

# Tewkesbury Borough Council

## Parish Boundary Review



Appendix 1  
Final Recommendations  
May 2022

## 1.0 **Ashchurch and Wheatpieces**

### 1.1 **First stage consultation**

1.1.1 Ashchurch Rural Parish Council made a submission proposing an increase to the number of Parish Councillors and alteration of parish boundaries to include the majority of the properties in the development known as 'The Meadows', currently within the Wheatpieces Parish (save for the properties being built on land next to the school). Changes were sought to create clarity for residents where some homes are within Ashchurch Rural Parish and neighbouring ones are within Wheatpieces Parish, and with consideration for further development along Rudge Lane.

1.1.2 The submission requested an increase in Parish Councillors by two; increasing from seven to nine, reflecting the increase in parishioners into the parish.

1.1.3 The proposal put forward by Ashchurch Rural Parish Council was contrary to the views received from Wheatpieces Parish Council and a household of The Meadows development. Electoral administrators were also aware that other residents at The Meadows had previously expressed the view that the Meadows should be part of the Wheatpieces Parish (although had not submitted representations during the initial consultation stage of this Review).

1.1.4 Wheatpieces Parish Council made a submission proposing an extension of the Parish boundary to include the new Bloor Homes development adjacent to the Wheatpieces estate known as The Meadows, based on the fact that residents on this estate looked to Wheatpieces to provide community facilities and there was no cohesion or identity with rural Ashchurch.

1.1.5 One household made a submission supporting an extension to the Wheatpieces Parish boundary to include the new housing development known as The Meadows.

### 1.2 **Draft recommendations**

1.2.1 It was recommended that the boundary for Wheatpieces Parish be extended to take in land/properties forming part of The Meadows development, running along Rudgeway Lane, west along the existing boundary line of Ashchurch Rural Parish and north following the River Swilgate (again reflecting the existing Ashchurch Rural Parish boundary).

1.2.2 The Community Governance Review Working Group ('Working Group') acknowledged that the draft recommendation specifically impacted on the Borough Ward, consent for which would be required from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) to ensure that Parish and Borough Ward boundaries are coterminous. This was specifically referenced in the draft recommendation consultation process.

1.2.3 It was not recommended that the number of Parish Councillors for Ashchurch Rural Parish Council be increased, as the draft recommendation, referred to in paragraph 1.2.1, proposed to reduce the electorate for Ashchurch Rural Parish to a level that reflects the existing number of Parish Councillors as provided in the Council's current scale of representation.

### 1.3 **Second stage consultation**

1.3.1 Support for the draft recommendations was received from Wheatpieces Parish Council and a household of The Meadows development.

1.3.2 Ashchurch Rural Parish Council's submission acknowledged the proximity of The Meadows to the existing Wheatpieces estate, and confusion for the residents with neighbouring homes being in a different parish, however, considered The Meadows a distinct separate housing area that they wished to retain. In addition, the Parish Council, whilst not supporting the extension to the Wheatpieces, suggested that a further piece of land to the right of The Meadows may end up with a housing estate with a boundary line running through it and therefore should transfer wholly to one parish.

1.3.3 Ashchurch Rural Parish Council also indicated that retaining The Meadows provided for an electorate that supported their earlier request for additional Councillor representation for Ashchurch Rural Parish.

### 1.4 **Final recommendations**

1.4.1 The Working Group maintained that to meet the aims of the community governance review as regards reflecting the identities and interests of the residents of The Meadows and for effective and convenient local government for that community, their draft recommendation was the right way forward. As there was no development scheduled on the additional piece of land referred to by Ashchurch Rural Parish Council, there was no support for any change in respect of this area of land.

1.4.2 It was noted that, whilst their recommendation would affect the Borough Wards of Isbourne and Tewkesbury East, there was no impact on the County Division.

- 1.4.3 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **The boundary between the Parishes of Ashchurch Rural and Wheatpieces is redrawn so the boundary for Wheatpieces Parish be extended to include the land/properties forming part of The Meadows development, running along Rudgeway Lane, west along the existing boundary line of Ashchurch Rural Parish and north following the River Swilgate as shown on Map 1. This would involve the transfer of approximately 182 properties (with an electorate of 289) in The Meadows development from the Parishes of Ashchurch Rural to Wheatpieces.**
  - b) **A request to the LGBCE be made to amend the boundaries of the Borough Wards of Isbourne and Tewkesbury East to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries.**
- 2.0 **Badgeworth and Shurdington**
- 2.1 **First stage consultation**
- 2.1.1 Badgeworth Parish Council had no comments or suggestions to submit to the first stage consultation.
- 2.1.2 Submissions were received from Up Hatherley Parish Council and two residents of that parish, proposing to return to the boundary position pre-1991; transfer of parts of land currently within Badgeworth Parish and Shurdington Parish to Up Hatherley Parish (Cheltenham Borough).
- 2.2 **Draft recommendations**
- 2.2.1 The first stage consultation proposals received related to the transfer of particular parts of Badgeworth and Shurdington Parishes from Tewkesbury Borough to a Parish within Cheltenham Borough. As this was outside of the terms of reference of the Community Governance Review which related to changes within the boundaries of the Borough of Tewkesbury, no action could be taken.
- 2.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 2.3.1 No responses were received in relation at the second stage consultation.
- 2.4 **Final recommendations**
- 2.4.1 In view of paragraph 2.2.1 no recommendations for change were proposed.
- 3.0 **Bishops Cleeve and Gotherington**
- 3.1 **First stage consultation**
- 3.1.1 Bishops Cleeve Parish Council's submission proposed an alteration of parish boundaries to include the site for the proposed primary school, and land to the north of the current Cleevelands development and opposite the proposed school site.

## 3.2 **Draft recommendations**

3.2.1 The Working Group did not support this proposal as it considered that, although it is possible that the proposed primary school may support a greater number of families residing in Bishops Cleeve than those families in surrounding areas, schools serve areas not limited by parish boundaries and therefore felt there was insufficient justification to extend the boundaries of Bishops Cleeve Parish.

3.2.2 In addition to the above, the Working Group considered that the existing Parish boundary had a strong definable line running along Dean Brook which provided effective and convenient governance within Gotherington Parish.

3.2.3 The Working Group recommended no changes to the existing boundaries between the Parishes of Bishops Cleeve and Gotherington.

## 3.3 **Second stage consultation**

3.3.1 Submissions were received from Gotherington Parish Council and Bishops Cleeve Parish Council.

3.3.2 Gotherington Parish Council supported the draft recommendation outlining that it was important for the Parish to retain its individual characteristics separate from Bishops Cleeve and that the strategic gap in development was retained as open farmland.

3.3.3 Bishops Cleeve Parish Council opposed the draft recommendation outlining that it was not a pre-requisite for parish boundaries to have a strong physical boundary and, in addition, it considered that future development on land north of the current parish boundary with Gotherington Parish would utilise facilities provided (financially and managed) by Bishops Cleeve Parish and financial infrastructure payments should be made to the Parish Council providing those facilities. In terms of the site for the proposed primary school, the Parish Council maintained the school would be used by children almost entirely residing in Bishops Cleeve and that this should form part of the community that the pupils came from as there is no physical/tangible link with Gotherington Parish.

## 3.4 **Final recommendations**

3.4.1 After further consideration by the Working Group, it was agreed that, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, no changes be made to the existing boundaries between Bishops Cleeve Parish and Gotherington Parish.

3.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**

- a) **No changes be made to the existing boundaries between the Parishes of Bishops Cleeve and Gotherington.**

## 4.0 **Brockworth and Hucclecote**

### 4.1 **First stage consultation**

4.1.1 Brockworth Parish Council's submission proposed i) the removal of all internal parish warding, ii) an increase of Parish Councillors by four; increasing from seventeen to twenty-one, reflecting the current electorate and increase in population from new housing development in the Parish and iii) the future creation of a separate Parish Council for the area known as 'Coopers Edge', currently falling within Brockworth, Hucclecote and Upton St Leonards Parishes (Stroud District).

4.1.2 Hucclecote Parish Council's views and suggestions for 'Coopers Edge', included firm, clear and timebound steps to establish a Coopers Edge Parish Council embracing the areas of the development currently covered by Hucclecote, Brockworth and Upton St Leonards (Stroud District) Parish Councils but in the interim, the creation of a new Coopers Edge Parish Council from those parts of the development that are currently located within both Brockworth Parish and Hucclecote Parish.

### 4.2 **Draft recommendations**

4.2.1 The Working Group acknowledged the preferred option of Brockworth and Hucclecote Parish Councils to form a Coopers Edge Parish Council covering areas within the Borough and in Stroud District but this was outside the remit of the review as it involved an area that is not within Tewkesbury Borough Council's area.

4.2.2 The Working Group considered three options and the consequential impact of each; i) create a Coopers Edge Parish Council from the two areas in Hucclecote and Brockworth Parishes, ii) creation of a Coopers Edge Ward in either of the current Hucclecote Parish or Brockworth Parish, and iii) retain existing arrangements.

4.2.3 A draft recommendation was made for no changes to the boundaries of Brockworth and Hucclecote Parish Councils in respect of the areas of Coopers Edge represented within those parishes, as it was felt there was insufficient community identity to create a Parish Council made up of those two areas only, particularly as the community facilities serving the residents are all located within Upton St Leonards (Stroud District) and there was no physical connection between the remaining areas of Coopers Edge in each of the Parishes. The Working Group was however keen to stress support for a separate Coopers Edge Parish Council should a Principal Area Review take place in the future or Local Government re-organisation that would facilitate all three areas of Coopers Edge being incorporated in one Parish Council including the area currently included in Stroud District Council.

4.2.4 In addition, it was recommended that no action be taken to remove all internal parish warding from Brockworth Parish, particularly as the current warding was introduced in 2018 by the LGBCE Review and was coterminous with the Borough Wards and would now require LGBCE consent to alter.

4.2.5 A recommendation was made to increase the number of Parish Councillors for Brockworth Parish Council from seventeen to twenty-one, as per the Council's current scale of representation.

#### 4.3 **Second stage consultation**

4.3.1 Submissions were received from Brockworth Parish Council, Hucclecote Parish Council, Coopers Edge Trust and two members of the public.

4.3.2 Brockworth Parish Council supported the recommendation to consider in the future the creation of a new Parish Council to serve the Coopers Edge area and to increase the number of Councillors serving on Brockworth Parish Council.

4.3.3 All other submissions received opposed the recommendation made in relation to Coopers Edge, outlining that there was sufficient community identity to create a Coopers Edge Parish Council from the areas within Tewkesbury Borough as residents did not relate to, or identify with, either Brockworth or Hucclecote Parishes.

#### 4.4 **Final recommendations**

4.4.1 The Working Group discussed the submissions at length and although recognised the issues raised and the disconnection felt by the community, it could not recommend the creation of a Coopers Edge Parish Council comprising areas within Brockworth and Hucclecote areas as there was no physical connection between the two areas in the Borough and all of the community facilities were located in Stroud District Council. It was felt that currently representation for the areas of Coopers Edge should be accommodated on the respective Parish Councils, pending a Principal Area Review or Local Government re-organisation that may occur in the next five to ten years although there was no certainty that this would happen at all or within the indicative timescale.

4.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**

- a) **No changes be made to the boundaries of the Parish Councils of Brockworth and Hucclecote in respect of the areas of Coopers Edge situated within those parishes.**
- b) **No action be taken to remove all internal parish warding from Brockworth Parish Council.**
- c) **The number of Parish Councillors for Brockworth Parish be increased to twenty-one in accordance with the scale of representation.**

#### 5.0 **Dumbleton**

##### 5.1 **First stage consultation**

5.1.1 Submissions were received from Dumbleton Parish Council and also on behalf of residents of Wormington.

5.1.2 Dumbleton Parish Council indicated that it would like to see no changes.

5.1.3 The submission on behalf of the residents of Wormington outlined the desire for Wormington to have governance of its own matters, particularly as it was felt they were two distinct communities and did not feel that their interests were represented by Dumbleton Parish Council.

## 5.2 **Draft recommendations**

5.2.1 The Working Group considered options to i) retain the status quo, ii) continue with Dumbleton Parish Council as present with a recommendation to change its electoral arrangements by the creation of new parish warding, and iii) create a Parish Meeting/Parish Council for a defined area of Wormington.

5.2.2 It was recommended to create a separate Parish Meeting to serve the residents of Wormington resulting in the abolition of the current Dumbleton Parish Council and creation of a new Parish Council for Dumbleton (excluding the area to form a new Wormington Parish Meeting).

5.2.3 On the basis of the recommendation in paragraph 5.2.2, it was also recommended that the number of Parish Councillors for the new Dumbleton Parish Council be in accordance with the Council's scale of representation.

## 5.3 **Second stage consultation**

5.3.1 45 submissions were received; 38 of which supported the draft recommendations and 7 opposed the draft recommendations.

5.3.2 Submissions in support were received from members of the public, Friends of St Katherine's Church, Trustees of Wormington Village Society and Dumbleton Parish Council. In general, similar comments were received outlining a current lack of support and effective response to wishes/needs of the villagers of Wormington by Dumbleton Parish Council, a desire for the transfer of land adjacent to the Church to Wormington Parish Meeting to enable residents to decide on any future plans for the land for the benefit of the residents, the likelihood of more fully engaged residents from Wormington should the draft recommendation be approved.

5.3.3 Generally, the submissions opposing the draft recommendations expressed a confidence in Dumbleton Parish Council, lack of factual information around finances and governance of the proposed Parish Meeting, concern that the recommendation had been made to cut Dumbleton Parish Council out of progressing the village hall project.

## 5.4 **Final recommendations**

5.4.1 It was acknowledged that there was support for, and some opposition to, the draft recommendations, although on balance more support was received to split Dumbleton and Wormington and that this view was shared by Dumbleton Parish Council.

5.4.2 The Working Group maintained that, in an attempt to achieve community effectiveness, identity and cohesion it be recommended to create a separate Parish Meeting to serve the residents of Wormington.

- 5.4.3 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **creation of a separate Parish Meeting to serve the residents of Wormington resulting in the abolition of the current Dumbleton Parish Council and creation of a new Parish Council for Dumbleton (excluding the area to form a new Wormington Parish Meeting) as shown on Map 2.**
  - b) **The number of Councillors for the new Parish Council for Dumbleton be five in accordance with the scale of representation.**

6.0 **Longford, Innsworth and Sandhurst**

6.1 **First stage consultation**

6.1.1 The first stage consultation raised two areas for review, i) Longford Parish/Innsworth Parish and ii) Longford Parish/Sandhurst Parish, as detailed in paragraphs 6.1.2 and 6.1.4.

6.1.2 Longford Parish Council's submission proposed altering the parish boundaries between Longford Parish and Innsworth Parish to the A40 and Horsbere Brook to take in the new development in this area in its entirety.

6.1.3 Thirteen households also made submissions sharing the same view as the Parish Council to include the new development within Longford Parish, currently within the Innsworth Parish. The reasons included no physical infrastructure to enter/exit Innsworth directly from the new build development/estate, the polling station in Longford is a short walk away but currently the allocated polling station is in Innsworth and is long walk or drive, local activity engagement falls within Longford.

6.1.4 The submission concerning Longford Parish/Sandhurst was received from one household proposing the area known as 'Walham' be included within Sandhurst Parish, as it was considered those residents do not currently identify with Longford Parish.

6.2 **Draft recommendations**

6.2.1 In respect of the Longford Parish/Innsworth Parish proposal, the Working Group considered the overwhelming support from residents as to community identity and cohesion in common with the community of Longford, the proximity of the new development to Longford and there being no physical link/access into Innsworth from Longford. It was considered that effective and convenient community governance would be better provided by Longford Parish Council and therefore recommended an extension to the Longford Parish boundary to run along clearly definable boundaries; A40 and Horsbere Brook.

6.2.2 In respect of the Longford Parish/Sandhurst Parish proposal, it was recommended to transfer the land between the A40 and the existing Longford Parish boundary comprising the community of Walham. It was acknowledged that as the draft recommendation would specifically impact on the Borough Ward, should the recommendation become final, consent would be required from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) to ensure that Parish and Borough Ward boundaries were coterminous.

### 6.3 **Second stage consultation**

6.3.1 The majority of second stage consultation submissions opposed the draft recommendations made in relation to the Longford Parish/Sandhurst Parish proposal, including a submission from Sandhurst Parish Council, 18 submissions from members of the public and a petition containing 135 signatories.

6.3.2 In summary the reasons were:

- the area of Walham being closer to Longford,
- there being an historical current boundary which follows a natural boundary,
- there being no ties between the residents of Walham and Sandhurst,
- the draft recommendation offered no greater community identity for the residents of Walham,
- that there was a physical disconnect between Sandhurst and Walham during periods of flooding,
- Sandhurst is a rural community lacking facilities/amenities to accommodate additional numbers but Longford had resources and infrastructure to support the community of Walham.

6.3.3 An alternative proposal was received from one household to transfer a smaller area of land located between the north west of the existing Longford Parish boundary and the adjoining current Sandhurst Parish comprising five properties, outlining the area as separate from and having little in common with urban Longford.

### 6.4 **Final recommendations**

6.4.1 In respect of the Longford Parish/Innsworth Parish proposal, the Working Group recommended the inclusion of the new development into Longford Parish extending the current boundary to run along clearly definable boundaries; A40 and Horsbere Brook.

6.4.2 In respect of the Longford Parish/Sandhurst Parish draft recommendation at paragraph 6.2.2, in view of the overwhelming opposition to transfer the area of Walham from Longford Parish to Sandhurst Parish and as the draft recommendation required implementation by the LGBCE there was a need to highlight that it had community support, the Working Group recommended that, other than in respect of paragraph 6.4.1, no alterations be made to the boundaries of the Parishes for Longford and Sandhurst.

6.4.3 In respect of the recommendation at paragraph 6.3.3, as the proposal received was from one household only and there was a strong boundary already in place, the Working Group recommended no alterations be made to the boundaries of the Parishes for Longford and Sandhurst.

- 6.4.4 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **The boundary between Innsworth Parish and Longford Parish be amended to transfer the area comprising the new development currently in Innsworth Parish to Longford Parish extending the current boundary to run along clearly definable boundaries; A40 and Horsbere Brook, as shown on Map 3. This would involve the transfer of approximately 305 properties (with an electorate of 491) from Innsworth Parish to Longford Parish.**
  - b) **Other than a) above, no alterations are made to the boundaries of the Parishes for Longford and Sandhurst.**
- 7.0 **Maisemore**
- 7.1 **First stage consultation**
- 7.1.1 Maisemore Parish Council's submission proposed tidying up the parish boundaries in an attempt to deal with boundary anomalies between the parishes of Maisemore and Highnam along the River Leadon and to regularise boundary anomalies between land within Maisemore Parish and neighbouring Hartpury Parish (Forest of Dean District).
- 7.2 **Draft recommendations**
- 7.2.1 Part of the submission included land falling within Forest of Dean District. As this area of land was outside of the terms of reference of this Community Governance Review, which related to changes within the boundaries of the Borough of Tewkesbury, no action could be taken. However, the proposals that could be dealt with identified strong boundaries following the River Leadon and had no impact on the number of electorate for either Maisemore Parish or Highnam Parish and it was recommended to approve and alter the boundaries, in accordance with the proposals made by Maisemore Parish Council.
- 7.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 7.3.1 Highnam Parish Council's submission indicated that it had no objection to the draft recommendations.
- 7.4 **Final recommendations**
- 7.4.1 The Working Group are in support of tidying up current boundary anomalies, in accordance with the submission received from Maisemore Parish Council.
- 7.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **the boundaries are altered between the parishes of Maisemore and Highnam along the River Leadon to tidy up boundary anomalies, in accordance with the submission received from Maisemore Parish Council, as shown on Map 4.**

## 8.0 **Northway and Ashchurch**

### 8.1 **First stage consultation**

8.1.1 Northway Parish Council's submission proposed an amendment to the boundary to include land to the east of the existing boundary to the highway; B4079 (retaining the M5 as the west boundary, the brook as the north boundary and the A46 as the south boundary), outlining that this would provide for a strong, clearly defined boundary reflecting local identities and facilitates effective and convenient local government, the creation of cohesion between two proposed new developments, the likelihood of residents of the proposed new developments to use existing facilities in Northway Parish.

### 8.2 **Draft recommendations**

8.2.1 The proposal by Northway Parish Council sought to extend the existing boundary to incorporate land currently forming part of Ashchurch Rural Parish, and was positioned between the current Northway Parish boundary and the highway; B4079. Although the land currently forms Ashchurch MOD/Army Base containing very few electorate, it is possible that over time this land could be an area of significant development; however, community cohesion between the existing Northway community and any new development was considered unlikely. The Working Group felt that the railway line acted as a physical barrier likely to impact on community cohesion in the future and currently provides for a strong definable boundary separating the existing Northway community and the land to the east of Northway Parish which may be the subject of major development in the future.

8.2.2 It was recommended that no changes be made to the existing boundaries for the Parish of Northway.

### 8.3 **Second stage consultation**

8.3.1 No submissions were received at the second stage consultation.

### 8.4 **Final recommendations**

8.4.1 The Working Group maintains its draft recommendation that no changes be made to the existing boundaries for the Parish of Northway.

8.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**

- a) **No changes be made to the boundaries between the Parish Councils of Northway and Ashchurch Rural.**

## 9.0 **Stanway and Toddington**

### 9.1 **First stage consultation**

9.1.1 Toddington Parish Council's submission proposed an increase in the number of Parish Councillors by two; increasing from five to seven, reflecting the increase in parishioners into the parish over the last 40 years and to reduce pressure on too small a number of Councillors, and an alteration of parish boundaries to run along the railway line from Stanway viaduct at the north end, south to the road to Didbrook and out to the highway; B4632 just south of Beecroft (taking in the Station Cottages), contending that residents living the Stow side of the Broadway roundabout consider themselves to live in Toddington and part of that community and infrastructure and services within Toddington Parish are used by local residents.

9.1.2 In view of the submission made by Toddington Parish Council, Stanway Parish Council submitted a proposal seeking changes to the boundary to include houses on the Toddington side of the roundabout (the houses on the Broadway Road and opposite the shop), to increase the size of the already small Stanway Parish.

### 9.2 **Draft recommendations**

9.2.1 In terms of the proposal by Stanway Parish Council to transfer the houses on the Toddington side of the roundabout (the houses on the Broadway Road and opposite the shop) from Toddington Parish to Stanway Parish, it was considered that the proposal did not offer a strong identifiable boundary or community identity to Stanway Parish.

9.2.2 In terms of the Toddington Parish Council proposal, it was considered that community identity for any new development for parts of the area of land proposed for transfer was likely to be with Toddington rather than Stanway and that the railway line was considered to be a strong definable boundary between both Parishes.

9.2.3 The proposals by Stanway and Toddington Parishes were considered in the round, and to best reflect the identity and interests of existing and future residents it was recommended that land located between the existing Stanway Parish boundary (running along the Broadway Road; B4632) and the railway line (incorporating Toddington Station and Station House), be transferred to Toddington Parish, meaning that Toddington Railway Station be incorporated within Toddington Parish. This would involve the transfer of approximately 24 properties (with an electorate of 46). It was considered that the clearly definable boundary was the railway line extending west to meet the existing Toddington Parish boundaries along the track/driveway to CTI Communications to the north and roadway leading to Didbrook to the south.

9.2.4 As the request for an increase in the number of Councillors did not meet the Council's scale of representation it was recommended that any possible increase in Parish Councillors for Toddington Parish Council be kept under review should further development take place increasing electorate levels.

- 9.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 9.3.1 No submissions were received at the second stage consultation.
- 9.4 **Final recommendations**
- 9.4.1 The Working Group considered its draft recommendations to be the right way forward to reflect community identity.
- 9.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **The land located between the existing Stanway Parish boundary (running along the Broadway Road; B4632) and the railway line (incorporating Toddington Station and Station House), be transferred to Toddington Parish with the definable boundary being the railway line extending west to meet the existing Toddington Parish boundaries along the track/driveway to CTI Communications to the north and roadway leading to Didbrook to the south, as shown on Map 5. This would involve the transfer of approximately 24 properties (with an electorate of 46).**
  - b) **No changes be made to increase Councillor representation for Toddington Parish Council in accordance with the scale of representation.**
- 10.0 **Tewkesbury Town**
- 10.1 **First stage consultation**
- 10.1.1 Tewkesbury Town Council's submission outlined that it would be content to see no change at all, however, it did propose an alteration to the town boundaries to include land and properties at the Hoo and former Tredington Hospital site within the Parishes of Deerhurst, Elmstone Hardwicke and Stoke Orchard.
- 10.1.2 The submission also suggested a longer term boundary change consideration to absorb Wheatpieces Parish and Northway Parish within Tewkesbury Town and an increase in Councillors to reflect electorate size.
- 10.2 **Draft recommendations**
- 10.2.1 The submission outlined that the proposal to transfer land to Tewkesbury Town, which currently forms part of three other Parishes; Deerhurst, Elmstone Hardwicke and Stoke Orchard, was based on a view in relation to funding the provision of services for the benefit of the residents at the nearby Odessa mobile home development.
- 10.2.2 Consent from the LGBCE would be required in respect of any changes to Tewkesbury Town's boundary as well as consequential Borough Ward changes.
- 10.2.3 The Working Group considered that although the electorate impact of the proposal would be negligible for each Parish, the question of community identity to Tewkesbury Town was not particularly strong and as such it was recommended that no changes be made to the existing boundaries for the town of Tewkesbury.

- 10.2.4 The longer-term proposals to absorb Wheatpieces Parish and Northway Parish were noted but not considered in any depth in this review.
- 10.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 10.3.1 No submissions were received at the second stage consultation.
- 10.4 **Final recommendations**
- 10.4.1 The Working Group considered that the existing Tewkesbury Town boundary was a strong definable line and that to recommend the transfer of land currently within the Parishes of Deerhurst, Elmstone Hardwicke and Stoke Orchard to Tewkesbury Town would not provide any greater benefit to the residents of the three Parishes in terms of community cohesion and as such it was recommended that no changes are made to the existing boundaries for the Town of Tewkesbury.
- 10.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
  - a) **No changes be made to the existing boundaries for the Town of Tewkesbury.**
- 11.0 **Bishops Cleeve and Southam**
- 11.1 **First stage consultation**
- 11.1.1 The review was seen as an opportune time to address the potential to tidy up the boundary between Southam Parish and Bishops Cleeve Parish by incorporating the business park/site of GE Aviation within Bishops Cleeve Parish.
- 11.1.2 Any recommendation in this respect would impact on Borough Wards and would be subject to consent of the LGBCE.
- 11.2 **Draft recommendations**
- 11.2.1 As the proposal does not involve any electorate, provides a strong definable boundary and was considered logical in terms of its location to Bishops Cleeve, it was recommended for the transfer of land incorporating the business park/site of GE Aviation from Southam Parish to Bishops Cleeve Parish.
- 11.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 11.3.1 A submission was received from Southam Parish indicating no objection to the draft recommendation.
- 11.4 **Final recommendations**
- 11.4.1 It is recommended that land (which does not comprise any electorate) included within Southam Parish incorporating the business site/park comprising GE Aviation, be transferred to Bishops Cleeve Parish and integrated within Cleeve Grange Parish Ward, with the highway A435 offering a strong definable boundary.

- 11.4.2 **It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved:**
- a) **To transfer the land included within Southam Parish incorporating the business site/park comprising GE Aviation to Bishops Cleeve Parish and integrate within Cleeve Grange Parish Ward, as shown on Map 6.**
  - b) **A request to the LGBCE be made to amend the boundaries of:**
    - i. **the Borough Wards of Cleeve Hill and Cleeve Grange and**
    - ii. **Winchcombe & Woodmancote and Bishops Cleeve County Divisions****to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries.**
- 12.0 **Badgeworth, Brockworth, Churchdown and Innsworth**
- 12.1 **First stage consultation**
- 12.1.1 The review was seen as an opportune time to address the potential to transfer three separate parcels of land currently included within Innsworth Parish, Badgeworth Parish and Brockworth Parish to Churchdown Parish.
- 12.1.2 Proposal 1 for the transfer of land from Innsworth Parish to Churchdown Parish  
The land includes government buildings at Elmbridge Court and Gloucester North Community Fire Station but does not currently involve any electorate. The proposed boundary follows an existing stream/brook and was considered logical in terms of its location to Churchdown and particularly the new development taking place on neighbouring land.
- 12.1.3 Proposal 2 for the transfer of land from Badgeworth Parish to Churchdown Parish  
The land runs along the M5 abutting the existing Churchdown Parish boundary. The boundary line currently separating Badgeworth Parish and Churchdown Parish straddles the property, Home Farm. The proposal seeks to rectify this, so the full extent of the property is within Churchdown Parish, although there is no impact for the residents of Home Farm in terms of voting as registered electors are currently included within Churchdown Parish. The M5 is considered to be a strong definable boundary and a logical proposal.
- 12.1.4 Proposal 3 for the transfer of land from Brockworth Parish to Hucclecote Parish  
The land surrounds the junction/roundabout serving the A417 and M5 and does not involve any electorate. It is considered that instead of the proposal to transfer the land to Churchdown Parish, it actually relates better to Hucclecote Parish, particularly as the Churchdown hill forms a barrier between Churchdown and the land concerned.
- 12.2 **Draft recommendations**
- 12.2.1 It was recommended that the land incorporating government buildings at Elmbridge Court and Gloucester North Community Fire Station be transferred from Innsworth Parish to Churchdown Parish.

- 12.2.2 It was recommended that land running along the M5 abutting the existing Churchdown Parish boundary incorporating the property; Home Farm is transferred from Badgeworth Parish to Churchdown Parish.
- 12.2.3 As the draft recommendations impact on Churchdown Parish and on the Borough Wards of Badgeworth and Churchdown Brookfield with Hucclecote, approval would be subject to consent of the LGBCE to ensure that Parish and Borough Ward boundaries are coterminous. The recommendations do not include any electorate thus having no impact on Borough Ward electorates.
- 12.2.4 It was recommended that land surrounding the junction/roundabout serving the A417 and M5 be transferred from Brockworth Parish to Hucclecote Parish.
- 12.2.5 As the draft recommendation impacts on the existing boundaries of Churchdown Parish approval to transfer to Hucclecote Parish would be subject to the consent of the LGBCE.
- 12.3 **Second stage consultation**
- 12.3.1 Brockworth Parish Council strongly objected to the draft recommendation to transfer land from Brockworth Parish to Hucclecote Parish, as it was anticipated that this land may be developed in the future and considered that it would be a mistake to split responsibility for any newly emerging community across parishes. In addition, the Parish Council outlined that there were no physical links to Hucclecote (now or planned) and the site was bounded on all sides by dual carriageway.
- 12.3.2 Hucclecote Parish Council also opposed the draft recommendation to transfer land from Brockworth to Hucclecote Parish.
- 12.3.3 No submissions were received in respect of the draft recommendations at paragraphs 12.2.1 and 12.2.2.
- 12.4 **Final recommendations**
- 12.4.1 The Working Group recommended their draft recommendations at paragraphs 12.2.1 and 12.2.2, however, in view of the opposition received did not recommend the transfer of land from Brockworth Parish to Hucclecote Parish at paragraph 12.2.4.

- 12.4.2 It is **RECOMMENDED** that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved; -
- a) To transfer the land (which does not comprise any electorate) incorporating government buildings at Elmbridge Court and Gloucester North Community Fire Station from Innsworth Parish to Churchdown Parish, as shown on Map 7.
  - b) A request to the LGBCE be made to amend the boundaries of:
    - i. the Borough Wards of Innsworth, Churchdown St. Johns and Churchdown Brookfield with Hucclecote and
    - ii. Highnam and Churchdown County Divisions to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries.
  - c) To transfer the land running along the M5 abutting the existing Churchdown Parish boundary incorporating part of the property; Home Farm, (which currently straddles the Parishes of Badgeworth and Churchdown) from Badgeworth Parish to Churchdown Parish as shown on Map 8. The recommendation has no impact on electorate as the residents of Home Farm are already included within Churchdown Parish.
  - d) A request to the LGBCE be made to amend the boundaries of:
    - i. the Borough Wards of Badgeworth and Churchdown Brookfield with Hucclecote and
    - ii. Brockworth and Churchdown County Divisions to be coterminous with the new parish boundaries.
  - e) There be no transfer of land surrounding the junction/roundabout serving the A417 and M5 from Brockworth Parish to Hucclecote Parish.

### 13.0 **Wheatpieces and Tewkesbury**

#### 13.1 **First stage consultation**

13.1.1 The review was seen as an opportune time to consider a transfer of land located between the by-pass and the Wheatpieces estate, forming the Nature Reserve, currently within Wheatpieces Parish, to Tewkesbury Town.

13.1.2 It was considered that, although the by-pass would provide a strong definable boundary, the existing boundary running along the River Swilgate worked well and did not necessarily require change. If recommended, the proposal would impact on Borough Wards as Wheatpieces Parish falls within Tewkesbury East.

#### 13.2 **Draft recommendations**

13.2.1 It was recommended that no action be taken to transfer land located between the by-pass and the Wheatpieces estate, forming the Nature Reserve, and that this land should be retained within Wheatpieces Parish.

#### 13.3 **Second stage consultation**

13.3.1 No submissions were received to the second stage consultation.

13.4 **Final recommendations**

13.4.1 The Working Group maintained its recommendation at paragraph 13.2.1.

**It is RECOMMENDED that the following community governance and electoral arrangements be approved; -**


- a. The land located between the by-pass and the Wheatpieces estate, forming the Nature Reserve, be retained within Wheatpieces Parish.**

## Map 1

### Ashchurch and Wheatpieces

Land edged in blue – existing Wheatpieces Parish

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Ashchurch Rural Parish to Wheatpieces Parish




## Map 2

### Dumbleton

Land edged in blue – existing Dumbleton Parish (part)

Land hatched in red – area to form a new Wormington Parish Meeting in accordance with the final recommendation




### Map 3

#### Longford and Innsworth

Land edged in blue – existing Longford Parish

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Innsworth Parish to Longford Parish




**Maps 4 (three maps)**

Maisemore

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Maisemore Parish to Highnam Parish

Land hatched in black – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Highnam Parish to Maisemore Parish



Maps 4 continued.....




## Map 5

### Stanway and Toddington

Land edged in blue – existing Toddington Parish (part)

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Stanway Parish to Toddington Parish.




## Map 6

### Bishops Cleeve and Southam

Land edged in blue – existing Bishops Cleeve Parish (part)

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Southam Parish to Bishops Cleeve Parish

Land edged in green – existing Bishops Cleeve Wards




## Map 7

### Churchdown and Innsworth

Land edged in blue – existing Churchdown Parish (part)

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Innsworth Parish to Churchdown Parish (Churchdown Brockworth with Hucclecote Borough Ward)

Land hatched in blue - land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Innsworth Parish to Churchdown Parish (Churchdown St Johns Borough Ward)



## Map 8

### Badgeworth and Churchdown

Land edged in blue – existing Badgeworth Parish

Land hatched in red – land subject to the final recommendation for transfer from Badgeworth Parish to Churchdown Parish (Churchdown Brookfield with Hucclecote Borough Ward).

