

Responses by Parish / Town Council

Responses from respondents are organised alphabetically by Parish. Some responses have been extracted to remove irrelevant information.

Please note that responses are presented as entered by survey respondents, including spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors. Views expressed are not those of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.

Bagworth & Thornton

It is proposed that the number of councillors for Bagworth ward increases from four to five and the number of councillors for Thornton ward decreases from four to three. The number of parish councillors on Bagworth & Thornton Parish Council would remain the same at eight.

All Wards

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
On behalf of a town/parish council	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	<p>The Parish Council have debated and rejected the recommended change to the allocation of ward councillors of 5 for Bagworth and 3 for Thornton. Currently the population figures for each ward are extremely similar but with Planning Permission granted in Thornton for an addition 49 dwellings this will increase the population of Thornton and thereby overtaking Bagworth.</p> <p>The current standing of the Council works extremely efficiently with both villages being served equally and fairly.</p> <p>We currently have two vacancies for Bagworth Ward Councillors and are experiencing difficulty in recruiting. We have no problem recruiting for Thornton.</p> <p>When arriving at a final decision, it is hoped that the opinion of the Parish Council is taken into account as those working the front line, and that the status quo is continued with no unnecessary change.</p>
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	<p>I write as Chairman of Bagworth and Thornton Parish Council, but separate to the Parish Council's expression of views past by resolution of a unanimous vote.</p> <p>I believe my views to be wholly consistent with my fellow Councillors and strongly object to any change of number of representatives for the two wards.</p> <p>At present the two wards are equally represented and during my time as an elected Councillor the Parish Council has worked professionally, harmoniously and both villages are equally served.</p> <p>The figures for each ward are not vastly different and if anything Thornton is likely to grow</p>

			<p>and overtake Bagworth in population.</p> <p>The hamlet of Merry Lees is part of Thornton Ward and any reduction in representation will be grossly unfair and unrepresented.</p> <p>In very simple terms I see the situation as it is not broken and does not require fixing.</p> <p>I trust you will take my views into consideration when arriving at a final decision as I truly believe that the current equal distribution of 4 members for each ward is correct and the status quo should be maintained with no change.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.</p>
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There are currently four councillors representing Thornton but only two for Bagworth despite numerous attempts to fill the vacancies through co-option. In addition to this according to your projection of electors, Bagworth's would go down (327 to 234) & Thornton's would go up (278 to 283). Finally, the Parish Council has not received one complaint regarding the number of representatives from either village. This leads me to say, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it"
Bagworth Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Levels up - Bagworth is growing in numbers of properties, Thornton is not to the same extent, and without this change Bagworth residents will be under-represented at local level.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	It would make a more equal representation between the 2 villages
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Seems like a better split of resource
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Bagworth is the bigger village and yet has fewer facilities. The focus for the future should be on levelling up the villages so more Bagworth reps may help to achieve this.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Don't know	Presumably the number of properties should reflect the number of councillors representing them. Are the proposed split of 5 Bagworth 3 Thornton a result of the above numbers? Maybe it is more difficult to get Thornton residents to volunteer and eight councillors are required.

Thornton ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	If the figures given by HBBC are correct then the redistribution of seats is, I believe, fair.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There should be fair balance across all villages, no matter their size
Area not specified			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
Unknown	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I think Thornton ward should keep four councillors in office, as we are proposed to have lots more dwellings being constructed in the near future

Groby, Field Head & Markfield			
<p>It is proposed that the boundary be redrawn between Groby and Markfield parishes to result in Field Head becoming part of Markfield Parish. If this boundary change was to take place and Field Head ward was no longer part of Groby parish, the number of councillors sitting on Groby Parish Council would reduce from 16 to 13.</p> <p>If this boundary change was to take place and Field Head ward was part of Markfield parish, the parish would be split into two wards, Markfield ward and Field Head ward. Markfield ward would be increased from ten to 11 councillors, and Field Head ward would be decreased from three to one councillor.</p>			
Existing Groby Parish Area			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
On behalf of a town/parish council	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Following consultation with Field Head residents, Groby Parish Council agreed that they wished to maintain the status quo and voted against the proposed boundary change to move Field Head into Markfield Parish.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for Groby Parish Council?	No	The loss of three councillors, should the boundary change take place, seems disproportionate to the size of the Parish. Should the boundary change and Markfield Parish gain one councillor, it is felt that the opposite should be true with Groby Parish losing only one councillor.

A town/parish councillor	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I believe it would be in the best interest of the Field Head residents to be part of Markfield, they are closer to Markfield, use there facilities and schools, and they have said previously that they do not feel part of Groby.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... Groby Parish Council?	Yes	There is no need for 3 councillors for Field Head
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	People of Field Head use Markfield for amenities, Groby village is aimed 3 Miles distant
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... Groby Parish Council?	No	The loss of three councillors, should the boundary change take place, seems disproportionate to the size of the Parish. Should the boundary change and Markfield Parish gain one councillor, it is felt that the opposite should be true with Groby Parish losing only one councillor.
Groby Parish Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	It's position relative to Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... Groby Parish Council?	Yes	It does not affect the number of electors per councillors.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ... For Groby Parish?	Yes	Groby is separated from Field Head
	... For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Markfield is more effected by new developments at Field Head than Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Its same as now for Groby.

	...the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Not sure
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Not sure
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head is nearer to Markfield and its residents use Markfields amenities.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head residents mainly use Markfield facilities. Any development to Field Head will impact Markfield.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	13 already represent Groby so if Field head was removed why would you need additional.
	...the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The increase should reflect the changes to Field Head.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Prefer one ward to reflect Whole Area and Field Head having its original 3 councillors on the parish council.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Many (or most) people in Groby do not actually think that Field Head is part of Groby, as the A50 out of Groby is naturally classed by most people as part of Markfield. It makes sense to have Field Head Parish representation in Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	I fully agree that the number of Groby Parish Councillors should be reduced to 13. It stands to reason that the loss of responsibility for Field Head will reduce the workload of Groby Parish Council accordingly.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	They use the facilities in Markfield rather than Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	3 councillors for Field Head for approximately 400 houses would leave 13 councillors for 5,200. The population is 6,796 so we need to keep all 16 councillors

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I don't see that moving Field Head into the Markfield parish would better represent the identity of Field Head
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	The number of councillors for Groby village would remain the same if you remove Field Head. Why not reduce the number of Field Head councillors to 1 and keep it in Groby?
An individual local resident <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SUR445113047</i>	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	<p>“...It is only now with the current Consultation on Draft Recommendations that it has become clear to me that parish boundaries might be changed with little evidence or rationale.</p> <p>Many parish boundaries, including Groby, have long ceased to reflect local identities and interests. A thorough review might include some of the suggestions made by Groby Parish Council regarding The Brantings and the identities of the National Forest and the Charnwood Forest. Similarly, such a review should include consideration of Groby Parish Cemetery, Brookvale Groby Learning Campus Playing Fields, Butler's Field, Groby Granite Railway, and Martinshaw Wood. There is a strong case for extending the Groby Parish boundary to the north side of the M1 corridor.</p> <p>Instead, the current review takes a piecemeal approach [...] This recommendation is based on the suggestion from respondents that Field Head should become part of Markfield Parish.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>After further consultation with residents, Groby Parish Council has reversed its opinion and now believes Field Head would be better served by remaining part of Groby Parish. This leaves two individuals suggesting change, one from Field Head Ward, and one from Groby Ward. Hardly a compelling case!</p> <p>Removing Field Head from Groby Parish will also remove Field Head from the Groby Parish Neighbourhood Area thus undermining valuable progress made by the Groby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Removing Field Head from the Groby Parish Neighbourhood Area would leave Field Head temporarily outside of any Neighbourhood Plan Area and potentially vulnerable to unwanted development.</p> <p>Field Head should remain part of Groby Parish.”</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head residents use Markfield facilities rather than Groby as it is closer, the residents have always stated they are not part of Groby

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	3 councillors is too many for Field Head but I think 15 councillors for the whole of Groby would be preferred
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head is physically closer to Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	418 residents per councillor remains
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head residents are very close to Markfield centre and remote from Groby village centre. It therefore makes perfect sense that Markfield assumes responsibility for those Field Head residents as Markfield is impacted by the residents shopping, using all village facilities, and the road traffic by this group of residents. Field Head residents are prevented from close proximity to Groby facilities by the very busy A50 as well as the physical distance from the village centre.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	At the moment, Groby residents within the village area itself are represented by about 400 people per councillor (HBBC projected figures up to 2027) whereas Field Head residents currently have three councillors and have a figure of about 180 residents per councillor. Reducing the number of councillors to 13 from 16 would not cause any deterioration in Groby village representation to that enjoyed today. There would be a negative impact on what Groby Parish council obtains in the precept as Field Head residents move to Markfield, but as the pot of money would not have to be spread so thin, this would hopefully not have too large an impact on parish council provision in the village.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head is so much closer to Markfield it was always a puzzle as to why it was linked with Groby.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	That's what we've got at the moment.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Unable to say it would better reflect local identities and interests but hope it would provide a more effective and convenient local government
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	13 or less makes sense
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head is clearly more physically and economically associated with Markfield than Groby. However, what I cannot understand is why you have not looked at the southern boundary of the Groby parish. The building of the M1 and A46 have formed natural major boundaries between Groby and Ratby. The existing boundary that straddles back and forth across both of these major roads now makes no sense. I would suggest making the southwestern boundary along the centre of the existing stretch of Markfield Lane, then down the centre of the M1. The southeastern boundary should be run along the centre of the A46 down to the point at which it joins the M1.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	It just seems about right
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Better from an economic point of view
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Less people to be accountable for and maybe funding might be reduced or relocated to Markfield.. less workload too . the top heavy Councillors and officers needs cutting in order to keep down cost and cut waste
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Field head has traditionally been part of Groby parish there is no obvious reason to change it
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	This very much reduces the balance of the parish council and where there has already been conflict could make getting a good balanced decision less likely.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head feels remote from Groby and the residents of Field Head primarily access schools and medical facilities in Markfield
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	People of Field Head already use Markfield for amenities
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	The loss of 2 councillors would be more appropriate given the size of the redrawn Groby parish area
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Given the number of residents 1 or at most 2 councillors is appropriate for Field Head settlement size
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	2 councillors for this settlement size
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	There is nothing wrong with the boundary as is. It reflects a fair split of councillors which should be maintained
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Residents and families of field head use the facilities and amenities f Groby including shops, schools, health facilities etc. it is wrong to suggest schools and Doctors in Markfield are for residents of Markfield only because they are funded independently. Other areas ie Barron, Stanton, Newtown Linford and Ulverscroft all use the doctors there for the local councillors assertions are uncover and totally misleading
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	A larger council set would offer far greater accountability with a wider cast of experience
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head is separated by the A50, those residents living on the Newtown Linford side have no affiliation whatsoever with Markfield. They are more aligned to Groby therefore the boundary should not be changed and councillors should not be reduced
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Not at all. There are no benefits to this proposal for the residents of field head, it should therefore be halted forthwith
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We have a large family spread in Groby and Field Head who use many of Groby's excellent amenities and facilities. Leave things as they are

	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Not at all. There are great ties between Groby and Field Head going back many years, why change it?
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Hardly good news having less experienced people supporting the community
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Not good news for field head whatever way you look at it
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Again. Hardly a progressive move restricting the right to be heard. How can one councillor and 2 residents be allowed to orchestrate this less than democratic fiasco
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Field Head residents are more aligned to Groby through a long-term relationship and share many facilities in Groby including the church, shops, public house, supermarket, post office, chemist and learning campus
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	A broader council would be more beneficial to the residents of Groby and Field Head
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	This should be a matter for residents of Field ahead via a parish pole and not something gift wrapped in a blatant attempt to surprise the legitimate concerns and views of a community very aligned to Groby
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Not at all, there is nothing wrong with the current boundary. Perhaps spend more time on important matters ie crime, development, environment etc
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Proportionate representation through the back door by a local borough councillor who has failed to do anything to support field head. A blatant attempt to steal the council tax precept for the advantage of Markfield not Field Head. [comment redacted]
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Ahardly a great selling point for field head people is it
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Not at all. Has all the hallmarks of a stitch up
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government...	No	My parents live in Field Head and we live in Groby, we share many amenities in Groby that Markfield and Field Head don't have. Our grand parents and niece are burries in Groby cemetery which is far more attractive than Markfields. Also children from Field ahead got o school in Groby

	...For Groby Parish?		
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Not at all. Groby and Field Head go hand in hand sharing so many amenities and facilities
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	I would much rather have a breadth of councillors including a degree of independence which is what Field ahead offers Groby
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Hardly fair on the residents of Field Head. Just a nonsense proposal from people playing god with absolutely nothing better to do. Self interest and nothing else
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Hardly fair on the residents of Field Head. Just a nonsense proposal from people playing god with absolutely nothing better to do. Self interest and nothing else
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	The boundary is wholly appropriate as is. Residents of Field ahead align wholly with Groby and share amenities and faculties in Groby
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field Head and Groby have been shoulder to shoulder throughout my life, we share many amenities including ships, schools, recreational facilities etc. Markfield offers no better options to Field Head resident
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	There is nothing wrong with the current level of councillors. Groby has its own issues and a wider breadth of expertise would be beneficial
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	It would appear that Markfield want Field Heads council tax precept, there are absolutely no benefits in this proposal for Field Head Residents
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Outrageously ridiculous
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Both communities share a common bond through the services and amenities available including shops, schools, etc
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	The facilities and amenities of Groby far better suit the residents of Field Head

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	How could you suggest having less representation would be appropriate.. Groby offers residents of Field ahead far more than Markfield
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	This proposal falls significantly short and fails to provide residents from Field ahead with any benefits what so ever
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	A very clear attempt to remove a democratic voice from field head
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	1...Field Head residents should have the opportunity to vote on this important change. 2...They currently have THREE parish councillors representing themthe Markfield suggestion reduces this to ONE
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	ALL Field Head residents should have a separate democratic vote on this suggestion
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	No...Field Head should remain within Groby parish
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	1..Field Head should remain within Groby as they have THREE Councillors representing them. A reduction to ONE councillor is not democratic
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head should remain within Groby as they have THREE Councillors representing them. A reduction to ONE councillor is not democratic
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	I have always thought the present arrangem to be strange. I am please that 'The White House' will stay in Groby

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Common sense
Field Head Parish Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I feel that we are adequately served by Groby Parish Council and can see no point in changing the present status of Field Head. At this moment we have 3 ward councillors to represent residents, this I understand will change if this unwarranted realignment of the boundaries takes place.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	As above my concern is that as a resident I would not be adequately represented at a time of change with regards to proposed building. Markfield PC have already made it quite clear that they are against the plan but unwilling to help by providing support
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I feel that Fieldhead is served well by the Groby parish council and can see no reason to change it.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	We would lose two of our councillors. Therefore have less of a voice .
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I shop, use the local Health Centre, attend various classes held at Markfield Community Centre and feel part of Markfield.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	We have a Councillor for Markfield who lives in Field Head and if I had any issues I would ask his advice.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	We have lived in Field Head for 26 years and can not understand why we are with Groby Parish council. I have no idea who our councillors are.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Because it wouldn't better reflect local identities and interests.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	The proposed boundary change would not better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Because it wouldn't be appropriate.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Because that would, in effect, reduce the number of Parish Councillors representing Field Head from three to one.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Because it would not be appropriate.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	For many years the current representation has worked perfectly well with the fieldhead area being represented by Groby. I see little point in making changes in what would appear to be a power grabbing battle between councillors From past experience with councillors in Markfield leaves much to be desired why would we want such people to represent us It must also be asked why waste time and money on a referendum of this nature when there are more important issues for both councils
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Why fix it if it's not broken the existing arrangement has worked well for many years
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	No, Groby parish council has views more inline with the residents of Fieldhead than Markfield parish. Groby understands the residents of Fieldhead and the fact it's not just an extension of Markfield, but shares boundaries with Groby and Newtown Linford. This move would be a step backwards for the area.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	I hope this change does not happen

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	If the change goes ahead, the residents of Field Head will be under represented. With the boundary being changed Field head residents would be taken advantage of with regard to planning applications by developers.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	We fo not want this proposal to go ahead.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Why change to markfield when it works fine with Groby not like we will get any hanging baskets or Xmas lights from either parish
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Would we get Xmas lights/ hanging baskets or even a Xmas tree
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Should remain 3 councillors if it was markfield
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Not at all if there was 3 with Groby how can markfield do it with one
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No should be 3 the same but we should stay with Groby as we've been here before 40+ years ago and no one wanted to change then
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Fieldhead always been part of Groby not markfield
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Fieldhead should be left as Groby parish as not markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Fieldhead should keep 3 parish councillors regardless if it's markfield or stays as groby
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Fieldhead should keep the 3 councillors regardless of if it stays with Groby or markfield
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No 1 councillors is not enough if there's 3 at Groby so should remain as Groby parish

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We've been with Groby for more than 40 years why do we need to change
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Should be left with Groby as it has been for over 40 years
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	So we've got 3 parish councillors on fieldhead now but if we move we only get one how's that work
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	If fieldhead has 3 it should continue to have 3 it's not like either parish are going to give us anything in return like hanging baskets Xmas lights or even a grit bin
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No fieldhead should have 3 as it's always had how's it go to 1
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Should stay with groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No not enough councillors for the fieldhead
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	How can we go from 3 to 1 should remain with Groby
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Closer to Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Greater voice

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Need a greater representation for Field Head
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Closer to markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	More people on the council the more help we get
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No enough people in the field head council to call it a parish council more people needed to make decisions.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Residents of Field Head need to be able to act together. In the future it would be good to also join with the other part of Field Head that is now in Charnwood.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	If this is the price of joining Markfield then 1 would be acceptable especially if Markfield was not split into 2 such unequally sized wards.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	we previously had 3 so not appropriate to reduce so much if Field Head has to be a separate ward.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	People of Field Head need to be able to act together. We need to use Markfield facilities so need to be able to have a say about them.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Markfield needs more than 1 extra because of number of extra residents both at Fieldhead and the new housing development on London Road. Fieldhead needs more than 1 because of the problems caused by the split between H & B and Charnwood. One day it would be good for all of Fieldhead to be together as one.

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	If the price of joining Markfield and the Groby part of Fieldhead is to lose 2 councillors then I would accept it. I don't see the reason for the split of Markfield into 2 wards.which are so different in size.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	The amenities I use are all in Markfield; the centre of the village is only a few minutes walk away; I attend the Methodist Church in Markfield; I feel that I belong to Markfield. It makes TOTAL sense to be a part of Markfield Parish rather than Groby. I never go to Groby or have any connection there.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	I trust that all the councillors for Markfield would also consider the needs of Field Head if it was part of the Parish.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It makes sense proportionally.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Field Head residents already identify with Markfield and not Groby by using their schools, Drs, pharmacy, community centre, local shops. I have no connection with Groby and have no idea how Groby supports Field Head other than cutting grass and I'm not sure about that. We asked the Parish councillor for the Field Head sign to be replaced that was on the grass verge of the A50 heading towards the Coach and Horses and was told they had no idea where the sign was originally. After 22 years as a Field Head resident and driving past the sign everyday, I could have shown them. So I would be extremely happy to be finally part of Markfield even though I feel I always have been.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	As a resident of 22 years I use all of the facilities in Markfield. I have no need to go to Groby and use their facilities, as Markfield offers everything and more. I have thought it ridiculous that Field Head has been in the Groby parish and there must be Groby residents who wonder why too. I have no idea what support or interest is shown in Field Head and who the councillors are, but I know the councillors for Markfield and how proactive they are.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	The reduction is not a significant amount and seems only right that there should be fewer councillors due to passing on the responsibility of Markfield to their parish.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Markfield I am sure would be well represented by 1 more councillor.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Yes, Field Head is not a huge parish.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Residents of Field Head currently experience a democratic deficit with decisions taken at a parish level geographically removed from Field Head. Decisions which impact Field Head often do not have the same impact on Groby per se. Second all services from GPs to Schools are in Markfield - we do not visit Groby for anything. I wholly support this move.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Loving in Field Head we visit Markfield for all our needs and services. Groby is largely irrelevant in to our daily lives.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Field Head needs to move to Groby - how Groby is organised is then an issue for Groby.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Field Head needs a representative.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	1 is enough given the area covered by Field Head.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Residents of Field Head use the services provided in Markfield, not Groby, so it would make sense that the local taxes collected should be for the benefit of Markfield. It will also mean that any future planning applications are in 'our back yard' and not controlled by either Groby or Newtown Linford
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	As most residents aren't aware who the three councillors are, there seems little effect if they are reduced to one.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I feel we are better staying as we are
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Fieldhead is at a crucial point, stay as it is
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We would lose 2 counsellors giving us less of a voice. We have been in Groby for a number of years and it should remain the same. The parish councils made this recommended with out consulting the residents. It was under hand and needs to remain the same.

	...For Markfield Parish?	No	No the neighbourhood plan would not vol over them and we would have to re draft to include field head. Waste of time and effort.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Field head had 3 counsellors and it should remain that way by removing the 3 from groby.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	If they come over to Markfield they should still remain to have 3 councillors not 1 so they have a say in matters.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No they should still have 3.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Please ensure that other parts of Markfield currently in the Ratby district (parts of the pinfold) are included in Markfield before adding field head. Surely Markfield should be represented by Markfield before parts of field head are included ?
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	As above - Markfield should have councillors supporting it not Ratby or other parishes
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	As above please review Markfields boundary's before looking at field head
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Makes geographical sense and would develop a closer inclusive identity.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Groby parish council would no longer represent field head so it's logical to increase markfield parish councillors as a replacement to maintain the status quo.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	The question says if the boundary change was to take place and field head ward was part of markfield parish, the parish would be split into two wards, markfield ward and field head ward. Markfield ward would have 11 councillors and field head would have 1 councillor. That makes 12. The proposal increases the markfield councillors from 10 to 11. Which is right.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Don't want to be part of groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Don't know
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Don't know
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I cannot get to Groby as an elderly resident and use services in Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Makes sense
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Sensible
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	As a field head resident I see myself as being from Markfield, I use all the Markfield services, and never use Groby services.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	As a field head resident I have no connection with Groby. I only use the services in Markfield, describe myself as "from Markfield " and only have interest in local issues in Markfield, not Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	More than enough representatives for the size of community
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Should be plenty to represent the local community

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Should be more than enough for a small community
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	They are joined together
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It is proportionate
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It seems proportionate
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head adjoins Markfield and in parts dissects it. It is an artificial political boundary and most if not all residents of Field Head use the service centre of Markfield and not Groby. It is right therefore that any local taxation goes to the local community which utilise rather than one 3 miles away.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Sensible proportion
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	We may have three today but not one of them is known by any residents so better to have one who is accountable than three who are not
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head has never been part of Groby despite being in Groby Parish, we were a forgotten area. It makes much more sense to be within the markfield area, we share doctors, schools and other facilities.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Why would Markfield increase by 1, yet Field head decrease by 2

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Why would Markfield increase by 1, yet Field head decrease by 2
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We would lose our voice with only 1 parish councillor casting a vote for this ward. We would be forgotten worse than we already are. Do not change the parish lines. Groby stood by us when a development happened 5 years ago and we want them to do the same this time and not remove us because we need their support.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	No they should remain in Groby. There is no benefit for them joining Markfield. They are not in our local Plan.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Why should Field Head development lose to parish councillors? Field Head development at three parish councillors in Groby should lose 3 I recommended no change is needed to the parish lines
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No Field Head should remain at 3 councillors.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head should be 3 councillors why are they being disadvantaged.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Field Head is better represented by staying in Groby.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field Head would suffer a loss of councillors to fight for their interests.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Does Groby need extra councillors in that case???
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Because of the representation Field Head has now, they would be way under represented if they go down to 1 councillor only.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	One councillor is not enough to fight for the interests of Field Head, especially with the current problems it has on its doorstep.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	There is a better ratio of councillors in Groby Parish for Field Head to look after our interests.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field Head residents have a better ratio of representation in Groby than they would have in Markfield parish.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	It would be simply a case of removing the Field Head councillors.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	In Groby parish, Field Head is represented by 3 councillors. A reduction in their representation would not give good service to them.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I feel that Field Head has problems peculiar to it and would need better representation to "fight it's corner"!
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	I live in Field Head and so all the services that I use are in Markfield. I don't go to Groby and don't feel a part of the Groby community. I do however feel a part of the Markfield community.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I live in Field Head and use Markfield services not Groby. It makes sense that Field Head is part of Markfield rather than Groby.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Groby parish would no longer be responsible for the Field Head area, and so it makes sense that the number of Groby parish councillors would be reduced accordingly.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It seems appropriate that Markfield would have an additional parish councillor as they would be gaining responsibility for the additional area of Field Head.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Field Head is not a large ward, and I think that having 1 parish councillor representing the ward would be sufficient.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	The proposal would give residents of Field Head a lesser voice. Markfield PC have never done anything to benefit Field Head
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	I use the facilities in Groby ie village hall, shops and pub as it is easier than Markfield

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	No, The proposal makes absolutely no sense and would be detrimental to Field ahead and leave GPC short of council tax precept funds
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head would be adversely effected moving from 3 councillors to just one, therefore giving us a lesser say in matters important to us
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Residents of Field ahead would have a lesser voice. Also the matter has never formerly been discussed with us as only 2 councils and 2 residents were aware, therefore along with then statistics being presented this is a fundamentally flawed proposal
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I can't see how this proposal benefits the residents of field head in anyway. A pipe dream with some polished text. It's completely unacceptable
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Absolutely not. Those submitting this proposal clearly don't know Giels ahead well and their affiliation to Groby, it's services and amenities
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	More waffle and polished text. Again how does it benefit the residents of Field ahead having less Councillors? Feels like a plan on how to silence a small community by taking away its voice
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Is there any good news here for the residents of field head. It feels like being stabbed in the back whilst recovering from being stabbed in the back.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I simply don't get the logic to this crazy proposal. How did it get by a committee and end up in the consultation phase? Ludicrous to say the least. This has no benefits whatsoever for residents of field head
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	The location of Field Head will be remote irrelevant of which boundary settlements it sits within. We use the Groby facilities and amenities
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field Head will always be remote due to its location. There are no benefits to the residents of Field Head from this unnecessary proposal. We use a lot of a Groby's amenities and facilities therefore the proposal, it's statistics and recommendations are fundamentally flawed

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	There are absolutely no benefits to the residents of Field ahead with this unnecessary proposal. The adverse impact to Field Head residents having a lesser say whilst it's council tax precept would benefit Markfield
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The proposal has no benefits to the residents of Field ahead. Dropping from 3 to 1 parish councillor hardly represents a compelling benefit, the proposal leaves Field Head residents with a significantly reduced voice
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As above. The proposal has absolutely no benefits for Field Head residents and the idea that a 66% reduction in councillors delivers any benefit whatsoever shows how fundamentally flawed this proposal is. Rob residents of a voice whilst acquiring their council tax precept to benefit others
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We use the local facilities in Groby including the pub, chemist, co-op and I went to Groby Brookvale Campus. My Nan, Grandad and Still Born Niece are hurried in Groby Cemetery. I cannot foresee any benefits for field head whatsoever with this proposal
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Absolutely not. We as a family use Groby facilities including the pub, shops, chemist, schools and cemetery which the family owns a plot, our grand parents and still born niece are hurried in Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Field Head loses its voice as a result of this proposal
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	This represents a move to silence the residents of Field ahead and remove their voice
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	How can a proposal reach this position when the residents were not consulted in the first place, they have not been afforded the respect of a parish vote and are being forced to defend themselves by way of a staged consultation. GPC voted overwhelmingly to reject the proposal at the last meeting therefore the voice of 2 individuals are permitted to impact a community of circa 600 people who frankly have far neither issues to focus upon. This is simply a Markfield parish councillor trying to grab the council tax precept and nothing else
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	As residents of Field Head we use the services and amenities in Groby, our granddaughter is hurried in Groby Cemetery and we own a burial plot, which incidentally Markfield wouldn't permit because we lived in Groby Parish
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	We use the amenities of Groby including the Chemist, Shops, Public House and school

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	It would give a lesser voice to the residents of Field Head
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	This would give residents of Field Head a lesser voice which under the present circumstances would be detrimental
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As above. Field Head residents would be given a lesser voice
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Local residents which includes Field Head will be disadvantaged as a result of these changes. Why was this conducted in secret? Why has there been no parish poll. Why have the residents not been informed prior to taking any action and making any decisions? It feels like proportionate representation through the back door
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field have is a small residential area that is separated by the A50. Those living in field head find it easier to use the facilities in Groby ahead of Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	This whole matter appears to be designed to take the voice of the local residents away. It ridiculous, truly ridiculous that anyone can even think this has benefits to the residents
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head ward currently benefits from three parish councillors , reducing this to one would give the residents of Fiwld ahead a lesser voice
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As above, a lesser chance to have our voice heard
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Although I use the nearby amenities in Markfield, I prefer to remain with Groby. We will have 3 councillors on Groby parish council, representing Field Head, wheras there would be only one on Markfield and furthrrmore I don't think Markfield really wants us, so the status quo would, I think be the best solution.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Field Head has 3 counccillors representing the residents on Groby Parish Council, Markfield Parish, Council, only 1, therefore I vote for the status quo! However, until recent weeks those councillors respresenting the Field Head residents, have never shown much support. I have lived at the Field Head for 26 years and apart from a large piece of granite stating that the area is part of Groby, no councillor has ever called at the house or advertised any activities or events in teh community. If it wasn't for articles in the 'Spotlight' we wouldnt have any idea about such things. Although most of us used Markfield amenities, I and others feel that Markfield Parish Council are not eager for Field Head to become part of their parish, apart from the taxes they would received. Hence my decision - better the Council I know than the one I don't!

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Don't know	If we were not part of Groby it might or might not be appropriate.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Since Field Head has never been part of Markfield, it makes no difference to myself
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The more Councillors representing us, the better, see my comment at 5. Finally, if Field Head remains as part of Groby Parish, I hope that, in future, those representing Field Head residents on the Parish Council will make more of an effort to make us feel included as part of Groby
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I have been a Field Head resident for the past 24 years and have never understood why Field Head was incorporated within the Groby parish. My address has always been Field Head, Markfield and the local services and amenities used by my family are all located in Markfield. Also, I have never been visited by a parish councillor from either the Markfield or Groby parish and have never really felt part of either parish. I did mention this issue during the consultation progress and I am therefore extremely pleased that this change of boundary has been recommended.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Due to the number of residents to be represented in the future because of the increased housing development in the village.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	I do not know the total number of Field Head residents to answer this confidently. However, why do we need separate Field Head and Markfield wards? It appears that Field Head will still be treated separately to Markfield and with less representation. What has really changed?
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	We all known markfield don't want us Seems funny is all happens now after we've been to so may meetings
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Aslong as fieldhead has a voice that's what matters Everyone happy to take our money but not bother with us Were a amazing and passionate community as proven fighting this awful development
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Agree

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Agree
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Agree
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I feel more connected to Markfield because I always use Markfields ammenities
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Just dont know how many coucillors are required for the Fieldhead area
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Same answer as above plus I dont know any of the councillors anyway
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	want to retain status quo
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	only one extra councillor
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Should kep existing number of councillors
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	would lose2 councillors
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	want to keep 3 councillors on Goby PC
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I believe Groby Parish is more likely to reflect local interests

	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Wouls only get one additional councillor
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Need to retain 16 councillors on Groby Parish council
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	One extra councillor not appropriate
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Should keep 3 councillors
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	If Field Head is pushed into Markfield the identity of the area will be lost forever. Whereas as part of Groby Field Head has its own uniqueness
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Without Field Head the parish of Groby would not need the 3 councillors anymore. Instead there should be 3 additional councillors appointed to Markfield to ensure that the interests and needs of the Field Head residents can be adequately represented
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	We have 3 Councillors in Groby - why would we want to move to an area with only 1 representative? We want to stay where we are - AND object to the duplicitous and underhand way all councils involved have gone about this with both Parish Councils denying any knowledge of a proposal
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I very strongly do NOT want to move from Groby because of the underhand way this has been carried out. Why on earth would we want to be represented by 1 Councillor when we have 3 at present?
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	2 wards - Markfield has 10 Councillors and Field Head are allowed 1!!!!. You are diluting our opportunity as a community for meaningful involvement in our local area politics
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	We won't be fully represented if adopted by Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for...	No	We have 3 currently, so we're loosing out in 2 councillors.

	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?		
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As explained before, we'd be losing out.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	No as we lose 2 councillors and so have less of a voice.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	We drop down by 2 councillors and so will have less of a voice.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	We will have less people representing us and lose councillors voting in Field Heads!
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I have no connection with Groby, I do not visit Groby. Markfield main street is a 10 minute walk away, my children have all gone to Markfield schools, I access no Groby facilities. it seems an anomaly to me that Field Head is part of Groby Parish Council.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	If we previously had 3 councillors for Field Head why are we now only getting 1 extra? Having said that, I would still prefer to be under Markfield Parish Council with 1 councillor than Groby with 3
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As above answer
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Groby should include markfield lane as well
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Be the same councillors for markfield or shouldn't be changed

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	prefer to stay in groby parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	its best to have as many councillors as possible to make vital decisions
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	prefer to stay in groby parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	the more the better to make decisions
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I feel more Parton Markfield than Groby.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I think it should remain at 10 and field head should have 2
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I don't feel 1 would be enough we need 2
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Markfield is the community I most relate to. I am registered with local GP, use a local hair salon, and shop at the local shops. When I take exercise I walk within Markfield.
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head relates more to Markfield than to Groby. I rarely go into Groby for any reason, I shop in Markfield, use the Medical Centre on Chitterman Way, and take exercise in Markfield.

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Groby ward will retain the same number of councillors that they currently have: 13.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It is appropriate that an additional councillor is allocated for Markfield because of added responsibilities and governance.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Having 3 councillors for Field Head ward would be disproportionate compared to Markfield ward, which will in any event gain an additional 1 councillor. The parish itself will now have 12 counsellors which seems appropriate. Keeping one counsellor of the 12 for Field Head ward will honour the legacy representation of Field Head.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I feel our voice will be heard more if we stay in Groby precept has been Paid to Groby for a number of years and any money used in Groby would be lost if we move to Markfield.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	It should should in Groby as the precept has been paid for a number of years and monies spent would be wasted and no benefit to Field Head.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	They only need 10 I don't see the point in them having 13.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No Field Head should retain 3 councillors.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No Field Head should remain 3.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	My concern is with the current planning application being put forward by Davidsons to build a large estate behind our property. Switching Field Head from Groby to Markfield could jeopardise the objection against the application being approved.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	A reduction in number of councillors will be of no benefit to the residents of Field Head.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	A reduction in number of councillors will be of no benefit to the residents of Field Head
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The residents of Field Head are effectively losing 2 councillors

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The residents of Field Head are effectively losing 2 councillors
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Not enough councilors to represent Fieldhead
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Why when Groby has so many more?
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	One is definitely not enough - please reconsider
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	No, because Markfield parish and councillors have their own agendas and that [redacted due to personal comment].
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Markfield parish have there own addenda and It will not benefit field head in any way but they will be happy to receive the money from them.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Field head should stay in Groby parish.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Doesn't represent the head field residents, all eggs in one basket.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Needs to be more than 1 councillor to represent a fair voice for the ward
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	The boundaries being redrawn have been bought forward by the proposed development site bordering Field Head and Markfield highlighting the need for a thorough and legal review to be raised to understand how a development site has been approved despite not being part of Groby or Markfield's long term development plan. This does not address that problem which will cause stress on both Markfield and Groby but instead shifts the focus away, which ultimately does not look after the residents best interest.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	The boundaries being redrawn have been bought forward by the proposed development site bordering Field Head and Markfield highlighting the need for a thorough and legal review to be raised to understand how a development site has been approved despite not being part of Groby or Markfield's long term development plan. This does not address

			that problem which will cause stress on both Markfield and Groby but instead shifts the focus away, which ultimately does not look after the residents best interest.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Field Head already has limited representation on council matters, this further increases that risk and provides a route of no longer looking after the residents and areas best interest.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Fieldhead already has limited counsellor representation and one extra to repressed a whole area is a reduction in the whole
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head already has limited representation on council matters, this further increases that risk and provides a route of no longer looking after the residents and areas best interest.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	The boundaries being redrawn have been bought forward by the proposed development site bordering Field Head and Markfield highlighting the need for a thorough and legal review to be raised to understand how a development site has been approved despite not being part of Groby or Markfield's long term development plan. This does not address that problem which will cause stress on both Markfield and Groby but instead shifts the focus away, which ultimately does not look after the residents best interest.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	The boundaries being redrawn have been bought forward by the proposed development site bordering Field Head and Markfield highlighting the need for a thorough and legal review to be raised to understand how a development site has been approved despite not being part of Groby or Markfield's long term development plan. This does not address that problem which will cause stress on both Markfield and Groby but instead shifts the focus away, which ultimately does not look after the residents best interest.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Field Head already has limited representation on council matters, this further increases that risk and provides a route of no longer looking after the residents and areas best interest.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Field Head already has limited representation on council matters, increasing the overall representation by just one councillor further increases that risk and provides a route of no longer looking after the residents and areas best interest.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As previously mentioned Field Head and Markfield already have limited representation as it stands. Simple questions such as enquiring as to where the parish budget as been spent in our area , already proves too much of a challenge for our existing number of councillors. Decreasing that number is more or a less a guarantee that neither Markfield or Field Head would be truly represented for any matters concerning our neighbourhood.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	I have been a resident of Field Head for well over 20 years and have no desire to change to Markfield Parish as I feel that Groby have always done their best for us to date.

	...For Markfield Parish?	No	Markfield have never shown any interest in supporting Field Head residents, so don't understand why that would possibly change, particularly if Field Head are being forced upon them.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Groby is a large parish and warrants having 16 Councillors to represent their constituents adequately.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	So Field Head residents are only worth one Councillor!!
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I seriously cannot believe that as a resident of Field Head, you expect me to accept and answer that!!
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	If the boundary changed we would have significantly less representation on the Parish Council and are already aware that Markfield Parish Council would only be taking Field Head as a force put. We have been residents of Field head for well in excess of twenty years and can see no benefit in changing to Markfield.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	The current boundary with Field Head being part of Groby should remain, as Markfield Parish have made no attempt themselves to wish to represent the residents of Field Head, quite the opposite in fact.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Because there needs to be fair representation of views and issues, which wouldn't be easily achieved by reducing the number of sitting Councillors.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No... obviously yet again there is a total disregard for the residents of Field Head, if the only increase in Councillors warranted is one.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	How can any Council seriously expect Field Head residents to accept a split of 11 Councillors for Markfield Ward and 1 for Field Head Ward. I think whoever has come up with this suggestion needs to take a long hard look at the reasons why they are part of the local Council, as it obviously isn't for the good of the people that they are meant to represent!
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	As a resident of Field Head, I want to remain in Groby parish and do not want the boundary to change.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	As a resident of Field Head, I want to remain in Groby parish and do not want the boundary to change.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for...	No	The current number is appropriate with 3 councillors representing Field Head.

	...Groby Parish Council?		
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The addition of 1 councillor for Field Head is not appropriate as the number of electors per councillor far exceeds the current number and the number for Markfield & Groby.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	The addition of 1 councillor for Field Head is not appropriate as the number of electors per councillor far exceeds the current number and the number for Markfield & Groby.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	There is no benefit to moving to markfield from groby
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	We have always been part of Groby and i would want to remain part of Groby. I see no benefit to moving.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	Fieldhead should staybwith Groby and representation should remain as is.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	We will be losing 2 councillors.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Hiw is it appropriate to lose 2 councillors ?
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Fieldhead wants to remain part of Groby.
	...For Markfield Parish?	No	We want fieldhead to remain with Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	With only 1 representative, our best interests will not lostened to.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	It is unfair for Fieldhead to lose 2 councillors
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	It is unfair for Fieldhead to lose 2 councillors

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head are on Markfields doorstep. Field Head council tax's currently go to Groby ??
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Self explanatory !
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Self explanatory !
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Always thought of Fieldhead as being in Markfield
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	They would work together as one
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Yes as previously said they would all work together for the village
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	It makes sense to be included in Markfield, as I do not go to Groby. When I pay my rates I want them to be used in Markfield NOT Groby!
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	The Councillors do an excellent job, and an extra one would help even more.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Yes I do, as they would all work together and do what was best for our village

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I am eighty one years of age - I live alone - so find it very convenient to be able to shop in Markfield - also the surgery - chemist and library are within easy reach - even if I had to walk it would not be a problem. My hope is that Field Head will be part of Markfield
Local residents	A petition of Field Head residents with 111 signatures (unverified) was presented to Council on 6 September with the following detail: "In responding to the HBBC Community Governance Review – Changes to Field Head Governance – It is proposed that Field Head is moved from being part of Groby Parish into Markfield Parish. We, the undersigned as electors in Field Head, fully support the proposed change, that would see Field Head become part of Markfield Parish Council. We believe this outcome is in the best interests of all Field Head residents and wish these views to be known and considered".		
Markfield Parish			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
On behalf of a town/parish council <i>Body text taken from Document 1, email from Markfield Parish Council</i>	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	"The Parish Council considered the recommendations proposed in connection with the above as it related to the Parish of Markfield at an Extra-ordinary Council meeting held on 15 August 2022. The Parish Council are in favour of the recommendation that the Markfield Parish Boundary be amended to include Field Head. However, the Parish Council would re-iterate its previous response that the Parish remain unwarded as this would promote the Council's objectives in having a single community."
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	"The additional councillor seat would be welcomed for Markfield Parish."
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Do not believe it will provide an effective and convenient local government. It works fine as it is. Why does Groby feel the need to suggest the change?

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Markfield PC is efficient and effective without the need for change
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Warding is not in the best interests of the local community
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Concerned this will cause difficulties to both Groby and Markfield Neighbourhood Plan which will affect the convenience and efficiency of Local Government
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Markfield Parish Council appears efficient and effective with the existing number it has
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Warding could lead to a divisive community
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Residents wherever they live can freely use any Service Centre/schools/facilities etc and do. Markfield Parish Council is well run and effective.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	A see warding as divisive and it seems that Field Head residents are currently dissatisfied as to their 3 elected ward members.

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	As above. Warding is divisive.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I feel that residents in the Field Head area use the facilities within Markfield such as the school, drs etc. Therefore it makes sense for this are to be part of the Markfield parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	There should be enough councillors to represent all parishioners and therefore if Field Head is part of Markfield there should be additional councillors
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	This is relatively small geographical area and therefore proportionate councillor headcount should be allocated to Field Head. I feel 1 is adequate
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Less boundaries, better combined services?? Not aware of what work is involved the reduced number of parishes and merged areas sounds like it might/should provide improvements
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Increased boundary area would warrant additional councilor (would this be the previous Field Head councilor?)
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	I am not aware of the workloads required to for this. Would the boundary change give the Field Head ward more or less work to do. If it is less then a reduction in councilors would be prudent.

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	On markfield doorstep far better controlled by Markfield than Groby because of proximity
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	Would this make any difference
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	Very small ward does not require three councillors
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Don't know	I feel that I order to determine if the local identities and interests will be best represented and provide effective, convenient local government the name, address and political party represented by any additional councillor, serving within Markfield parish, as a result of the proposed boundary change should be published as part of the consultation process along with which parish/ward they currently represent.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	This would depend on how the additional councillor was selected (such as by a recognised published democratic process).
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	I am concerned that the proposed change in the number of councillors as a result of this proposed boundary change from 3 to 1 effectively means the residents of the current Field Head political choice and local representation is potentially limited "by default". Furthermore that no details of how the councillor who would represent Field Head would be selected and why the the number of councillors would be reduced from 3 to 1 should the boundary change go ahead had been included in the consultation. Finally, the phrase " the parish would be split into two wards" implies division not unity which seems self defeating in achieving the goal "change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?"

An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Don't need the extra and it's not part of our village neighbourhood plan
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Not needed
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	No leave it alone
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	It seems a logical solution,backed by Councilor M.Lay,,whose judgement I accept.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	AS ABOVE.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	As above.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Field Head is closer to Markfield than to Groby.

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	If the parish is bigger, an extra councillor is appropriate.
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	I think representation would be sufficient.
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	I first moved to Markfield as a child in 1964. As a family we always regarded Field Head and Markfield as one Parish and it makes so much sense to finally amalgamate the two together, something which has been long overdue. Over the years I have had friends move to Field Head and my father spent his final years living at Field Head. They, their neighbours and surrounding residents, all use the local amenities. By local I mean Markfield of course, rather than a parish that is 3 miles away, to which there is no connection and never has been, let alone anyone having a clue as to who represents them in the Groby Parish! Another valid point to mention is when asked where someone lives, the answer is Field Head, Markfield, NOT Field Head, Groby!
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	As the councillors would be working together both for Markfield and Field Head (as Field Head as always been regarded as part of Markfield) at close quarters it would be quite appropriate. Far more beneficial than what exists today!
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	As I have previously stated, people weren't aware of being represented by or knowing the councillors in Groby, so the fact that it will go down to 1 councillor that is KNOWN, will be far more beneficial.
An individual local resident <i>Transcribed from paper form</i>	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Don't know	Most probably as Field Head retains Markfield Lane from Newtown Linford and Markfield Road after leaving Groby on the A359, moreover heading for it (Groby). Having glanced at the notes, it appears Field Head, is now a mini-borough ward of its own, with perhaps a putative identifiable own boro councillor. Only Field Head residents have mounted a resistance to building campaign [unclear]
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	With ridiculous signs such as Markfield Village as you leave the A539 for the old Ashby Road (now truncated by a roundabout en route for c'ville. The population (source ex-councillor + lady [unclear]) is over 5,000. Once a village had 200 population

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Don't know	With 1 councillor no Field Head is this a pocket / mini district or what?
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Having lived at Field Head many years ago, I have always considered Markfield to be my locality - not Groby
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	To me this would be a sensible move
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No answer given	I assume the number of councillors proposed for each ward would roughly reflect the population split
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	Common Ground. Common People
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	See previous Page
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	I don't need to - see previous answers
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an	Yes	Field Head is part of Markfield and much nearer to Markfield than Groby. It makes total sense to redraw the boundary and include Field Head in Markfield Parish council rather than Groby.

	effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?		
	...For Markfield Parish?	Yes	It makes total sense to make Field Head part of Markfield Parish Council
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	3 councillors are aligned to Field Head today and therefore 3 should go with the move.
	... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	It makes sense to increase the number by one as the area increases
	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	No	Why would you not have the same as there is today? It should be a like for like swap
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Don't know	Im still dubious. Questions unanswered. Especially how it affects our existing neighbourhood plan? It will leave us open to developers?
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	n/a
An individual local resident	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	Yes	Most people I know in field head feel they are part of markfield.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Don't know	I don't know much about the workings of the parish council.
An individual local resident	"My response to the merger question is influenced by being a long-standing local resident a retired parish council and the NP work I did.		

<p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document MPC_email_2</i></p>	<p>If we can backtrack about 5 years, when we were looking to define the boundary for the Markfield NP, I met with the then chair of Groby PC to talk about the advantages of Neighbourhood Plans and the possibility of Groby PC pursuing one at the same time as Markfield did. He could see the potential benefits of that approach, but it wasn't until about 18 months ago the Groby plan area was designated. Their plan area included Fieldhead, so it does seem strange that the subsequent suggestion from Groby members to move the area has now been raised.</p> <p>Markfield NP defined a settlement area, which would need reviewing should Fieldhead become part of the parish, since, in my opinion, without doing so would weaken objections to potential speculative developments. Now, whilst the Markfield NP might need reviewing in relation to the developing HBBC District Plan and potential; changes in housing demands etc, I don't think we'd want to have to run two review processes.</p> <p>It is true to say that in terms of service provision, Fieldhead residents have always looked more to Markfield than Groby. When we conducted our NP surveys, I remember some Fieldhead residents complaining they hadn't been included – they had to be politely told it was down to the parish boundary! Whether Field head becomes part of Markfield parish or not the latter will still play an important role in service provision.</p> <p>Markfield PC has never operated on a “ward” system – unlike Groby. Along with Markfield village the parish also contained settlements at Little Shaw Lane and Copt Oak. I estimated those two outlying areas include 121 houses. My estimate for Fieldhead in 230 houses. Whilst I can see that, should Fieldhead join Markfield parish, there might be a statistical need for an additional councillor, I question the need for it to be allocated on a “ward” basis. Don't forget that Markfield already has one parish councillor living in Fieldhead and he is also a HBBC councillor!!!”</p>
---	--

Area not specified

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
A Leicestershire County Councillor	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Markfield Parish?	No	Markfield Parish, under existing boundaries, has a Local Neighbourhood Development Plan in place. The inclusion of Fieldhead within Markfield Parish has the potential to unravel this resulting in less protection from speculative developers. This in turn would not provide effective or convenient local governance.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ... the proposed Markfield Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	The number of Parish Councillors is broadly right.

	...the proposed Field Head Ward of Markfield Parish Council?	Yes	FieldHead is a smaller constituent part of Markfield and its representation shouldn't be exaggerated. 1 of 11 Parish Councillors feels appropriate.
On behalf of a group, organisation or club	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	Field Head has been part of the Groby for a number of years. Field Head sits better in Groby at the moment due to the current situation regarding developments and that Markfields neighbourhood plan would not cover Field Head.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	Yes	Yes I think reducing the number to 10 would be good enough as that way it would mean more value for money.
Other respondent: "I AM A REGISTERED GROBY PARISH ELECTOR WHO REPRESENTED THE FIELD HEAD WARD ON GROBY PARISH COUNCIL FOR 12 YEARS AND HAVE BEEN ASKED TO RESPOND ON BEHALF OF A GROUP OF FIELD HEAD RESIDENTS WHO I HAVE PREVIOUSLY REPRESENTED AND I AM ALSO REGISTERING MY OWN CONCERNS"	Do you feel that the proposed boundary change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government... ...For Groby Parish?	No	"The process was only triggered by a miniscule percentage of the total number of residents and then only by vested interests. Not only has this been a waste of public money but the whole process lacks credibility and is unsound not only because crucial information that should have been regarded as a material consideration that could very likely influence people's response has been withheld from electors; e.g.: If Field Head is moved to Markfield Parish then Groby's parish precept will require a significant increase just to maintain existing management costs and services but no mention of this in the consultation. There would be no cost reduction for Groby by the transfer of Field Head to Markfield, as the services and facilities used by Field Head are essentially provided in Groby, such as the provision and maintenance of the Groby Parish Council cemetery where all families residing in the Parish of Groby, have the automatic right of internment, a right NOT available to non Groby Parish residents."
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate for... ...Groby Parish Council?	No	WHEN THERE HAS BEEN NO CONTESTED MAIN ELECTION SINCE 2007 IN THE GROBY GAA & GAB WARDS, IT WOULD MAKE FAR MORE SENSE TO REDUCE THIS TO 10 COUNCILLORS! FIELD HEAD WARD HOWEVER SHOULD STAY IN GROBY BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT FIELD HEAD RESIDENTS VOTED FOR OVERWHELMINGLY ORIGINALLY AND EVEN THOUGH THERE HAVE BEEN CONTESTED ELECTIONS EVERY 4 YEARS APART FROM 2019 IN FIELD HEAD, THE NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS SHOULD BE REDUCED TO 2 FROM 3 AS 2 WOULD BE NEEDED TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION.

<p>AND THAT OF NEIGHBOURS IN GROBY WHO STRONGLY FEEL THAT THIS CONSULTATION IS SERIOUSLY FLAWED AND NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE.”</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SUR449461111</i></p>			
--	--	--	--

Peckleton			
It is proposed that the name of the parish be amended to “Kirkby Mallory, Peckleton & Stapleton”.			
Kirkby Mallory Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	we should mention the three villages as its not just Peckleton and is misleading
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think its more appropriate to list the tree villages in Alphabetical order

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	It includes all 3 villages that the parish represents
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	The name change to correctly identify the 3 villages that the Parish Council cover is a simple change that I support. The current name identifies only Peckleton - a resident of Stapleton or Kirkby Mallory does not readily identify with Peckleton Parish Council. It is a fact that Kirkby Mallory and Stapleton have been under-represented by Parish Councillors for many years. There are 6 councillors, 2 for each of the 3 villages, however for many years there are hardly ever more than 1 Councillor for Stapleton or Kirkby Mallory. The current 4 councillors are due to be reduced to 3 (one for each village), due to a retirement. This simple change would be a step in the correct direction to encouraging participation by Stapleton and Kirkby Mallory residents.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	

Peckleton Ward

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Is says what it is. It is not just Peckleton but all three villages as represented in the new name.

Stapleton Ward

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Brand new 'PECKLETON PARISH COUNCIL' noticeboard appears in Stapleton park. Brand new noticeboard contains a sign about *changing* the NAME of PECKLETON PARISH COUNCIL. Makes sense ... Money is spent on a brand new noticeboard which contains a sign asking if we should change the name on the brand new noticeboard. (Name amended to include Stapleton recognises our identity. I just hope it doesn't cost too much unnecessary money to change the names noticeboards 😊)

Stoke Golding

It is proposed that the number of councillors for Stoke Golding would increase from seven to eight.

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
On behalf of a town/parish council	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	The village is growing rapidly and would benefit from an additional councillor
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	With the recent significant increase in housing over the last 5 years and the number of proposed development sites that have received Planning Approval the size of the Parish Council should be increased by at least one place.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	With the amount of housing due to increase in the coming years an increase in representation will enable the council to better serve the increased population.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	The Stoke Golding community growing significantly as more housing estates are built; it makes sense to increase the size of the parish council
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	More and better choice of representation on the parish council
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Don't know	Its the start of the survey document so I'm unable to ascertain if the addition of an extra councillor makes a difference or is sufficient

Sutton Cheney

It is proposed that the name of the parish be amended to “Dadlington & Sutton Cheney”.

It is also proposed that the number of councillors for Dadlington ward be increased from three to four, thereby increasing the number of councillors sitting on the parish council from seven to eight.

All wards

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Don't know	There is no name to reflect the 3 communities that isn't clumsy
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	<p>Dadlington has the majority of electors and should have the majority of councillors, i.e.5</p> <p>The extraordinary meeting of Sutton Cheney Parish Council held 6th September showed a new depth of antagonism by 3 parish councillors towards the 2 representatives from Dadlington ward.</p> <p>The only way forward is to separate into 2 councils, 1 for Dadlington and another for Sutton Cheney and Shenton.</p> <p>The pc was informed that 2 petitions had been submitted to H&BBC by members of the public to cover the 3 villages, over 100 signatures on each. This is overwhelming public support for the move and forms a basic part of the LGR principles. It also far exceeds the requirements of 37% to ask for a LGR. All of the people who signed have made informed judgment.</p> <p>The overriding view of those councillors who wished to remain as 1 pc appeared to be so that Dadlington's large contribution to the precept would subsidise projects in the other 2 villages.</p> <p>I hope I can rely on you to ensure ALL district councillors are aware of the depth of public feeling on this matter before the vote.</p>
On behalf of a town/parish council <i>Text taken from Document SPC_email_2</i>	<p>“Four councillors in favour and one against: that the name of a parish council that does not separate should be 'Dadlington, Sutton Cheney, and Shenton Parish Council'.</p> <p>Four in favour and two against with one abstention: that Dadlington should only have three seats, not four as proposed.</p> <p>Five councillors in favour and two against: noting that the Parish Council is divided on this matter but also noting that petitions have been submitted to HBBC by residents in favour of two separate parish councils.</p> <p>Four councillors in favour and three against: that the parish council should separate into one council for Dadlington and one for Shenton and Sutton Cheney.”</p>		

<p>A town/parish councillor</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_23</i></p>	<p>“I would like to see Sutton Cheney Parish Council remain the same with NO change. this would include the villages of Sutton Cheney, Shenton and Dadlington.</p> <p>I also do not consider there should be any change to the name, I would prefer the name to stay as Sutton Cheney Parish Council.</p> <p>For the present and future of the Council I can see no valid reasons why there should be any change.</p> <p>Sutton Cheney has a very vibrant Council, who have completed a number of projects in the last year, a very experienced and helpful clerk, and some good Councillors. Finances of the Council are closely monitored by the Finance committee, so I can see no reason why there should be any change within the Council.</p> <p>For the future, we have the 1485 statues to be erected in the church yards in the Parish, plus a walk throughout the villages, yet another reason to keep the Parish Council with no change.</p> <p>On the negative side, there are approximately, a group of about six residents in Dadlington, who would like to see change and have a Parish Council. They have no experience, and have no idea about the procedures of a Parish Council. They would probably step down within a short period of time, when they realise procedures must be followed, and they cannot make their own rules.</p> <p>To me, splitting up the Parish Council would be a step backwards, these hamlets are too small to make any difference to their community, too small to have any strong representation, too small to have any effect financially with such a small Precept.</p> <p>For the future, with an increasing population, I would like to see Parish Council’s grow, take on more responsibility in their community, have more say on local issues, have larger Precepts, and have more effective use of their resources.</p> <p>Lets move forward with the Council, build and grow for the future, not recede and go backwards.”</p>		
<p>A borough councillor</p>	<p>Previously as you are aware I haven't responded to the Governance Review on the issue of separation of Dadlington from Shenton and Sutton Cheney because opinion seemed split and I would need to work with whatever structure emerges. I abstained on the vote on the draft proposals for this reason.</p> <p>However, over the last few days petitions have emerged from large numbers of residents in Dadlington, Sutton Cheney (and to an extent Shenton) calling for separation.</p> <p>In addition to this I understand there was a Special General Meeting of the current Sutton Cheney Parish Council which voted in favour (albeit narrowly).</p> <p>Given this I think I should support these calls now that there seem a clear majority of local residents calling for this change.</p>		
<p>Dadlington Ward</p>			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
<p>An individual local resident</p>	<p>Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?</p>	<p>Don't know</p>	<p>The purpose of the review is to better reflect the community the parish council represents.</p> <p>This name ignores the fact that Shenton is also part of the pc. Also it is extremely clumsy</p>

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There exists on the present Sutton Cheney parish council an antagonistic attitude towards Dadlington by other councillors. To increase the councillors to 4 for Dadlington would result in few proper decisions being taken with the chair having to use the casting vote a disproportionate number of times and thus being the decision maker. To counter balance this and to reflect the fact that the majority of the electorate is Dadlington based, Dadlington needs 5 councillors. This is the number of councillors required for a separate authority and this is the preferred option of not only the majority of the residents of Dadlington but also those of Sutton Cheney.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	In a recent survey conducted amongst the Dadlington residents eligible to vote, approximately 150 voted for Dadlington to go its own way and have its own independent parish while about 7 voted against. Merely changing the title of the existing parish council does not satisfy that desire.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Shenton and Sutton Cheney are small private villages, each controlled and managed by a couple of landlords, but Dadlington has a larger population than the other two villages together and its residents own their own homes. Dadlington needs a greater portion of the precept than the other villages (payment for mowing the village green, for example, which is not required in the other two villages), so when Dadlington's requests for financing other tasks in the village is often voted down by the other councillors. Giving Dadlington an extra councillor would probably mean regular dead heats with the chair, currently not from Dadlington, determining the outcome.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	The new name includes Dadlington which forms a significant part of the population of the parish. Keeping the 3 villages together is important since they are all 3 rural hamlets with similar issues, and each alone is too small to have a significant voice.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	As noted above since a significant part of the population comes from Dadlington, then an increased number of councillors is appropriate.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Changing the name should bring the communities together I think
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	The people of Dadlington need another councilor to represent them and listen to their views

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think it would bring the communities of all villages closer together. I know that the Dadlington Village Hall committee are trying to get their own parish council, but this would be run by the committee and volunteers which is not good as they can be a negative group of people and just want to take over and not listen to the residents views
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	I think this is a good idea. A lot of residents didnt know of matters within Dadlington until the new Councilor Peter Dyde joined the council and introduced himself and to matters relating to Dadlington. [comment redacted]
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	We are the bigger of the 3 villages
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Makes more sense being the larger village. Also i'm against Dadlington going solo as this is planned by sime residence/PC's who think they own the village. Plus the current chair is also campagning locally for Dadlington to break away from SCPC!
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I received a leaflet from Cllr Dyde and we were grateful for that as he explained the situation to us as we had no notification previously. Having been to a recent meeting from the '.steering group' it seems Dadlington Village Hall committee want to run a new parish council with a group of volunteers, which makes not sense whatsoever.... and if they dont like you, they let you know. Just my opinion
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	We need more councillors like Cllr Dyde. The councillor that resigned this year was excellent but the other current ones are not very friendly and only seem out for themselves.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think this is a good idea and gets residents of Dadlington more involved
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	We need another good councilor for Dadlington
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Due to the number of Councillors proposed the Chairman would still have the casting vote which is not a democratic vote.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Due to the number of Councillors proposed the Chairman would still have the casting vote which would not be a democratic vote for Dadlington, as the Chairman currently resides in one or other of the Parishes and is liable to be biased toward Shenton &

			Sutton Cheney. It would be better if Dadlington was able to form its own Parish Council and become independent from Shenton & Sutton Cheney and have control of its own destiny and manage its own affairs as at the moment the current Parish Council seems to be biased towards the other 2 wards, There is a different make up of residents within Dadlington as most dwellings are privately owned and not Estate owned as are Shenton & Dadlington. The residents of Dadlington need to be able to have a say with actions to be carried out in their own village and the decisions not made by others.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Its obvious that if your name is in something it will give you a better reflection of identity. However i don't believe just a name change will provide a more effective local government
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	It wouldn't be appropriate because the majority of responders to the Dadlington survey chose to have their own parish council. So in a democratic society I think this is what should happen for the best interests of Dadlington Village which be even more of a reflection of local identity as you put it.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Unnececcary
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Seldom enough vounteers to fill the existing 3 places
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Dadlington is by far the largest of the three villages and this would be reflective in the changed name
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	The number of residents represented by a councillor would be evened up with the other two villages
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I believe that Dadlington should be separate to avoid the continuing conflict with parish councillors from Sutton Cheney and Shenton voting against many many proposals and issues expressed by Dadlington Councillors and the wishes of the majority of the people of Dadlington.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	This is a proposal that will lead to conflict and stalemate with 4 councillors from Dadlington cancelled out by the 2 of Sutton Cheney and the 2 of Shenton. Whoever is the chairman will have the casting vote, a nightmare situation that could be resolved by allowing Dadlington its own separate PC. There are at least 5 people of Dadlington willing

			to stand as councillors, including myself, but most would not wish to stand for the proposed continuing combined council where meetings are negative and unpleasant.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Much larger population in Dadlington than in the other two combined; the village is independent of influence by estate land owners
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	More representative of the population
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I can see no benefit in being annexed with Dadlington. We do not do any joint community projects or activities together. If anything, we seem to be competing with each other for funding and road calming measures not working together.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	For the size of Dadlington three should be sufficient.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Dadlington needs to be separate as it has different needs to the other two villages. Councillors need to appreciate the discord that has existed for some time. Dadlington wished to create a neighbourhood plan but the others did not. When the draft was presented, the councillors from Sutton and Shenton voted to change it significantly. Dadlington has a village green which the others voted to control its use. Dadlington wanted to protect historic areas from Solar panels but the others refused to object to that. Dadlington is at serious risk of inappropriate housing closing the area of separation between Dadlington and Stoke Golding but the others are not interested in protecting it.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Previously the 2 councillors of Shenton and 2 of Sutton Cheney have outvoted the 3 of Dadlington on matters relating solely to Dadlington. Increasing Dadlington to 4 councillors will produce a stalemate. This will add to everyone's frustration.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Dadlington is the largest of the three villages in the Parish. It has always caused confusion and annoyance that "Dadlington" was not included in the Parish name.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	This evens up the number of electors per ward councillor. It also prevents the smaller villages outvoting the larger Dadlington at Parish Council meetings.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	The change of name does not adequately reflect the views of Dadlington residents. A letter and tick box survey was undertaken by a Dadlington community group towards the end of March 2022 to gauge the opinion of the residents of the village. There was an overwhelming level of support for the formation of Dadlington Parish Council run by the people of Dadlington. The response was 150 in favour and 7 against which represents

			<p>70% of the electors of the village. Therefore, the review recommendations WOULD NOT better reflect local identities and interests.</p> <p>Also, within Dadlington there are enough people prepared to serve on a new parish council which solely related to the village. Of the 150 electors who are in support of a Dadlington Parish Council there would be a sufficient number who have indicated that they would serve as Parish Councillors. I know of at least 7 residents who have indicated their willingness to be committed to the role of parish councillor in Dadlington, should the opportunity arise. They are not however willing to be part of the current Parish Council, for a mixture of reasons.</p> <p>The appropriate documentation from the community group for Dadlington was submitted to HBBC as part of the review.</p> <p>My question is why should the views of Dadlington residents be bypassed in favour of the survival of Sutton Cheney and Shenton as a viable parish council? And is combining with Dadlington in the best interests of Sutton Cheney and Shenton as villages?</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	5 parish councillors for a Dadlington only parish council would better reflect the local identity and interest of Dadlington and provide a far more effective and convenient local government for Dadlington.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I believe this decision will enable the residents of Dadlington to feel more included within the parish council as a whole.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	I feel that by having an additional councilor for Dadlington, this will reflect the feelings of residents, who at present don't feel they can approach two of the current councilors, as they present a negative attitude. The newest councilor for Dadlington (Cllr Dyde) has done an excellent job in bringing the residents together about matters they have concerns for.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Dadlington is the bigger village with a more engaged population
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Four would be ok, but five would better reflect the comparative size of the villages

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I feel this decision is exactly what was needed within the community of Dadlington. I personally feel that the residents have felt 'left out' previously and this decision to change the name, will hopefully bring the residents of all parishes together.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	This is the correct decision for the residents of Dadlington, in order for them to engage more with an additional councilor for Dadlington.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	This suggestion will make no difference at all and it pointless
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I do not feel that simply increasing the Dadlington representation is adequate. Dadlington requires its own parish council where representatives from the two other villages are no longer able to block, delay, change and otherwise interfere with decisions which are in the best interests of Dadlington itself. I strongly back a parish council for Dadlington alone. Much work has been done by villagers to consider and prepare for a new Parish Council for Dadlington and it is by far the best route in my opinion.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	This is not adequate in any way. It is my opinion that Dadlington requires its own Parish Council and should be wholly separated from the other two villages.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	As above, this will make little difference to the struggles we currently have. I do not feel that simply increasing the Dadlington representation is adequate. Dadlington requires its own parish council where representatives from the two other villages are no longer able to block, delay, change and otherwise interfere with decisions which are in the best interests of Dadlington itself. I strongly back a parish council for Dadlington alone. Much work has been done by villagers to consider and prepare for a new Parish Council for Dadlington and it is by far the best route in my opinion.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I would like to see Dadlington separated to have its own parish council for Dadlington alone and to be unlinked from Shenton and Sutton Cheney parish council
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I do not feel that simply increasing the Dadlington representation is adequate. Dadlington requires its own parish council where representatives from the two other villages are no longer able to block, delay, change and otherwise interfere with decisions which are in the best interests of Dadlington itself. I strongly back a parish council for Dadlington alone. Much work has been done by villagers to consider and prepare for a new Parish Council for Dadlington and it is by far the best route in my opinion.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	The name change will make the community of Dadlington more included rather than be left out
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Another councillor will listen to our views of matters that concern us, I hope
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think it will make residents feel better that they are included and this name change, does that
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Yes I think it will be better to have another councillor who will listen to the residents of Dadlington
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	The name is much better as it includes the residents of Dadlington
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	I personally think it would be best to have another councillor.....
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think its good as locals dont feel included a lot of the time, so this will be better
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Always better to have another councillor to represent us
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Its a good idea to include Dadlington as some people feel they are left out sometimes
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	We need to be fairly represented and another councillor will be good I think
An individual local resident	"...The current Sutton Cheney PC is made up of three villages; Sutton Cheney, Dadlington and Shenton. Over the last few years it has become very clear to a lot of us (at least within Dadlington) that the current situation is no longer tenable.		

<p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_3</i></p>	<p>A letter was distributed to every eligible voter in Dadlington and 150 of us responded that we needed a Dadlington Parish Council as a standalone council.” [...]</p> <p>“...1. It is recommended that a PC be formed called Dadlington and Sutton Cheney PC with Dadlington to have an additional councillor making 4 in all and no change to representation from Sutton Cheney and Shenton. This recommendation has obviously not been thought about in any real way. If I was a resident of Shenton (as indeed I have been) I would already be thinking I was very much an afterthought of both the current PC and certainly the Borough Council.</p> <p>However more worryingly if the proposed “new PC” is to have 4 councillors from Dadlington, 2 from Shenton and 2 from Sutton Cheney a very obvious issue immediately raises its head – how many decisions are going to be split. Who will have the deciding vote? Will the Chair carry 1¹/₂ votes so there is always a majority option?</p> <p>2. A Parish Council for Sutton Cheney and Shenton without Dadlington is considered to be unsustainable because insufficient numbers are likely to come forward as councillors.</p> <p>3. The BC is not convinced that a Parish Council for Dadlington on its own would be unsustainable for the same reason. If, by “unsustainable” the BC means that Dadlington could not have enough people from within the village to make a committee, they are very much mistaken. It is true that over the last few years there has been a perceived issue at times to have enough representatives to step up and be a rep for the village on the Sutton PC, but that is because people feel that the existing scenario does not work – hence the large number of Dalingtonians requesting / demanding a fundamental change!</p> <p>Talking to members of the village I know of at least a dozen people who would be willing to stand on a Dadlington ONLY PC – I, for one! where none of them (me included) would want to work with the existing set up as it is seen by a lot of residents as basically perfidious. If however, the BC means by the word “unsustainable” that the village is too small ie the population of the village means that a village only PC is not viable option there is already a precedent within the borough, and is therefore at odds with itself!</p> <p>There are at least 2 Parish Councils that are already operating sustainably yet have a smaller electorate than Dadlington. According to HBBC’s own statistics as of January 2022 Dadlington had an electorate of 225. Osbaston (who have run their own PC for a number of years) have a stated electorate of 214. While Cadeby only have 180! This would still leave 198 electorates within the 2 villages of Sutton Cheney and Shenton. [...]</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_14</i></p>	<p>“...The current Sutton Cheney PC is made up of three villages; Sutton Cheney, Dadlington and Shenton. Over the last few years it has become very clear to a lot of us (at least within Dadlington) that the current situation is no longer tenable. A letter was distributed to every eligible voter in Dadlington and 150 of us responded that we needed a Dadlington Parish Council as a standalone council.” [...]</p> <p>“...1. It is recommended that a PC be formed called Dadlington and Sutton Cheney PC with Dadlington to have an additional councillor making 4 in all and no change to representation from Sutton Cheney and Shenton. This recommendation has obviously not been thought about in any real way. If I was a resident of Shenton (as indeed I have been) I would already be thinking I was very much an afterthought of both the current PC and certainly the Borough Council.</p>

	<p>However more worryingly if the proposed “new PC” is to have 4 councillors from Dadlington, 2 from Shenton and 2 from Sutton Cheney a very obvious issue immediately raises its head – how many decisions are going to be split. Who will have the deciding vote? Will the Chair carry 1½ votes so there is always a majority option?</p> <p>2. A Parish Council for Sutton Cheney and Shenton without Dadlington is considered to be unsustainable because insufficient numbers are likely to come forward as councillors.</p> <p>3. The BC is not convinced that a Parish Council for Dadlington on its own would be unsustainable for the same reason. If, by “unsustainable” the BC means that Dadlington could not have enough people from within the village to make a committee, they are very much mistaken. It is true that over the last few years there has been a perceived issue at times to have enough representatives to step up and be a rep for the village on the Sutton PC, but that is because people feel that the existing scenario does not work – hence the large number of Dalingtonians requesting / demanding a fundamental change!</p> <p>Talking to members of the village I know of at least a dozen people who would be willing to stand on a Dadlington ONLY PC – I, for one! where none of them (me included) would want to work with the existing set up as it is seen by a lot of residents as basically perfidious. If however, the BC means by the word “unsustainable” that the village is too small ie the population of the village means that a village only PC is not viable option there is already a precedent within the borough, and is therefore at odds with itself!</p> <p>There are at least 2 Parish Councils that are already operating sustainably yet have a smaller electorate than Dadlington. According to HBBC’s own statistics as of January 2022 Dadlington had an electorate of 225. Osbaston (who have run their own PC for a number of years) have a stated electorate of 214. While Cadeby only have 180! This would still leave 198 electorates within the 2 villages of Sutton Cheney and Shenton. [...]”</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_10</i></p>	<p>“I am very disappointed to read the draft recommendations. A combined Parish Council for Dadlington, Sutton Cheney and Shenton will not address the problems that Dadlington has experienced previously in getting decisions through which are to the benefit of the village</p> <p>If there are 4 councillors from Dadlington and 4 from the other 2 villages then this will create a stalemate situation which would be avoided if Dadlington had its own Parish Council.</p> <p>How can the BC assume a Parish Council for Dadlington would not be sustainable? Cadeby, with a population of 169 (2011 census) and Osbaston with 162 electors is sustainable, both having less electors than Dadlington (227) on its own and a combined Sutton Cheney and Shenton with 193. I am aware of 6 people who are currently willing to stand for a Dadlington Parish Council.</p> <p>I am also aware that a disproportionate amount of the current precept for Sutton Cheney is spent on the Clerk's salary and admin expenses. I understand this would be addressed by a Dadlington PC which would need only 5 meetings a year without sub-committees.</p> <p>I trust the BC will review their recommendations in favour of Dadlington as I firmly believe this would be the right decision.”</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p>	<p>“I moved into Dadlington Four years ago and settled in well. Attending SCPC meetings became part of being a resident who wanted to feel I could contribute to the village matters.</p>

<p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_11</i></p>	<p>However I now feel that it is time for me address issues which concern me and about how I feel that Dadlington needs to have it's own Parish Council.</p> <p>We need to retain our own identity as a Hamlet with a great heritage background which makes our village individual. All villages have similar issues but in many areas their own needs. We need our own Parish Council and should not be bundled together with Sutton Cheney and Shenton even though they are close neighbours. The history of the merger of these villages must move on to modern times as things change and new issues present themselves in our small villages.</p> <p>Each village is individual and as part of this group Parish Council we have less control of what really matters to it's residents. We have a village green which we feel we could use more but there is apparent lack of interest if the subject forms part of the meeting agenda. Our village green is the heart of Dadlington and we do understand it's use has certain restrictions.</p> <p>Attending SCPC meetings it is noticeable that the coverage Dadlington issues is given little time for discussion and time seems to be given as a valid reason for this but we have a voice and should have been granted more 'air time'. When the Agenda is set out it should cover all the three villages equally but when again attending these meetings I feel it's hurried along with great speed with little time for the residents views to be discussed.</p> <p>The size of a village is not important it is the commitment of it's residents that is paramount and Dadlington is committed to wanting its own identity. I have no doubt that if we have our own PC it would attract and fill those councillor positions.</p> <p>The Steering Group has worked so hard in the last few months on the residents behalf and that shows exactly what the villagers want.</p> <p>We want to 'stand alone' and make our own decisions without feeling we are being moulded into a group that has lack of understanding how we want our village to be run.</p> <p>This will benefit us in the years ahead and give us security on daily matters.”</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_12</i></p>	<p>“We recently received a note from Bill Cullen outlining a proposal for a new parish council structure which includes an additional representative for Dadlington village, on the newly proposed ‘Dadlington and Sutton Cheney’ Parish Council.</p> <p>We wish to make it clear to you that this approach is not only unacceptable to us but also seems to completely dis-regard the clearly expressed views of the vast majority of Dadlington residents.</p> <p>We are among the 150 electors in Dadlington who wholeheartedly supported the proposal that Dadlington should establish it’s own Parish Council, and the newly suggested approach does not take account of our clearly expressed wishes.</p> <p>We would strongly urge the Borough Council to take full account of the overwhelming opinion of the residents of Dadlington and acknowledge the entirely reasonable proposal to create a separate and fully representative Dadlington Parish Council.</p> <p>It is democracy at it’s most fundamental level after all.”</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p>	<p>“Whilst the renaming of the PC and the extra councillor for Dadlington will respond to some of the existing problems this does not resolve the issue of public opinion in Dadlington being firmly expressed as wanting an independent council for the village. There were many</p>

<p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_18</i></p>	<p>points put forward in the document by the PC for Dadlington Steering Group which do not seem to have been addressed in the draft recommendations. Was this document made available to Members of the Council?</p> <p>I am aware of at least 5 residents who would stand for a Dadlington PC and I myself would be prepared to do so. Therefore the issue of sustainability would be resolved. It has become clear that some residents of Sutton Cheney and Shenton are in favour of Dadlington separating which indicates that sustainability of the remaining PC would also be addressed.”</p>
<p>On behalf of a group, organisation or club (A Steering Group for Dadlington)</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_letter_1</i></p>	<p>“The Steering Group is disappointed that the Borough Council (BC) has apparently chosen to retain the three village structure instead of taking the opportunity to separate Dadlington albeit in draft at this time. We understand that the BC’s consideration that neither Sutton Cheney and Shenton without Dadlington or Dadlington on its own would be considered to be sustainable is based upon a statistical analysis of the number of elections required within a period of years since the last CGR which indicated a lack of such elections. Most of the smaller Parish Councils (PC) fill casual vacancies by co-option and this has been the case within Sutton Cheney PC. Therefore the Steering Group cannot accept that the analysis based upon elections only is valid without also considering the co-option rates, particularly as the cost of elections would fall on PCs.</p> <p>It is clear that the BC must consider what is best for a parish area not specifically based upon individual villages, however this must surely have to be balanced by consideration of what the local population wants. If a compromise solution is offered which basically means no real change then this is not likely to provide a settled arrangement particularly for Dadlington. Sutton Cheney and Shenton have far more in common than Dadlington and if separation took place then these villages would be freed from contributing to the maintenance of Dadlington Village Green from which they receive no direct benefit. Additionally the same applies to the maintenance of the churchyard in Dadlington as it is a closed churchyard. The same does not apply to the two other villages.</p> <p>Each village is different in certain respects but Dadlington has developed a uniquely independent community within Sutton Cheney PC. This is an important reason why the people of the village want their own PC. This strong feeling within the village is not going to go away. We see this as far more than the alteration of electoral arrangements but as a great opportunity to carry out the things we want to do in the village such as working closely with other bodies like the Village Hall Management Committee, looking for opportunities to increase biodiversity and action on global warming etc. In effect, a more community based PC where costs can be minimised by the involvement of the people of the village.</p> <p>Presently we are locked into a PC which spends far more than is necessary of the precept on salaries and admin costs. If we can provide a more economical model of what a PC serving a smaller village should be then this is surely the right way to go.</p> <p>Returning to the sustainability of a PC for Dadlington, comparisons with existing smaller stand alone parishes such as Cadeby and Osbaston are inevitable because their existence supports the view that a Dadlington parish which would be larger than both of these, would be sustainable. This approach also would apply to a combined parish of Sutton Cheney and Shenton. Dadlington on its own would have 225 electors whereas Cadeby has 180 and Osbaston has 214.</p> <p>The draft recommendation of the BC referring to possible changes to Sutton Cheney PC to rename it as Dadlington and Sutton Cheney does not change the three village setup. The additional representation of another member for Dadlington means that there may often be no clear majority and it may still be a “battle” to get decisions made. In effect unless the Chair is from Dadlington this solution would be sentencing the villages to a stalemate that will suit no-one, resulting in more frustration and preventing Dadlington operating as an</p>

	<p>efficient, cost-effective village, where self-help and voluntary community participation could show the way in which all villages should function. This solution is unlikely to prove acceptable to the villagers.</p> <p>In conclusion we would like to take the opportunity to clarify the involvement of the Steering Group within Dadlington. The whole process started with an exploratory meeting to discuss the feasibility of separation from Sutton Cheney Parish Council which was then followed up by an open village meeting. After this a Steering Group was set up. Right from the start it was recognised that this was not a matter which should be driven by individuals but needed to come from the village as a whole. A local survey was undertaken to establish what the electors of the village wanted which resulted in an overwhelming response of 150 for having its own parish council and 7 against. The Steering Group then produced a "Case Document" which was then submitted to the BC for consideration."</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_20</i></p>	<p>"If Dadlington is included within Sutton Cheney it will continue a situation of stalemate and frustration between villages that have entirely different needs. Shenton and Sutton are largely estates, protected by that against development. Dadlington is made up of individual properties and as such is at risk to developers and needs independence to be able to protect itself with its own neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>It is also a village with a community that gets things done with a lot of volunteers. Dadlington will prove far more economic administratively and provide a blueprint for other rural locations in operating with a community spirit with low expenditure."</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_letter_2</i></p>	<p>"The idea of a change of name to reflect the population balance of the three villages with the additional councillor may, on paper, address the current situation but I fear that it fundamentally misses the point. It was very clear that there was a high level of dissatisfaction and a majority preference for the establishment of a separate council.</p> <p>I have followed the activities of the Parish Council closely for a number of years now and as an interested villager and also as a member of the group that produced the Neighbourhood Plan for Dadlington. Many of the meetings that I attended were quite acrimonious and I did begin to understand why the turnover of councillors is so high. There is a fundamental mismatch in the structure of the villages concerned and it is hard to imagine that the residents of one village would have much concern with the activities of the others. This is reflected in the meetings but has been brought into sharp focus by the way the current council has handled the Neighbourhood Plan that was created by after some very extensive consultation and research by the action group in Dadlington. The working group was basically excluded from the process and the Borough Council is now considering a plan, modified without proper consultation, that does not reflect the wishes of the people of Dadlington. The feelings of mistrust are now so deep that the sort of people who would make a difference are extremely reluctant to put themselves forward as they have no confidence in the process. I think it highly unlikely that Dadlington will continue to contribute its current quota of councillors never mind an additional one whilst the current situation exists. I would willingly serve as a councillor for a separate Parish Council but I would be unwilling to do the same for the present arrangement.</p> <p>The current Governance Review is an opportunity to correct a situation now that will only get worse into the future and, whilst I speak as a representative of Dadlington, I genuinely believe that a clean break now will prove beneficial to all parties. Within Dadlington there is a very strong community spirit and a structure within the management of the village hall that would easily assimilate the duties of a Parish Council. I believe this course of action would only strengthen the sense of community and provide a structure to enhance the lives of all our residents. I further believe that the present council is inefficient and wasteful and that the separation would bring many opportunities for economies to the benefit of all.</p> <p>I earnestly ask you to please reconsider your current position to more accurately reflect the very clearly expressed wishes of the people of Dadlington."</p>

Shenton Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	No I think the councils should stay as they currently are to ensure a fair and balanced approach to decisions.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	If the villages remain in one council, I don't think Dadlington should have four councillors. The numbers need to even for all locations to ensure unbiased voting imo.
An individual local resident <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SPC_email_1</i>	<p>"I hope that HBBC can reconsider the future of Sutton Cheney Parish Council, as I believe that future good governance will best be ensured by two separate parish councils. This is justified on all three grounds considered by the review - identity, the need for effective government, and the desires of residents.</p> <p>Identity</p> <p>Sutton Cheney village and Shenton village are linked and are both adjacent to the Battlefield Country Park and connected to the public paths that radiate from it. They form a coherent whole, united by patterns of land ownership and land use. Dadlington village is not connected to them and is geographically distinct. Indeed, it is virtually contiguous with its neighbouring village of Stoke Golding (in another parish), connected by pavements all the way.</p> <p>Effective Government</p> <p>Priorities between the settlements are substantially different. Currently funding is disproportionately tilted towards Dadlington because of the substantial asset of the Green, which requires significant maintenance. There is also a Dadlington Neighbourhood Plan, which uses significant parish council resources. The lop-sided nature of the current parish area means that there is a permanent structural problem in the council that guarantees dysfunctional government.</p> <p>Desires of residents</p> <p>Over 230 electors of the current Sutton Cheney Parish have submitted their names on petitions asking for two separate parish councils. This reflects the public responses to your first consultation, in which there were 13 responses from electors, all but one of which were in favour of separating the parish. The existing Parish Council itself has also now voted that it supports separating into two councils.</p> <p>The question of the governance review has been a source of unnecessary division within the existing parish council, and has been a stimulus for an unprecedentedly large number of residents to request change from HBBC."</p>		

Sutton Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton Cheney and Shenton are similar villages but very different from Dadlington. It is an insult to Shenton to name two of the very separate villages. Dadlington already dominates the parish council.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	It would be difficult to get an agreement with voting split 4 against 2+2 so not practicable for 8 total councillors. Dadlington has very different requirements to Shenton and Sutton and would be best served as its own separate PC. I suggest two PCs each of 5 councillors, one for Dadlington and one for Shenton and Sutton Cheney. The Sutton Cheney PC to have 3 councillors in sutton ward and 2 in shenton ward. I suggest that making the PC local for the village will increase the local engagement with the PC
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_21</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I believe that there should be two separate parish councils, one for Dadlington and one for Sutton Cheney and Shenton. Sutton Cheney and Shenton would work well together and Dadlington, being slighter larger in size, would run well on its own. I feel residents of Sutton Cheney and Shenton would have more of a voice this way. The speed registering device that is shared between Sutton Cheney and Dadlington is an example of how separate they are - they have no bearing on each other at all, Dadlington is more linked to Stoke Golding.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I don't understand why Dadlington would be given so many more councillors? I see that it would reduce the number per resident, but it seems grossly unfair and out of kilter to increase Dadlington's voice whilst keeping Sutton Cheney's minimal.
	"I am responding to the above consultation and believe that Sutton Cheney and Shenton should have their own parish council. Our councillors are very active and residents have a vested interest in the running of the village. I feel strongly that we should be separate from Dadlington, as the 3 together do not feel like an efficient unit and Sutton Cheney and Shenton have more in common to run together. Dadlington is better linked to Stoke Golding and should be run alongside their parish council, as events are commonly attended by residents of these 2 areas together. I don't feel that our interests as a village would be well represented"		
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	This will not be representative and would be undemocratic.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Re HBBS recommendations for Sutton Cheney PC, at present, the number of councillors for each village reflects perfectly their respective populations; the proposal to increase the Dadlington representatives from three members to four will destroy the balance and would be undemocratic.

<i>from Document SCPC_email_22</i>	Re HBBS recommendations for Sutton Cheney PC, at present, the number of councilors for each village reflects perfectly their respective populations; the proposal to increase the Dadlington representatives from three members to four will destroy the balance and would be undemocratic. The proposed changes would only be appropriate if the HBBC has plans to permit the building of significant additional housing in Dadlington, in which case, the village should have its own PC, separate from that of Sutton Cheney and Shelton.		
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Don't know	I have no particular preference. The name is historic and whilst Dadlington has grown in population I do not believe that has any more or greater issues than Sutton Cheney with it's proximity to the Battlefield and Wharf, arguably, the Boroughs greatest tourist attractions
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I think an even number would be disastrous because any vote could potentially result in stalemate and would make decision making extremely difficult. Giving the Chair a casting vote would most likely favour the village which the chair represents.
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_15</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton Cheney is important for many reasons and should not be dominated by dadlington
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I don't think dadlington should have four councillors. If they have Sutton Cheney should have an equal number
	"I have read with interest the discussion over the representation on the Sutton Cheney / Shenton / dadlington parish councils . I think Sutton and Shenton should separate itself from dadlington or if that was not possible have the same number of councillors as dadlington"		
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	We want a separate parish council for Sutton Cheney & Shenton and Dadlington should have it's own parish council. We believe that the needs of our local community would be far more effectively served by having a more local parish council. We believe the needs of Sutton Cheney / Shenton are different from those of Dadlington.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	If the three villages end up staying in the one council (even though people for Sutton & Shenton want separate councils - and so do the people of Dadlington) - we don't think that Dadlington needs to have four councillors. They should have the same number as Sutton/Shenton.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It would better reflect local identities and interests to separate the councils so that Dadlington has its own and Sutton Cheney works with Shenton to have their own parish council.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	It would not be appropriate for one village to have more parish councillors than the other villages as this would not provide an equal or fair means for Sutton Cheney to have their voices heard.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton Cheney and Dadlington should separate their parish councils and be individual from each other due to each village having different needs.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	If you are proposing to keep the parish councils together it would be unfair for dadlington to have more parish councillors than sutton cheney or shenton have.
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_8</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I feel the parish would be better served with the amalgamation of Sutton Cheney and Shenton, two villages exceptionally close to each, whereas Dadlington a few miles away virtually touches Stoke Golding.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	If Sutton Cheney has to amalgamate with Dadlington, we should have an equal number of representatives, between the villages, we have a lot of issues within the village with reference to speeding, parking and visitors to our many historical sites, church, battle field etc.
	"I am responding to the consultation to say that Sutton Cheney and Shenton should have its own parish council separate from Dadlington."		
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_9</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I believe there should be 2 separate parish councils, one for Dadlington and one for Sutton Cheney
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I don't agree that If the villages do remain in one council, Dadlington should have 4 councillors
	"... I'm responding to the consultation to say that Sutton Cheney and Shenton should have it's own Parish Council, separate from Dadlington."		
An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_6</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Sounds fine.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	At the very least, councilors should be even between Sutton Cheney and Dadlington. Sutton Cheney has considerably more attractions and historical landmarks and should be properly represented.
	"I am a resident of Sutton Cheney and am responding to the consultation that Sutton Cheney and Shenton should have a separate parish council from Dadlington."		

An individual local resident <i>Response received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_email_4</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I feel that should the villages come under one parish council, there is no justification for four councillors for Dadlington. My concern would be that any future decisions to be made would always benefit Dadlington first and foremost. Sutton Cheney is an important village historically with strong connections to the battlefield and railway and subsequently attracts many visitors. For these reasons alone I feel that maintaining a more equal number of councillors to safeguard the interests of the village crucial .
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	See above.
	"I am writing in response to the consultation regarding the amalgamation of Dadlington Parish Council to that of Sutton Cheney and Shenton. As a resident of Sutton Cheney, I am aware of the village's importance historically and it's close connections to the battleground and station, and the subsequent number of visitors it attracts, Sutton Cheney would be in danger of unfair representation should the villages come under one parish umbrella with Dadlington gaining an additional Councillor as proposed."		
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton Cheney and Dadlington should separate into two separate parish councils, with Sutton Cheney including the ward of Shenton.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	If the number of councillors for Dadlington ward is increased then this ward should separate to become its own parish council.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton cheney is a historic village snd encompasses the Battlefield Centre so covers a large busy tourist area and I consider should be noted . I cannot see any reason to change the name of the parish council
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	The parish council seems to work well with the number of councillors and it will be very unequal for Dadlington to have double the number of parish councils than Sutton Cheney of Shenton,
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Sutton Cheney and Darlington are two completely separate villages, with unique differences and challenges. SC as a major tourist attraction should be independently supported by those that understand fully our needs.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Sutton Cheney should have the same amount of councillors as Dadlington. The population is similar, however Sutton Cheney has far more visitors thanks to the Wharf, Battlefield Centre and loop, Shenton Station and traffic (often speeding and heavy loads) using the Fenn Lane as a cut through. All of these add up to a bundle of challenges that the residents have to deal with on a daily basis and are not felt by the likes of Darlington, Shenton or even stoke Golding.

			Therefore I would like to see SC have 4 representatives and additional funding allocated for use in our village and surrounding area since we have additional requirements and a population that multiplies exponentially on any given day with visitors.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Prefer it to remain the same
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There is no sensible rationale for Dadlington to have double the number of representatives than Sutton Cheney. SC has a similar number of residents and a more significant number of attractions and visitors.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Because it would reflect that the two villages have very different identities.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I feel that Sutton Cheney and Dadlington should both have three councillors. Although Dadlington is likely to have an increased population, Sutton Cheney has at least as many issues, taking into account the Wharf, battlefield centre, two pubs and serious traffic issues.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Because it would reflect that the two villages have very different identities.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I feel that Sutton Cheney and Dadlington should both have three councillors. Although Dadlington is likely to have an increased population, Sutton Cheney has at least as many issues, taking into account the Wharf, battlefield centre, two pubs and serious traffic issues.
A town/parish councillor	<p>“My views if anything is to be more determined to keep SCPC as one. Our parish overall has a great community, that is vibrant with a lot happening in each individual village.</p> <p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_3</i></p> <p>The Parish council is trying to evolve , with changes and better communication to the community. We have a hardworking clerk, who is faced with difficult issues, but must adhere to the guidelines that LRAC dictate and also with guidance from HBBC, which people don't want to accept as the answer to there issues.</p> <p>It's been a very difficult 12 months, the Parish finances needed to be brought into line, which is now the case, councillors have come and gone due to varying reasons, there has been an ongoing investigation into a councillor, certain councillors abuse the code of conduct rules, also the ongoing DNP issues.</p>		

I was dismayed at our last PC meeting to see three of our councillors along with a Borough Councillor, in discussion relating to the presentation from Martin Cartwright Councillor Executive for Rural Affairs, a good friend to the Parish, but in support of the Parish staying as one, which he presented at the last governance meeting held at HBBC

He was then asked to defend his views in a private meeting with our Parish chairman and [name redacted] the steering group for Dadlington to have its own PC.

I believe from that meeting both realised that certain criteria was not achievable, due to legislation from Westminster and HBBC guidelines.

So we then have more breakaway meetings, but not just Dadlington now Sutton Cheney have a meeting because we are told we need to support a breakaway, about 10 people at Dadlington and about 17 at Sutton Cheney, so this isn't working so let's have a petition, any facts, figures or explanation why we need to separate, of course not, have they told you to expect a possible 50% increase in precept costs if it did happen, I doubt not.

One other thing to remember if the council was separated, it would require five seats in each Parish making ten in total, causing a risk of uncontested elections, so less democratic and regularly having vacant places on both new PC.

[...]

"I have seen and witnessed misgivings by councillors and steering groups in Dadlington

I have been asked by a councillor to get the DNP over the line, I don't think it matter how.

They blatantly flaunt rules and regulations, I have been witness to people being asked to change minutes and remove names from the same minutes, change boundary lines to enable a build site in the DNP, the same people that want to run a separate PC.

Sadly two ex councillors from Dadlington were described as the 'wrong sort' by a present councillor, two people who had the Dadlington community at the top of there agenda.

In my role as ward councillor for Dadlington, I have realised that there is part of the community that welcomes me and what SCPC is trying to do.

My belief is that HBBC will keep the Parish as is, they may give extra seat to Dadlington we may have a name change, but that's not a definite.

Moving forward I hope that the two ex councillors get the opportunity to rejoin the PC and we can move forward with a togetherness and build a strong Parish Council, that has councillors from the three villages working together to support the Parish community."

Area not specified			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
Other: Not specified <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_5</i>		"I am writing to you to respond to the above Consultation and express a strong preference that Sutton Cheney and Shenton should have their own parish council and should be separate from Dadlington."	
Other: Not specified <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_7</i>		<p>"Speaking on behalf of several in my household, we would like to state that the current movements within the Parish Council aiming to split the entity in two are entirely unneccessary and a total waste of public money.</p> <p>Through my experience as a councilor for Shenton ward it was apparent that the motives of the majority of the group of retirees in Dadlington pushing for this change, were based on a desire to remove the influence of councilors they didn't like or didn't agree with. I think valuable opinions and wise voices would be lost if any changes are made."</p>	
Other: Not specified <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_13</i>		<p>"I would like to object to the proposals that HBBC have suggested in response to the proposal from a number of Dadlington residents.</p> <p>I understand the sustainably concerns but feel those regarding Dadlington are misplaced. I know that in recent times, Dadlington has struggled to find parish councillors but this appears directly related to what was described by many who attended meetings as members of the public as the toxic nature of the council. I understand that things have improved, although the way the new council has dealt with the honest endeavours of the neighbourhood plan planning committee, including accusing those involved, myself included, of collusion and dishonesty.</p> <p>The fact remains that Dadlington is a very different kind of community to both then other villages, and although an additional councillor would equal things up, a two-way split over Dadlington matters would still be dependent on the chair's casting vote and so the same situations could reoccur.</p> <p>I hope that HBBC will consider these points in making their final decision, especially if you receive a substantial response from other residents."</p>	
Other: Not specified <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_17</i>		"Independence Independence Independence Why not ?"	
Other: Not specified		"I am writing to express my views regarding the proposed change to Sutton Cheney Parish Council. I think that Dadlington and its residents deserve a parish council of their own. There is a significant difference in character and size between Sutton Cheney, Shenton	

<p><i>Relevant extracts taken from Document SCPC_letter_19</i></p>	<p>and Dadlington. Dadlington is much bigger than the other two villages. I live in Dadlington and have no knowledge of the issues which concern the villagers of Sutton Cheney and Shenton, and I daresay they don't know about Dadlington issues. It is inconvenient for villagers to have to travel between the three villages for meetings, and the only body for which a new Dadlington and Sutton Cheney PC would be useful would be the Borough Council itself as it would have only one PC to deal with, instead of the more sensible 2 or even 3 PCs.</p> <p>At various meetings in Dadlington Village Hall regarding the proposed changes, the hall was packed - people were propping themselves up on the walls because all the seats were taken, so I think there is plenty of interest in how we are represented in a truly democratic fashion; I don't know why the Borough Council have decided that there would not be sufficient people interested in serving the community by serving on a Dadlington Parish Council.</p> <p>I hope that the Borough Council will reconsider their decision, and allow grass-roots democracy to flourish.”</p>
<p>Residents</p>	<p>A petition with 130 signatures (unverified) was received with the following request: “We, the villagers of Dadlington, would like to express our concern that the results our village survey for the Local Governance Review are not being accurately reflected in the current proposals under consultation. We feel that the current position of a single council for the three villages is no longer appropriate as Dadlington has evolved into a thriving community of owner-occupied properties whereas Sutton Cheney and Shenton are still effectively estate controlled. We feel that the interest of all parties would now be better served by a clean separation that would allow all communities to develop naturally along their chose paths. We urge the Borough council to use this Governance Review opportunity to put in place a separate Parish Council for Dadlington that will carry the full support and enthusiasm of the residents. We, the undersigned villagers of Dadlington, affix our signatures in support of this petition for an independent Parish Council for Dadlington.”</p>
<p>Residents</p>	<p>A petition with 89 signatures (unverified) was received with the following request: “We, the undersigned, are opposed to the plan of Hinckley and Bosworth Council to keep Dadlington together in a single parish with Sutton Cheney and Shenton. Sutton Cheney and Shenton have a separate identity from Dadlington and joining the villages together makes effective local government very difficult. We would like to see Sutton Cheney and Shenton have their own parish council.”</p>

<h2>Witherley</h2>			
<p>It is proposed that the name of the parish be amended to “Witherley & Fenny Drayton”. It is also proposed that the number of councillors for Witherley ward be increased from four to five, thereby increasing the number of councillors sitting on the parish council from 11 to 12.</p>			
<h3>All wards</h3>			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments

On behalf of a town/parish council	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	I think this better represents the parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Witherley is the larger village so proportionally should have more councillors than Fenny Drayton.
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	<p>Definitely NO.</p> <p>The change of name proposed is inappropriate and best left as is i.e. Witherley Parish Council using the strap line 'Serving the communities of Atterton, Fenny Drayton, Ratcliffe Culey and Witherley'. The change of name would be a mistake because it does not provide a solution inclusive of all of the communities represented by the Parish Council and potentially will lead to more discontent. Most residents I believe accept Witherley is traditionally the name of the Parish.</p> <p>The change of name is likely proposed because there is evidence of unrest amongst residents in Fenny Drayton about governance. However, this is much more deep rooted than a change of name can soothe. I believe relations have been damaged because of the way in which Witherley Parish Council has communicated with residents and the problems have been compounded because there is a serious failing in local democracy.</p> <p>The scrutiny of councils set out in the Localism Act 2011 does not apply to Parish Councils. The government's preferred approach being to leave complaints to be remedied through the ballot box. With elections every four years this is not a solution. Beleaguered Councillors and residents have nowhere to go. Complaints may be made to the Monitoring Officer of a district authority but they do not have the teeth to investigate and deal with bad conduct. The remit of the local government ombudsman does not extend to Parish Councils. The government has been aware of problems for sometime but still nothing has been done.</p> <p>This serious failing in local democracy has led to discontent in Witherley Parish.</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	<p>Yes (although the number of residents per councillor does not appear regularised throughout the Borough).</p> <p>HOWEVER, whilst I believe in the fairness of proportional representation in any government, I am compelled to point out, in reality, there is potential for problems. For example, a rural Parish like Witherley, has four separate communities and there is potential when decisions are made about contentious issues (eg housing and development_ as we have seen already when developing our neighbourhood plan we</p>

			know that the powers conferred on Councillors with their own prejudices outstrip the votes of Councillors representing our smaller communities and are unfair.
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	No need for change.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	No need to have extra Councillors.
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It would cost too much money and inconvenience to change the name.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	There are enough councillors already to make decisions.
A town/parish councillor	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	It better represents the population statistics of the Parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	It would seem to better represent the population make-up of the Parish
Atterton Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	This parish council represents Witherley, Fenny Drayton and Ratcliffe Culey - which are 3 distinct Church parishes and individual villages - which have little in common apart from being under ONE Parish Council - currently known as Witherley Parish Council. To change the name and NOT include all 3 village names would be confusing to all and insulting to one. (Note: the hamlet of Atterton is part of the Witherley Church parish and therefore not as separate in its own right as the others)
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Don't know	I see no reason to change the current representation - as both the larger villages are almost equally represented in terms of 'per head'.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	<p>The change of name proposed is inappropriate and best left as is i.e. Witherley Parish Council using the strap line 'Serving the communities of Atterton, Fenny Drayton, Ratcliffe Culey and Witherley'. The change of name would be a mistake because it does not provide a solution inclusive of all of the communities represented by the Parish Council and potentially will lead to more discontent. Most residents I believe accept Witherley is traditionally the name of the Parish.</p> <p>The change of name is likely proposed because there is evidence of unrest amongst residents in Fenny Drayton about governance. However, this is much more deep rooted than a change of name can soothe. I believe relations have been damaged because of the way in which Witherley Parish Council has communicated with residents and the problems have been compounded because there is a serious failing in local democracy. The scrutiny of councils set out in the Localism Act 2011 does not apply to Parish Councils. The government's preferred approach being to leave complaints to be remedied through the ballot box.</p> <p>With elections every four years this is not a solution. Beleaguered Councillors and residents have nowhere to go. Complaints may be made to the Monitoring Officer of a district authority but they do not have the teeth to investigate and deal with bad conduct. The remit of the local government ombudsman does not extend to Parish Councils. The government has been aware of problems for sometime but still nothing has been done. This serious failing in local democracy has bred discontent in Witherley Parish.</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Don't know	<p>Yes (although the number of residents per councillor does not appear regularised throughout the Borough).</p> <p>HOWEVER, whilst I believe in the fairness of proportional representation in any government body, I wish to point out, in reality, there is potential for problems. For example, a rural Parish like Witherley, has four separate communities and there is potential when decisions are made about eg. about contentious issues such as housing and development - as we have seen already when developing our neighbourhood plan) the extra voting powers conferred on Witherley Councillors will outnumber the votes of Councillors representing smaller communities and there is potential for them to be unfairly prejudiced, i.e. subjective rather than objective community wide.</p>

Fenny Drayton Ward

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley should be split from the other 3 hamlets
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Unfair to the other hamlets and does not reflect the views of Fenny Drayton residents

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It would be more democratic for Fenny Drayton to stand alone from Witherley as recent events have proved that Witherley having more Councillors than the other villages has led to decisions being made detrimental to Fenny Drayton.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Please see above. It would be fairer if Witherley ward was reduced to three councillors
An individual local resident <i>Response was submitted online twice in the same name, relevant extracts taken from Document SUR438727748 SUR450022405</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	The reference to Fenny Drayton is merely a sticking plaster to try and placate residents who have voiced serious concerns about the conduct of Witherley Parish Council, specifically in relation to the drafting of an NDP. There are two other hamlets which should be mentioned, Atterton and Ratcliffe Culey. By omitting reference to them in the title of the Parish Council (but including Fenny Drayton) suggests that hamlets are of less significance. I live in Fenny. Perhaps a better total would be the Parish Council of Witherley and surrounding hamlets. Singling out Fenny Drayton to be included in the title would risk upsetting those residents of the other hamlets who are aware and angered by Witherley Parish Council's conduct - there are many but some have not been vocal.
		No	<p>“...Those of us in rural hamlets have nothing in common with Witherley other than the Parish Council that is narrow minded and cannot be trusted.</p> <p>Semi-urban Witherley has many community facilities and is fast becoming an extension of Atherstone. Fenny Drayton, Ratcliffe Culey and Atterton are rural hamlets without such amenities. The proposed name does not reflect these differences which are so important for building policies and for our quality of life. A name is of little consequence when there is no actual change in our power to govern ourselves”</p> <p>“By ignoring the 30 plus residents who have suggested the split from Witherley Parish Council into Witherley Village Parish and Hamlets Parish, you are also ignoring all the evidence that has been sent to HBBC about the questionable practices undertaken by WPC [...] These are serious concerns that HBBC should not be ignoring by attempting to placate residents with a name change.”</p> <p>“HBBC state that because Parish elections were uncontested some years ago, there is no evidence to justify changes to the Parish Council now. In making that statement, HBBC has ignored 4 years of local residents’ democratic campaigning, information seeking, and community planning all completed independently of WPC.”</p> <p>“There are now 6 residents in Fenny alone who are willing to stand for election as a Parish Cllr in 2023 - such is the level of anger and upset. A change of name is simply not enough!”</p>

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	“By increasing the number of Cllrs in Witherley you are simply allowing the local mafia that exists to ensure that they have a block vote of 6. The additional seat will be taken by one of the residents who is known to and shares the same views as the existing Cllrs of Witherley, the current chair and the previous chair. The latter still plays an active role in the Council matters and remains influential. The actions of those involved in the creation of the draft NDP are well known to HBBC, as is their conduct and action taken to try and ignore HBBC Core development policy. By increasing their representation on the Council it appears to be actively rewarding them for their conduct.”											
		No	<p>“This makes no sense and in any event would ensure that Witherley Councillors have a domination to out vote anyone outside of the village.”</p> <p>“Current total 11 councillors:- 1 Atterton; 4 Fenny Drayton; 2 Ratcliffe Culey and 4 Witherley village. Proposed total 12 councillors:- 1 Atterton; 4 Fenny Drayton; 2 Ratcliffe Culey but 5 Witherley village ?</p> <p>This is in direct contrast to other similar Parish Councils, eg, Stoke Golding as highlighted in the table below -</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>Electorate (Jan 22)</th> <th>Electors/councillor</th> <th>Number of councillors</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Stoke Golding</td> <td>1621</td> <td>232</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Witherley</td> <td>1187</td> <td>108</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>HBBC’s own Full Council meeting record (12 July 2022, p59) states: “... supported by NALC’s [National Association of Local Councils] guidance that the appropriate number of councillors for a parish council the size of Stoke Golding is eight”. This means there should be fewer Witherley councillors, not more!”</p>	Parish	Electorate (Jan 22)	Electors/councillor	Number of councillors	Stoke Golding	1621	232	7	Witherley	1187	108
Parish	Electorate (Jan 22)	Electors/councillor	Number of councillors											
Stoke Golding	1621	232	7											
Witherley	1187	108	11											
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I object to this. The residents of Fenny Drayton are not heard, by changing the name it will not change as the Fenny Drayton residents will remain ignored. Most of the meetings are held at Witherley which does not account for the residents of Fenny Drayton who are unable to drive. Fenny Drayton needs to be split from the other hamlets and have our voices heard.											
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Why do Witherley need more councillors when other areas with more residents have fewer councillors? Why has this even been put forward as a recommendation.											
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Changing the name of the parish council will not change the way the council is treating the public. THIS WILL NOT WORK. As a resident of Fenny Drayton for many years, I can confirm Fenny Drayton is excluded from Witherley parish council unless there is housing to put this way. At the Annual meeting - the only ward represented was Witherley. We cannot as a community continue this way. So no, changing the name will not work.											

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	How this has even been suggested by HBBC is a joke. Why should Witherley get more councillors? They already out vote the other councillors for the hamlets. The bullying that has gone on from the previous chair and many of the current councillors is unacceptable. What are HBBC thinking? The only way forward is a separate council for the hamlets. HBBC should be ashamed and embarrassed that they even put this forward as a suggestion. So no, this is completely inappropriate.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Fenny Drayton is a small village without any amenities whilst Witherley is a large community with many of its own amenities.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I think that there would be a better balance if Witherley had less councillors
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	We are not part of Witherley, but a separate Hamlet
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Why would they need more Purely to our vote Fenny Drayton it would seem or also increase ours
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	<p>Changing the name of Witherley Parish Council to Witherley & Fenny Drayton Parish Council is a complete and utter waste of time and money and reduces the credibility of HBBC in the eyes of the electorate.</p> <p>Changing the name does nothing to address the issues raised by all but one of the residents who responded to the first consultation. WPC does not serve the community well and changing the name does nothing to address this. The residents of Fenny Drayton and Ratcliffe Culey will know once again HBBC is ignoring their concerns.</p> <p>The residents of Ratcliffe Culey and Atterton will be annoyed as you don't even think their settlements worthy of mention in their Parish Council's name.</p> <p>WPC will have extra cost in modifying every document to change every mention of WPC to Witherley & Fenny Drayton Parish Council. In these challenging times financially, money could be better spent than changing a name as a supposed sop to residents that residents will just view as an insult. I could use stronger language here but there is no point writing something you would need to be redacted.</p>

			<p>You state that a separate Parish Council would not be sustainable because Fenny Drayton has not had an election in the last 10 years. There was a contested election in 2011 and for a while a Fenny Drayton resident represented Witherley Ward as Witherley was short of Councillors. Since elections take place every 4 years you should either go back to 11 years or 7 years.</p> <p>Your proposal leaves the residents of the hamlets almost disenfranchised. I conclude the Governance Review is a box ticking exercise and doesn't really want to address resident's concerns.</p> <p>The Governance review remit states the "This is to ensure they continue to reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government." The current structure of Witherley Parish Council does not reflect the local identities of the hamlets and it is certainly not effective unless you live in Witherley village.</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Initially I didn't disagree with increasing the number of Witherley Ward councillors to 5 given the number of electors each councillor will represent. I assume you have reviewed councillor numbers across the whole of the borough. However, no Witherley resident or any Witherley Parish Councillor asked for the numbers of councillors to be increased, one could conclude they are happy with the status quo. If so why change?
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	<p>Fenny Drayton is a hamlet with different requirements to Witherley. Witherley is semi urban right next door to the town of Atherstone, Witherley has it's own community facilities , Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without amenities and with different requirements.</p> <p>The proposed name change does not reflect those differences which are important for building policies and quality of life within a small hamlet, which is why we moved here 11 years ago.</p> <p>There would be a change in name only not an actual change of power of Fenny Drayton to govern - Pointless change</p>
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	<p>Why is there a need for another councillor, the National Association of Local Council guidance actually states fewer councillors as a recommendation. Stoke Golding has 1621 on the electorate and only 7 councillors, Witherley has 1187 on the electorate and already has 11 councillors, why is there a need for another one ?</p> <p>Not justified and makes no sense or then trying to push through Witherley's mandate / policies.</p>
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	<p>Fenny Drayton is a hamlet with totally different requirements to Witherley Witherley is semi-urban and has many community facilities, Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without amenities and with different requirements.</p> <p>The proposed name change does not reflect those differences which are important for building policies and quality of life.</p>

			There is a change in name but NOT an actual change in the power of Fenny Drayton to govern - A pointless change
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	WHY ! Why is there a need for another Witherley councillor , is this a way of getting agreement through for more housing outside of Witherley? Pushed into Fenny Drayton, Ratcliffe or Atterton - NOT acceptable National Association of Local Councils guidance actually states fewer councillors as a recommendation, so how can there be a justification for an increase from 4 witherley councillors to 5 . - It does NOT make sense ! Check out Stoke Golding as an example, more electorate less councillors.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	It's two separate communities
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Witherley Councillors would be able to outvote Fenny Drayton councillors to suit their own village concerns. This is undemocratic.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It excludes Ratcliffe Culey and Atterton which in alphabetical order would precede Witherley which is really Mancetter or Atherstone orientated. Fenny Drayton and the other 2 hamlets would be better represented by another Leicestershire authority geographically nearer to the main HBBC governing body. Or save the money and scrap Parish Councils and remove one layer of unaccountable bureaucracy.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	1 I can only conclude that the comments that were made with reference to the friction already generated by the perceived weighting of influence in favour of one facet of this conglomeration versus the other 3 were not noticed or ignored entirely. Now the proposal is to tilt the balance even further, simply based on a numbers game, which will add nothing to cohesion and may result in reduced cooperation from some quarters. 2 It is well known that "the number of decisions made by a committee are inversely proportional to the number of people sitting on that committee", so why exacerbate this further by increasing this number of unpaid, unaccountable and by many of the populous unelected representatives that are beyond recall once they have assumed their exalted position?
An individual local resident <i>Response received via</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Fenny Drayton is classed as a HAMLET and as such its Parish name/identity should be protected and kept individual. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet with totally different requirements to the much much larger Witherley which has many community facilities and is increasingly becoming an extension of Atherstone. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without such amenities and the

<p><i>online form and same comments via email (WPC_email_1)</i></p>			<p>proposed name does not reflect these many differences which are so important for building policies and for our Hamlet quality of life and this name change would not mean an actual change in our power to govern ourselves which is very very important and much needed. Fenny Drayton residents are better at knowing what is in the best interest of their village than others who do not live within it ! as past experience tells us.</p> <p>I believe approx 30 responses came from Fenny Drayton residents with many supporting splitting off from Witherley village on a past survey. HBBC state that because Parish elections were uncontested some years ago, there is no evidence to justify changes to the Parish Council now!! It seems HBBC has ignored 4 years of local residents democratic campaigning, information seeking, and community planning all independently of WPC. Then why is the HBBC issuing surveys asking for residents opinions if they are going to be totally ignored ?</p>
	<p>Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>I do not agree with the increase of councillors for Witherley from four to five increasing councillors sitting numbers to 12. The National Association of Local Councils guidance on councillors are being ignored..why ? ie: Stoke Golding Electorate 1621 Councillors (7) Witherley Electorate 1187 Councillors proposed (12) !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>The Hamlet Fenny Drayton needs extra councillors to safeguard and represent the village and its residents best interests otherwise the larger Witherely Parish number of councillors will not reflect the smaller villages interests.</p>
<p>An individual local resident</p> <p><i>Response received via online form and same comments via email (WPC_email_2)</i></p>	<p>Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Fenny Drayton is classed as a HAMLET and as such its Parish name/identity should be protected and kept individual. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet with totally different requirements to the much much larger Witherley which has many community facilities and is increasingly becoming an extension of Atherstone. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without such amenities and the proposed name does not reflect these many differences which are so important for building policies and for our Hamlet quality of life and this name change would not mean an actual change in our power to govern ourselves which is very very important and much needed. Fenny Drayton residents are better at knowing what is in the best interest of their village than others who do not live within it ! as past experience tells us. I believe approx 30 responses came from Fenny Drayton residents with many supporting splitting off from Witherley village on a past survey. HBBC state that because Parish elections were uncontested some years ago, there is no evidence to justify changes to the Parish Council now!! It seems HBBC has ignored 4 years of local residents democratic campaigning, information seeking, and community planning all independently of WPC. Then why is the HBBC issuing surveys asking for residents opinions if they are going to be totally ignored ?</p>

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I do not agree with the increase of councillors for Witherley from four to five increasing councillors sitting numbers to 12. The National Association of Local Councils guidance on councillors are being ignored..why ? ie: Stoke Golding Electorate 1621 Councillors (7) Witherley Electorate 1187 Councillors proposed (12) !!!!!!!!!!!!!!! The Hamlet Fenny Drayton needs extra councillors to safeguard and represent the village and its residents best interests otherwise the larger Witherly Parish number of councillors will not reflect the smaller villages interests.
An individual local resident <i>Two online responses under the same name were received via online form and Relevant extracts taken from Document WPC_letter_1 & WPC_letter_3</i>	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Semi-urban Witherley has many community facilities itself and very close to adjacent Atherstone for others. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without such amenities. The proposed name does not reflect these vital differences which are so important for very different policies and for the hamlets' quality of life. It could also create the misleading impression that the hamlet is as appropriate as the semi-urban village for housing or commercial development. Fenny Drayton would get its name in the Parish title but no actual change in its influence upon Parish affairs. In fact, this influence would be decreased by increasing the number of Witherley councillors. The change still omits recognition of the two smaller settlements.
		Yes	Adding Fenny Drayton to the parish Council title makes it clearer what the council communities it is supposed to represent.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Stoke Golding 1621 (electorate Jan 22) 232 (electors/councillors) 7 (number of councillors) Witherley 1187 108 11 HBBC's own Full Council meeting record (12 July 2022, p59) states: "... supported by NALC's [National Association of Local Councils] guidance that the appropriate number of councillors for a parish council the size of Stoke Golding is eight". This suggests there should be fewer – not more - Witherley councillors.
		No	Additional Councillor for Witherley parish will create an unfair advantage for one village over the rest of the community. It would be much better and beneficial to split Witherley village away, and create a new parish Council for Fenny Drayton Atterton and Ratcliffe Culey. Leaving Witherley village as the only site for future housing development to decide it's own path. Leaving the other 3 settlements to concentrate on their own pressing issues and concerns.

	<p>“Whatever the rights or wrongs, the continuing stream of complaints from residents about WPC and individual councillors demonstrate there is no confidence whatsoever in its representative role and activities. “</p> <p>“The number of responses from the parish settlements submitted flatly contradicts the HBBC ‘reasoning’: there were 128 responses of which 31 – virtually all in favour of independence – came from residents in Fenny Drayton and 5 from Ratcliffe Culey. These response tallies contrast with the zero residents’ responses from the larger Witherley settlement. Merely adding ‘Fenny Drayton’ to the Council title does nothing but paper over this very evident ‘great divorce’ between WPC and the other settlements, avoiding the difficult questions to be asked about local democratic institutions and fundamental accountability to all residents equally.”</p> <p>“I return to the proposal of Witherley being a separate Parish Council, enlarging itself and following its semi-urban trajectory of development. The other settlements can form a Hamlets Council, with or without any other adjacent hamlets. Witherley can determine/increase its own number of councillors according to its developing needs, as can the Hamlets to serve their predominantly rural identity.”</p> <p>“The recommendation that Witherley has one extra councillor merely exacerbates difficulties as the perceived Witherley factional representation on WPC is numerically strengthened and divisions within the Parish only deepen. If Witherley requires such an addition on the grounds stated by HBBC, then it is more appropriate for further development to be located in Witherley as the ‘suggested need’ for additional councillor(s) shows that it is already developing a significant urban character, in sharp contrast with the rural hamlets.”</p> <p>“On page 59 of HBBC Full Council meeting record (12 July 2022) there is the following quote regarding Stoke Golding despite Witherley Parish population being much smaller than that of SG).</p> <p>'... <u>supported by NALC's guidance</u> that the <u>appropriate number of councillors</u> for a parish council the size of <u>Stoke Golding is eight</u>.' “</p> <p>“The imposition of one extra councillor on Witherley Parish because of ratio of electors: councillors is not supported by the actual facts (numbers of councillors elsewhere and ratios): [...] The figures for Barlestone, Market Bosworth and Stoke Golding (even with 8 councillors) shows that Witherley should <u>not</u> have an extra councillor on basis of numbers of electors”</p> <p>“The name ‘Witherley and Fenny Drayton’ is deeply unsatisfactory because Witherley is a village with multiple facilities close to major settlements whereas Fenny Drayton is a hamlet without facilities away from locations with amenities. They are not at all equal in amenities and geographical settings, as the proposed title would imply, especially in matters of potential development.”</p> <p>“Instead, I return to the proposal of Witherley being a separate Parish Council, enlarging itself and following its semi-urban trajectory of development. The other settlements can form a Hamlets Council, with or without any other adjacent hamlets. Witherley can determine/increase its own number of councillors according to its developing needs, as can the Hamlets to serve their predominantly rural identity”</p>		
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherly and Fenny Drayton have very different needs. Fenny Drayton should be part of a Hamlet parish council eg Fenny Drayton Ratcliffe Culey. Whilst Fenny is part of Witherly, Fenny’s needs will continue to be overlooked and it’s hamlet status ignored.

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Why do Witherly need more councillors? This will weaken Fenny Drayton's position and force development in Fenny which should be protected in hamlet status. Stoke Golding is bigger but has less councillors so why increase Witherly? Why is Witherly so favoured and afforded special treatment?
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	No need for change
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	No need
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Using the term Witherley & Fenny Drayton could undermine Ratcliffe and Atterton and upset the residents there. I understand the concept of Witherley parish covering several villages in and around Witherley but Witherley & Fenny Drayton makes these two villages appear more noteworthy than the other two villages in the parish. Adding Fenny Drayton to the name is a nice thought but it confuses the issue to me.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I think that four Witherley councillors works well and there isn't a great need for more. The village hasn't grown significantly in the last 10 years. But I appreciate the numerical analysis that has been conducted which shows that there should perhaps be another councillor for Witherley based on the population of the village.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	For too long Fenny Drayton residents have been excluded from Witherley Parish Council. They do not represent anyone but Witherley. Why are you ignore the public when we want SEPARATION from Witherley Parish Council.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Giving Witherley Ward an extra Councillor will only lead to more houses being batted to the hamlets. More bullying towards hamlet residents. More exclusion toward hamlet residents. The Hamlet residents want SEPARATION. Stop ignoring the people. We do not want association with the Witherley Parish Councillors. HBBC have turned a blind eye to the continued bullying. Why? Stop? Listen! WE NEED A NEW HAMLET PARISH COUNCIL. Thank you.
Ratcliffe Ward			
Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley is a large village with more needs whereas Fenny Drayton is far smaller and more like a a rural hamlet (as is Ratcliffe Culey).

	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Definitely not! I strongly feel that Witherley will be over represented with FIVE councillors and decisions will be biased to the detriment of the smaller villages. The number of councillors for Witherley should be DECREASED not increased.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Similar sized villages, better describes the area covered.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There should NOT be a higher number of councillors from just 1 village because it would bias decisions & give a dis-proportionate number of votes to that village. It would then not be representative of the whole parish. The current 11 councillors are more evenly spread and there is no need or benefit in changing at the current time.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I don't understand why particular villages are selected for the name? This from my perspective is purely down to the amount of councillors they have. I believe there should be a Witherley Parish and then a Parish for the 3 hamlets of Ratcliffe Culey, Atterton and Fenny Drayton. These decisions should be put to a vote as they are a hamlet the same as us all.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	No as there shouldn't be a higher majority for any one parish as then the smaller parishes can be overruled and decisions taken away from them. Ideally there should be an equal number for each parish.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	There is no point in changing the name. It would imply the other 2 hamlets are of less importance
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	It would make Witherley far too dominant over Ratcliffe, Fenny & Atterton. These small hamlets would not have a fair say in decision making
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Why add Fenny to the name of the parish council when there are two other hamlets in the parish, this appears to exclude these hamlets.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	This move will make Witherley more dominant in decision making than they already are, it would make more sense to have the extra councillor in Atterton or Ratcliffe. Therefore making decision outcomes fairer.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	As long as each area still retains good representation.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I feel that there should still be four and one more for Ratcliffe Culey. Any issues on Ratcliffe Culey May be misrepresented in the favour of Witherley and Fenny Drayton.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Do not see the point in the change of name
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I feel there is no need to increase the number of councillors for Witherley. It gives more power to Witherley they have enough already. Ratcliffe Culey is a rural hamlet which will be spoiled like Witherley already has been. Witherley councillors could out vote our two councillors when voting on important issues affecting our village.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Don't know	I feel that some of the concerns of my fellow Ratcliffe residents, which have been expressed in Facebook and in leaflets, stems from the lack of recognition of our village in the title, but recognise it would be very long if all the settlements were listed. I wonder if an alternative could be found that is a common theme to us all? Unfortunately I don't think the Anker runs through all the villages but is there another landmark or common geographical term that could be used?
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	A key principle of democracy is that people are represented. As Witherley is the largest village it should have the largest number of seats and I trust that councillors will adhere to the Nolan principles of public life and make decisions that are right for the whole parish
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It somewhat more accurately reflects the make-up of the Parish, but does little to reduce the dominance of Witherley over the wishes and requirements of the smaller villages.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	I am very disappointed to see this. It runs completely contrary to the views I and my neighbours expressed to you, that Witherley Councillors have tended to override the needs and requests of the smaller villages. By increasing the number of Witherley councillors this simply makes matters worse. We made the point that the needs of Witherley, as a large village closely associated with Atherstone, are very different from those of the rural villages/hamlets - has no account been taken of that? What about the other matters raised in our earlier comments? What action is being taken on what appears to be the mis-governance of Witherley PC? For example that the many serious

			concerns raised by HBBC in your report of 21 January regarding the Witherley PC Neighbourhood Development Plan were not responded to, and serious concerns raised by the residents of the smaller villages/hamlets have been ignored by the controlling faction on the PC? It is hard to see how our views have been considered, when the recommendations on which we are asked to comment are so brief.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	It reinforces the existing marginalisation of the two hamlets within the parish.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	My main concern in responding to the initial consultation was the way the current structure enables the Council and its business to be dominated by the interests of the Witherley Councillors. The proposed change exacerbates this problem.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Not sure how including Fenny Drayton benefits Ratcliffe Culey. The administration cost of doing this would be the same if you included all four village. Picking 2 villages out of 4, just because they are the biggest does not feel inclusive.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	This is favouring the two larger villages with different needs over smaller villages.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	I cannot see the benefit for Ratcliffe Culey of Witherley parish council amending their name to include Fenny Drayton. There are 4 Villages in the parish area not 2, Atterton and Ratcliffe should be included if you wish to be inclusive.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Whilst I understand that the electoral numbers would make this seem fair it gives a disproportionate vote to 1 of 4 villages who have varying needs and could mean the smaller villages voice is lost.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Entirety different villages, any such amalgamation in name or otherwise would undermine democracy for the other villages, that's what happens with unequal power, only natural, in the main look to self interest first.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Same answer as above. The flier sheet that came round lists an abysmal record of neglect and inertia, to this village, there may be genuine reasons for this but it doesn't look good. One fact I do see every day are vehicles flying by on main road Ratcliffe Culey, that will at sometime, cause a life changing injury.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Nobody cares versus costs of change
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	4 councillors must be able to cover such a small area if competent
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Doesn't reflect the smaller communities of equal importance in the parish
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Not level voting in parish decisions, weighted to two communities.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley Parish is a good name that doesn't need to change, too much cost.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	The Witherley village councillors have too much power over the smaller hamlets, such as Ratcliffe Culey already.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley village is the biggest so that should be the name of parish.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There are enough councillors already.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley has all the amenities, they have a school, they are on a bus route and they have a pub, plus it is the biggest village out of all of the village, in fact I think Fenny Drayton is a hamlet, so is Atterton and Ratcliffe Culey basically leave it as it is Witherley Parish Council as it is.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	All the Councillors in Witherley have their own agendas, they don't want any more houses in their village, dump them on other places like Ratcliffe Culey which is a hamlet, so why give them another person to decide they don't want any more houses.

An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley village is the biggest in our parish where all the houses should go plus they have all the amenities so leave it as it is
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There are too many councillors for Witherley village as it is, they are all ant building and development any they all have their own personal agenda's so why the hell give them more power to dump housing in Ratcliffe Culey after all we are only a hamlet with NO amenities and now the pub has now closed
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley is a large village with more needs whereas Fenny Drayton is far smaller and more like a a rural hamlet (as is Ratcliffe Culey).
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Definitely not! I strongly feel that Witherley will be over represented with FIVE councillors and decisions will be biased to the detriment of the smaller villages. The number of councillors for Witherley should be DECREASED not increased.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Similar sized villages, better describes the area covered.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There should NOT be a higher number of councillors from just 1 village because it would bias decisions & give a dis-proportionate number of votes to that village. It would then not be representative of the whole parish. The current 11 councillors are more evenly spread and there is no need or benefit in changing at the current time.
An individual local resident <i>Relevant extracts taken from Document WPC_Letter_2</i>	<p>“I do NOT agree to the proposed Parish name change. Witherley village is the largest settlement which has many amenities, for example school, football club and public house. There is close access to health facilities and work opportunities in Atherstone, several Industrial Estates, 3M's along with a bus & train station - terminal stop Euston, London. Witherley village is becoming an urban extension of Atherstone. Fenny Drayton is a rural hamlet without such amenities. Why change the name? Having read the residents comments one may query the logic behind this recommendation when the majority of comments are negative towards Witherley Ward Councillors. Hamlet residents do NOT wish to be linked with Witherley village.”</p> <p>“I do NOT agree to increasing the number of Councillors for Witherley village from 4 to 5.</p> <p>Current number of Councillors for WP:- 1 cllr for Atterton; 4 cllrs for Fenny Drayton; 2 cllrs for Ratcliffe Culey and 4 cllrs for Witherley, total number of councillors is eleven.</p>		

	<p>When comparing the parishes of Stoke Golding and Witherley, the Stoke Golding Councillors have in excess of double the number of electors, thus highlighting an excess of Witherley councillors. [...] The current draft recommendation contradicts NALC guidance.”</p> <p>“Over 30 responses came from hamlet residents with the majority supporting a separation from Witherley village. HBBC state that because Parish elections were uncontested some years ago, there is no evidence to justify changes to the Parish Council now. I would counter this statement is out of date, in the recent Witherley Ward election on 7 October 2021 three individuals stood for the Councillor position. There are numerous individuals currently considering the position of Parish Councillor in the run up to elections in May 2023 – hamlet residents are no longer satisfied with the current regime – there is significant unrest within the hamlet communities. “</p> <p>“To divide Witherley Parish into 2 separate Parish Council’s allows the Hamlet Council to develop their own Neighbourhood Development Plan and associated policies to enable interaction with land owners to ensure the hamlet’s receive the changes appropriate to their situation and lack of amenities.”</p>
--	---

Witherley Ward

Respondent	Subject	Response	Supporting comments
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	This is how the current parish council operates currently- together
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	Witherley is a slightly bigger Parish so 5 is appropriate.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	Witherley and Fenny Drayton being the largest 2 settlements - therefore a name change would reflect those settlement more
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	It would provide a levelling up across the Parish of the ratio between Ward councillors and residents. It would improve the representation of the Witherley parishoners.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	Yes	As Witherley and Fenny Drayton are the two largest settlements, the change of name is appropriate.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	Yes	It's clear that Witherley ward has been under-represented given that it has the largest population of all the parish's settlements. It is therefore highly appropriate that this

			under-representation is addressed by increasing the number of councillors from four to five.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Would rather the name was kept the same for ease and cheaper.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	Four councillors is enough for Witherley ward.
An individual local resident	Do you feel the proposed name change would better reflect local identities and interests and provide an effective and convenient local government?	No	Witherley village is the largest settlement with all the amenities so the name should say as Witherley Parish.
	Do you feel the proposed number of councillors would be appropriate?	No	There are enough councillors for Witherley ward already.