

# Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026

---

## Community Governance Review – Finstall Parish

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor May, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Strategic Partnerships, Economic Development and Enabling
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Assistant Director	Claire Felton, Assistant Director of Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services
Report Author	Job Title: Electoral Services Manager, Darren Whitney Contact email: darren.whitney@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk Contact Tel: 01527 881650
Wards Affected	Tardebigge
Ward Councillor(s) consulted	Yes
Relevant Strategic Purpose(s)	N/A
Non-Key Decision	
If you have any questions about this report, please contact the report author in advance of the meeting.	

### 1. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Members are asked to RESOLVE**

- 1) **To note the results of the consultation undertaken.**
- 2) **One of the following options as detailed in this report for the Community Governance Review Draft Recommendations to be further consulted upon:**
  - i) **OPTION 1: One or both the changes in the review be adopted; or**
  - ii) **OPTION 2: no change be undertaken; or**
  - iii) **OPTION 3: That an alternative proposal from the Committee be adopted.**
- 3) **The consultation method on the Draft Recommendations.**

# **Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026**

---

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The report sets out the results of the initial consultation which closed on 17 April 2026 regarding the Community Governance Review (CGR) for Finstall Parish and on the basis of these asks for draft recommendations be drawn up for further consultation.
- 2.2 Finstall Parish Council asked Bromsgrove District Council if they would review the parish boundaries of Finstall Parish. The decision to go ahead with the CGR for Finstall was made at the Electoral Matters Committee's meeting held on 7 December 2025.
- 2.3 The review covers two possible changes requested by the Parish Council:
  - a) Field View House: to support re-drawing of the parish boundary so that it runs alongside the railway line to the south of Field View House, thereby placing Field View House to the north of the parish boundary. The change affects 22 electors who have no contact with the rest of Finstall Parish.
  - b) Rutherford Road area (otherwise known as Hazelcroft): to seek to move the parish boundary northwards to run alongside the railway line, to incorporate Hazelcroft within Finstall parish. This change relates to a whole polling district (TAE – Gambolds). The area is currently unparished so would just be a matter of moving the parish boundary to incorporate that polling district.
- 2.4 The Terms of Reference were agreed by this Committee at its meeting held on 2 February 2026.

## **3. OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

- 3.1 A webpage was set up on the District Council's website for the CGR providing consultees relevant information and included maps of the areas under review, which can be found at:  
<https://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/council/elections/community-governance-reviews/community-governance-review-for-finstall-parish/>

## **Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026**

---

To make it easier to consider the areas under review they were referred in the consultation questionnaire as being East and West of the railway line which reflects better on the maps.

- 3.2 Consultation opened 16 February and letters to all electors of the parish were sent out on 24 February. The letters directed the elector to the review webpage and informed them how they could respond to the consultation. At the close of the consultation 49 responses had been received.
- 3.3 The consultation was primarily through an online form which asked electors the following when responding:
- If and how they were affected by the review;
  - If they agreed with the area west of the railway line moving out of the Parish of Finstall;
  - If they agreed with the unparished area of the railway line moving into the Parish of Finstall; and
  - If they would like to make any further comments regarding the review

The consultation form was anonymous, but electors were asked for a postcode so officers could gauge where responses were coming from.

### **Consultation Results**

- 3.4 The first question—following the request for a postcode—asked respondents to indicate the capacity in which they were completing the consultation. Eighty percent of responders indicated that they were electors directly affected by one of the proposals. Sixteen percent said they were electors of the parish but not directly affected. In addition, one Parish Councillor responded in that role and one person responded as “a citizen of Finstall”.
- 3.5 The second direct question asked: “Do you agree with the area west of the railway line moving out of the Parish of Finstall?” Over two thirds (68%) agreed with this statement. There were no direct comments regarding this area.
- 3.6 The following question asked: “Do you agree with the unparished area east of the railway line moving into the Parish of Finstall?” A majority of respondents (60%) disagreed with this proposal. Common concerns centred on the perceived lack of clear benefits and the potential impact on the parish. Several responses also questioned the underlying rationale for the proposed change.

## **Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026**

---

- 3.7 The final question asked for any further comments regarding the review. The full list of comments can be found in Appendix 1.

### **Draft Recommendations**

- 3.8 Option 1 is to Recommend one or both requests made by the Parish Council.
- 3.9 Since there is broad support for the moving the boundary to exclude Field View House from the parish, it would make sense to include this in the draft recommendations.
- 3.10 If Members decide that the draft recommendation should include Polling District TAE becoming part of Finstall Parish there may be an argument to create a parish ward for this polling district which should be included in the second consultation.
- 3.11 Option 2 is for no change and keep both boundaries as they currently lie.
- 3.12 Option 3 is for the Committee to make an alternative draft recommendation based on the results of the initial consultation.

### **Second Consultation**

- 3.13 The agreed timetable states the second consultation on draft recommendations is due to commence on 15 June until 1 October 2026. Members of the Committee are required to decide how the consultation should be carried out.

## **4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The initial consultation cost £1,310.34 and Subject to the Committee's decisions, there may be some further financial implications for the second consultation exercise which would be found within existing budgets.

## **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 A CGR must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (Part 4) and the associated Dept. of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Guidance on Community Governance Reviews, the Local Government (Parishes and Parish Councils) Regulations 2008 and the

## **Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026**

---

Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The authority must have regard to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State (s100 (4) of the 2007 Act) and must give consideration to the views of local people in reaching its decision.

- 5.2 Section 93 of the 2007 Act sets out the council's duties in undertaking a community governance review. In relation to deciding what recommendations to make, it provides that the council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review:

- a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
- b) is effective and convenient.

Section 93 (6) provides that the council must "take into account" any representations received in connection with the review as one element of these considerations.

- 5.3 Section 2 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 states that there is a duty on principal councils to promote understanding among local people, which extends to parish councils.

### **6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Local Government Reorganisation**

- 6.1 The change in paragraph 3.8 would mean moving the parish, district and divisional boundaries which would mean a more sensible electoral boundary when and if it becomes part of a new Unitary Council.
- 6.2 There could be other Community Governance Reviews in the near future so notice should be made of the potential of these in the draft recommendations.

#### **Relevant Council Priority**

- 6.3 Work on CGRs supports all of the Council's current priorities.

#### **Climate Change Implications**

- 6.4 There are no direct climate change implications arising from this report.

# **Electoral Matters Committee    11 June 2026**

---

## **Equalities and Diversity Implications**

6.5 In conducting a review the Council will ensure that electoral equality is taken into consideration.

## **7. RISK MANAGEMENT**

7.1 It would be beneficial that the CGR be completed in 2026 so that the changes, if any, can be introduced at the May elections in 2027.

7.2 There are risks linked to public engagement. A CGR requires extensive consultation, which may create expectations that changes will be made.

## **8. APPENDICES and BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Appendix 1: Further Comments made by respondents.

Background papers:

- DCLG Guidance
- Relevant Statutory provisions

**Electoral Matters Committee    11 June  
2026**

---

**9.    REPORT SIGN OFF**

<b>Department</b>	<b>Name and Job Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Portfolio Holder	Councillor May - Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Strategic Partnerships, Economic Development and Enabling	
Lead Director / Assistant Director	Claire Felton - Assistant Director Legal Democratic and Procurement Services	
Financial Services	Deb Goodall - Assistant Director - Finance and Customer Services	1 June 2026
Legal Services	Nicola Cummings – Principal Solicitor (Governance)	