

## **Community Governance Review**

### **Analysis of stage 1 consultation**

#### **Draft recommendations**

#### **1. Background to the review**

1.1 The following draft recommendations are intended to ensure that community governance is:

- Reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area
- Effective and convenient.

1.2 The review must take into account:

- The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion
- The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

1.3 The review must consider the following options for all areas:

- Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes
- The naming of parishes and the style of new parishes
- The electoral arrangements for parishes including
  - The ordinary year of election
  - Council size
  - The number of councillors to be elected to the council
  - The warding (if any) of the parish.
- Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes.

1.4 In undertaking the review, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council has taken into account key data for each parish and ward. The range of data used is as follows:

- Electorate size and projected housing development data
- Elections data from previous elections and by-elections including the number of seats contested in recent years
- Responses to the initial consultation which took place between 23 February and 18 May 2022
- Council size given the legal minimum of five members and the National Association of Local Councils recommendation of a minimum number of seven
- The ratio of councillors to electors.

## **2. Consultation**

2.1 The initial consultation took place between 23 February and 18 May 2022. The following methods of consultation were undertaken:

- Open consultation on the council's website
- Advertisement in the Borough Bulletin with a link to the consultation on the website and contact details should respondents require a paper copy
- Social media posts
- Email to borough councillors inviting them to respond to the consultation online or by email / letter
- Email to parish clerks inviting a formal response to the consultation online or by letter / email and inviting individual responses from parish councillors and offering a visit to talk about the review and receive views
- Email to a database of voluntary & community sector bodies
- Email to a database of around 700 businesses in the borough
- Email to Leicestershire County Council inviting them as a body and county councillors to respond to the review
- Email to Leicestershire & Rutland Association of Local Councils inviting them to respond
- Email to neighbourhood development groups
- Email to the MPs for Hinckley & Bosworth inviting a response
- Display at the Rural Conference
- Posters in public buildings.

2.2 Following the above, we attended a meeting of the Dadlington Steering Group to talk about the review, a meeting with Sutton Cheney parish councillors and a meeting with representatives of parish councillors arranged by the Leicestershire & Rutland Association of Local Councils.

2.3 128 consultation responses were received from borough and parish councillors, parish councils residents, and the MP for Bosworth. These responses are contained within appendix B.

2.4 It should be noted that a number of the submissions received raised issues with other aspects of parish councils outside of the remit of this review, for example dissatisfaction with decision-making.

2.5 The Community Governance Review Working Group met on 26 May 2022 to consider the responses to the consultation and to make recommendations to Council. Their considerations and recommendations are contained within this document.

### **3. Next steps**

- 3.1 The recommendations of the working group will be put to Council on 12 July 2022. Those approved by Council will be open for public consultation from 13 July to 7 September 2022. The working group will then meet to consider consultation responses and make final recommendations to Council. Following Council approval, Orders for those changes agreed will be made and will come into effect in May 2023.

#### 4. Considerations and recommendations of the Community Governance Review Working Group

##### 4.1 Bagworth and Thornton

Four responses were received, three of which suggested Bagworth and Thornton had become quite distinct settlements and it was no longer appropriate for them to be represented by a single parish council.

Members acknowledged the differences in the two settlements, however it was noted that if they were split into two parishes each would be small in terms of number of seats and, given the fact that all ten vacancies on the parish council since 2015 had been uncontested, there was little evidence that each village could sustain its own parish council.

Members did, however, feel that representation of electors per councillor could be more equal.

To make the representation of electors per councillor more equal, Bagworth ward should increase from four to five seats and Thornton ward should decrease from four to three seats, thus retaining the same number of councillors overall.

##### *Recommendation*

The parish council remains as a body. The number of overall number of seats remains the same with Bagworth ward increasing from four to five seats and Thornton ward decreasing from four to three seats.

##### *Current representation*

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Bagworth	4	327
Thornton	4	234

##### *Recommended representation*

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Bagworth	5	278
Thornton	3	283

##### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considers that a community governance change in terms of the number of councillors representing each parish ward would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## 4.2 Barlestone

Two responses were received and were largely satisfied with the arrangements. Comments related to the actions of individuals rather than the electoral arrangements.

One response suggested that Barlestone should merge with Osbaston, given the geographical links, however Osbaston Parish Council was satisfied with its arrangements and there was no evidence to suggest change was necessary.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## 4.3 Barwell

Four responses were received with a mixed interest in change, although reasons given mostly related to matters that were not within the remit of this review.

Barwell Parish Council expressed an interest in more seats on the parish council which was also suggested by the borough councillor for Barwell. Only one resident suggested an increase in seats but the reasoning for this request was not sufficient to be considered. Whilst NALC guidance suggests an electorate of Barwell's size could sustain 14 seats (an overall increase of 2), the number of councillors would not be able to be applied equally to the parish wards and would negatively affect the equity of the elector-to-councillor ratio. Barwell is evenly represented with an average elector to councillor ratio of 611:1

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.4 Burbage**

Nine responses were received and were mostly positive or neutral. Any dissatisfaction expressed related to matters not within the remit of this review. The Parish Council did not request any changes.

Whilst NALC guidance suggests an electorate of Burbage's size could sustain 18 seats (an overall decrease of 2), there were no suggestions that the current number of councillors is inappropriate and therefore no evidence to support change.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.5 Cadeby**

One response received (from the parish council) which was satisfied with maintaining the status quo.

Cadeby Parish Council has five councillors which is the legal minimum yet also has the lowest elector-to-councillor ration in the borough. Cadeby has not received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest in the last ten years. It would therefore be inappropriate to increase the number of councillors to NALC's recommended minimum of seven.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.6 Carlton**

One response was received, from Carlton Parish Council. The response requested a change to the boundary between Carlton and Market Bosworth (see the map enclosed with their response).

The changes requested by Carlton Parish Council would require a move to the boundaries around Friezeland Farm, land adjacent to the two southern-most cottages on Westfields Lane, the canal towpath, Park View Farm and the carriageway of Barton Road.

Market Bosworth Parish Council, which would be affected by these boundary changes, does not support the requested changes.

Members acknowledged that a change in boundary would prevent it bisecting some plots along the border and understood how the parish council may feel this would improve governance in the area. They concluded, however, that the issue of the parish boundary bisecting plots was not a cause for concern and was a regular occurrence throughout the country. Given that no other consultation responses had been received from the area and that Market Bosworth Parish Council did not support the request, members did not feel change was appropriate.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.7 Desford**

Four responses were received, mostly positive or neutral. Dissatisfaction expressed was in matters not within the remit of this review.

Whilst NALC guidance suggests the parish council could sustain 11 seats, which would be a decrease of one seat, there was no suggestion that the current representation is ineffective and therefore no evidence for change.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.8 Earl Shilton**

Four responses were received with mostly positive or neutral views. Two of the responses expressed an interest in more councillors and, whilst an electorate of Earl Shilton's size could sustain 15 seats (an increase of 1), applying this to the two parish wards proportionately would negatively affect the equity in the elector-to-councillor ratio.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.



## 4.9 Groby

Four responses were received, three of which expressed an interest in a change to Groby parish's border. Some of these suggested changes would require a change to the external border of the borough which cannot be considered as part of this review. However several responses suggested that Field Head ward would be more suitable as part of Markfield parish. Groby Parish Council also suggested this change.

Members felt that Field Head becoming part of Markfield Parish would not only align better with borough ward boundaries but would improve governance, community cohesion, and would better reflect identities of residents in the area.

### *Recommendation*

The boundary be redrawn between Groby and Markfield parishes to result in Field Head becoming part of Markfield Parish. The number of councillors for Groby Parish Council be set at 13 with no warding.

### *Current representation*

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Groby	13	418
Field Head	3	154

### *Recommended representation*

Parish	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Groby	13	418

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considers that a community governance change by taking Field Head ward out of Groby parish and reducing the number of overall seats by three to 13 with no warding would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.10 Higham on the Hill**

No responses were received. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, there is no disproportionality in elector-to-councillor ratios and no drive for change amongst residents.

##### *Recommendation*

No change.

##### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.11 Hinckley**

Seven responses were received, with none expressing a particular interest in becoming a parished area.

##### *Recommendation*

No change.

##### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.12 Market Bosworth**

Four responses were received, including a response from the parish council which had requested an increase in the number of seats. Members noted, however, that the electorate of Market Bosworth has decreased over the last five years despite a small increase in the number of properties. It is therefore felt that there was no evidence for change. This is further supported by the fact that there has been sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest only once in the last ten years.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.13 Markfield**

Four responses were received, two of which, including the parish council, suggested that the border of Markfield parish should be extended to include land adjacent to the A50 (which may include Field Head), although part of this land fell outside of the borough boundary and was therefore not within the remit of this review. Whilst Markfield Parish Council had not specifically suggested that Field Head be moved within the parish boundary of Markfield, members felt that change was important to the residents of Field Head (as suggested by Groby Parish Council) and that this would improve governance and community cohesion and would better reflect identities of the residents within the area.

In relation to the size of Markfield Parish Council, members supported NALC's suggested increase of one seat (on the current size of the parish council). Including Field Head within Markfield Parish did not affect this recommendation, however Field Head had historically been represented by three seats (whilst part of Groby parish) which would lead to inequity in the elector-to-councillor ratio if part of Markfield Parish Council. It is therefore felt that, on the basis of Field Head becoming part of Markfield parish, the representation for Field Head ward should be reduced to one councillor.

### *Recommendation*

The boundary be redrawn to incorporate Field Head ward within Markfield parish. The number of councillors for Markfield Parish Council be set at 12 with 11 for Markfield ward and one for Field Head ward.

### *Current representation*

Parish	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Markfield	10	401

### *Recommended representation*

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Markfield	11	365

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Field Head	1	463

#### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considers that a community governance change by incorporating Field Head ward into Markfield parish and increasing the overall number of parish councillors to 12 with 11 for Markfield ward and 1 for Field Head ward would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.14 Nailstone**

No responses were received. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, there is no disproportionality in elector-to-councillor ratios and the parish council has received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest only twice in the last ten years.

#### *Recommendation*

No change.

#### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.15 Newbold Verdon**

Four responses were received, none of them suggested a change in governance arrangements. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, there is no disproportionality in elector-to-councillor ratios and the parish council has received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest only twice in the last ten years.

#### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.16 Osbaston**

Two responses were received with no request for change. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, there is no disproportionality in elector-to-councillor ratios and the parish council has not received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest in the last ten years.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.17 Peckleton**

Four responses were received, two of which suggested splitting the parish into three separate parishes along ward lines. Other suggestions included increasing the number of councillors and changing the name to reflect the other settlements within the parish.

Members considered the suggestion to create three smaller parishes and noted that, whilst each village had an electorate above the minimum advised by NALC guidance, each would be small and, as parish wards, none have received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest in the last ten years (with Kirkby Mallory having received no nominations in the 2019 elections), which demonstrated potential difficulties in each sustaining their own quorate parish council.

It is, however, acknowledged that Stapleton is now the largest of the three villages and Peckleton the smallest so the name is not reflective of the make up of the area. It is felt that the name should be amended to "Kirkby Mallory, Peckleton and Stapleton Parish".

### *Recommendation*

The name of the parish be amended to “Kirkby Mallory, Peckleton and Stapleton Parish” with the name of the parish council also amended to the same.

### *Reason*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considers that a community governance change by amending the name of the parish to “Kirkby Mallory, Peckleton and Stapleton Parish” would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.18 Ratby**

No responses were received. Whilst NALC guidance suggests an electorate the size of Ratby’s could sustain 11 seats (an increase of two), there had been no request for change.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## **4.19 Shackerstone**

One response was received which supported no change. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, there had been no request for change and there is no evidence that change is required.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.20 Sheepy**

No responses were received. Whilst NALC guidance suggests seven seats would be an appropriate size for Sheepy parish (an overall decrease of four seats), a reduction would negatively impact the equity of the elector-to-councillor ratio between the five wards (which must all be represented by a minimum of one councillor). Sheepy ward is considerably larger than the other villages and hamlets in the parish and the seats allocated reflect this.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.21 Stanton Under Bardon**

Four responses were received, with any dissatisfaction being directed at matters not relevant to the review. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, members felt that the current size of five councillors is appropriate given the size of the electorate.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## 4.22 Stoke Golding

Three responses were received, all (including Stoke Golding Parish Council) suggesting there should be an increase in the number of councillors to reflect the 8.79% increase in the electorate over the last five years. Members also acknowledged that an increase from seven to eight councillors would follow NALC's guidance.

### *Recommendation*

The number of councillors on Stoke Golding Parish Council be increased from seven to eight councillors.

### Current representation

Parish	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Stoke Golding	7	266

### Recommended representation

Parish	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Stoke Golding	8	232

### *Reasons*

Based on the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change to increase the number of councillors from seven to eight would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

## 4.23 Sutton Cheney

25 responses were received, the majority from residents of Dadlington ward, generally expressing dissatisfaction with the current governance arrangements. Whilst the dissatisfaction seems to stem from experiences surrounding the Neighbourhood Development Plan, actions and decisions of the parish council, which is not within the remit of this review, there were suggestions that the current arrangements do not reflect identities of the residents in Dadlington as Shenton and Sutton Cheney are estate-owned and partially estate-owned respectively. The view was also expressed that Dadlington is now the largest settlement within the parish, therefore the name of the parish is not appropriate. It was also felt that Dadlington was underrepresented on Sutton Cheney Parish Council.

A submission from "the Steering Group for a Dadlington Parish Council" argued strongly that there should be a separate parish council for Dadlington and cited receipt of 150 responses in favour of this (from an electorate of 225) in an informal poll of residents.



Sutton Cheney Parish Council requested no change to the parish boundaries but indicated that they would accept a change in name to reflect the size of Dadlington.

Members acknowledged the points raised and appreciated the work put into the responses. They did, however, note that none of the wards within Sutton Cheney parish had received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest in the last ten years and whilst Dadlington ward had produced the required number of nominations on three occasions in the last ten years, Shenton and Sutton Cheney wards had consistently produced fewer than required for the number of seats. It was therefore felt that Shenton and Sutton Cheney as a parish would not be sustainable and neither is there sufficient evidence that Dadlington would be sustainable as a separate parish council.

Members felt that the most appropriate change to improve representation, better reflect identities within the area and ensure effective governance of the parish as a whole is to recommend a change in name to “Dadlington & Sutton Cheney Parish” and to increase the number of seats in Dadlington ward from three to four which would create the best equity in terms of elector-to-councillor ratio, thereby increasing the overall total for the parish to eight seats.

#### *Recommendation*

The name of Sutton Cheney Parish be amended to “Dadlington & Sutton Cheney Parish” with the name of the parish council also amended to the same. The number of councillors for Dadlington ward be increased from three to four.

#### Current representation

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Dadlington	3	79
Shenton	2	43
Sutton	2	56

#### Recommended representation

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Dadlington	4	59
Shenton	2	43
Sutton	2	56

### *Reasons*

Based on the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change to amend the name of the parish and to increase the number of councillors representing Dadlington ward from three to four would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.24 Twycross**

One response was received which did not comment on the current governance arrangements. Whilst NALC guidance suggests a minimum number of seven seats, members felt that the current size of six councillors is appropriate given the size of the electorate and this number allowed for equity in electorate distribution. It was also noted that Twycross had not received sufficient nominations to achieve an electoral contest in the last ten years.

### *Recommendation*

No change.

### *Reasons*

Based upon the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change would NOT:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.

#### **4.25 Witherley**

35 responses were received, 33 of which felt that a change to governance arrangements was necessary, however the majority of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with issues such as parish council decision making, planning matters and the actions of individual parish councillors, largely stemming from events surrounding the Neighbourhood Development Plan, which were not matters that could be considered as part of this review.

The most common suggestion in the responses was the creation of two separate parish councils – one for Witherley and another for the remaining hamlets of Fenny Drayton, Atterton and Ratcliffe Culey. Where separation was not suggested, respondents requested a change of name to reflect the hamlets and changing the number of parish councillors for the area to allow fairer representation for all parish wards as many felt the hamlets were underrepresented.

Whilst NALC guidance suggested an appropriate number of councillors for an electorate the size of Witherley Parish was seven seats (which would be a reduction in four overall), members noted that a reduction to this size would negatively impact the equity of the elector-to-councillor ratio between the four wards, which must be represented by a minimum of one councillor each.

In acknowledging the strength of feeling from respondents of Fenny Drayton and Ratcliffe Culey wards, members emphasised that whilst responses were overwhelmingly in favour of a change to electoral arrangements, as a proportion of the electorate of the parish and even of the hamlets alone, the number did not represent a majority by any means.

In considering the suggestion of creating two separate parish councils, members noted that Witherley ward had produced the required number of nominations to achieve an electoral contest twice in the last ten years, with the other wards not having achieved a contest at all during that time. Members felt that there was a risk that neither Witherley nor the hamlets would be able to sustain a parish council for those reasons.

Members did, however, feel that there was a need for change both in the name of the parish in order to better reflect the settlements within the parish, and in representation on the parish council. They felt the name “Witherley & Fenny Drayton Parish”, with the parish council name being amended in the same vein, would best reflect the two largest settlements in the parish. In order to achieve equity in the elector-to-councillor ratio, members recommended that the number of seats in Witherley ward be increased from four to five, thereby increasing the overall number of seats for the parish to 12.

### *Recommendation*

The name of Witherley Parish be amended to “Witherley & Fenny Drayton Parish” with the name of the parish council also amended to the same. The number of councillors for Witherley ward be increased from four to five.

### Current representation

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Fenny Drayton	4	111
Atterton	1	33
Ratcliffe	2	75
Witherley	4	144

### Recommended representation

Parish ward	Number of councillors	Electors per councillor (2027 projection)
Fenny Drayton	4	111
Atterton	1	33
Ratcliffe	2	75
Witherley	5	115

### *Reasons*

Based on the evidence currently available, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, on balance, considered that a community governance change to amend the name of the parish and to increase the number of councillors representing Witherley ward from four to five would:

- Help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community
- Help to secure more effective and convenient governance of the area.