

Agenda



Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Steven Corrigan, Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 07717 274704

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

Date: 14 November 2022

A MEETING OF THE

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee

WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2022 AT 6.30 PM

MEETING ROOM 1, ABBEY HOUSE, ABBEY CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 3JE

Members of the Committee:

Lynn Lloyd (Chair)

Ken Arlett

David Bartholomew

Maggie Filipova-Rivers

Mocky Khan

David Turner

Substitutes

Anna Badcock

Pieter-Paul Barker

Sue Cooper

Stefan Gawrysiak

Lorraine Hillier

Kellie Hinton

George Levy

Axel Macdonald

Ian Snowdon

Celia Wilson

You can watch this meeting via the council's YouTube channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/c/SouthandValeCommitteeMeetings>

An application to speak must be made in writing or by email to democratic services democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk by 5.00 pm on Monday 28 November 2022.

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 receive any apologies for absence and details of the attendance of any substitutes.

2 Minutes (Pages 4 - 8)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2022.

3 Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest and any other conflicts of interest in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

4 Urgent business and chair's announcements

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

5 Public participation

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

6 Community Governance Review - Didcot (Pages 9 - 18)

At its meeting held on 10 October 2022, the committee did not reach a decision on this community governance review matter – see minute 25/10/2022.

The committee is invited to make a final decision in respect of CGR_G.

7 The timing of future community governance reviews

At its meeting on 10 October 2022 the committee, following an exchange of views, agreed to defer consideration of this item until a future meeting when more members of the committee would be in attendance – see minute 26/10/2022.

The [Local Government and Public Involvement and Health Act 2007](#) provides for principal councils to conduct a community governance review (CGR) at any time.

The relevant [guidance](#), issued by the Local Government Boundary Commission for

England and the Department for Communities and Local Government, suggests that principal councils will want to keep their community governance arrangements under review. The guidance goes on to offer the following 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 new local issues
- communities may expand with new housing developments over time. 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 is good practice to consider conducting a review every 10-15 years

There is also provision for a community governance review to be triggered by a petition for the whole or part of the council's area, but this is subject to rules around previous CGR's carried out by the principal council.

In 2017 this committee agreed to undertake a community governance review every four years after the scheduled parish council elections, with any agreed changes implemented in time for the next scheduled elections.

Officers experience since 2017 has been that undertaking reviews every four years is a very resource intensive for the elections team and other service teams which support the reviews. Furthermore, undertaking a review every four years, generally invites parish councils to consider and submit speculative requests often on a repeat basis. A number of the matters considered generate little interest from the public.

The guidance states that principal councils should consider the benefits of undertaking a review of the whole of its area in one go, rather than carrying out small scale reviews in a piecemeal fashion of smaller areas, recognising that occasionally specific reviews, for example to adjust minor parish boundary anomalies, may be appropriate. Committing to undertake a review every four years is contrary to the above guidance, is unnecessary, and as can be seen from the most recent review, causes tension between parish councils.

Officers firmly recommend that the council relies on the statutory guidance provided on the timing of a community governance review, including the provision for a district wide review every 10-15 years. The committee will know that it is perfectly acceptable and possible for specific reviews to be carried out to address anomalies.

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee authorises the democratic services manager to carry out future reviews at timescales provided for in the government guidance in consultation with the chair of the committee.

Patrick Arran
Head of Legal and Democratic

Minutes



Listening Learning Leading

OF A MEETING OF THE

Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee

HELD AT 6.30 PM ON MONDAY 10 OCTOBER 2022

MEETING ROOM 1, ABBEY HOUSE, ABBEY CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 3JE

Present in the meeting room

Councillors: Lynn Lloyd (Chair), Sue Cooper (as substitute for David Turner) and Mocky Khan

Officers: Susan Baker (Electoral Services Team Leader), Steven Corrigan (Democratic Services Manager) and Chris McMullin (Electoral Services Officer)

Remote attendance:

Councillors: David Bartholomew and Ken Arlett (not permitted to vote)

Officers: Jordan Kennedy (Electoral Services Officer) and Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer)

14 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Turner (with Councillor Cooper attending as substitute) and Councillor Filipova-Rivers.

15 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2022 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign them as such.

16 Declarations of interest

Councillor Mocky Khan declared an interest in agenda item 12 – Community Governance Review – Didcot, as a Didcot Town Councillor (see minute 25).

17 Urgent business and chair's announcements

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. There was no urgent business.

18 Public participation

Councillor Suter, Chairman of Great Haseley Parish Council, made a statement to the committee, which is set out under minute 23, Thame and Great Haseley.

Councillor Havel made a statement to the committee, which is set out under minute 25, Didcot.

19 Community Governance Review - final recommendations

The committee considered the head of legal and democratic's report on six community governance reviews. The committee had agreed to undertake the reviews at its meeting in February 2022 and agreed terms of reference on matters submitted by parish councils. In May, the committee had agreed draft proposals for consultation and agreed revised terms of reference to provide for a longer consultation period and time to analyse the responses.

Consultation had been carried out on proposals in each of the reviews. A schedule setting out the detail on each review was attached as a separate agenda item, along with the consultation results, an officer recommendation, and the justification for that recommendation. The committee was invited to agree the final recommendations for implementation. The minutes for each review are shown below.

The committee noted that after it had taken its final decisions on each community governance review, work would commence to make the necessary order to bring the changes into effect in time for the 2023 parish council elections. This included making applications to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to make related alteration orders to make district wards and county divisions coterminous with such changes. In July 2022, Council had authorised the head of legal and democratic, in consultation with the chair of this committee, to submit any such applications to the boundary commission.

RESOLVED: to

1. agree final recommendations in relation to each item below in minutes 20 to 25; and
2. authorise the head of legal and democratic to make a reorganisation of community governance order to implement the changes agreed.

20 Community Governance Review - Cuddesdon and Denton

The committee considered the community governance review CGR-A on a proposal to create a single ward covering Cuddesdon and Denton Parish Council.

The committee considered that Cuddesdon and Denton was an integrated community and that the warding arrangements, introduced when Cuddesdon Parish Council and Denton Parish Meeting became a single parish council, were not required to address separate community identities or to achieve effective and convenient representation.

RESOLVED: to remove the current warding arrangements for Cuddesdon and Denton Parish Council.

21 Community Governance Review - Henley-on-Thames and Bix and Assendon

The committee considered the community governance review CGR-B on a proposal to transfer Swiss Farm Touring and Camping site from Bix and Assendon parish to Henley-on-Thames parish.

The democratic services manager advised the committee that, since the publication of the agenda, Bix and Assendon Parish Council had confirmed that it had no objection to the proposed boundary change.

The committee noted that no objections had been received to the proposal from affected residents with three expressing support, no objection from Bix and Assendon Parish Council and support from Henley-on-Thames Town Council for the proposal.

The committee agreed the proposal because it would serve the identities and interests of the residents and provide effective and convenient representation at local government level.

RESOLVED: to transfer Swiss Farm Touring and Camping site from Bix and Assendon parish to Henley-on-Thames parish within the Henley-on-Thames North Ward.

22 Community Governance Review - Sonning Common

The committee considered the community governance review CGR-C on a request to increase the size of Sonning Common Parish Council from 12 to 15.

The committee noted that the number of parish councillors on Sonning Common Parish Council exceeded the number considered appropriate in the National Association of Local Council (NALC) guidance. The committee had seen no evidence to support an increase in the current size of the parish council.

RESOLVED: to make no change to the number of parish councillors for Sonning Common Parish council.

23 Community Governance Review - Thame and Great Haseley

Councillor Tim Sutter, Chairman of Great Haseley Parish Council, made a statement reiterating Great Haseley Parish Council's objection to any change to the parish boundary.

The committee considered the community governance review CGR-D, on a proposal to amend the parish boundary to include land currently within Great Haseley parish within Thame parish.

The committee agreed to make no change to the parish boundary because such a change would not address issues of the identity and interests of the local community or the effective and convenient representation of local residents.

RESOLVED: to make no change to the parish boundary between Thame parish and Great Haseley parish.

24 Community Governance Review - Thame

The committee considered the community governance review CGR-E on a proposal to revise the town council ward boundaries for the purposes of parish council elections.

The committee agreed the proposed change to the town council ward boundaries to provide for a better electoral balance between the wards in the interest of achieving effective and convenient local government representation and to provide for a more logical division of the parish.

RESOLVED: to amend the town council ward boundaries as set out in the map attached to the report schedule of the head of legal and democratic to the Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee held on 10 October 2022.

25 Community Governance Review - Didcot

Councillor Mocky Khan declared an interest in this item as a Didcot Town Councillor, and as such did not take part in the decision-making on this item.

Councillor Victoria Haval addressed the committee in her capacity as a town councillor for the Ladygrove town ward. She opposed the revised proposal which would reduce the number of town councillors for Ladygrove ward from seven to six councillors at a time when development is increasing within the ward and would result in an imbalance in electoral representation in the future.

With only two members of the committee entitled to vote on this item, and with no agreement on a proposal, the committee agreed to defer this item to a future meeting of the committee.

26 The timing of future community governance

Officers presented a proposal to amend the requirement to carry out community governance reviews every four years. In 2017 the committee had agreed to undertake a community governance review every four years after the scheduled parish council elections, with any agreed changes implemented in time for the next scheduled elections. However, this had proved resource intensive. It also invited parish councils to consider and submit speculative requests, often on a repeat basis.

Legislation enables community governance reviews to be conducted at any time. Guidance issued by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and the Department for Communities and Local Government suggested that reviews could be triggered by:

- changes in population, or in reaction to specific or new local issues
- new housing developments expanding communities over time
- councils exercising their discretion, but conducting a review every 10 to 15 years
- a petition for the whole or part of the council's area, subject to rules around previous reviews carried out by the principal council

The guidance suggested that councils should consider undertaking a community governance review of its whole area in one go, rather than carrying out small scale reviews in a piecemeal fashion of smaller areas. However, specific reviews could be undertaken at any time, for example to adjust minor parish boundary anomalies.

Following an exchange of views, the committee agreed to defer consideration of this item until a future meeting when more members of the committee would be in attendance.

27 Great Western Park - proposed boundary review

The committee noted an agenda item on the process required for a review of the district council boundaries.

The committee requested that all members of the council receive details of the agenda item prior to the Council meeting on 13 October at which a motion on this matter had been submitted.

RESOLVED: to note the process for the review of principal area boundaries.

The meeting closed at 7:40pm

Chair

Date

--	--

CGR_G

Parishes Affected

Didcot

Matter to be considered

A review of the number of councillors elected for each town council ward to reflect the number of electors they represent.

Impact on district and county council boundaries

Didcot West and Didcot East & Hagbourne County Divisions.

There would be no impact on the district wards arising from the recommendation.

Proposal agreed by the Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee on 25 May 2022 for consultation

To consult on a proposal that each of the existing parish wards is represented by the following number of councillors:

All Saints – 5 councillors

Ladygrove – 6 councillors

Millbrook – 1 councillor

Northbourne – 3 councillors

Orchard – 1 councillor

Park – 5 councillors

Summary of responses to the draft consultation

As can be seen from the engagement summary report, the consultation responses are equally split between those who support the draft proposal and those who oppose them – although the number who strongly oppose the draft proposal is higher than those who strongly support them. Feedback from the consultation included several comments suggesting that the parish should be divided into several more parish wards, a reduction in ward size, the merging of some of the existing wards and that account should be taken of future housing/population growth in certain areas of the town.

It is important to note that the current Community Governance Review was intended to pick up issues raised by parish councils for review and not intended as an extensive district wide review. Guidance suggests that such

district-wide reviews should be undertaken every 10-15 years and South Oxfordshire undertook such a review in 2013/14. In responding to the request from Didcot Town Council, officers have sought to address the councillor to elector ratio within the existing ward structure and council size (number of councillors).

Didcot Town Council responded that its comments and requests “had been largely ignored” by the committee. The resolution of the town council meeting held on 7 March 2022 is set out below:

1. SODC to conduct the full boundary review based on population growth.
2. The whole of Great Western Park to be within the Didcot boundaries and under the remit of Didcot Town Council.
3. Aspiration to have an equal number of Councillors to represent an equal number of residents on each ward.

Resolutions 1 and 2 are both outside the remit of a community governance review.

In respect of resolution 1, this is interpreted as relating to district wards and would require an electoral review to be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

In respect of resolution 2, as advised at the previous meeting of this committee, parishes must fall within the boundaries of a single principal council area. Therefore, any move to include the whole of Great Western Park within Didcot parish would necessitate a Principal Area Boundary Review to alter the district boundary between South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Council. Such a review would be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

In respect of resolution 3, this committee agreed draft proposals for consultation at its meeting on 25 May 2022 recognising that other proposals could be put forward. In doing so there was an expectation that the town council would put forward proposals. As can be seen from the consultation responses, Didcot Town Council has not put forward any suggestions.

Recommendation

To combine the parish wards of Northbourne and Orchard and for each parish ward to be represented by the following number of councillors:

All Saints – 5 councillors

Ladygrove – 6 councillors

Millbrook – 1 councillor

Northbourne and Orchard – 4 councillors

Park – 5 councillors

Justification for recommendation

It is an important democratic principle that each person’s vote should be of equal weight so far as possible. Whilst there is no legislative provision that each parish councillor should represent the same number of electors, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England states that it is not in the interests of effective and convenient local government to have significant differences in levels of representation.

At the last meeting of the committee a number of members suggested that combining wards could achieve improved equality of weight. Combining Northbourne and Orchard wards addresses the anomaly of a councillor representing less than 500 electors.

Based on the current electorate for the parish (at 1.5.22) each of the 21 councillors would represent approximately 1103 electors across the whole parish. Based on this ratio the number of councillors for each ward would then be allocated as follows:

Parish Ward	Proposed number of councillors	Electorate at 1.5.22	Proposed electors per councillor (existing ratio shown in brackets)
All Saints	5 councillors	5896	1179 (1179)
Ladygrove	6 councillors	6102	1017 (872)
Millbrook	1 councillor	1637	1637 (1637)
Northbourne & Orchard	4 councillors	4405	1101 (985+467)
Park	5 councillors	5115	1023 (1705)

It is recognised that Millbrook will still have a larger elector to councillor ratio. However, the ward has a well defined boundary along Jubilee Way and the railway and is not suitable for merging with another ward.

Officers acknowledge that a wider review may be required to address the growth in population and potentially the size of wards, both matters raised during the consultation, but that this should form part of the next district wide review.

Didcot Community Governance Review: we'd like your feedback

1. Are you responding as:				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	a resident within the parish		81.48%	22
2	someone who works within the parish		3.70%	1
3	a business / organisation operating within the parish		3.70%	1
4	a visitor or interested party		0.00%	0
5	a councillor (parish, district, county)		11.11%	3
6	an officer (parish, district, county)		0.00%	0
7	Other (please specify):		0.00%	0
			answered	27
			skipped	1
Other (please specify): (0)				
No answers found.				

2. If you are responding as a business / organisation, council or body please provide its name:				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	2
	1	South Oxfordshire District Councillor		
	2	Didcot Town Council		
			answered	2
			skipped	26

3. To help us analyse responses, please provide your full postcode (e.g. RG9 1XX)

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	23
		answered	23
		skipped	5

4. To what extent do you support or oppose the proposal to amend the number of councillors elected for each town council ward to reflect the number of electors they represent?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly support 	11.54%	3
2	Tend to support 	34.62%	9
3	Neither support or oppose 	3.85%	1
4	Tend to oppose 	3.85%	1
5	Strongly oppose 	46.15%	12
6	Not sure	0.00%	0
7	I don't have a view	0.00%	0
		answered	26
		skipped	2

5. If you have stated 'tend to oppose' or 'strongly oppose', please state your reason(s) why below.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	17
1	Your reducing the number of councillors in areas where there will be more people living. Stupid idea.		
2	Do not understand why Millbrook where I live appears to have far fewer councillors for the population And this does not seem to be addressed though changes are being made		
3	No. of electorates in Didcot is growing due to the new housing developments throughout, so why should the No. of councillors reduce.		
4	It is not just about the number of people, it is about quality and willing to do something for the community.		
5	It has a balanced ratio per parish compared to the previous proposal.		
6	Too many councillors reduce the numbers to a more suitable level ie one per area		
7	I'd prefer to see Orchard ward merge with a neighbouring ward, making the average No of electors per councillor more even with other wards.		
8	The number of councillors for Ladygrove ward should not be reduced. The figures for electorate are already out of date (May 22). The Ladygrove ward is growing rapidly with the housing development		

5. If you have stated ‘tend to oppose’ or ‘strongly oppose’, please state your reason(s) why below.

	to the north and imminent development to the east. Baking in these changes on out of date data will lead to inequality of representation for years. Either pause this exercise until all housing development is complete or use projected data for the completed population at end of development.		
9	This is not what we requested at Didcot Town Council. We need to have all wards electing a similar amount of councillors. Not some wards electing 6 councillors and others electing two. That is not equal. The wards need to be redrawn and ideally made smaller. The size of Millbrook is a good size. Smaller wards reflect local communities better rather than being drowned out in larger wards. Didcot is growing and each area should have a strong and equal voice. Wards should be no larger than 2,000 electors.		
10	Due to the almost completed new housing developments on Hagbourne Road and on the corner of the old High Street and Church Road, the Northbourne electorate will increase considerably. This increase needs to be taken into account by adjusting Park's councillors to 4 and maintaining Northbourne's number of 4.		
11	Why do we have to have wards?		
12	The Wards are not equal. Ideally, they should be made smaller and provide them with equal number of councillors.		
13	Disproportionately gives some wards precedence over others, as they will have more representatives at Town Council meetings making decisions for them. Not a democratic decision; the same people, and their friends, will end up representing the same wards, and opposition voices will be shut out.		
14	Wards should not have such disparity. Wards should elect an equal number of councillors and not be over sized. This is not representative or fair and I would like to see more Wards that are fairer and equally distributed both with electors and councillors.		
15	I oppose this because the wards all elect different numbers of councillors. I have moved here from people a town in Wales where our town council had small ward and each elected the same number of councillors. It surprises me moving here that someone in one part of Didcot has six votes, others three or one. Each ward should elect the same number of councillors. And why are the wards so large? They should be made smaller and more representative , living on a great Western Park it makes no sense to be in the Park Ward. We can't even drive between GWP south and the rear of the ward! Please redraw the wards and make them smaller instead of keeping them the same.		
16	<p>Firstly, there should be more consistency in the number of councillors per ward. Either All Saints, Ladygrove and Park are split into smaller wards or Millbrook Orchard and Northbourne are merged into one larger. In the latter case a proportional representation should be implemented, which would encourage a more diverse set of councillors on the council.</p> <p>If no change to the wards is made, then growth of the number of dwellings and therefore residents should be taken into account in allocating the number of councillors. For instance All Saints has seen considerable growth recently and now Ladygrove will see significant expansion, even in the next five years.</p>		
17	<p>Response below received via email.</p> <p>In response to the consultation on the Governance review, Didcot Town Council held at an Extra Ordinary full Council meeting on 18th July 2022. The view of the Town Council was that the comments and requests submitted and ratified at our full Council meeting on 7th March 2022 had been largely ignored by SODC.</p> <p>The instruction given to me is to re-send the requests that were ratified at our full Council meeting on 7th March 2022. You will find these attached. The recorded vote on the minutes of this item was unanimous.</p>		
		answered	17
		skipped	11

6. Do you have any alternative suggestions or approaches that you think we should use in relation to the representation of councillors for the Town Council. If so, please provide full details below and explain why you think this suggestion or approach would be preferable.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	15
1	Why is "Orchard" a parish with so few electorate? Can it not be combined with one or more of the neighbouring?		
2	Ladygrove Ward is now building again on the North and there are plans in for the East too. If you reduce the number of councillors for ladygrove it will soon become unbalanced and under-represented. I would strongly suggest retaining 7 councillors for Ladygrove. Park Ward is complete housing wise. I would suggest Park having 4 councillors (1279) is balanced as that is mid point between the figures for Northbourne and All Saints. Please retain 7 councillors for Ladygrove.		
3	At least remain at current levels.		
4	Councillors should work under constant target goal. They need to have clear evaluation and makes things happen. Also residents must be able to comment about those tasks to see if it was really done as good as it can be.		
5	One per area no more		
6	See 5. [Officer note: This comment relates to "I'd prefer to see Orchard ward merge with a neighbouring ward, making the average No of electors per councillor more even with other wards. "		
7	Use proportional representation across Didcot to allocate councillors against the total poll.		
8	Yes, please draw Didcot's wards smaller to be more representative. With the electorate being 23,155, you could create 10 wards, each electing 1-2 councillors, with an electorate around 2,316. This would be very good for the town and allow for better democracy and representation.		
9	In support of my above statement, may I also add the potential electorate increase in Northbourne due to the imminent completion of the new care home next to the Aldi supermarket.		
10	1 councillor per 1000 residents		
11	Yes, I believe there should 10 wards with each selecting 1-2 councillors.		
12	Each ward should be altered in size (relative to population) and made as equal as practically possible; that way, each ward can have the same number of councillors and there will be no inequality of representation		
13	I would like to see smaller wards. I know it was proposed at Didcot Town Council that there would be 10 wards each electing 1 or 2 Councillors. This makes sense, and would be very representative. It would ensure small communities are heard in a growing town. I would like to see this as I currently feel the current way we elect the town Council is not fair.		
14	My friend is a councillor and he has mentioned there should be 10 wards electing 1 or 2 councillors per ward. This is appropriate and would make every area of Didcot equal and have a local voice. The wards in Didcot are too large and small communities lose their voice when bundled together with other communities. Please make the wards smaller and equal.		
15	Best way to ensure a council that will do justice to the diverse population of Didcot is to have a small number of large wards and PR within each of these wards.		
		answered	15
		skipped	13

6. Do you have any alternative suggestions or approaches that you think we should use in relation to the representation of councillors for the Town Council. If so, please provide full details below and explain why you think this suggestion or approach would be preferable.

7. You can upload any supporting documents using the button below.

File Type	Average Size	Files Uploaded
.pdf	420946Kb	1
To view the files uploaded, go into the individual results.	answered	1
	skipped	27

Please see attached

8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the Didcot Community Governance Review 2022?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Open-Ended Question	100.00%	11
1 Please improve amenities in the Didcot area around Great Western park as we need proper facilities such as GPs surgery and NHS dentist.		
2 Yes, Get things done! I am tired of paying council tax from day one, when I moved to the new house in 2018 and in 4 years, can't really see anything happening. Why does it take 4 years to have a bus running, well, still not running yet. Why there isn't enforcement for illegal parking on pavement? Why Diamond road has no bumps or control of the speed? Why there are no clear pathways? You are waling on a pavement and soundly you need to jump onto the street as it is ended. Has someone really check the planning? Why do we pay full council if the area still belongs to the developer? Why Council is not effective and faster? Why everything takes ages?		
3 Infrastructure not keeping up with Didcot's expansion Who is responsible for the complete mess re the ongoing road work		
4 Actually ask people what they want! I have met or heard from any local counselor		
5 No		
6 The starting point of no growth in councillor numbers appears unfair. Didcot Garden Town is doubling in size. Exactly how did the review arrive at the conclusion that the same number of councillors will be fine for a town double the size? Is this County/District well known bias against Didcot having allocated a large proportion of Oxfordshire's housing growth to Didcot? AKA "Dumping on Didcot".		
7 Yes, Harwell (Vale of White Horse) portion of GWP and the proposed Valley Park should come into Didcot (South Oxfordshire). The people there identity with Didcot and use our facilities.		
8 The parish should include all housing within the GWP development and any future development within a 2 mile radius of the current boundaries.		
9 No.		
10 Great Western Park should completely be in South Oxfordshire and not have a portion in the Vale of White Horse.		

8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the Didcot Community Governance Review 2022?

11 Why does the boundary of the two districts go through Great Western Park.
Please put all of GWP under one council, and that should be South Oxfordshire.

answered	11
skipped	17

lights at Willowbrook Leisure Centre to company B – Lighting Electricians – at a cost of £15,299 + VAT.

114. To receive the Mayor’s Report

The Mayor gave an account of his recent activities as Mayor and reminded the Councillors that the Awards Evening will be held on Saturday 26th March and the Mayor’s Civic Dinner will be held on Saturday 2nd April. He also reminded Councillors that the Annual Town Meeting will be held on Wednesday 23rd March 2022 at the Civic Hall. A full list of events attended is attached to the agenda.

115. To elect the Mayor-designate for 2022 – 2023 civic year

It was proposed by Cllr D Macdonald and seconded by Cllr M Khan to nominate Cllr P Siggers as the Mayor-designate. There being no other nominations it was RESOLVED to elect Cllr P Siggers as Mayor-designate.

116. To approve the recommended response to the Community Governance Review at SODC

A cross party working group had met to discuss the individual recommendations from members. The Mayor read out the three recommendations that had been agreed to forward on to SODC:

1. SODC to conduct the full boundary review based on population growth.
2. The whole of Great Western Park to be within the Didcot boundaries and under the remit of Didcot Town Council.
3. Aspiration to have an equal number of Councillors to represent an equal number of residents on each ward.

It was proposed by Cllr M Khan and seconded by Cllr E Hards and RESOLVED to approve the three recommendations to the Community Governance team at SODC.

Recorded vote

	For	Against	Abstention
Cllr D Chandran	x		
Cllr P Davies	x		
Cllr A Dearlove	x		
Cllr J Durman	x		
Cllr P Giesberg	-		
Cllr E Hards	x		
Cllr V Haval	x		
Cllr A Hudson	x		
Cllr M Khan	x		
Cllr A Macdonald	x		
Cllr D Macdonald	x		