

## **Cherwell District Council**

### **Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 Community Governance Review for Adderbury**

#### **Final Recommendations**

##### **1. Brief background to the Review**

- 1.1 On 6 April 2020, Cherwell District Council (CDC) validated a Community Governance Review petition from West Adderbury Residents Association, requesting that the area known as West Adderbury be split from the current parish of Adderbury, to form a separate parish with its own parish council.
- 1.2 The reasons given for requesting the Community Governance Review were as follows:
  - *APC [Adderbury Parish Council] is not reflective of West Adderbury's needs, interests and identity;*
  - *APC cannot represent a geographically, socially and politically distinct West Adderbury;*
  - *West Adderbury residents have no stake in deciding their own future;*
  - *West Adderbury residents do not share a vision of the future with APC;*
  - *West Adderbury residents have no sense of belonging with APC;*
  - *APC is not capable of allowing West Adderbury residents a voice in the management of their own community;*
  - *There is currently no community cohesion between West and East Adderbury;*
  - *APC is not capable of allowing West Adderbury residents to solve their own problems and meet their own needs;*
  - *APC prevents West Adderbury from fulfilling its potential as a community.*
- 1.3 In accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the Council had 12 months to conduct the review, starting on the date the petition was deemed valid.
- 1.4 Full Council considered Terms of Reference for the Review at its meeting on 20 May 2020, and resolved to appoint a Community Governance Review (CGR) Working Group to undertake the review, and make recommendations.

##### **2. Summary of the Consultation**

- 2.1 Two consultation stages were held in relation to the review.
- 2.2 The first consultation stage ran from 29 June to 28 August 2020. A consultation letter was delivered to every residential address in the existing parish, and included a reply slip and reply-paid envelope. Responses could also be submitted via email, or directly into an online survey.
- 2.3 The first consultation asked:

- If it was a good idea for Adderbury parish to be split in two
  - If agreeing that it was a good idea, the proposed location of the boundary
  - For suggestions of names for the two parishes
- 2.4 739 responses were received, with 181 agreeing it was a good idea to separate the parish, and 553 disagreeing.
- 2.5 Taking into account the responses received during the first consultation stage, the CGR Working Group recommended to full Council on 19 October 2020 that no separation of Adderbury Parish should take place, as the residents did not want it.
- 2.6 Due to the number of comments received during the first consultation that referred to some residents feeling West Adderbury did not have its own voice, the CGR Working Group recommended that consideration be given to warding the existing parish council.
- 2.7 The CGR also made a further recommendation regarding consideration of the number of parish councillors on the existing parish council.
- 2.8 Full Council approved the recommendations as a basis for the second consultation period, which ran from 2 November 2020 to 4 January 2021.
- 2.9 Each residential household in the existing parish was again sent a consultation letter, with a reply slip and reply-paid envelope. Responses could also be submitted via email, or directly into an online survey.
- 2.10 The second consultation asked:
- If it was a good idea to create two wards in Adderbury Parish Council
  - If two wards were created, where the boundary between them should be
  - What the names of the wards should be
  - If the number of parish councillors for the parish should be reviewed
- 2.11 463 responses were received, with 100 responses saying yes to the creation of two wards, and 359 responses saying no.
- 2.12 65 responses thought that, if created, the ward boundary should be the Sor Brook; 56 responses thought the ward boundary should be the A4260/Oxford Road. 3 Responses thought the ward boundary should be somewhere else, and 291 responses stated that they did not think there should be two wards.
- 2.13 Regarding possible names for the two wards if they were created, 40 responses preferred West Adderbury and East Adderbury; 60 responses preferred West Adderbury and East Adderbury & Twyford; 310 responses stated that they did not think there should be two wards.
- 2.14 Finally in response to the number of parish councillors for the existing parish council, 71 responses thought that the number of parish councillors should be increased; 18 responses felt that the number of parish councillors should be decreased; and

2.15 327 responses felt that the number should stay the same.

All information relating to this review, including copies of the consultation letters and all responses received, can be found on the [Community Governance Review page](#) of the Cherwell District Council website.

### **3. Consequential Matters**

#### **The Law, Duties and Guidance**

3.1 Under Section 93 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, a Principal Council must comply with various duties when undertaking a CGR, including:

1. It must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review
  - i. Reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area;
  - ii. Is effective and convenient
2. The Council must take into account any representations received in connection with the review.

3.2 Under Section 100 of the Act, the Council must have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State. In March 2010, Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England published guidance on CGRs.

3.3 The guidance states that the Council must have regard to the need to secure community governance within the area under review; it reflects the identities of the community in the area, and is effective and convenient. Paragraph 50 of the guidance notes that in defining a Parish “the views of local communities and inhabitants are of central importance.”

3.4 The guidance also acknowledges that how people perceive where they live is significant in considering the identities and interests of local communities and depends on a range of circumstances, often best defined by local residents.

### **4. Final Recommendations**

4.1 Taking into account the guidance, the statutory obligations and the responses of the consultations, the CGR Working Group has made the following final recommendations for the community governance review of Adderbury:

1. That no changes be made to the existing parish area of Adderbury
2. That no changes be made to the existing number of Adderbury Parish Councillors

4.2 The working group have reached their recommendations after giving full consideration to all representations received across both consultation stages.

- 4.3 Following the first consultation stage it was clear that residents of Adderbury did not want a split to take place, with 553 of the 739 submitted responses disagreeing with the proposal. The Working Group made recommendations to explore other options, to understand the wishes and views of West Adderbury Residents Association and the residents who had supported the CGR petition.
- 4.4 During the second consultation stage it was again made clear that residents of Adderbury do not wish to see a split of any description take place. Although the two wards would still work together to form Adderbury Parish Council, the view of the majority of responses to the second consultation was that Adderbury should remain an unwarded Parish Council, with 359 of the 463 submitted responses saying no to the warding proposal.
- 4.5 With regard to the number of parish councillors on Adderbury Parish Council, the consultation responses did not support any change, therefore the Working Group consider taking into account all the information before it that to recommend an increase or a decrease would be enforcing an unwanted change on the residents.
- 4.6 Following the second consultation, the Working Group again considered the question of separating Adderbury into two parish council areas. The Working Group agreed that nothing had been submitted during the second consultation stage to change their recommendations.
- 4.7 In conclusion the Working Group felt that given the level of opposition to the proposals consulted upon demonstrated during both consultation stages, the recommendations to full Council should be that no changes be made to the existing parish area of Adderbury, and the number of parish councillors should remain at 12.
- 4.8 Full Council will consider these recommendations at its meeting on 22 February 2021.