

# **Cherwell District Council**

## **Council**

**17 October 2022**

### **Community Governance Review (CGR) – results of second consultation stage and final recommendations**

#### **Report of Chief Executive**

This report is public

#### **Purpose of report**

To update Council on the outcome of the stage two consultation that was held between 4 July and 23 September 2022; to delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer to complete the required legal order; to update Members on the upcoming Oxfordshire County boundary review being carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, and the ongoing Parliamentary Boundary Review.

#### **1.0 Recommendations**

The meeting is recommended:

- 1.1 To approve a change in the boundary between Ambrosden and Blackthorn for area A, as shown by the dotted black line on map 1.
- 1.2 To approve a change in the next ordinary year of elections for Ambrosden and Blackthorn parish councils, bringing them forward to 2023.
- 1.3 To approve a change in the boundary between Bodicote and Banbury for area F1, as shown by the dotted black line on map 2, to take effect in May 2024.
- 1.4 To agree that Merlin Close remain in Bodicote.
- 1.5 To approve a change in the boundary between Bodicote and Banbury for area F, as shown by the dotted black line in the inset box on map 3, to take effect in May 2024.
- 1.6 To approve a change in the boundary between Bodicote and Banbury for area E, as shown by the dotted black line on map 3, to take effect in May 2024.
- 1.7 To approve a change in the boundary between Drayton and Banbury for area D, as shown by the dotted black line on map 4, to take effect in May 2024.
- 1.8 To approve a change in the boundary between Drayton and Banbury for area C, as shown by the dotted black line on map 4, to take effect in May 2024.

- 1.9 To approve an increase in the number of Banbury Town Councillors by one, to be allocated to the Hardwick West Town Ward, to take effect in May 2024.
- 1.10 To approve a Banbury-only Community Governance Review to take place after the County boundary review has concluded, in advance of the 2028 local elections.
- 1.11 To approve a change in the boundary between Bicester, Ambrosden, Blackthorn and Launton for area L, as shown by the dotted black lines on map 5, to take effect in May 2023.
- 1.12 To approve a change in the next ordinary year of election for Launton Parish Council, bringing them forward to May 2023.
- 1.13 To approve a change in the boundary between Chesterton and Bucknell for areas G and H, as shown by the dotted black lines on map 6, to take effect in May 2023.
- 1.14 To approve a change in the boundary between Bicester and Bucknell for area I, as shown by the dotted black lines on map 6, to take effect in May 2023.
- 1.15 To approve a change in the boundary between Hanwell and Horley for area O, as shown by the dotted black line on map 7.
- 1.16 To approve a change in the boundary between Horley and Wroxton for area N, as shown by the dotted black line on map 7.
- 1.17 To approve an increase of one parish councillor for Begbroke Parish Council, increasing from six to seven, taking effect in May 2023.
- 1.18 To approve an increase of two parish councillors for Chesterton Parish Council, increasing from seven to nine, taking effect in May 2023.
- 1.19 To approve an increase of one parish councillor for Somerton Parish Council, increasing from five to six, taking effect in May 2023.
- 1.20 To delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Working Group, to prepare and finalise the required Reorganisation Order to implement approved recommendations.
- 1.21 To approve an extension of the Terms of Reference of the Working Group to cover the County boundary review, and delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Working Group, to consider and draft a response to the LGBCE consultations at the relevant times.
- 1.22 To note the update on the Parliamentary Boundary Review.

## **2.0 Introduction**

- 2.1 On [18 October 2021](#) full Council approved Terms of Reference for a district-wide CGR, to start on 19 October 2021 and run to October 2022.
- 2.2 The first consultation stage ran from 22 November 2021 to 31 January 2022, and sought views from any interested parties (residents, parish councils, general

members of the public) on the issues for consideration put forward by town and parish councils and council officers.

- 2.3 On [18 May 2022](#), full Council approved recommendations for the second consultation stage that ran from 4 July to 9 September 2022.
- 2.4 The Parliamentary Boundary and Community Governance Review Working Group (the Working Group) have considered all consultation responses and are making their final recommendations.

### **3.0 Report Details**

- 3.1 Details of the consultation were posted online on the ['Let's Talk Cherwell'](#) platform, with links provided from the [CGR page](#) of the Cherwell District Council website.
- 3.2 As during the first consultation, paper copy letters were posted out to addresses potentially affected by the proposals, to raise awareness of the consultation. Paper copies were also available from the Democratic and Elections Team on request.
- 3.3 All town and parish councils affected by the proposals were provided with links to the relevant documents, and encouraged to further publicise the consultation within their areas.
- 3.4 Democratic and Elections Officers offered to attend town and parish council meetings of the affected parishes, to answer questions on the CGR process in general or specific aspects of the proposals. No town or parish councils requested officer attendance at meetings.

#### **Proposal 1 – Ambrosden/Blackthorn**

- 3.5 Ambrosden Parish Council requested that the boundary with Blackthorn be reviewed, in light of development at Blackthorn Meadows in Ambrosden.
- 3.6 85 properties from Blackthorn Meadows have been built across the parish boundary, meaning they are in Blackthorn parish. Ambrosden Parish Council requested that the boundary be moved so that the 85 properties move into Ambrosden Parish.
- 3.7 85 documents were posted out, 1 per address, to the streets in Blackthorn Meadows potentially affected by a boundary move. None were returned as 'undeliverable'.
- 3.8 14 responses were submitted, a return rate of 16.4% (responses were not limited to one per household).

Figures regarding recommendation to move the boundary

- 11 responses said yes, they agreed with the recommendation to move the boundary
- 2 responses said no, they did not agree with the recommendation
- 1 response said they had no view

- 3.9 Neither Ambrosden nor Blackthorn Parish Councils responded to the second stage consultation.
- 3.10 The Working Group considered the responses and as they are supported by residents in the affected area, and the affected area is a natural expansion of Ambrosden, the final recommendation is that the boundary be altered as shown by the dotted black line on **map 1**, with area A and the surrounding fields being moved from Blackthorn in to Ambrosden.
- 3.11 Boundary changes should take effect from the next ordinary year of election, which for Ambrosden and Blackthorn parishes is 2024.
- 3.12 As part of this CGR, consideration is also being given to boundary changes at Bicester (see paragraphs 3.59 - 3.70).
- 3.13 Bicester Town Council are due to have elections in 2023. It is therefore recommended that the term of office for Ambrosden and Blackthorn Parish Councils is shortened by one year, and their next local elections are brought forward to 2023. The boundary changes recommended by the Working Group will take effect in 2023.
- 3.14 Parish Councillors elected for Ambrosden and Blackthorn in 2023 will serve a five year term of office, with the next elections being held in 2028 as originally scheduled.

### **Proposal 2 – Banbury and surrounding areas/Bodicote**

- 3.15 Banbury Town Council requested that all boundaries with neighbouring parishes be reviewed, in light of recent housing developments that have taken place across the town.
- 3.16 In addition to the general request from Banbury Town Council, the Street Naming and Numbering Team highlighted two specific areas of Bodicote Parish to be addressed during the review.
- 3.17 The first related to Longford Park, and two properties which appeared to be part of Bodicote Parish, rather than Banbury, following an earlier CGR in 2013.
- 3.18 The second related to a recent planning application that had been given permission, located on the edge of Longford Park and the current parish boundary between Bodicote, Banbury and Adderbury.
- 3.19 Following the first stage consultation, the Working Group recommended that residents in the Merlin Close area of Bodicote be consulted on the possibility of the boundary changing and the area moving into Banbury.
- 3.20 95 documents were posted out in total, to the properties in Longford Park specifically affected by a potential boundary move, residents of Merlin Close, the two properties on Longford Park Road and properties at the end of Salt Way.
- 3.21 Copies of the consultation documents were also provided to the David Wilson and Barratt show homes on Blackwell Drive, to raise awareness of the consultation

amongst prospective buyers and new residents who had recently completed their house purchase.

- 3.22 In early August the wording of consultation questions 1 to 3 was amended, and updated consultation documents were posted out to the 95 properties. Updated copies were also provided to the show homes.
- 3.23 Due to the amendment of the questions and following advice from the Monitoring Officer, the consultation period was extended by two weeks and closed on 23 September.
- 3.24 Responses to the original questions continued to be accepted, and were included in the final figures reported to the Working Group.
- 3.25 161 responses were submitted in total, 43 to the original questions and 118 to the revised questions.
- 3.26 The breakdown of responses was as follows:

Figures regarding possibility of moving the boundary between Bodicote and Banbury, so that area F1 is moved from Bodicote and becomes part of Banbury

- 7 responses said yes, the boundary should be moved
- 127 responses said no, the boundary should not be moved
- 1 response said they had no view

Figures regarding possibility of Merlin Close, area F2, moving out of Bodicote and into Banbury

- 6 responses said yes, it should move
- 107 responses said no, it should not move
- 25 responses had no view

Figures regarding properties in area F moving out of Bodicote and into Banbury, to formalise the changes already made to Council Tax and Electoral Register records

- 14 responses said yes they should be moved into Banbury
- 81 responses said no they should not be moved into Banbury
- 43 responses had no view

Figures relating to recommendation to move parish boundary so that area E becomes part of Banbury

- 7 responses said yes, the boundary should be moved
- 99 responses said no, the boundary should not be moved
- 30 responses had no view

- 3.27 Bodicote Parish Council responded to the consultation, submitting an overall statement alongside detailed response to each question.
- 3.28 Banbury Town Council responded to the consultation, and reiterated their support for the boundaries being altered.

### **Area F1 – Blackwell Drive/Whitechapel Gardens/The Pavilions**

- 3.29 The Working Group discussed the responses, and considered the existing development at Blackwell Drive in the context of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031.
- 3.30 The site of Banbury 17 covers the development at Blackwell Drive, and development within the neighbouring area of Banbury that starts at the A361 Bloxham Road and continues east towards Bodicote. Once all developments have been built out the area will include outdoor sports provision.
- 3.31 The Working Group discussed and the majority agreed that as Blackwell Drive will act as a spine road through the whole development, providing a link to the A361 Bloxham Road, and due to the associated facilities included in the development, the Bodicote development would be considered an urban extension of Banbury.
- 3.32 Regarding the junction of White Post Road and Blackwell Drive, the Working Group agreed that the recently built car park used by Bishop Loveday Primary School should remain in the same parish as the school.
- 3.33 The properties at the end of Salt Way and the adjacent grass verge would also remain in Bodicote. This would provide a 'buffer' area between the end of Banbury and the start of Bodicote.
- 3.34 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that the boundary between Bodicote and Banbury should be amended so that area F1, as shown by the dotted black line on **map 2**, becomes part of Banbury, with the new car park, cricket club, playing field and allotments remaining in Bodicote.
- 3.35 If approved, the changes will take effect from the next year of elections for Banbury and Bodicote in 2024.

### **Area F2, Merlin Way**

- 3.36 The Working Group discussed the proposal and agreed that as Merlin Close is a private road with the only access and egress off the Oxford Road, and no possibility of access into Longford Park, the boundary should not be altered in that area.
- 3.37 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that no change be made to the boundary of Merlin Close, and that it remain in Bodicote.

### **Area F, two properties in Longford Park**

- 3.38 The Working Group discussed the proposal and agreed that as the two affected properties had indicated at first consultation stage they were happy for the amendment to be made, the boundary should be amended.
- 3.39 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that the boundary in area F, shown by the dotted black line in the inset box on **map 3**, be amended to formalise the changes already made on council tax and electoral register records.
- 3.40 If approved, the changes will take effect from the next year of elections for Banbury and Bodicote in 2024.

## **Area E, outline planning application 19/01047/OUT**

- 3.41 The Working Group discussed the proposal and the majority agreed that the development would be considered an urban extension of Longford Park, due to access and egress being via the existing Longford Park development.
- 3.42 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that the boundary in area E be moved, as shown by the dotted black line on **map 3**, so that it becomes part of Banbury.
- 3.43 If approved the changes will take effect from the next year of elections for Banbury and Bodicote in 2024.

## **Proposal 3 – Banbury/Drayton**

- 3.44 Drayton Parish Council had previously contacted the council requesting a CGR be carried out in relation to the Castle Grange development.
- 3.45 283 properties forming part of Castle Grange have been built across the parish boundary, meaning they are in Drayton parish rather than Banbury.
- 3.46 Drayton Parish Council requested that consideration be given to moving this area into Banbury, and Banbury Town Council supported the proposal.
- 3.47 As well as the request from Drayton Parish Council, the Working Group highlighted one further area of development (planning application reference 18/01882/OUT) that they wished to consult on regarding possible boundary changes.
- 3.48 289 documents were posted out, 1 per address, to the properties in Castle Grange specifically affected by a potential boundary move, plus existing residential properties in the area of the outline planning application.
- 3.49 30 responses were submitted, a return rate of 10.3% (responses were not limited to one per household).

### Figures regarding recommendation to move area C into Banbury

- 7 responses said yes they agreed with the recommendation to move the boundary
- 21 responses said no, they did not agree with the recommendation
- 2 responses stated no view

### Figures regarding recommendation to move area D into Banbury

- 6 responses said yes they agreed with the recommendation
- 22 responses said no, they did not agree with the recommendation
- 1 response had no view

### Figures regarding the need for additional councillors for Banbury Town Council, if the boundary changes went ahead

- 8 responses said yes, Banbury Town Council would need additional councillors
- 3 responses said no, Banbury Town Council would not need additional councillors
- 19 responses had no view

- 3.50 Banbury Town Council did not comment on the second consultation.
- 3.51 Drayton Parish Council reiterated their support for areas C and D moving into Banbury.
- 3.52 The Working Group agreed that as the Castle Grange development (area D) has always been considered an urban extension of Banbury, and due to the request from Drayton Parish Council to move the area into Banbury, the final recommendation is to amend the boundary so that area D, as shown by the dotted black line on **map 4**, becomes part of Banbury, taking effect in May 2024.
- 3.53 In relation to area C and planning application 18/01882/OUT, the Working Group agreed that due to the distance from the main settlement of Drayton, this too would be an urban extension of Banbury, and the final recommendation is to amend the boundary so that all of area C, as shown by the dotted black line on **map 4**, becomes part of Banbury, taking effect in May 2024.
- 3.54 Regarding the number of town councillors for Banbury, the Working Group agreed that Banbury Town Council should have its total number of town councillors increased by one, giving 23 in total, taking effect from the next scheduled elections for Banbury Town Council in 2024.
- 3.55 The additional councillor is to be allocated to the Hardwick West town ward, being the town ward that areas C and D will move in to.
- 3.56 Boundaries at different levels of local government in Banbury – town, district and county level – are not co-terminus, which can cause confusion for residents and elected representatives at all levels.
- 3.57 The Working Group further recommend that a Banbury-specific CGR be carried out, after the County boundary review has concluded, to consider the warding arrangements for Banbury Town Council in advance of the 2028 local elections.
- 3.58 For the avoidance of doubt, the 2024 local elections for Banbury Town Council will be conducted on existing town boundaries.

#### **Proposal 4 – Bicester and surrounding areas**

- 3.59 Councillor Dan Sames requested that the site of approved development at Wretchwick Way, planning application reference 16/01268/OUT, be included in the CGR.
- 3.60 The majority of the 1500 new home site is currently in Ambrosden parish, with some in neighbouring Blackthorn and Launton parishes. Councillor Sames requested the inclusion of the site in the CGR to consider moving the area into Bicester.
- 3.61 Six residential properties would be affected by a boundary move linked to the Wretchwick Way planning application. All six properties were sent a paper copy consultation document.
- 3.62 No large scale posting of documents took place as no further existing residential properties were identified as being affected by the proposals.



3.63 Two responses were submitted, from Bicester Town Council and Launton Parish Council.

Figures regarding recommendation to move the boundary so that area L is all within Bicester

- 0 responses agreed with the recommendation
- 1 response said no, they did not agree with the recommendation that all of Area L should be within Bicester
- 1 response had no view

Launton Parish Council would prefer the existing boundary between Launton and Ambrosden is unchanged, particularly as the planning application doesn't show any development in that area. This would allow the area to be a buffer between Launton and Bicester

3.64 Bicester Town Council commented on areas J and K (that had been under consideration during the first consultation), but made no comment on area L.

3.65 Launton Parish Council commented that they would prefer the existing boundary between Launton and Ambrosden to remain unchanged, particularly as the planning application doesn't show any development in that area. That would allow the area to be a buffer between Launton and the new development.

3.66 Launton Parish Council added that if the council were minded to alter the boundary, it should be on the Wretchwick side of the railway line (the southern side), at the bottom of the embankment.

3.67 The Working Group agreed that as previous developments on the outskirts of Bicester had been moved into the town, it would make sense for the Wretchwick Way development to be included in the town boundary.

3.68 The final recommendation is to amend the boundary so that all of area L, as shown by the dotted black lines on **map 5**, becomes part of Bicester, taking effect in May 2023.

3.69 As Ambrosden, Blackthorn and Launton Parish Councils are all affected by the boundary change, it is recommended that the terms of office for all three parishes are shortened by one year, and their next parish elections are held in 2023.

3.70 Parish Councillors elected for Ambrosden, Blackthorn and Launton in 2023 will serve a five year term of office, with the next elections being held in 2028 as originally scheduled.

### **Proposal 5 – Chesterton/Bucknell/Bicester**

3.71 Chesterton Parish Council requested that the boundary between Chesterton and Bucknell be included in the CGR, due to a section along the B4030/Middleton Stoney Road where the existing boundary follows the Gagle Brook rather than following the road.

- 3.72 This means that for a short section an area north of the road is within Chesterton, and an area south of the road is in Bucknell. Chesterton Parish Council requested that the boundary be straightened so that it follows the road all the way to Bicester.
- 3.73 In addition to the request from Chesterton Parish Council, the Planning team highlighted a recent planning application on the outskirts of Bicester, planning application reference 14/02121/OUT. Part of the application site crosses the Bicester boundary meaning that it would sit within Bucknell.
- 3.74 No large scale posting of documents took place as there are no existing properties in the affected area.
- 3.75 Two responses were submitted.

Figures regarding recommendation to move the boundary so that area G becomes part of Chesterton

- 0 responses agreed with the recommendation to alter the boundary
- 1 response said no, they did not agree with the recommendation
- 1 response had no view

Figures regarding recommendation to move the boundary so that area H becomes part of Bucknell

- 2 responses had no view

Figures regarding recommendation to move the boundary so that all of area I becomes part of Bicester

- 0 responses agreed with the recommendation
- 1 response said no, they did not agree with the recommendation
- 1 response had no view

- 3.76 Bicester Town Council responded to the consultation, stating that the section of area I that crossed the current boundary should remain in Bucknell.
- 3.77 Neither Bucknell nor Chesterton Parish Councils responded to the second consultation.
- 3.78 The Working Group considered the responses and their final recommendation is that the boundary be altered so that areas G and H, as shown by the dotted black lines on **map 6**, become part of Chesterton and Bucknell respectively, taking effect in May 2023.
- 3.79 Regarding the area of planning application reference 14/02121/OUT, area I, the final recommendation is that the boundary between Bucknell and Bicester be amended, as shown by the dotted black line on **map 6**, so that all of area I is within Bicester, taking effect in May 2023.

### **Proposal 6 – Horley/Hanwell/Wroxton**

- 3.80 Horley Parish Council requested inclusion in the CGR, to move the boundary between Horley and Wroxton, and Horley and Hanwell, to take in some additional land to Horley parish.

- 3.81 No large scale posting out of documents took place as there are no existing properties in the affected area.
- 3.82 No responses were submitted to the second consultation.
- 3.83 As there had been no objections to the proposals during the first stage consultation, the final recommendation of the Working Group is that the boundary be amended as requested, with areas N and O moving into the parish as shown by the dotted black lines on **map 7**.
- 3.84 Horley and Wroxton Parish Councils are next due to hold elections in 2026, with Hanwell Parish Council elections due in 2024.
- 3.85 As the request for a boundary change was made by Horley Parish Council, the Working Group are seeking their views on whether the current term of office should be shortened by two years.
- 3.86 If the terms of office for existing Horley and Wroxton parish councillors are shortened, they will next elect in 2024 for a two-year term, reverting to their four yearly term from 2026.
- 3.87 When the views of Horley Parish Council are known the Working Group will discuss with the Monitoring Officer and include relevant details in the legal order.

#### **Proposal 7 – increase of Parish Council numbers at Begbroke, Chesterton and Somerton**

- 3.88 As well as amending town and parish boundaries, a CGR can alter the number of town/parish councillors.
- 3.89 Three parish councils requested an increase in numbers, due to an increased workload; Begbroke, Chesterton and Somerton.
- 3.90 One consultation response was received from Somerton Parish Council, who reiterated that an extra parish councillor would help their increased workload.
- 3.91 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that Begbroke Parish Council have an increase of one parish councillor, from six to seven, taking effect at the next scheduled election for Begbroke in 2023.
- 3.92 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that Chesterton Parish Council have an increase of two parish councillors, from seven to nine, taking effect at the next scheduled election for Chesterton in 2023.
- 3.93 The final recommendation of the Working Group is that Somerton Parish Council have an increase of one parish councillor, from five to six, taking effect at the next scheduled election for Somerton in 2023.

#### **Local Government Boundary Review for Oxfordshire**

- 3.94 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) have advised Oxfordshire County Council it will be carrying out an electoral review of the County divisions as significant variations have developed between the number of electors in each division since the last review, which was implemented in May 2013.

- 3.95 A report on the review is being considered by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) at their Council meeting on [7 October 2022](#).
- 3.96 The timetable for the review is as follows
- Phase 1 – develop Council size proposal – 13 September to 19 December  
Council size published by LGBCE – 14 February 2023
- Phase 2 – consultation on division arrangements – 21 February to 1 May 2023  
Consultation on draft recommendations – 25 July to 2 October 2023  
Final recommendations published by LGBCE – 9 January 2024
- Phase 3 – order laid before Parliament Spring 2024  
Order made by Parliament Summer 2024
- Phase 4 – implementation of new arrangements at scheduled County elections 2025
- 3.97 Cherwell District Council (CDC) involvement in the review is limited to provision of electoral roll data, as this function is carried out at District and City Council level rather than County level.
- 3.98 As with other boundary reviews, CDC will be able to submit consultation responses to LGBCE at the relevant time.
- 3.99 Council are recommended to agree that the Terms of Reference for the Working Group be extended to cover the County boundary review, and delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Working Group, so that they can consider consultation information from the LGBCE and draft a consultation response on behalf of CDC at the appropriate times.
- 3.100 The Working Group responding on behalf of CDC would not preclude individual Councillors or political groups submitting their own responses to the consultations.

### **Parliamentary Boundary Review**

- 3.101 The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) have confirmed that revised proposals for Parliamentary boundaries will be published on 8 November.
- 3.102 A consultation period will run from 8 November to 4 December 2022, and this will be the final opportunity for people to be involved in the review.
- 3.103 Council has previously delegated authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Working Group, to respond to BCE consultations on behalf of CDC.

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

- 4.1 The Working Group have considered all consultation responses and information provided from the town and parish councils.

- 4.2 The final recommendations have been discussed in detail by the Working Group, with advice from the Monitoring Officer as required and reference to the guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (as it was).
- 4.3 Final recommendations relating to the CGR approved by Council will be incorporated into the required legal order, and implemented according to the timetable detailed for each proposal in section 3 of this report.

## **5.0 Consultation**

Public consultation as detailed in section 3 above; full consultation reports are available via the [CGR page](#) of the Cherwell District Council website and the '[Let's Talk Cherwell](#)' platform.

Parliamentary Boundary and Community Governance Review Working Group.  
Recommendations as detailed in section 3 above.

## **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: Not to approve the recommendations of the Working Group. This is rejected, as the Working Group have considered all consultation responses submitted and discussed all proposals in detail.

## **7.0 Implications**

### **Financial and Resource Implications**

- 7.1 Consideration of the final recommendations brings the Community Governance Review to an end. Appropriate notifications will be sent out to existing properties affected by approved final recommendations, the cost of which can be met from existing budgets.

Comments checked by:

Michael Furness, Assistant Director of Finance (S151 Officer). Telephone 01295 221845, [michael.furness@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:michael.furness@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

### **Legal Implications**

- 7.2 The Council is empowered to undertake a Community Governance Review by section 79 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act). The review must follow sections 88, 93 and 96 of the Act.

Comments checked by:

Shahin Ismail, Interim Assistant Director Law Governance and Democratic Services (Interim)/Monitoring Officer. [Shahin.ismail@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:Shahin.ismail@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

## **Risk Implications**

- 7.3 The Community Governance Review process is an opportunity for the council to re-draw parish boundaries where the proposals are supported by electors, resulting in clarity regarding local identity and reducing the risk of elector confusion. Arising risks will be managed through the service operational risk and escalated to the leadership risk register as and when necessary.

Comments checked by:

Celia Prado-Teeling, Interim Assistant Director – Customer Focus. Telephone: 01295 221556 [Celia.Prado-Teeling@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Celia.Prado-Teeling@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)

## **Equalities and Inclusion Implications**

- 7.4 There are no equalities and inclusion implications arising directly from this report. The council will take steps to ensure that the outcome of the review reflects the identities and interests of the area(s) being reviewed and the need to ensure effective and convenient community governance, in line with the commitments stated in our equalities and inclusion framework.

Comments checked by:

Celia Prado-Teeling, Interim Assistant Director – Customer Focus. Telephone: 01295 221556 [Celia.Prado-Teeling@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Celia.Prado-Teeling@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**

All

**Links to Corporate Plan and Policy Framework**

N/A

**Lead Councillor**

N/A

**Document Information**

**Appendix number and title**

- Map 1 – Ambrosden and Blackthorn

- Map 2 – Banbury/Bodicote 1
- Map 3 – Banbury/Bodicote 2
- Map 4 – Banbury/Drayton
- Map 5 – Bicester and surrounding areas
- Map 6 - Chesterton/Bucknell/Bicester
- Map 7 - Horley/Hanwell/Wroxton proposals

**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