

# **Cherwell District Council**

## **Council**

**22 February 2021**

## **Final Recommendations for the Adderbury Community Governance Review**

### **Report of Chief Executive**

This report is public

### **Purpose of report**

To report the results of the second consultation stage of the Community Governance Review (CGR) for Adderbury.

To consider the final recommendations of the CGR Working Group, that will bring the review to a close.

### **1.0 Recommendations**

The meeting is recommended:

- 1.1 To note the results of the second consultation stage of the Adderbury Community Governance Review
- 1.2 To approve the final recommendations that no warding of Adderbury Parish Council take place, and that the number of parish councillors for Adderbury Parish Council should remain as 12.

### **2.0 Introduction**

- 2.1 At the October 2020 Council meeting, draft recommendations were considered to form the basis of the second consultation period for the Community Governance Review (CGR) for Adderbury.
- 2.2 The recommendations were to consider warding the existing parish council and reviewing the number of parish councillors.
- 2.3 Warding would mean each area of the parish having its own parish councillors that residents can contact to discuss issues, but all councillors act together for the whole parish.
- 2.4 The second consultation stage ran from Monday 2 November 2020 to Monday 4 January 2021.

### 3.0 Report Details

- 3.1 A second consultation document was produced (appendix 2) and again posted to every address on the electoral register in Adderbury parish, a total of 1,387 properties. A copy was also published on the CGR page of the Council's website.
- 3.2 The document outlined the results of the first consultation, when the questions had related to separating the existing parish of Adderbury in to two separate parishes, each with their own parish council. It also detailed the draft recommendations which included the possibility of warding the parish, and reviewing the number of parish councillors.
- 3.3 A reply slip with four questions and space to provide general comments was also included with the document. Responses could be completed using the reply slip and returning it in the pre-paid envelope provided; submitted online through a Survey Monkey version of the reply slip; or by email.
- 3.4 **463** responses were received, with the results breakdown as follows:
- Those agreeing with the proposal to ward the parish council – **100** (21.79% of responses received).
  - Those disagreeing with the proposal to ward the parish council – **359** (78.21% of responses received).
  - Regarding the boundary location if two wards were created, 65 responses felt that the Sor Brook should be the boundary; 56 responses felt the A4260/Oxford Road should be the boundary; 3 responses thought the boundary should be somewhere else, and 291 responses did not want two wards to be created.
  - In relation to 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 with Twyford, and 310 responses did not want two wards to be created
  - Finally on the question of reviewing the number of parish councillors, 71 responses thought the number of parish councillors should be increased; 18 responses thought the number should be decreased; and 327 responses thought the number should remain the same.
- 3.5 All responses received, including letters, are available to view on the Council's [CGR webpage](#)
- 3.6 Responses submitted by West Adderbury Residents Association, who arranged and submitted the initial petition and Adderbury Parish Council, as the parish council for the review area, are included at appendix 3 to the report.
- 3.7 The CGR working group met during January to consider the second consultation responses, and to agree final recommendations.

- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 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.
- 3.10 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.
- 3.11 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.
- 3.12 Appendix 1 is the full final recommendations document that was published on 1 February 2021.

## **4.0 Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1 Council is requested to approve the recommendations as set out in section 1 of this report, as the CGR working group believe they are in the best interests of the parish of Adderbury.

## **5.0 Consultation**

Residents of Adderbury  
Responses as detailed on the [CGR page](#) of the CDC website.

CGR Working Group  
Responses as set out in this report.

## **6.0 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

- 6.1 The following alternative options have been identified and rejected for the reasons as set out below.

Option 1: To recommend that Adderbury Parish be warded. This is rejected for the reasons set out in paragraph 3.11 above

## 7.0 Implications

### Financial and Resource Implications

- 7.1 Costs associated with the review have been met from existing Democratic and Elections budget. Consideration of these recommendations will bring the review to a close.

Comments checked by:

Michael Furness, Assistant Director of Finance, 01295 221845, [michael.furness@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:michael.furness@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

### Legal Implications

- 7.2 Following receipt of a valid petition and Full Council agreeing to the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Community Governance Review, it has been run in accordance with these ToR and Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

Comments checked by:

Chris Mace, Solicitor. 01295 221808, [Christopher.mace@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:Christopher.mace@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

### Risk Implications

- 7.3 The proposals in this report are in line with the powers of the council as set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and reflect the views expressed during the consultation period.

Comments checked by:

Louise Tustian, Head of Insight and Corporate Programmes. 01295 221786, [louise.tustian@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:louise.tustian@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

### Equality Implications

- 7.4 The process of undertaking the community governance review and the approach taken to ensure that all voices in the community were heard is set out in the report and appendices in line with government guidance that the views of local communities and inhabitants are of central importance. The recommendations of the working group are intended to best serve all parts of the community as set out in the accompanying report and no additional equalities implications are identified within the report or raised by the recommendations.

Comments checked by:

Robin Rogers, Head of Strategy, [robin.rogers@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:robin.rogers@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)

## 8.0 Decision Information

**Key Decision N/A as not an Executive report**

**Financial Threshold Met:** N/A

**Community Impact Threshold Met:** N/A

**Wards Affected**

Adderbury, Bloxham and Bodicote.

**Links to Corporate Plan and Policy Framework**

N/A – statutory obligation to undertake a Community Governance Review following receipt of a valid petition.

**Lead Councillor**

N/A

**Document Information**

**Appendix number and title**

- Appendix 1 - Final recommendations document as published on 1 February 2021
- Appendix 2 - Second stage consultation document
- Appendix 3 - consultation responses from West Adderbury Residents Association and Adderbury Parish Council

**Background papers**

None

**Report Author and contact details**

Emma Faulkner, Democratic and Elections Officer. [democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)  
01295 221534