

COUNCIL

1 April 2015

EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF CABINET HELD 18 MARCH 2015 AND THE  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD 23 MARCH 2015

REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC SERVICES MANAGER

Contact Officer: David Blakemore Tel No: 01962 848217,  
dblakemore@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

None

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Appendix A to this report sets out extracts from the minutes from Cabinet held 18 March 2015 and The Overview and Scrutiny Committee held 23 March 2015 for the consideration of Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council considers the matters set out in the attached minute extracts.

**Minute Extract from Cabinet held 18 March 2015**

1. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND –  
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINCHESTER**  
(Report CAB2668 refers)

Councillor Godfrey highlighted that of the 16 points made in the Council's submission on the suggested approach for devising new Ward boundaries (Appendix 1 of CL101 refers), 12 had been taken on board but 4 had not been. Cabinet might wish to consider recommending to Council that the Commission review these four points.

Cabinet noted that the deadline for comments to the Commission was 6 April 2015 and the Report would be considered at The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 March prior to Council on 1 April 2015.

The Corporate Director advised that the Barton Farm Forum had expressed some concern about the proposal for Barton Farm to be parished and not included within the Town Wards.

One Member queried whether it was possible to suggest changes to proposed Ward names as he considered the proposed Wickham Ward did not reflect the historic importance of Southwick so should be renamed "Southwick and Wickham". The Chief Operating Officer confirmed it would be possible to suggest such name changes, although for consistency with other Ward names, "Wickham and Southwick" might be regarded as preferable.

In response to questions, the Chief Operating Officer confirmed that the proposals did not affect the current status of parish councils or parish precept charges. For example, although a separate parish ward had been created for Harestock, it remained within Littleton and Harestock Parish and would be subject to the Parish precept. It would not become part of the Town area, and therefore subject to the Town precept, unless further changes were made as a result of a future Community Governance Review by the City Council, which would involve community consultation.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Henry, Laming and Learney addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Henry spoke as a Ward Member for Colden Common and Twyford in opposition to the Commission proposals to divide the existing Ward. She emphasised the shared nature of the two communities, including doctors surgery, churches, local charities and youth and community groups. The current Police Team structure aligned with the existing Ward. The communities faced shared challenges in terms of lack of public transport, concern regarding traffic along the B335 and issues with airplane noise. In addition, she did not believe that Twyford shared anything currently with the

parishes it was suggested it be joined with and the proposed new Ward was too large, both in terms of geographical area and number of electors. Councillor Henry confirmed she would be making a submission directly to the Commission.

Councillor Laming stated that Badger Farm had grown out of Oliver's Battery and had a number of community links and the two parish councils wished to remain in the same City Council Ward. He did not consider there were any links between Badger Farm and Stanmore. If any change was required, it would be better to join with Hursley and Compton.

Councillor Learney expressed disappointment that the Commission had not adopted all 16 of the Council's stated preferences. She believed that the Council should reaffirm these principles and also address any other anomalies contained within the Commission's proposals. Councillor Learney highlighted that the Council had wanted Barton Farm to be within a Town Ward. She suggested that Barton Farm be warded within the current Headbourne Worthy Parish to ensure that in any future governance review it was easier to define boundaries and include it within the Town area. She also queried whether the Commission's proposed changed boundary in this area covered all of the proposed Barton Farm development.

Following discussion, Cabinet agreed to recommend to Council that the Commission reconsider the remaining four points not included within the current draft proposals (as set out in the recommendation below).

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT THE COUNCIL WELCOMES THE FACT THAT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION TOOK ACCOUNT OF 12 OF THE POINTS MADE IN THE COUNCIL'S SUBMISSION ON THE SUGGESTED APPROACH FOR DEVISING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES (APPENDIX 1 OF CL101 REFERS).**

**2. THAT THE COMMISSION BE ASKED TO RECONSIDER THE REMAINING POINTS THAT HAD BEEN MADE BY THE COUNCIL AND WHICH ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT DRAFT PROPOSALS:**

- A) THE BARTON FARM DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE PART OF THE "TOWN WARDS";**
- B) EITHER DURLEY OR UPHAM PARISHES (NOT BOTH) SHOULD BE JOINED WITH BISHOPS WALTHAM TO MAKE A NEW SINGLE WARD;**
- C) THE PARISHES OF BISHOPS SUTTON, TICHBORNE, OLD ALRESFORD, BIGHTON AND ITCHEN STOKE ALL LOOK TOWARDS NEW ALRESFORD AS THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY**

**HUB, SO SHOULD ALL BE PLACED IN THE SAME WARD, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE (THE CURRENT DRAFT PROPOSALS EXCLUDE TICHBORNE FROM THE PROPOSED ALRESFORD & ITCHEN VALLEY WARD).**

**D) COLDEN COMMON AND TWYFORD PARISHES SHARE MANY COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS, SO SHOULD REMAIN IN THE SAME WARD.**

### **Minute Extract from The Overview and Scrutiny Committee held 23 March 2015**

#### **2. LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND – DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB2668 refers)

The Committee noted that the report had been considered by Cabinet at its meeting held 18 March 2015. Members noted that Cabinet had made recommendations to full Council on further representations to be made to the Commission.

Councillor Godfrey introduced the Report and outlined that of the 16 points made in the Council's submission to the Commission on the suggested approach for devising new Ward boundaries (Appendix 1 of CL101 refers), 12 had been taken on board but four had not been. He highlighted each of these four points. It was suggested that The Overview and Scrutiny Committee might wish to consider recommending to Council that the Commission review each of these together with any further matters that it may wish the Council to raise.

The Committee noted that the deadline for comments to be submitted to the Commission was 6 April 2015 following the meeting of the Council on 1 April 2015.

Members expressed concerns regarding the size and scale of the proposed geographical areas of the new Ward boundaries, resulting in some particular Wards encompassing up to 17 parishes over a broader area, including large areas of open countryside. One Member felt that the ability of Ward Members to serve their residents, particularly in larger Wards, could be compromised.

The Committee raised further concern in relation to the splitting of communities where connections have been built and strengthened over many years and the amalgamation of different parishes combined to form the proposed new Wards. Members were of the opinion that smaller communities, such as those within the Winnall and Highcliffe area would not be heard amongst others contained within the Ward area.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT THE VARIETY OF COMMENTS MADE BY MEMBERS  
BE NOTED, BUT NO SPECIFIC COMMENTS FROM THE  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSAL BE  
MADE TO COUNCIL.**

-----