

North Northamptonshire Council Community Governance Review (CGR) Terms of Reference

2025/26 Summary

Summary of the Terms of Reference

Purpose of the Review

The review covers **all 106 parish areas** within North Northamptonshire and is intended to ensure that community governance arrangements remain effective, reflect local identities and provide convenient local government. It is the first review undertaken by North Northamptonshire Council since its creation in 2021.

The review has been prompted by:

- changes arising from the 2025 electoral boundary review;
- significant housing growth in some locations;
- population changes affecting representation;
- local governance issues identified by individual parishes; and
- the expectation that governance reviews are undertaken every 10–15 years.

Matters the Review Can Consider

The review may recommend changes including:

- creation, merger or abolition of parishes;
- alteration of parish boundaries;
- grouping or de-grouping of parishes under a common parish council;
- parish names and styles (Parish, Town, Village, Community etc.);
- warding arrangements;
- number of councillors;
- election years.

Importantly, **nothing has been proposed yet**. The document simply establishes the scope of what may be considered.

Consultation Process

The review follows four stages:

- Initial consultation (Dec 2025 – Feb 2026)
- Draft recommendations (July – September 2026)
- Consultation on draft recommendations
- Final recommendations and Reorganisation Order (December 2026)

Any governance changes would generally take effect from **1 April 2027**, while electoral changes would normally take effect at the **May 2029 parish elections**, unless an earlier election is specifically ordered.

Councillor Numbers

The document repeats national guidance rather than imposing any requirements.

For smaller councils:

- Legal minimum: **5 councillors**

- Aston Business School guidance:
 - under 500 electors → **5–8 councillors**
- NALC guidance suggests **7 councillors** is generally a practical minimum for effective governance.

These are **guidelines only**. There is no proposal within the document to reduce councillor numbers for any parish.

Matters Affecting Little Harrowden Parish Council

Direct proposals

There are **none**.

The Terms of Reference do **not** propose any changes to:

- Little Harrowden Parish Council;
 - its boundary;
 - its number of councillors;
 - parish warding; or
 - its governance arrangements.
-

Nearby parish requests

The document identifies only those councils that had already expressed an interest in taking part in the review.

These are:

- Corby Town Council
- Deene & Deenethorpe Parish Council
- Desborough Town Council
- Glapthorn Parish Council
- Kettering Town Council
- Pytchley Parish Council
- Stanwick Parish Council
- Weekley Parish Council

together with the Priors Hall Park Residents Association.

Notably absent

There are **no requests identified** from:

- Little Harrowden
- Great Harrowden Parish Meeting
- Isham
- Hardwick
- Orlingbury
- Great Doddington

- Glenvale Park
 - any neighbouring parish that would directly affect Little Harrowden.
-

Grouping of Parishes

The document confirms that legislation permits two or more parishes to be grouped under a common parish council where appropriate, provided this reflects community identity and supports effective governance.

Based on the document and your additional context:

- there is **nothing in these Terms of Reference** suggesting that North Northamptonshire Council intends to group Little Harrowden with another parish;
- there is **no proposal involving Great Harrowden**;
- there is **no proposal involving Glenvale Park**;
- there is **no indication that NNC is considering reducing LHPC councillor numbers**.

Your previous approach to Great Harrowden Parish Meeting therefore has **no bearing on this CGR**, as there is no current proposal for a grouping. Should Great Harrowden's position change before the review concludes, a proposal could still be submitted during the consultation process, but there is no evidence of that within this document.

Overall assessment for LHPC

From Little Harrowden Parish Council's perspective, these Terms of Reference are largely procedural.

The only points to note are:

- the entire North Northamptonshire area is under review, so any parish may submit proposals during the consultation period;
- neighbouring parishes whose boundaries could be affected would be consulted before recommendations are made;
- there are currently **no proposals affecting Little Harrowden or its neighbouring parishes**;
- there is **no indication** that councillor numbers, boundaries or governance arrangements for LHPC are under consideration at this stage.

Summary of Draft Recommendations

Direct impact on LHPC

None

Little Harrowden is specifically listed in the section "**Areas where no submissions were received**". The report recommends that, subject to changes elsewhere, the **current electoral arrangements remain unchanged**.

There are **no recommendations** to:

- alter the Little Harrowden parish boundary;
- alter the number of parish councillors;
- ward the parish;
- group LHPC with another parish;
- merge LHPC with another council;
- create any neighbouring parish that would absorb part of Little Harrowden.

Nearby parishes

Parish	Proposal	Potential impact on LHPC
Little Harrowden	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Great Harrowden	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Hardwick	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Isham	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Orlingbury	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Grendon	No submission. No change proposed.	None
Great Doddington	Specifically recommended to remain unchanged.	None

Great Harrowden Parish Meeting

No mention of discussions with Great Harrowden Parish Meeting re:

- grouping;
- merger;
- common parish council;
- boundary review.

A future CGR could revisit the matter if both communities wished to pursue it.

Glenvale Park

There is also **nothing** relating to Glenvale Park, Little Harrowden or the wider Wellingborough growth area.

The only major strategic growth area discussed is:

- Priors Hall Park (Corby)

- West Corby SUE
- East Kettering SUE
- Rushden East Garden Community

None of these have any governance implications for LHPC.

Councillor numbers

Several councils have requested increases or decreases, for example:

- Ashley 5 → 7
 - Gretton 9 → 11
 - Stanwick 7 → 9
 - Titchmarsh 9 → 7
 - Raunds 12 → 15
 - Corby 17 → 21
-

One point worth noting

Although LHPC is unaffected, the report establishes NNC's policy approach for future reviews. Throughout the report, the reviewing officer repeatedly states that they favour:

- clearly identifiable parish boundaries;
- boundaries following roads, rivers or other permanent features;
- maintaining community identity;
- avoiding splitting communities;
- avoiding parish wards crossing unitary ward boundaries.

Those principles are applied consistently across every recommendation.

If Little Harrowden were ever to pursue a governance proposal in a future review (for example, a grouping with Great Harrowden), it would need to demonstrate that it:

- reflects a genuine community identity;
- improves effective and convenient local governance; and
- has local support.

The report makes it clear those are the tests NNC is applying.

Overall conclusion

LHPC should submit a no change submission in response to these draft recommendations.

The report:

- leaves Little Harrowden completely unchanged;
- leaves all neighbouring parishes around Little Harrowden unchanged;
- contains no proposal affecting LHPC's boundary, governance or councillor numbers;
- contains no proposal relating to Great Harrowden Parish Meeting or any future grouping;

- contains no governance changes associated with Glenvale Park or the Wellingborough area.

LHPC should **formally note** the consultation and resolve that it has **no comments on the draft recommendations**, as there are no proposals that directly or indirectly affect the parish. That provides a clear audit trail showing the Council considered the consultation, even though it had no objections or suggested amendments.