

---

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Held on Wednesday, 28 March 2018 at 2.00 pm in  
Norfolk Room, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Councillor E. Gould  
Mrs J. Hollis  
Mr M. J. Nairn

Mr M. S. Robinson  
Mr W.H.C. Smith

**Also Present**

Mr T. J. Jermy - District Councillor, Thetford Burrell Ward  
Mr R King - Chairman, Croxton Parish Council  
Mr M. Engwell – Vice Chairman, Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council

**In Attendance**

Sue Daniels - Electoral Services Team Leader  
Rory Ringer - Democratic Services Manager  
Teresa Smith - Democratic Services Team Leader

**Action By**

**7/18 APOLOGIES**

An apology was received from Cllr T Hewett.

**8/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Hollis indicated that a comment had been made in her name as part of the Thetford Consultation, but that she had not pre-determined any decisions and would consider all of the available evidence presented as part of the meeting and would make any decisions on the evidence before her and with an open mind.

**9/18 STAGE 1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

**(a) Carbrooke**

Carbrooke Parish Council had requested to increase the size of the Parish Council from seven to nine councillors, to reflect substantial growth in the village.

Five responses were received with mixed responses to the consultation.

Cllr Gould stated that many parishes had trouble in filling parish vacancies, and would an increase in membership lead to problems with filling the extra seats.

Action By

The Electoral Services Team Leader indicated that Carbrooke Parish Council traditionally has always filled all of its vacancies.

Cllr Smith was supportive of the proposal to increase the size of the parish council.

The options members considered were to:

- Agree to increase from 7 to 9
- No change to current arrangements

It was **RESOLVED** and members agreed to a 2<sup>nd</sup> stage consultation recommending an increase from 7 to 9 for Carbrooke Parish Council in line with the national guidance from NALC: The National Association of Local Councils (NALC) suggests that the minimum number of councillors should be seven and the maximum twenty five.

**(b) Great Ellingham**

Great Ellingham Parish Council had requested an extension to the southern boundary of the parish of Great Ellingham to meet the natural boundary provided by the A11; which currently lies within the parish of Attleborough (Queens and Besthorpe Parish ward).

Three responses had been received in response to the consultation and all disagreed with the original proposal.

Great Ellingham Parish Council had requested an extension to the southern boundary of the parish of Great Ellingham to meet the natural boundary provided by the A11; which currently lies within the parish of Attleborough (Queens and Besthorpe Parish ward).

Members had regard to three consultation responses. They were mindful that all three were opposed to the proposal, but also that this represented a very low response rate and they could not necessarily be considered representative.

The Democratic Services Manager reminded members that DCLG guidance suggests that where possible natural boundaries should be used as the defining line.

Cllr Smith said residents within the area had made a request to Great Ellingham Parish Council to move into the Great Ellingham parish, rather than remain in Attleborough. He felt that the consultation responses received were predominantly based on the Local Plan consultation, and not reflecting the Community Governance Review request.

Cllr Gould suggested that the boundary should be extended to the natural boundary of the B1077

Members agreed with the proposal.

Action By

It was **RESOLVED** and members agreed to a 2<sup>nd</sup> stage consultation on extending the parish boundary to the natural boundary with the B1077, in line with DCLG Guidance that boundaries should be and remain easily identifiable.

**(c) Thetford**

Thetford Town Council had requested an extension to the Parish boundary to include the new Sustainable Urban Extension area (SUE) which currently lies within the parishes of Croxton and Brettenham & Kilverstone. The Town Council had also asked to increase its size from 16 to 20 councillors to reflect the increased area. This would mean additional councillors in the Thetford Town Council Wards of Boudica (+1), Anne Bartholomew (+1) and Castle Ward (+2).

Members were informed of an error at the top of page 12; the report referred to two prior extensions to the Parish Boundary, when in fact the extension relates to the Settlement Boundary and not the Parish Boundary.

Members took into account the unequal populations of the parishes and considered the proportion of the population that responded, rather than total numbers. Members were mindful that Thetford residents who had responded in favour of the proposal represented 2% of the population of that parish (there were very few Thetford residents who responded that they were opposed to the proposal). Croxton and Brettenham & Kilverstone residents who had responded that they were opposed to the proposal represented 12% of the population of that parish (there were very few Croxton and Brettenham & Kilverstone residents who had responded that they were in favour of the proposal).

Members were made aware that if they were minded to consult at the second stage, with a view to extending the Parish Boundary to include the SUE area, it would be advisable to consult on including the properties in Hill House Lane, and Heathlands Drive which are currently in the Parish of Croxton within the proposed Thetford Boundary.

Cllr Jermy was pleased to see the number of responses, and was struck that a number of residents in Croxton and Kilverstone were supportive of the proposal. In his view Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) development was part of Thetford.

Mr Engwell, the Vice-Chairman of Brettenham & Kilverstone said the area of development mostly affected was in the parish of Kilverstone. The general view of the Kilverstone residents was that they did not want the Thetford parish boundary to move and would prefer to stay rural and not urban.

Cllr Gould suggested that it was premature to consider these

Action By

proposals at this stage, especially when the additional houses had not yet been built.

Members also felt that, before making such a significant change, those who would in due course live in the SUE area should be consulted, and this should be carried out when the houses are occupied.

Cllr Nairn asked how many dwellings were in Croxton and Kilverstone at the moment, and what the expansion would mean. It was confirmed that 350 houses would be built over the next 3 to 5 years. He agreed with Cllr Gould and suggested that it was premature to consider Thetford Town Councils proposals at the moment.

Cllr Smith added there had been a view for some considerable time that the parishes should not be obliged to have changes forced upon them, and that any income from future development should be shared across all involved.

Cllr Jermy said the first tranche of houses would be built on the new development shortly. He had no strong feelings about the number of councillors.

Cllr Nairn felt that Hill House Lane and the Heathlands Drive area should not be excluded from the consultation, if members were minded to agree the Thetford proposal.

It was felt that residents from the neighbouring parishes all used the amenities of Thetford a small number of these amenities are provided by the Town Council. It was identified that residents from other areas (including residents of Thetford) utilised the Croxton Play area as it was felt it provided for a safe environment

Mr Engwell reiterated that the residents of Kilverstone did not want to become part of the town and wanted to protect the rural status.

It was **RESOLVED** and members agreed to a 2nd stage consultation that no change to the current arrangements be proposed at this time for the following reasons:

1. 2% of Thetford residents had indicated that they were in favour of the boundary change whilst 12% of the Croxton, Brettenham and Kilverstone residents had indicated that they were opposed the boundary change, and
2. Before making such a significant change, those living in the SUE area should be consulted, and this should be carried out when the houses are built and occupied.

**Action By**

**10/18 NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held in July.

The meeting closed at 3.00 pm

CHAIRMAN