

Agenda



Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Matthew Gaskin, Electoral Services Officer

Tel: 01235 422532

E-mail: matthew.gaskin@southoxon.gov.uk

Date: 12 October 2017

Website: www.southoxon.gov.uk

A MEETING OF THE

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee

WILL BE HELD ON MONDAY 30 OCTOBER 2017 AT 6.30 PM

MEETING ROOM 1, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK, MILTON,
ABINGDON, OXFORDSHIRE, OX14 4SB

Members of the Committee:

Ian White (Chairman)

Charles Bailey
Steve Connel

Anthony Dearlove
Will Hall

Mocky Khan

Substitutes

Anna Badcock
Joan Bland

Stefan Gawrysiak
Toby Newman

David Turner
John Walsh

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

1 Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence and the attendance of substitute members.

2 Minutes (Pages 3 - 4)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2017 - **attached**

3 Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

4 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

To receive notification of any matters which the chairman determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent, and to receive any announcements from the chairman.

5 Public participation

To receive any questions or statements from members of the public that have registered to speak.

6 Community Governance Reviews - suggested timetable and process (Pages 5 - 7)

To consider the report of the head of legal and democratic services on a suggested timetable and process for community governance reviews - **attached**

7 Community Governance Review - review of the size of Sonning Common Parish Council (Pages 9 - 15)

To consider the report on the review of the size of Sonning Common Parish Council - **attached**

8 Community Governance Review - review of the parish boundary between Harpsden and Henley-on-Thames (Pages 17 - 21)

To consider the report on a review of the boundary between Harpsden parish and Henley-on-Thames parish – **attached**

MARGARET REED

Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee

HELD AT 6.30 PM ON MONDAY 10 JULY 2017

MEETING ROOM 1, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK

Present

Ian White (Chairman), Charles Bailey, Anthony Dearlove, Will Hall and David Turner.

Officers

Steven Corrigan and Matthew Gaskin.

27 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Steve Connel. No substitute was appointed.

28 Declarations of interest

None.

29 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2017 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman signs them as such.

30 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chairman gave an announcement regarding a briefing on the management of elections which will come before this committee at the meeting on 30 October 2017. Officers will carry out a review in to lessons learnt from recent elections and any risks that can be identified and mitigated for forthcoming elections.

The officer confirmed that fees and charges relating to elections, such as fees for town and parish elections that are invoiced to the relevant town or parish council, is the responsibility of Council and not this committee. However, it might be possible for the committee to provide a view on a future review of the scale of fees and charges to Council.

31 Public participation

No members of the public had registered to speak.

32 Community Governance Review - review of the size of Cholsey Parish Council

The committee considered the report of the head of legal and democratic services on whether to agree to retain the number of parish councillors at 13 for Cholsey Parish Council.

The committee agreed at its meeting on 6 March 2017 to authorise the head of legal and democratic services to undertake a second stage consultation proposing no change to the current number of parish councillors for Cholsey Parish Council at 13. The parish council had previously requested a reduction from 13 to 12 parish councillors leading to a community governance review and initial consultation but no longer supported this change.

No responses to the second stage consultation were received.

The committee considered and supported the officer's recommendation to retain the number of parish councillors for Cholsey Parish Council at 13.

RESOLVED: to agree to retain the number of parish councillors at 13 for Cholsey Parish Council.

33 Community Governance Review - review of the size of Kidmore End Parish Council

The committee considered the report of the head of legal and democratic services on whether to agree to undertake a second stage consultation proposing a reduction in the number of parish councillors for Kidmore End Parish Council from 12 to 10.

The committee had agreed at its meeting on 6 March 2017 to undertake a community governance review of Kidmore End Parish Council. The parish council had requested a reduction from 12 to 10 due to the reduced electorate size and the infrequency of a full surplus of parish councillors. One response, which was circulated at the meeting, was received at the initial consultation stage. This was from Kidmore End Parish Council confirming their commitment to wanting a reduction in the number of parish councillors.

The committee considered and supported the officer's recommendation that a second stage consultation be carried out proposing a reduction in the number of parish councillors for Kidmore End Parish Council from 12 to 10.

RESOLVED: to

1. agree to undertake a second stage consultation proposing a reduction in the number of parish councillors for Kidmore End Parish Council from 12 to 10.
2. authorise the head of legal and democratic services to undertake the consultation.

The meeting closed at 6:41 pm.

Chairman

Date

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee



Report of head of legal and democratic services

Author: Steven Corrigan, Democratic Services Manager

Telephone: 01235 422526

E-mail: steven.corrigan@southandvale.gov.uk

To: Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee

DATE: 23 October 2017

Community Governance Reviews – suggested timetable and process

Recommendations

1. To agree that the council undertakes a community governance review every four years with changes agreed for implementation at the next scheduled parish elections;
2. Recommends that Council rescinds its previous decision that a significant development proposal that sits adjacent to or straddles a parish boundary should automatically trigger a community governance review, such a review to take place on the inclusion of a site in a document that forms part of the approved Local Plan or when planning permission has been granted for the development of the site.

Purpose of report

1. To invite the committee to consider a process for future community governance reviews and to recommend Council to rescind its resolution agreed at its meeting on 17 July 2014.

Background

2. Local authorities (in the case of two-tier areas, district councils) have had powers to review parish arrangements for many years. Until 2007, any proposals for change resulting from such reviews had to go to the relevant secretary of state for approval. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act) changed that and gave full powers to local authorities to implement proposals without reference to central government. The Act created the title of community governance reviews (CGR) to cover such activity.

3. There is no duty on the council to carry out a CGR unless it is petitioned to do so. Rather, it is a permissive power. The guidance offers the following pieces of advice on what might trigger a CGR:

it can be helpful to undertake community governance reviews in circumstances such as where there have been changes in population, or in reaction to specific or local new issues

over time communities may expand with new housing developments. This can often lead to existing parish boundaries becoming anomalous as new houses are built across the boundaries resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours. In such circumstances, the council should consider undertaking a community governance review

councils should exercise their discretion, but it would be good practice to consider conducting a review every 10-15 years

4. South Oxfordshire District Council undertook a comprehensive review of the whole district in 2013/14 with final decisions agreed at the Council meeting in July 2014. This committee is currently undertaking and considering undertaking further reviews at this meeting.
5. At its meeting in July 2014 Council agreed the following resolution:
 - that a significant development proposal that sits adjacent to or straddles a parish boundary should automatically trigger a community governance review, such a review to take place on the inclusion of a site in a document that forms part of the approved Local Plan or when planning permission has been granted for the development of the site

Current reviews/potential workload

6. The committee is currently undertaking a review of Kidmore End Parish Council and will consider requests for two further reviews at this meeting.
7. The motion agreed by Council in July 2014 provides that the council must undertake a review in certain circumstances. With the number of neighbourhood plans going forward for referendum and increased development there is currently insufficient resource to comply with this piecemeal and unplanned approach to reviews. Officers propose that the committee recommends that Council rescinds this resolution to provide for a more structured approach as set out in paragraph nine of this report.
8. In addition, there is now an expectation from parish councils that a request for a review of governance arrangements will be taken forward although there is no requirement for the council to do so. A schedule for a review would address this.

Proposal for the arrangement of future reviews

9. As set out in paragraph three there is no duty to undertake a community governance review unless the council is petitioned to do so. Guidance suggests councils should exercise their discretion but good practice is to consider conducting a review every 10-15 years. This council undertook a comprehensive review in 2013/14 but is still engaged in a number of reviews and receives enquires for further reviews.

10. Officers propose that the council undertakes a district wide review every four years commencing after the scheduled parish council elections with any agreed changes implemented for the next scheduled elections. This would ensure the reviews are sufficiently resourced, avoid the inefficiencies of carrying out small scale reviews in a piecemeal fashion of two or three areas, allow the council to address circumstances such as where there have been changes in population or in response to specific or local issues at regular intervals (well within the LGBCE guidance of every 10-15 years), offer parish councils the opportunity to proactively consider areas for review, ensure parish councils are aware of proposals from neighbouring parishes at an early stage in the process and allow this council to look at the whole district as part of the review.
11. This approach would not preclude the council from undertaking a review if circumstances required – for example in response to a unitary council proposal, to ensure the provision of effective and convenient local government in circumstances where the current parish council arrangements have failed or to address a minor parish boundary anomaly.

Financial Implications

12. There are no financial implications directly arising from this report.

Legal Implications

13. The legal implications are set out in the body of this report.

Risks and Options

14. None associated with this report.

Conclusion

15. The council is currently undertaking a number of community governance reviews, has a policy which triggers automatic reviews and encourages applications for small piecemeal reviews. Officers propose that the council agrees to undertake a district wide review every four years as a more structured and efficient approach which is well within the good practice guidance and will ensure community governance arrangements are kept under regular review. To facilitate this approach the committee is invited to recommend Council to rescind the resolution agreed in July 2014.

Background papers

Report to Council on 17 July 2014

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee



Report of Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Author: Steven Corrigan

Telephone: 01235 422526

Textphone: 18001 01235 422526

E-mail: steven.corrigan@southandvale.gov.uk

To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE AND ELECTORAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

DATE: 30 October 2017



Community Governance Review – request to review the size of Sonning Common Parish Council

Recommendation: not to undertake a review of parish councillor numbers for Sonning Common Parish Council.

Purpose of Report

1. To invite the committee to consider a request from Sonning Common Parish Council to increase the size of the parish from 12 councillors to 14.

Strategic Objectives

2. Community governance reviews contribute to the council's strategic objective of building thriving communities.

Background

3. Sonning Common Parish Council has requested an increase in the number of parish councillors from 12 to 14 for the reasons set out in the letter dated 15 June 2017 attached.

Size of parish councils

4. When considering the number of councillors to be elected for a parish the council must have regard to the number of local government electors for the parish and any change to that number that is likely to occur within five years. The number of registered electors for the parish of Sonning Common is currently 3,005.

5. Joint guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in 2010 provides further information on community governance reviews and the factors influencing size and membership of parish councils. On size, the guidance says:

“154. In practice, there is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. That variation appears to be influenced by population. Research by the Aston Business School Parish and Town Councils in England (HMSO, 1992), found that the typical parish council representing less than 500 people had between five and eight councillors; those between 501 and 2,500 had six to 12 councillors; and those between 2,501 and 10,000 had nine to 16 councillors. Most parish councils with a population of between 10,001 and 20,000 had between 13 and 27 councillors, while almost all councils representing a population of over 20,000 had between 13 and 31 councillors.

155. The LGBCE has no reason to believe that this pattern of council size to population has altered significantly since the research was conducted. Although not an exact match, it broadly reflects the council size range set out in the National Association of Local Councils Circular 1126; the Circular suggested that the minimum number of councillors for any parish should be seven and the maximum 25.

156. In considering the issue of council size, the LGBCE is of the view that each area should be considered on its own merits, having regard to its population, geography and the pattern of communities. Nevertheless, having regard to the current powers of parish councils, it should consider the broad pattern of existing council sizes. This pattern appears to have stood the test of time and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have provided for effective and convenient local government.

157. Principal councils should also bear in mind that the conduct of parish council business does not usually require a large body of councillors. In addition, historically many parish councils, particularly smaller ones, have found difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to stand for election. This has led to uncontested elections and/or a need to co-opt members in order to fill vacancies. However, a parish council’s budget and planned or actual level of service provision may also be important factors in reaching conclusions on council size.”

6. The National Association of Local Councils Circular 1126 recommends:

Electors	Councillors	Electors	Councillors
Up to 900	7	10,400	17
1,400	8	11,900	18
2,000	9	13,500	19
2,700	10	15,200	20
3,500	11	17,000	21
4,400	12	18,900	22
5,400	13	20,900	23
6,500	14	23,000	24
7,700	15	45,000	25
9,000	16		

Consideration of request

7. The table in paragraph six suggests a parish council size of no more than 11 parish councillors for a parish the size of Sonning Common – it currently has 12. The guidance suggests that a council size of 14 is appropriate for a parish council with an electorate of 6,500 – well above the electorate of Sonning Common which is not predicted to increase to this level within five years.
8. At the 2011 elections 14 candidates stood for election and in 2015 the parish council elections were uncontested. The parish council states that there is interest from a number of residents wishing to become parish councillors but this is no guarantee of future interest. As stated in the parish council letter as recently as 2003 the parish council requested a reduction in size due to problems attracting sufficient candidates for election. A surplus of candidates at an election reflects a healthy democracy and provides the electorate with a choice at the ballot box. In respect of co-option the parish council should have a process to assess candidates if there is more interest than vacancies.
9. The parish council provides evidence to show that it is active. Whilst this may be the case this council has applied the NALC guidance when considering requests to increase councillor numbers unless there are exceptional circumstances. Until a review is undertaken of this approach officers continue to have regard to this.
10. In addition, as part of the 2013/14 review, the council considered a request to increase the parish councillor numbers to 15 (CGR 23). Council agreed to make no change at that time.

Financial Implications

11. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, local authorities have responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews. The process is prescribed and involves officer time and other associated costs, such as postage and printing. These costs can be met from within existing budgets.

Legal Implications

12. The Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee has delegated authority to deal with all matters relating to parish community governance reviews.

Risks

13. There is a risk that someone could challenge the decision of the committee. Officers have considered the request from Sonning Common in accordance with the joint guidance on community governance reviews published by the Communities and Local Government Department and LGBCE in 2010 and applied the NALC guidance to determine whether or not to recommend support for the request to undertake a review of the size of the parish council.

Conclusion

14. Sonning Common Parish Council has requested a community governance review of the size of the parish council. The council has consistently applied the NALC guidance in determining whether or not to increase councillor numbers unless there are exceptional circumstances. This suggests that a council size of 12 is more than appropriate for a parish council with an electorate of 3005. Officers therefore recommend that a community governance review is not undertaken.

Background Papers

- None

**SONNING COMMON PARISH COUNCIL
SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE**

Parish Office

VILLAGE HALL, WOOD LANE
SONNING COMMON, OXON, RG4 9SL

Parish Clerk – Philip Collings

Tel 0118 972 3616

Email clerk@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee
South Oxfordshire District Council
Milton OX14 4SB

15 June 2017

Dear Sirs

Request to increase the number of Sonning Common Parish Councillors from 12 to 14.

Background: The Council had 15 members until 2003 when, being almost moribund, a reduction to 12 was agreed. In 2011 the council was revived and began to become the active force that it is now. In June 2013 we applied for an increase as part of our input to the wide ranging Community Governance Review. We were advised in January 2014 that our application had actually been overlooked and it was then dismissed in the CGR23 conclusions with a reference to 1988 NALC guidelines and without any apparent examination of the four very compelling reasons that we had put forward – Appendix A.

Current situation: We had a fully elected council of 12 members in 2011 after a contested election with 14 candidates. In 2015 the 12 stood again and were returned unopposed. There are currently 11 members in post and we have three local residents wishing to be co-opted for the single vacancy. The Council has had the General Power of Competence since November 2013 which has enabled it to tackle many new opportunities.

Workload: The workload of the council has grown immensely since 2011 such that we now have four formal committees plus four, soon to be five active working parties and we are also represented on 10 external bodies. All these responsibilities are listed overleaf and give an outline of the level of unremunerated work in hand. A new Woodlands Management Working Party about to be set up will require at least two councillors as members whilst the work to revise and update our Neighbourhood Plan will again take a significant toll on several members.

Constraints: The NALC guidance is almost thirty years old and not relevant to the present position wherein more and more services and activities are either being formally devolved to parish councils or just being quietly abandoned by higher authorities. This is leaving the parishes either to make their own arrangements to meet local needs or to accept lower standards. Sonning Common Parish Council is firmly in the former category.

Village expansion: Sites allocated under our Neighbourhood Plan plus those arising from the 2033 revision and other infill developments will add some 400 homes to the village; these new residents will all be expecting us to serve them as well as we do those here now.

Conclusion: Our request is to be allowed to increase the number of our councillors to 14 in total to help to continue with our work to provide our own residents and those in the surrounding small villages with an attractive, vibrant and a well managed large village.

Yours faithfully,

For and on behalf of Sonning Common Parish Council



Philip Collings
Parish Clerk

Sonning Common Parish Council Committees and Working Parties

Finance Committee now: John Stoves (Chair); Chrissie Phillips-Tilbury; Dirk Jones; Barrie Greenwood; Douglas Kedge; Carole Lewis.

Planning Committee now: Stan Rust (chair); Tom Fort; ; Douglas Kedge; Carole Lewis; Chrissie Phillips-Tilbury; Leigh Rawlins; John Stoves (non-voting ex officio as Vice Chair)

Trees Committee: Stan Rust (Chair); Tom Fort; Dirk Jones; Douglas Kedge.

Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party (NDPWP) now: Barrie Greenwood; Leigh Rawlins; Tom Fort; Stuart Howe plus co-opted members.

Memorial Hall Field Working Party (MHFWP): Leigh Rawlins; Vacancy; Chaired by Diana Pearman with several active co-opted members. Parish Clerk and Deputy both attend as members.

Village Centre Working Party (VCWP): Stuart Howe (Chair); Jane Diwell; Tom Fort; Chrissie Phillips-Tilbury; Leigh Rawlins; Stan Rust. Parish Clerk and Deputy both attend as members. Co-options will take place soon.

Recreation Working Party (Skate Park): Carole Lewis; Dirk Jones; Douglas Kedge; Chrissie Phillips-Tilbury.

Widmore Pond Committee: Jane Diwell; Tom Fort

Footpaths Working Party: John Stoves; Stan Rust.

External Bodies: Council is represented by custom or by requirement on the following external bodies.

Allotments Committee: John Stoves.

Village Hall Management Committee: Barrie Greenwood.

Sonning Common Magazine Committee: Tom Fort

Club SC: Dirk Jones.

Sonning and District Welfare and Educational Trust: Jane Diwell.

Chiltern Edge Community Association: Chrissie Phillips-Tilbury

Poor's Land Trust: Leigh Rawlins; Bernard Winnington.

On Your Bike (Health Centre) Committee: Tom Fort

Police Neighbourhood Action Group: Douglas Kedge

Scouts/Guides Hut Management Committee: Tom Fort

Other activities that members are actively involved with include the Village Gardeners; FISH volunteers; Nottakwire; Horticultural Society and many others.

Appendix A - Notes from the previous application.

Rationale for an increase as put forward to the 2013 Community Governance Review:

(Note that this is as submitted and has not been updated)

- a) Sonning Common is a key district centre as is indicated by the 8,400 patients registered at its Health Centre. Collectively the population of 'Greater Sonning Common' (including Rotherfield Peppard and Kidmore End) was 6,735 at the March 2011 Census. Sonning Common is unusual in having such populous other settlements so close to and dependent on it. We are actually servicing needs arising from well beyond our actual boundary.
- b) The parish of Sonning Common had 1,595 dwellings in March 2011 but as SODC Planning has determined we are actually a "larger village" settlement that has 1,916 dwellings (including 321 from Rotherfield Peppard) for the purposes of allocating new homes under the Core Strategy.
- c) The number of parish councillors has no bearing on any costs as they are all volunteers and in many cases retired. As we are currently inhibited from doing things we want to do because of a shortage of members then surely it should be up to SCPC to decide how many councillors it actually needs. The public are being denied the opportunity to participate in local democracy and get things done.
- d) We are faced with the likely retirement of some experienced and very hard working members in 2015. With more members we may be able to spread the workload more evenly to help new members to gain experience by gentle rather than total immersion.

Letter 20 May 2014 from SCPC to SODC:

Re: CGR23: To increase the number of councillors from 12 to 15

In our initial submission in June 2013 we gave a short rationale and merely asked that we be considered for an upward revision without specifying a number.

We were advised on 14 January 2014 that our request had been overlooked and that *'I note that the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) guidance on councillor numbers suggests that 12 councillors is the appropriate number for an electorate of 4,400. If the working group is going to recommend an increase it will need to have compelling reasons to move so far outside of the NALC guidelines.'*

We responded to this on 21 January with a full rationale that was reproduced under CGR23. In recommending refusal of an increase the working group report states that: *'The working group notes that the parish council's request appears to be based on an assumption that this council will support its proposal to extend its boundary.'* That takes but one of four equally important criteria and ignores the rest – is cherry picking criteria really the hallmark of this whole exercise?

We are very certain that an increase is justifiable on any one of the four criteria and remind you that our original request was for an upward revision; we would certainly like to end up with an odd number above 12. Please reconsider.

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee



Report of Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Author: Steven Corrigan

Telephone: 01235 422526

Textphone: 18001 01235 422526

E-mail: steven.corrigan@southandvale.gov.uk

To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE AND ELECTORAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

DATE: 30 October 2017



Community Governance Review – request to review the boundary between Harpsden parish and Henley-on-Thames parish

Recommendation:

1. To agree to undertake a community governance review of the parish boundary between Harpsden parish and Henley-on-Thames parish south of Greys Road (Highlands Farm).
2. To authorise the head of legal and democratic services to draft and publish the terms of reference for the review.

Purpose of Report

1. To invite the committee to consider a request from Henley-on-Thames Town Council to review the boundary between Harpsden parish and Henley-on-Thames parish to transfer land south of Greys Road (Highlands Farm) currently in Harpsden parish to Henley parish.

Strategic Objectives

2. Community governance reviews contribute to the council's strategic objective of building thriving communities.

Background

3. Henley-on-Thames Town Council has requested a review of the parish boundary between Harpsden parish and Henley-on-Thames parish for the reasons set out in the letter dated 15 August attached.

Consideration of request

4. As part of the district wide community governance review undertaken in 2013/14 Henley-on-Thames Town Council proposed moving land south of Greys Road into Henley parish. The town council argued that the land is largely made up of Highlands Farm, a potential development site for housing at the time, and that any future housing development was better included within the town boundary rather than Harpsden parish. As that review finished before decisions were made about housing allocations Council agreed to make no change because the case largely rested on whether the land was designated for housing. Without a designation for housing there was little case for change as its rural nature fitted much better with Harpsden parish than Henley. Council did make a general recommendation about how to deal with future housing sites that straddle or abut parish boundaries as set out in paragraph 5 below.
5. At its meeting in July 2014 Council agreed the following resolution:
 - that a significant development proposal that sits adjacent to or straddles a parish boundary should automatically trigger a community governance review, such a review to take place on the inclusion of a site in a document that forms part of the approved Local Plan or when planning permission has been granted for the development of the site.
6. Highlands Farm is allocated in the made Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan, which forms part of the approved Local Plan, for residential led mixed use development for around 170 dwellings. Outline planning permission was granted in December 2016 and reserved matters granted in May 2017. Development has started on site and most of the development should be complete by Spring 2019. Therefore, in accordance with the resolution of Council, a review must be undertaken.

Terms of reference

7. The first stage of a review is the drawing up of terms of reference. In effect, this document becomes the council's policies for the conduct of the review. It should provide background information to help electors and other interested organisations to make informed submissions and should also refer to the legislative framework against which the review must operate. Publication of the terms of reference commences the review, which the council then has twelve months to complete.
8. The committee is requested to authorise the head of legal and democratic services to draft and publish the terms of reference for this review to be completed in 2018. This will allow for the implementation of any changes in May 2019.

Financial Implications

9. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, local authorities have responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews. The process is prescribed and involves officer time and other associated costs, such as postage and printing. These costs will be met from within existing budgets.

Legal Implications

10. The Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee has delegated authority to deal with all matters relating to parish community governance reviews.
11. All community governance reviews will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements laid down in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the joint guidance on community governance reviews published by the Communities and Local Government Department and LGBCE in 2010.
12. The council will implement any changes by making a reorganisation of community governance order. Where the changes impact on arrangements put in place by the LGBCE's reviews of the electoral arrangements for Oxfordshire County Council and South Oxfordshire District Council, the council will need the LGBCE's consent before making an order and request related alteration orders are made to county division and district ward boundaries to ensure these are coterminous with any change to the parish boundary.

Risks

13. There is a risk that someone could challenge the outcome of a particular review item through judicial review. Council officers will mitigate against this by ensuring that at all times the council follows the requirements laid down in the 2007 Act and guidance.

Conclusion

14. Henley-on-Thames Town Council has requested a review of the parish boundary in relation to Highlands Farm situated off Greys Road and currently in the parish of Harpsden. In accordance with the Council resolution set out in paragraph five of this report the committee is invited to agree to this request and authorise the head of legal and democratic services to draft and publish the terms of reference for this review.

Background Papers

- None

This page is intentionally left blank



HENLEY-ON-THAMES
TOWN COUNCIL

Town Hall **Agenda Item 8**

Market Place
Henley-on-Thames
Oxfordshire
RG9 2AQ

Tel 01491 576982

enquiries@henleytowncouncil.gov.uk
www.henleytowncouncil.gov.uk

15 August 2017

Margaret Reed
South Oxfordshire District Council
135 Eastern Avenue
Milton Park
Milton
OX14 4SB

Re: Parish Boundary Review

Dear Margaret,

Following previous communication with David Buckle and Steven Corrigan, Henley Town Council wishes to request a review of the Parish Boundary in relation to Highlands Farm, situated off the Greys Road and currently in the parish of Harpsden.

As you will be aware, the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in April 2016. The Plan includes the site at Highlands Farm, identified for around 170 dwellings. An outline planning application for the site, P16/S0077/O, was also approved in December 2016.

In line with the recommendation from the SODC Community Governance Review from July 2014 'to agree that a significant development proposal that sits adjacent to or straddles a parish boundary should automatically trigger a community governance review, such a review to take place on the inclusion of a site in a document that forms part of the approved Local Plan or when planning permission has been granted for the development of the site', Henley Town Council would like to request a review.

I appreciate that it is unlikely that the outcome of the review would be implemented before the next scheduled elections in May 2019.

Please could you confirm whether SODC are now able to start the Review and when we can expect to see the result.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Janet Wheeler
Town Clerk



Page 21

This page is intentionally left blank