

## Community Governance Review – Coalville (Unparished Area)

### Consultation Summary Report

#### 1. Purpose of Report

This report summarises the responses received during consultation on the potential creation of a new parish for the unparished area of Coalville.

#### 2. Summary of Responses

Total responses: 153

In favour (Yes): 123 (80%)

Against (No): 22 (14%)

Not sure / Neutral: 8 (5%)

#### 3. Responses in Favour (Yes)

Strong support for improved local representation and dedicated voice for Coalville

Concern about loss of influence under future local government reorganisation

Desire to improve town centre, infrastructure, and civic pride

Recognition of Coalville as a distinct town requiring its own council

Need for parity with neighbouring parished areas such as Ashby and Whitwick

Support for warding arrangements to ensure fair representation across communities

Desire for local decision-making on planning, investment, and services

#### 4. Responses Against (No)

Concerns about increased council tax and financial burden on residents

Perception of unnecessary additional layer of governance and bureaucracy

View that existing District and Parish arrangements are sufficient

Risk of duplication, inefficiency, and confusion over responsibilities

#### 5. Not Sure / Neutral Responses

Uncertainty regarding overall benefits compared to costs

Concerns about additional bureaucracy and governance complexity

Questions on how a new Town Council would interact with existing parish councils

Requests for further clarity on structure, boundaries, and representation

#### 6. Conclusion

The consultation demonstrates strong overall support for the creation of a Town Council for Coalville. Support is primarily driven by the desire for stronger local representation, protection of local influence during reorganisation, and improvements to community identity and local decision-making. Opposition is limited and focuses mainly on cost and bureaucracy concerns. Neutral responses highlight the need for further clarity on implementation and structure.

# Community Governance Review – Thringstone

## Consultation Summary Report

### 1. Purpose of Report

This report summarises the responses received during consultation on the potential creation of a new parish for Thringstone.

### 2. Summary of Responses

Total responses: 54

In favour (Yes): 51

Against (No): 2

Not sure: 1

### 3. Responses in Favour (Yes)

The majority of respondents supported the creation of a parish council for Thringstone.

Key themes included:

- Desire for stronger local representation and a dedicated voice for the village
- Concerns regarding future local government reorganisation and loss of local influence
- Need to improve community identity, cohesion, and preserve village character
- Ability to address local issues such as anti-social behaviour, maintenance, parking, and infrastructure
- Access to funding through a parish precept to support local improvements and community initiatives
- Desire to achieve parity with neighbouring parished areas such as Whitwick
- Support for greater community engagement and local democratic involvement
- Suggestions regarding council structure, including councillor numbers, warding, and governance arrangements

### 4. Responses Against (No)

A small number of respondents opposed the creation of a parish council. Key concerns were:

- Potential additional cost and financial burden on residents
- Perception that an additional layer of governance may increase bureaucracy without clear benefit
- Questions regarding whether the size of the village would allow for effective delivery

## **5. Not Sure / Neutral Responses**

One respondent indicated uncertainty. Key considerations included:

- Whether there would be sufficient local interest and commitment to staff a parish council
- Ensuring fair representation across all groups within the community
- Consideration of alternative arrangements, including potential merger with neighbouring parishes

## **6. Conclusion**

The consultation demonstrates strong support for the creation of a parish council in Thringstone, with the majority of respondents highlighting the benefits of improved local representation, community engagement, and ability to address local issues. Opposition was limited and primarily focused on financial and governance concerns.

# **Community Governance Review – Ashby de la Zouch and Blackfordby**

## **Consultation Summary Report – Current Governance Arrangements**

### **1. Purpose of Report**

This report summarises responses received to the consultation questions relating to the current governance arrangements for Ashby Town Council, including representation, parish boundaries, council name, councillor numbers/warding, and wider comments regarding local governance.

### **2. Summary of Responses**

A substantial number of responses were received during the consultation process.

Overall responses indicate broad support for existing arrangements, with mixed views on boundaries, identity, and representation, and varied opinions on councillor numbers and warding.

### **3. Representation by the Current Town Council**

A majority of respondents indicated that they feel suitably represented by the Town Council.

Positive feedback referenced community engagement, local knowledge, and responsiveness.

Some respondents raised concerns regarding communication, visibility of councillors, and influence over higher tiers of government.

### **4. Parish Boundaries and Community Identity**

Views were mixed on whether current parish boundaries reflect community identity.

Some respondents felt boundaries are appropriate, while others expressed confusion or lack of awareness.

There were differing views regarding Blackfordby, with some seeing it as part of Ashby and others as a distinct community.

Specific concerns were raised about boundary anomalies and alignment with local communities.

## **5. Name of the Town Council**

The majority of respondents did not support changing the name of the Town Council.

Concerns included loss of identity, increased complexity, and cost implications.

Some respondents supported including Blackfordby to better reflect the area served, or suggested a more inclusive name.

Others felt the name was of less importance than effective governance and communication.

## **6. Number of Councillors and Warding Arrangements**

There was no clear consensus on councillor numbers or warding arrangements.

Some respondents supported changes to reflect population growth, particularly in areas such as Money Hill.

Others felt current arrangements are appropriate, while a smaller number suggested reducing councillor numbers.

Common themes included maintaining balanced representation and aligning wards with communities.

## **7. Wider Governance and Service Delivery Comments (Not Review related)**

Respondents highlighted the importance of communication and clarity regarding roles and responsibilities across different tiers of local government.

There were calls for stronger influence of the Town Council in planning decisions.

Concerns were raised about population growth and maintaining community identity.

Some comments focused on service delivery and accountability for local issues.

## **8. Key Overall Findings**

Overall, there is strong support for maintaining a local Town Council.

Current arrangements are generally viewed as effective but may require future adjustments.

Key debates centre on boundaries, Blackfordby's role, and representation levels.

Respondents emphasised the importance of communication, accountability, and local identity.

## **9. Conclusion**

The consultation indicates that while existing arrangements are broadly supported, there is an expectation that governance structures should evolve to reflect future growth and community needs.

Ensuring effective local representation and communication will remain key priorities.

# **Community Governance Review – Ibstock Parish**

## **Consultation Summary Report – Current Governance Arrangements**

### **1. Purpose of Report**

This report summarises responses received to consultation questions relating to the current governance arrangements for Ibstock Parish Council, including representation, parish boundaries, and wider comments regarding local governance and service delivery.

### **2. Summary of Responses**

A range of responses were received from residents across Ibstock and surrounding areas. Overall, responses indicate mixed views on the effectiveness of current arrangements, with a significant proportion expressing dissatisfaction or uncertainty about representation and communication, alongside some positive feedback reflecting recent improvements. Strong recurring themes relate to lack of visibility, awareness, and engagement.

### **3. Representation by the Current Parish Council**

Views on representation were mixed, with a notable number of respondents indicating dissatisfaction or uncertainty. Key themes included limited awareness and visibility, concerns about responsiveness, and a perception that residents do not know who councillors are or what they do. Some respondents reported lack of response when contacting the Parish Council, while a smaller number provided positive feedback about recent improvements. A significant number selected “Not sure”, indicating low engagement overall.

### **4. Parish Boundaries and Community Identity**

Responses show mixed and often unclear views regarding parish boundaries and identity. Many respondents stated they do not have a clear sense of community identity linked to the Parish Council, while others felt boundaries are appropriate. Concerns were raised about fragmentation, including views that Ibstock is split across multiple areas. There were also comments about specific areas feeling less connected, along with concerns that ongoing development is affecting community identity and cohesion.

### **5. Communication and Engagement (Not Review-Specific)**

Communication and engagement was the strongest and most consistent theme across responses. Residents reported a lack of accessible information about meetings, decisions, and activities, and highlighted poor visibility of governance structures. Comments also indicated that information is not presented in accessible or

easily understandable formats, and that engagement opportunities are limited. There were calls for greater transparency and improved communication with residents.

#### **6. Wider Governance and Service Delivery Comments (Not Review-Specific)**

Respondents raised broader issues including housing growth and infrastructure pressures, concerns about the impact of development on village character, and the need to maintain community identity. There were also calls for the Parish Council to have greater influence in planning decisions and to ensure resources are used for the benefit of the wider community.

#### **7. Key Overall Findings**

There is no clear majority view on the effectiveness of current governance arrangements. However, widespread concerns were expressed regarding communication, visibility, and engagement. Views on representation were mixed, with many residents feeling disconnected. There is also uncertainty around community identity and boundaries, alongside strong concerns about development and growth.

#### **8. Conclusion**

The consultation indicates that current governance arrangements in Ibstock are not consistently understood or experienced positively by residents. While some respondents recognise recent improvements, the prevailing themes highlight a need to improve communication, visibility, and engagement, and to consider how governance arrangements can better reflect community identity and support future growth.