

Community Governance Review

08/10/2026

Policy and Resources Committee

PART I

District wide Community Governance Review (CGR)

1 Summary

- 1.1 To consider the findings of the first stage of the district-wide Community Governance Review and agree draft recommendations for the second stage consultation, these relate to the structure and questions for the second stage of the consultation. These are not the final recommendations.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee agree the following draft recommendations and to move to stage 2 of the consultation:

- 2.1.1 ***Little Green Lane:*** To change the ward boundary around the proposed development site north of Little Green Lane from Sarratt Parish Council to Croxley Green Parish Council.

- 2.1.2 ***Penn and Mill End, Maple Cross and West Hyde:***

- 2.1.2.1 To create a separate parish council for Penn and Mill End, Maple Cross and West Hyde area subject to confirmation of the boundary, electorate, council size, name and financial viability.

OR

- 2.1.2.2 To merge the unparished areas of Penn and Mill End with Batchworth Community Council, and Maple Cross and West Hyde with Chorleywood Parish Council.

OR

- 2.1.2.3 Consult on two new separate parish councils of Penn and Mill End, and Maple Cross and West Hyde subject to confirmation of the boundary, electorate, council size, name and financial viability.

OR

- 2.1.2.4 Take no action at this time.

- 2.1.3 ***Heronsgate:*** To prepare a mapped single-member Hersongate parish ward within Chorleywood Parish, without increasing the overall number of Chorleywood Parish Councillors by moving 1 Councillor from the Chorleywood South Ward to the new Heronsgate Ward as discussed at the Policy and Resources Meeting on 09 March 2026.

- 2.1.4 To make no other changes to existing parish boundaries, parish wards, parish names, parish status or councillor numbers at this stage, except for changes consequential upon recommendations 2.1.1 to 2.1.3.

- 2.1.5 To proceed to the second stage of consultation on the draft recommendations once the required maps, electorate forecasts and implementation information have been prepared.

Report prepared by: Lucy Smith, Committee and Electoral Services Manager

3 Details

- 3.1 In 2026 Three Rivers District Council commenced a district wide Community Governance Review to consider what, if any, changes are needed to parish governance arrangements across the district. The review includes parish boundaries, the creation or alteration of parishes and parish wards, parish names and status, and the number of parish councillors.
- 3.2 The first stage of consultation began on 30 July 2026 and closed on 21 September 2026. The consultation platform recorded 118 contributors and 126 submissions. The report contains 126 submitted records but does not provide a reliable contributor identifier with which to consolidate repeat submissions. The figures below therefore describe submissions and not necessarily 126 different people. This is a small percentage of the population and so consideration will need to be given as to whether this is a true reflection of people living in the area.
- 3.3 Consideration will need to be given to the size of electorate against the level of engagement when considering the draft recommendations. The electorate size of the unparished area Penn and Mill End is currently 4742 and the electorate size of the unparished area Maple Cross and West Hyde is 1834.
- 3.4 The information below has been drawn from the structured answers and associated free text fields. Each count is shown as a percentage of all 126 submissions and, where useful, as a percentage of the relevant follow up answers. Categories overlap where one submission proposed changes affecting more than one area. A submission is counted within each stated category.
- 3.5 After the second stage of consultation, final recommendations will return to Policy and Resources Committee and Full Council. Any agreed changes will not take effect until a Reorganisation Order has been made, and the relevant electoral arrangements are in place.

4 Options and reasons for recommendations

4.1 Overall Consultation results

- 4.1.1 The table below gives the actual district wide totals before any geographic breakdown. Percentages are calculated from all 126 submissions unless a different base is stated. Totals may not add up to exactly 100% due to rounding.

Question	Yes	No	Unsure	Not Applicable
Review parish boundaries	42 (33.3%)	57 (45.2%)	27 (21.4%)	-
Development means arrangements should be reviewed	32 (25.4%)	60 (47.6%)	34 (27.0)	-
Merge, divide or abolish an existing parish	16 (12.7%)	75 (59.5%)	35 (27.8%)	-

Currently unparished areas should become parished	71 (56.3%)	16 (12.7%)	22 (17.5%)	17 (13.5%)
Unparished areas should merge with an existing parish (Base: 71)	21 (29.6%)	27 (38%)	23 (32.4%)	-
Parishes have the correct number of councillors	53 (42.1%)	29 (23.0%)	37 (29.4%)	7 (5.6%)
Change or remove parish wards	19 (15.1%)	58 (46.0%)	38 (30.2%)	11 (8.7%)
Change a parish name	11 (8.7%)	75 (59.5%)	27 (21.4%)	13 (10.3%)
Change parish status	11 (8.7%)	68 (54.0%)	36 (28.6)	11 (8.7%)
Current arrangements reflect local identity	73 (57.9%)	16 (12.7%)	10 (7.9%)	27 (21.4%)

4.2 Area Evidence and Draft Recommendations

Area	Details	Recommendations
Croxley Green and Sarratt	19 Submissions (15.1%) of all submissions) identified the Croxley Green/ Sarratt boundary or review. 14 submissions (11.1% of all submissions and 33.3% of the 42 submissions supporting boundary review) specifically referred to Little Green Lane, the proposed development of around 600 homes or land north of Croxley Green. The replacement boundaries suggested were not identical.	To change the ward boundary around the proposed development site north of Little Green Lane from Sarratt Parish Council to Croxley Green Parish Council.
Penn and Mill End	Seventy-one submissions (56.3%) supported parishing the four currently unparished areas collectively. Of the 13 submissions carrying a WD3 8 postcode, 9 supported parishing (69.2%) and 4 opposed it (30.8%). On merger with an existing parish, 2 answered yes (15.4%), 7 no (53.8%) and 4 did not answer (30.8%). Free-text responses from this group repeatedly described Mill End as distinct and requiring its own local voice. Across the district, 18 of the 71 merger follow-up responses (25.4%) could be read as supporting a link between Penn and Mill End and Batchworth or wider Rickmansworth.	Create a separate parish for Penn and Mill End and consult on its boundary, council size and name or to merge with Batchworth Community Council, or create a new parish with the unparished areas of Maple Cross and West Hyde. Or take no action at this time.

Maple Cross and West Hyde	Of the 9 submissions carrying a WD3 9 postcode, 8 supported parishing (88.9%) and 1 opposed it (11.1%). On merger with an existing parish, 1 answered yes (11.1%), 2 no (22.2%), 5 were unsure (55.6%) and 1 did not answer (11.1%). Four submissions (3.2% of all submissions) explicitly proposed linking Maple Cross and West Hyde to Chorleywood; three (2.4%) proposed a link to Batchworth or wider Rickmansworth. Local free-text responses emphasised the need for a distinct local voice.	Create a separate parish for Maple Cross and West Hyde and consult on its boundary, Council size and name or merge the unparished areas with Chorleywood Parish Council or create a new parish with the unparished areas of Penn and Mill end, or take no action at this time.
Heronsgate ward	Two submissions requested a separate Heronsgate ward or a division of Chorleywood South that included Heronsgate. This was previously discussed in a prior CGR.	To prepare a mapped single-member Heronsgate parish ward within Chorleywood Parish, without increasing the overall number of Chorleywood Parish Councillors by moving 1 Councillor from the Chorleywood South Ward to the new Heronsgate Ward as discussed at the Policy and Resources Meeting on 09 March 2026.
Batchworth and Wider Rickmansworth	Fifteen submissions (11.9% of all submissions) identified a Batchworth, wider Rickmansworth or directly related unparished-area boundary issue. Nine of the 11 submissions supporting a parish-name change (81.8% of that group; 7.1% of all submissions) concerned Batchworth or Rickmansworth. The proposals included expansion, renaming and a wider Rickmansworth council and were not mutually compatible. District-wide, 75 submissions (59.5%) opposed changing a parish name and 75 (59.5%) opposed merging, dividing or abolishing an existing parish.	No separate change at this point.
Moor Park and Eastbury	Three submissions (2.4% of all submissions) explicitly proposed a separate Moor Park and Eastbury parish. Among the 10 submissions carrying an HA6 postcode, 4 supported boundary review (40.0%), 5 opposed it (50.0%) and 1 was unsure (10.0%). The detailed submissions alleged unequal representation and expenditure within Batchworth; those assertions and the referenced supporting evidence require verification.	No change at this stage.

Chorleywood other than Heronsgate	Three submissions (2.4% of all submissions) proposed Chorleywood ward or boundary changes other than the specific Heronsgate proposal. The suggestions concerned the M25, Quickwood, Loudwater and division of existing wards and did not establish one consistent alternative. Across the district, 19 submissions (15.1%) supported changing or removing a parish ward, 58 (46.0%) opposed, 38 (30.2%) were unsure and 11 (8.7%) selected not applicable.	No change at this stage.
Sarratt and Chipperfield	One submission (0.8% of all submissions) proposed merging Sarratt with Chipperfield or abolishing Sarratt Parish. No second submission made the same proposal. References to transferring the Little Green Lane development land are considered separately under Croxley Green and Sarratt above.	No merger or abolition recommended.
Abbots Langley and Leavesden	Three submissions (2.4% of all submissions) proposed a change affecting this area: one proposed extending Abbots Langley to include Leavesden, one proposed renaming Abbots Langley West, and two proposed town status or a change to the council name. The categories overlap because one submission made more than one proposal.	No change at this stage
Watford Rural and South Oxhey	Three submissions (2.4% of all submissions) made a specific proposal: one sought increased representation for Watford Rural/South Oxhey, one proposed three councillors for Oxhey Hall and a different name, and one proposed dividing South Oxhey and Ashridge wards. No proposal was repeated by more than one submission.	No change at this stage
Councillor numbers	Fifty-three submissions (42.1%) considered the existing number of parish councillors correct, 29 (23.0%) did not, 37 (29.4%) were unsure and 7 (5.6%) selected not applicable. Of the 29 seeking change, 16 (55.2%) favoured an increase and 13 (44.8%) a decrease. Twelve of the 29 (41.4%; 9.5% of all submissions) named Batchworth, four (13.8%; 3.2% of all submissions) named Chorleywood, two named Croxley Green and two named Watford Rural or South Oxhey. These named-parish counts overlap	No change at this stage

	because a response could identify more than one parish.	
Parish Names and Status	Eleven submissions (8.7%) supported changing a parish name; 75 (59.5%) opposed, 27 (21.4%) were unsure and 13 (10.3%) selected not applicable. Nine of the 11 proposed name changes (81.8%) related to Batchworth or Rickmansworth; one related to Watford Rural and one to Abbots Langley. Eleven submissions (8.7%) supported a status change; 68 (54.0%) opposed, 36 (28.6%) were unsure and 11 (8.7%) selected not applicable. The status suggestions included town and community council terminology and were not consistent.	No change at this stage

5 Policy/Budget Reference and Implications

- 5.1 There are no immediate budget implications arising from agreement of draft recommendations for consultation.

6 Financial, Legal, Equal Opportunities, Staffing, Environmental, Community Safety, Public Health, Customer Services Centre, Risk Management and Health & Safety Implications.

- 6.1 None specific.

7 Communications & Website

- 7.1 There will be an implication to Communications and website as to promoting the second consultation.

Background Papers

Previous Community Governance Review Minutes from 09 March 2026

APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A Submissions
Appendix B Map Little Green Lane
Appendix C Unparished Areas

