

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL – MONDAY, 8 JUNE 2026**



<p><b>Title of Report</b></p>	<p><b>COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p>	
<p><b>Presented by</b></p>	<p>Councillor Nick Rushton Infrastructure Portfolio Holder</p>	
<p><b>Background Papers</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Guidance on community governance reviews</a></p> <p><a href="#">Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007</a></p> <p><a href="#">Council Report – Terms of Reference</a></p>	<p><b>Public Report: Yes</b></p>
<p><b>Financial Implications</b></p>	<p>To date an estimated £4,000 has been spent on Stage 1 of the public consultation process managed out of existing budgets. It is estimated that a further £4,000, if the decision is taken to proceed to Stage 2 of the consultation process for all affected areas.</p> <p>The existing budget is sufficient to cover the £8,000 cost. Any additional expenditure arising from the consultation will be approved in accordance with the Constitution.</p>	
	<p><b>Signed off by the Acting Section 151 Officer: Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Legal Implications</b></p>	<p>The Council has responsibility for conducting community governance reviews under the Local Government and Public involvement in Health Act 2007. A review is either commenced as a consequence of a valid petition or application being made or by the Council choosing to conduct such a review where it considers it necessary to make recommendations in relation to parished and unparished areas. The legislation and government guidance set out how such reviews should be conducted and these are considered when conducting all stages of this review.</p>	
	<p><b>Signed off by the Interim Monitoring Officer: Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b></p>	<p>Offices have taken the decision to outsource some of the work connected to Stage 1 analysis and progression to Stage 2 consultation to an experienced local government consultant, provided by the Association of Electoral Administrators (AEA). The cost of this is included in the estimate noted above.</p>	
	<p><b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes</b></p>	

<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To advise members of the outcome of the first stage consultation of the Community Governance Review, to present the draft recommendations and to seek a decision on progression of the public consultation to Stage 2.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>1. THAT THE PROPOSALS SET OUT IN SECTION 3 BE ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL AS DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW.</b></p> <p><b>2. THAT THE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS BE PUBLISHED FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES FROM 1 JULY 2026 TO 13 SEPTEMBER 2026 INCLUSIVE.</b></p> <p><b>3. THAT THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION BE REPORTED TO FULL COUNCIL ON 16 NOVEMBER 2026.</b></p>

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act), the Council has responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews and deciding on recommendations made in relation to those reviews. A Community Governance Review (CGR) is a legal process whereby the Council will consult those living in the area and other interested parties on the most suitable way of representing people in the areas identified by the review. This means making sure that those living in the area and other interested groups, have a say in how their local communities are represented. The CGR process should consider changes in population or other specific local issues.
- 1.2 Government guidance states that it is good practice to conduct a full CGR at least every 10 to 15 years. As it is unclear as to when the last CGR was carried out for North West Leicestershire, Council agreed to review the current arrangements, along with the possibility of creating parish councils for the unparished areas of the district, to ensure that the electoral arrangements of parishes (the warding arrangements and the allocations of councillors) are appropriate, equitable and understood by their electorate.
- 1.3 The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026 and subsequent implementation have wide ranging implications for local government and its reorganisation. Consequently, there is a desire to review local arrangements – particularly the current unparished areas of North West Leicestershire and other parishes that have recently requested that their areas be reviewed.
- 1.4 As a result, on Tuesday 20 June 2023, Council resolved to undertake a Community Governance Review. However, it was also agreed that no such review would commence until the completion on the Local Government Boundary Commission of England’s (LGBCE) electoral review of North West Leicestershire, provided that it started no later than November 2025. Since then, the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026 was issued with wide ranging implications for local government and its reorganisation. Following this, the Council was advised that the recommendations of the LGBCE would not be implemented.
- 1.5 Accordingly, on Tuesday, 4 November 2025 Council resolved to undertake a CGR of four areas within the Council boundaries, including the unparished areas of Coalville and Thringstone.

- 1.6 Prior to the commencement of the CGR Council had also received a request that the following areas be reviewed from Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council:
- the boundary between the parishes of Ashby-de-la-Zouch and Packington.
  - both the number of Town Councillors and their distribution among the current seven wards and any new wards, should they be recommended, of the parish.
  - name of the parish of Ashby-de-la-Zouch to include Blackfordby.
- 1.7 A request was also received from Ibstock Parish Council, that residents be consulted on the boundary of the Parish, with particular reference to the ward of Ellistown and Battram.
- 1.8 To accommodate these potential changes, the Terms of Reference also allowed for the CGR to include all the existing Town and Parish Councils which border any of the four areas under review, as adjustments to their boundaries or electoral arrangements may be required.

## **2.0 CONSULTATION**

- 2.1 The first stage of consultation was carried out between 15 December 2025 and 7 February 2026 and invited electors, residents and other interested persons to put forward their views in relation to the four areas noted above, and, indeed to any other part of the Council area.
- 2.2 A detailed analysis of the results of the consultation is shown in Appendix A to this report, and are summarised as follows:
- For the Coalville area a total of 153 responses were received, with 123 (80.4%) in favour of the establishment of some form of parish council for the area. It is recommended that this be considered at Stage 2 of the consultation.
  - In the area of Thringstone, 54 responses were received, with 51 (94.4%) in favour of a parish for the area. It is recommended that this be considered at Stage 2 of the consultation.
  - Given the nature of the consultation in Ashby-de-la-Zouch responses were more mixed, but 75 (55.6%) of respondents felt that the current parish boundary reflected their personal sense of community. The suggestions put forward by the Town Council are sensible, and it is recommended that they be carried forward to Stage 2 consultation.
  - The consultation for Ibstock showed little consensus and did not indicate a need for any governance change. Only one comment referred to the Battram area, which does not indicate sufficient desire for a boundary change in that area. It is, therefore, not recommended that any changes for this parish be considered in Stage 2.
  - The requested change of name put forward by two members of Whitwick Parish Council for the Broom Leys ward is reasonable, and it is recommended that this suggested change be carried forward to Stage 2.
  - Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council put forward a suggestion for a boundary alteration on their northern boundary with Ashby Woulds Parish Council, and it is recommended that this is also considered at Stage 2 of the consultation.

### **3.0 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 Draft Recommendations are proposed here, for consideration by Full Council. Once approved, there will be a second round of public consultation on those Draft Recommendations as outlined in the timetable shown in the Terms of Reference.
- 3.2 The general principle is that Draft Recommendations must be both clear (easy to understand what the proposal is) and definite (making a recommendation), rather than leaving an area with no Draft Recommendation and leaving a 'blank sheet' for consultation. This allows residents and elected bodies to respond effectively and makes clear the proposed outcome of the CGR for each area. This supports open consultation and democracy, encouraging responses to definite proposals. However, there is one area where the outcome of the initial consultation has left a question mark over the proposed outcome, and in this instance (the unparished area of Thringstone) it is recommended that two alternative options are consulted upon.
- 3.3 No decisions are confirmed at this stage. The consultation process on the Draft Recommendations is an essential part of the CGR, and responses will (by law) be considered in producing the Final Recommendations to Council.
- 3.4 This section of the report presents the rationale and evidence for the Draft Recommendations. The Council is required to publish the reasons for making its decisions as a result of a CGR. As such, the responses to the consultation are included at Appendix B with personal information redacted or removed.
- 3.5 The sections of the report that follow detail each area in turn, with consideration given to the proposal and assessment of each suggestion. The Draft Recommendations shown are as agreed by the Electoral Review Working Party, which were considered by the Party on 3 June 2026.
- 3.6 Note that maps are included where a proposed Draft Recommendation includes a change to an existing boundary or creation of a new boundary. The maps include the external parish boundaries and the internal ward boundary maps, which are based on the existing District wards are being produced for the consultation. The external parish boundary maps can be found at Appendices C to I.
- 3.7 In considering the number of parish councillors to serve a particular area, the following has been used:
- Whilst the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) published guidance in 1988 on the suggested number of parish councillors per parish area based on the size of the electorate, these are non-statutory and there is no requirement for parish councils within an area to have equal ratios of electors to councillors. The statutory minimum number of councillors is five; there is no maximum, although it becomes more difficult and less effective or efficient to maintain an excessively large parish council. This allows North West Leicestershire District Council to consider the current number of parish councillors by area, recognise the different situations within each area, and then assess the appropriate number of parish councillors. There is no requirement for the number of electors represented by a single parish councillor to be the same between different parishes, although they should be comparable between wards of the same parish.

- Where necessary, the current number of electors and parish councillors is shown. In broad terms, the 1988 NALC guidance for the number of councillors per parish area is used. No such guidance exists for parish wards. The current number of parish councillors for the area must, therefore, be considered, along with planned changes and development, and adjusted accordingly, whilst attempting to maintain electoral equality between wards of a parish.

3.8 Once approved by Full Council, there will be a period of public consultation on the Draft Recommendations. Where a parish council, local resident, business or other organisation or body does not agree with a Draft Recommendation, they are invited to respond to the consultation stating their views, their reasons, and any alternative proposal.

<b>Area</b>	<b>Unparished area of Coalville</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	Formation of a civil parish and parish council for the currently unparished area of Coalville.
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>Support for a Coalville Parish Council is driven primarily by concerns about the impending dissolution of North West Leicestershire District Council and its merger into a larger unitary authority post-2027, with respondents fearing that without a Parish (or Town) Council, Coalville, the largest town in the district, will lose its voice in local governance decisions and be left without tier-two representation, a situation many compare unfavourably to Ashby-de-la-Zouch which has long enjoyed its own Town Council.</p> <p>Respondents express a strong desire for community-led, transparent governance with local councillors who understand their area, preferring a ward-based structure of councillors under the name 'Coalville Town Council'. Underpinning this support is a desire for a renewed civic pride and an essential safeguard for local democracy and an opportunity to reverse the town's fortunes and develop a sense of civic identity.</p> <p>Members of the Electoral Review Working Party also considered that Coalville may be more effectively served by establishing two smaller parish councils rather than a single town-wide body. Members considered that the town contains distinct communities with differing priorities, identities and patterns of development, particularly between the established central and western neighbourhoods and the newer growth areas to the east, largely split along the south-western boundaries of the unparished parts of the Greenhill, Broom Leys and Castle Rock wards, as shown on the map.</p> <p>Creating two separate parishes would allow each area to benefit from more focused, locally responsive governance, with councillors representing communities they know well and able to tailor services, priorities and investment to local circumstances. This option is, therefore, considered capable of delivering effective and convenient local government while ensuring that representation remains proportionate to the differing needs and identities within Coalville.</p> <p>It is, therefore, recommended that both options be put to the</p>

	<p>electorate in Phase 2 of the consultation.</p> <p>Further, members were concerned to learn that the Parish Meeting which serves Bardon civil parish has not met for at least the last twenty years, and that residents in the area are, therefore, not receiving any representation at parish level. It was agreed that all residents in the Bardon civil parish area be individually contacted and asked if they wish to join with any future Coalville parish council.</p>																											
<p><b>Draft recommendation</b></p>	<p>Draft Recommendations for Coalville:</p> <p><b>OPTION 1</b></p> <p>It is recommended THAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A civil parish be created for the currently unparished area of Coalville as shown by the red line on the attached map (Appendix C), but with the possibility of also including the civil parish of Bardon.</li> <li>• A parish council be created to serve the newly created civil parish.</li> <li>• The civil parish be named “Coalville.”</li> <li>• The Council for the civil parish shall have the style of “Parish Council.”</li> <li>• The total number of councillors to be elected to the Parish Council of Coalville is 21</li> <li>• The parish council be divided into wards using the boundaries of the existing wards of North West Leicestershire District Council as shown by the blue lines on the attached map (Plan will be available for the consultation)</li> <li>• The names of the wards and the number of councillors to be elected to each is as shown in the table:</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="475 1458 1370 1809"> <thead> <tr> <th>NAME OF WARD</th> <th>ELECTORATE 2031</th> <th>NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bardon (inc Parish Meeting)</td> <td>2557</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Broom Leys (part)</td> <td>1252</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Castle Rock (part)</td> <td>2330</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coalville East</td> <td>2231</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coalville West</td> <td>2046</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greenhill</td> <td>2347</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Snibston North (part)</td> <td>1720</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Snibston South</td> <td>2263</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The civil parish and parish council will come into existence on 1st April 2027</li> <li>• Elections to the new parish council will be held on Thursday 6 May 2027 and every four years thereafter.</li> <li>• The total precept to be specified in the Reorganisation of Local</li> </ul>	NAME OF WARD	ELECTORATE 2031	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	Bardon (inc Parish Meeting)	2557	3	Broom Leys (part)	1252	2	Castle Rock (part)	2330	3	Coalville East	2231	3	Coalville West	2046	2	Greenhill	2347	3	Snibston North (part)	1720	2	Snibston South	2263	3
NAME OF WARD	ELECTORATE 2031	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS																										
Bardon (inc Parish Meeting)	2557	3																										
Broom Leys (part)	1252	2																										
Castle Rock (part)	2330	3																										
Coalville East	2231	3																										
Coalville West	2046	2																										
Greenhill	2347	3																										
Snibston North (part)	1720	2																										
Snibston South	2263	3																										

Government Order is £TBC – *The information will be available for the consultation.*

## OPTION 2

It is recommended THAT:

- Two civil parishes be created for the currently unparished area of Coalville as shown by the red lines on the attached map (Appendix D), but with the possibility of also including the civil parish of Bardon.
- Parish councils be created to serve the newly created civil parishes.
- The civil parishes be named “Coalville” and “Broom Leys.”
- The Councils for the civil parishes shall have the style of “Parish Council.”
- The total number of councillors to be elected to the Parish Council of Coalville is 17, and for the Parish Council of Broom Leys it is 13.
- The parish councils be divided into wards using the boundaries of the existing wards of North West Leicestershire District Council as shown by the blue lines on the attached maps (Plan will be available for the consultation)
- The names of the wards and the number of councillors to be elected to each is as shown in the table:

COALVILLE PARISH NAME OF WARD	ELECTORATE 2031	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS
Bardon (inc Parish Meeting)	2557	4
Coalville East	2231	3
Coalville West	2046	3
Snibston North (part)	1720	3
Snibston South	2263	4

BROOM LEYS PARISH NAME OF WARD	ELECTORATE 2031	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS
Broom Leys (part)	1252	3
Castle Rock (part)	2330	5
Greenhill	2347	5

- The civil parishes and parish councils will come into existence on 1st April 2027
- Elections to the new parish councils will be held on Thursday 6 May 2027 and every four years thereafter.
- The total precept to be specified in the Reorganisation of Local Government Order for Coalville is £ TBC – *The information will be available for the consultation* and is £ TBC – *The information will be available for the consultation* for Broom Leys.

<b>Area</b>	<b>Unparished area of Thringstone</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	Formation of a civil parish and parish council for the currently unparished area of Thringstone.
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The consultation received 55 responses from local residents the overwhelming majority of which expressed support for the formation of a parish council. Supporters cited the need for enhanced local democratic representation, particularly given proposed local government reorganisation, and noted concerns about Thringstone being overlooked compared to neighbouring areas with existing parish councils, the desire to preserve the village's distinct historic identity, and practical issues including inadequate amenities and maintenance.</p> <p>Among those expressing a preference on governance structure, the clear majority (eight comments) favoured a stand-alone Thringstone Parish Council, emphasising the village's distinct character, while only two respondents suggested merging with Whitwick Parish Council. Suggested councillor numbers ranged from seven to 10, with one detailed submission proposing the inclusion of the Gracedieu woodland area and nine councillors.</p> <p>The two respondents opposing the proposal cited concerns about funding adequacy for a small parish and scepticism regarding the value of an additional tier of local government.</p> <p>The unparished area of Thringstone currently comprises of 2044 electors, which would make any stand-alone parish council of reasonable size, raising a modest precept, a fair percentage of which is likely to be spent on Clerk's salary and other administrative costs. It is, therefore, considered appropriate that residents be given the option to explore in depth the possibilities of creating a stand-alone parish council for Thringstone, or of joining with the adjacent Whitwick Parish Council as an additional ward of that parish.</p>
<b>Draft recommendation</b>	<p>Draft Recommendations for Thringstone:</p> <p><b>OPTION 1</b> It is recommended THAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A civil parish be created for the currently unparished area of Thringstone as shown by the red line on the attached map (Appendix E)</li> <li>• A parish council be created to serve the newly created civil parish.</li> <li>• The civil parish be named "Thringstone."</li> <li>• The Council for the civil parish shall have the style of "Parish Council."</li> <li>• The total number of councillors to be elected to the Parish</li> </ul>

	<p>Council of Thringstone is nine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parish council shall not be divided into wards.</li> <li>• The civil parish and parish council will come into existence on 1st April 2027</li> <li>• Elections to the new parish council will be held on Thursday 6 May 2027 and every four years thereafter.</li> <li>• The total precept to be specified in the Reorganisation of Local Government Order is £ <b>TBC</b> – <i>The information will be available for the consultation.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>OPTION 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the currently unparished area of Thringstone become part of the civil parish of Whitwick, and that the Thringstone area becomes a separate ward of that parish and is served by three elected members. (Appendix F)</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Parish area</b>	<b>Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The addition of two extra members to the Money Hill ward.</li> <li>• Changes to the boundary with Packington Parish Council to align the boundary to the A42.</li> <li>• Changes to the boundary with Ashby Woulds to include the area known as “Boothorpe” within the Ashby-de-la-Zouch TC area.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The first stage consultation received 135 responses, generating 246 individual comments across five consultation areas covering community representation, parish boundaries, council naming, councillor numbers, and general feedback.</p> <p>Overall sentiment was positive, with respondents praising the Town Council's higher profile since the introduction of the Business Improvement District, its proactive community engagement, and popular events such as the Christmas Fayre, Soapbox Derby, and monthly farmers markets. However, concerns were raised about representation for newer developments including Money Hill and Spring Avenue, while Blackfordby residents remained divided between those seeking closer integration with Ashby and those preferring a distinct identity or separate parish council.</p> <p>On specific questions, 69 respondents felt their community was suitably represented (29 disagreed), 75 believed the parish boundary reflects their community identity (23 disagreed), 43 supported including 'Blackfordby' in the Council's name while 76 opposed it citing cost and identity concerns, and opinion was evenly split on whether councillor numbers should change (44 yes, 51 no, 40 unsure).</p>

	<p>Key suggestions for change included adding two councillors to Money Hill ward to reflect 2031 population projections and including Boothorpe within Ashby Town Council given its access is only via Blackfordby and using the A42 as a natural boundary. Other comments concerned more day-to-day matters related to the running of the Town Council which are outside the scope of this review.</p>
<b>Draft recommendation</b>	<p>Draft Recommendations for Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The addition of two extra members for the Money Hill ward of Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council</li> <li>• Amending the boundary between Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council and Packington Parish Council so that it runs along the A42 between the Leicester Road and junction 12 with the B4116 – see blue line on attached map (Appendix G)</li> <li>• Amending the boundary between Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council and Measham Parish Council so that it runs along the A42 between junction 12 with the B4116 south-west to the existing boundary and running south along the B4116 to the existing boundary – see blue line on attached map (Appendix G)</li> <li>• Amending the boundary between Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council and Ashby Woulds Parish Council to include the Boothorpe area within Ashby Town Council– see blue line on attached map (Appendix H)</li> <li>• The Boothorpe area which is to be added to Ashby-de-la-Zouch Town Council extended to the north to include Askew Way, Hepworth Road, Butterfly Gardens, Bluebell Grove, Windmill Close and Oakway Drive, etc - see blue line on attached map (Appendix H).</li> </ul> <p><b>Please note:</b> Any fixed assets of either Parish Council within the areas of land in question will transfer ownership to the parish council within the amended boundaries.</p>

<b>Parish area</b>	<b>Whitwick Parish Council</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	Change the name of the existing “Broom Leys” ward to “Hall Lane ward”
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>This proposal arose from the Stage 1 consultation as a suggestion from two members of Whitwick Parish Council</p> <p>This suggestion assumes that the ward name in this area for any new Coalville Town Council is indeed “Broom Leys,” which is reasonable, and it would not be sensible to have two adjacent wards in two different parishes which share the same name as each other. Subject to further consultation, this change is recommended.</p>

<b>Draft recommendation</b>	<p>Draft Recommendations for Whitwick Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the existing “Broom Leys” ward is renamed as “Hall Lane” ward, this being conditional upon a new parish council being created in the Coalville area which also uses “Broom Leys” as a ward name.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	--

<b>Parish area</b>	<b>Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	Amend the boundary to the north of ODA Parish Council so that roads around the southern parts of Donisthorpe Lane and Moira Road be included within the parish boundary (and thus removed from Ashby Woulds Parish Council). See red line on attached map. (Appendix I)
<b>Assessment</b>	This is a second encroachment onto Ashby Woulds PC (in addition to the Boothorpe suggestion, above). ODA PC has provided an outline of its rationale for transferring this area of land, and a more detailed submission will be requested during Stage 2 consultation for consideration. Consultation to take place with Ashby Woulds PC and <u>all</u> the electors in the affected area.
<b>Draft recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the boundary between Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council and Ashby Woulds Parish Council to include the southern part of Donisthorpe Lane and Moira Road within Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council – see red line on attached map (Appendix I).</li> </ul> <p><b>Please note:</b> that any fixed assets of either Parish Council within the areas of land in question will transfer ownership to the parish council within the amended boundaries.</p>

#### 4.0 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 Once Full Council has agreed the draft recommendations, the Community Governance Review will move into a structured Stage 2 consultation designed to give electors and stakeholders a clear opportunity to comment on the proposals. The consultation will run between 1 July 2026 to 13 September 2026, and the Council will publish all relevant maps, explanatory material, and supporting evidence on its website and make hard-copy information available on request. All local government electors in the affected areas, along with parish councils, community organisations, and other interested bodies, will be invited to submit representations.
- 4.2 During the consultation period, the Council will actively promote awareness of the review through its usual communication channels to ensure that residents understand the proposals and how to respond. All representations received will be logged, analysed, and reported in a transparent manner, with particular attention given to how they relate to the statutory criteria of community identity and effective and convenient local governance. At the close of Stage 2, officers will prepare a comprehensive summary of the consultation findings to support

members in determining the final recommendations which will be brought to Council on 16 November 2026.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	Planning and regeneration Communities and housing Clean, green and Zero Carbon A well-run council
Policy Considerations:	Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Guidance on community governance reviews issued by LGBCE and MHCLG
Safeguarding:	The Council will publish all consultation responses that are received, but all personal details will be redacted.
Equalities/Diversity:	The consultation process will be accessible to all residents and stakeholders in the affected areas.
Customer Impact:	Generally, the provision of services closer to the client population will have positive impacts upon those in the local area, as those services are more dynamically tailored to their needs and those of the local area.
Economic and Social Impact:	None at this time.
Environment, Climate Change and zero carbon:	Consultation methods are carefully considered to avoid paper consultation where possible, although this will still be available to those who require it.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Consultations will be undertaken as part of all stages of the CGR process, and methodology will be detailed in a separate report.
Risks:	Should a decision not to continue with the review be taken, then the community governance arrangements for North West Leicestershire will remain as they are.
Officer Contact	Rochelle Tapping Interim Head of Legal and Monitoring Officer <a href="mailto:rochelle.tapping@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">rochelle.tapping@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>