felt that, if a new parish were to be created as part of this CGR, then its boundary should reflect this proposed change.

No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
13	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Little Wratting •Kedington 	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site.

Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party

Adopt final recommendation below.

Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation

The boundary of Haverhill Parish be extended as indicated on consultation map H to incorporate the Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Haverhill".

The new northern boundary for Haverhill which the Council suggests should be tested through consultation reflects the Vision 2031 growth sites and elements of the submissions of the town and parish councils and parish meeting. In addition, the Council has proposed the testing of the Town Council's suggestion that, since the green buffer for the North-East growth site by Calford Green is designated as park land, it would also make more sense to include this area within the Haverhill boundary.

In accordance with the recommendations for issue 26, if these proposals are agreed, the transferred parish areas would be temporarily added to the existing Haverhill East Ward, pending any review of town and borough council wards by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

The reason for the recommendation include:

1. **local preference and/or evidence** (*the principle of the proposal for issue 13 was supported by the town and parish councils and parish meeting in phase 1, and by many of the local electors who commented*);
2. **it potentially offers parish boundaries to reflect the identities and interests of local residents and businesses (current and future) and offer them more effective and convenient local government** (*the Town Council has suggested that administrative boundaries around Haverhill should reflect the patterns of everyday life and the ability of the respective parish and town councils to provide effective local government to new and existing electors. There was also consensus that the identity of all surrounding villages should be protected through the CGR*).


Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation

While there was general support for, or reluctant acceptance of, the main principle of the recommendation (i.e. that the new homes are in Haverhill Parish), Kedington Parish Council and other local respondents asked that the boundary change did not encompass the "green buffer" area around Calford Green. The Town Council, however, argued that this green buffer would be most closely associated with Haverhill Parish, in terms of the CGR criteria. There were also mixed views on the recommendation to leave the Little Wratting boundary by the A143 unchanged but, overall, a majority of respondents supported this course of action (or did not formally object).

In respect of Calford Green, the Working Party took the view that, as part of the

masterplan for the growth site, the proposed parkland was most closely associated with the new development (and, therefore, with Haverhill Parish in CGR terms) and that, in planning terms, it would still act as the desired green buffer irrespective of the outcome of the CGR.

Consultation Map H – Issues 12-14




No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
14	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Hanchett End" (Haverhill Research Park) <i>(All of the area bounded by the A1017, A1307 and Hanchett End)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Haverhill •Withersfield 	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site.
Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party			
Do <u>not</u> adopt final recommendation below and retain existing boundary			
Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation			
<p>The boundary of Haverhill Parish be extended as indicated on consultation map H to incorporate the "Hanchett End (Haverhill Research Park)" Vision 2031 Strategic Site.</p> <p><i>Consultation map H can be found in the report for issue 13 above.</i></p> <p>The new northern boundary for Haverhill which the Council suggests should be tested through consultation reflects the Vision 2031 growth sites and elements of the submissions of the town and parish councils and parish meeting. In accordance with the recommendations for issue 26, if these proposals are agreed, the transferred parish areas would be temporarily added to the existing Haverhill West Ward, pending any review of town and borough council wards by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.</p> <p>The reasons for the recommendation include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. local preference and/or evidence <i>(There was no consensus over issue 14 in phase 1, with Withersfield Parish Council and most existing local electors who responded opposed to what is being recommended but the Town Council and the Research Park operator providing evidence that the growth site should be in Haverhill. Therefore the Borough Council believes local preference should be tested further through consultation on this final recommendation to obtain more evidence);</i> 2. it potentially offers parish boundaries to reflect the identities and interests of local residents and businesses (current and future) and offer them more effective and convenient local government <i>(the Town Council has suggested that administrative boundaries around Haverhill should reflect the patterns of everyday life and the ability of the respective parish and town councils to provide effective local government to new and existing electors. There was also consensus that the identity of all surrounding villages should be protected through the CGR).</i> 			
Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation			
<p>There remained no consensus on this issue, but the consultation achieved its objective of obtaining more evidence to support the final decision. The Working Party noted that Withersfield Parish Council and the majority of local respondents (particularly those in affected properties) disagreed strongly with the recommendation, wanting to see no change in the boundary. This was particularly the case in relation to Hanchett End and Barsey Close where the majority of affected households responded to the consultation and there was very strong support for remaining in Withersfield. Haverhill Town Council continued to support the change, as did around a third of the 73 local respondents.</p>			

No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
17	Oak Lodge, Mill Road, Hengrave (IP28 6LP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Culford •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve •Hengrave 	Boundary between Culford, Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve and Hengrave in vicinity of Mill Road
Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party			
Adopt final recommendation below.			
Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation			
<p>The area shown on consultation map K be transferred from Culford Parish to Hengrave Parish.</p> <p>The reasons for the recommendation include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. local preference (<i>the principle of a transfer from Culford Parish was supported by all respondents in Phase 1, and a transfer to Hengrave Parish was the preference of the affected electors themselves</i>); and 2. it potentially provides more appropriate parish boundaries to reflect the interests and identity of local electors and offers them more effective and convenient local government (<i>the local electors stated they were most closely affiliated with nearby Hengrave Village</i>). 			
Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation			
<p>The affected electors did not respond in phase 2, but the recommendation was based on their phase 1 response, which explained their postal address was Hengrave and that they most closely affiliated with that Parish in terms of patterns of daily life (e.g. church and public transport).</p> <p>Hengrave Parish Council had not responded at either stage of the review so their view is not known. However, the current Parish (Culford, West Stow and Wordwell Parish Council) did not object to the proposal to transfer Oak Lodge from its area, as they felt it had no significant connection to their community. This Parish Council also agreed with a transfer to Hengrave.</p> <p>Fornham St Martin cum Fornham St Genevieve Parish Council did not indicate that it wished to change its phase 1 submission, which was to express the view that Oak Lodge should transfer to Fornham St Genevieve parish, on the basis that it was very close to existing properties in the Parish on Mill Road, and that this provided a community connection and more effective local government.</p> <p>Along similar and additional lines, a nearby resident submitted a detailed argument in phase 2 that, given the strong natural boundary of the river and the historical context, it would be more logical to recommend that the river be used as the new parish boundary for Culford, Hengrave and Fornham St Genevieve in this vicinity, and that Oak Lodge be transferred to Fornham St Genevieve, in order to achieve CGR objectives. This elector asked that, given the lack of consensus, if it was too late to implement his own suggestions, then the Council make no change to the current boundaries, allowing the matter to be looked at in a future CGR.</p>			


The Working Party considered the various submissions and has proposed that the original recommendation for phase 2 be adopted given the clear consensus that the property be transferred from Culford Parish and, in that regard, the views of the directly affected electors.

Consultation map K – Issue 17



No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
19	Elm Farm and associated cottages, Assington Green, Stansfield (CO10 8LY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denston •Stansfield 	Boundary between the parishes of Denston and Stansfield in vicinity of Elm Farm
Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party			
Do <u>not</u> adopt final recommendation below. Retain current parish boundaries.			
Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation			
<p>The area shown on consultation map M be transferred from Denston Parish to Stansfield Parish.</p> <p>The request for the transfer was received from Stansfield Parish Council which believes the properties in question have closer links to Stansfield socially and geographically, and would benefit from the democratic representation of a parish council. This view was supported by the County Councillor. However, Denston Parish Meeting was unable to respond during phase 1 of the review since it fell between parish meetings. The affected electors also expressed strong and differing views on whether to transfer from or remain in Denston. The Council therefore felt that it would be worth exploring the potential for the change further through consultation in phase 2, by way of a definite proposal.</p> <p>The reasons for the recommendation include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. local preference and/or evidence (see above); and 2. it potentially provides more appropriate parish boundaries to reflect the interests and identity of local electors and offers them more effective and convenient local government. 			
Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation			
<p>Given the lack of consensus/information in phase 1, the Council used phase 2 to test the appetite for change by consulting again on a definite proposition. There is still no consensus, with the two parishes and affected electors taking strongly varying views on the need for change, and an objection to the recommendation from a landowner. Furthermore, if the two consultation exercises are taken separately, a majority of electors (57% and 63% respectively) have opposed a change on each occasion.</p> <p>The Working Party felt, therefore, that having tested the matter twice through consultation it did not have enough evidence, in relation to the criteria for CGRs and local opinion, to justify a change to the current parish boundary.</p>			

Consultation map M – Issue 19



No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
20	Area between Fornham Lock Bridge and the Sheepwash Bridge, adjacent to the sewage works entrance, Fornham St Martin.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fornham All Saints •Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve 	Boundary between the parishes of Fornham All Saints and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve along the B1106.

Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party

Adopt final recommendation below.

Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation

The area shown on consultation map N be transferred from Fornham All Saints Parish to Fornham St Genevieve Parish.

There was not a consensus from phase 1 on whether or not to make a change, with the parish councils and affected electors expressing different views. The Council therefore felt there was merit in a final recommendation to use the river as a strong natural boundary being tested through further consultation.


The reasons for the recommendation include:

1. **local preference and/or evidence** (see above);
2. **it potentially provides more appropriate parish boundaries to reflect the interests and identity of local electors and offers them more effective and convenient local government;** and
3. **it utilises the strong natural boundary of the river.**

Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation

Given the lack of consensus in phase 1, the Council used phase 2 to test the appetite for change by consulting again on a definite proposition. The only new evidence received in phase 2 (from one of the affected properties) supported the recommendation, but there is good reason to believe from phase 1 that there is unlikely to be consensus either way. On balance, the Working Party felt that, given the expressed view of some of the residents, it had enough evidence to endorse the final recommendation.

Consultation Map N – Issue 20



- Existing Parish Boundary
- Recommended Parish Boundary
- From Fornham All Saints to Fornham St Genevieve

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100023282 / 100019675.
 You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

No	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Matter covered by final recommendation
25	Great and Little Thurlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Great Thurlow •Little Thurlow 	Whether or not to combine the parish councils of Great and Little Thurlow.
Recommendation of Democratic Renewal Working Party			
Adopt final recommendation below, and respond to Little Thurlow Parish Council as indicated.			
Final Recommendation in Phase 2 consultation			
No change be made to the community governance arrangements for Little Thurlow and Great Thurlow at the current time.			
<p>The reason for the recommendation is local preference - there is no consensus among the villages and local electors on whether or not to bring the two parishes together through formal changes to their electoral arrangements i.e. grouping or merging the two parishes to form one council.</p> <p>This issue was proposed by one of the two parishes for inclusion in (and examination under) the CGR. A range of views have been expressed in the first evidence gathering stage of the review, with no consensus emerging. In particular, Great Thurlow Parish Council has made it clear it favours no change to the current arrangements. It may also be that, reflecting subsequent comments from Little Thurlow Parish Council, it would be more appropriate to look at informal ways to build upon the successes of the existing joint arrangements between the two villages, outside of the formal constraints of a CGR process. This could link to the Council's Families and Communities Strategy and would not preclude this issue being returned to in any future CGR.</p>			
Brief Summary of Phase 2 Consultation			
<p>No suggested changes to the CGR recommendation were received through the consultation but Little Thurlow Parish Council reiterated its request for an independent review of the relationship between the two parishes, outside of a formal CGR process.</p> <p>The Working Party felt that a review of the type which Little Thurlow Parish Council appears to be seeking might best be facilitated by the Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC), but would still require the consent of both parishes. Furthermore, as explained in the final recommendation, it would definitely be possible to look also at informal ways to build upon the successes of the existing joint arrangements between the two villages, outside of the formal constraints of a CGR process. This could link to the Council's Families and Communities Strategy and would not preclude any future CGR, if a local consensus for formal change ever emerged. In that context, the Locality Officer could be asked to talk to the two parish councils, involving the local ward member and County Councillor.</p>			