

Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Review of Vale of White Horse District Council – Member responses to LGBCE proposals and officer recommendations.

Abingdon-on-Thames (Abingdon East, Abingdon North and Abingdon South Wards)

LGBCE proposal

Reflects the council's proposal for three three-member wards in Abingdon. The Commission proposes two changes to make adjustments around Matlock Way and Hendred Way affecting the proposed ward boundaries between Abingdon East and Abingdon North.

Whilst, if agreed, the adjustments would result in different county division and ward boundaries, there is logic in the LGBCE's proposals. However, if coterminosity with the Oxfordshire divisions is considered a priority the council should emphasise this in its response.

Councillor comments

At the briefing the view was expressed that the LGBCE proposal would reflect where the community around Matlock Way consider themselves part of.

Recommendation

To determine whether to support the LGBCE proposal or the council's submitted proposal.

Kingston Bagpuize

LGBCE proposal

Similar to the council's proposal with the addition of Littleworth parish.

Councillor comments

Councillor Coleman sees merits in proposal. Councillor Rayner asked that Kingston Bagpuize is not referred to as a town.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Botley & Sunningwell

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Kennington & Radley

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Cumnor

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Marcham & Wootton

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

Councillor Clegg supportive.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Blewbury

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

See below.

Recommendation

To agree a response and consider views on the proposed name of 'Blewbury & Chilton'

Harwell & Western Valley

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

Councillors Gascoigne and Dewhurst have raised the following points:

1. Harwell Campus is geographically closer to Chilton and therefore any planning matters are most likely to affect Chilton residents. Some Chilton residents (those living in Severn Rd) actually reside within the Harwell Campus boundary. It makes much more sense that Chilton and Harwell Campus be in the same ward.

2. Harwell is a rural village, Western Valley (and eventually Valley Park) are more of a town and have a very different identity and demographic. It seems odd for Harwell village to be isolated from the other rural villages and placed in a ward that will be more of a town, especially when Valley Park is built. It would make more sense for Harwell to be in a ward with other rural villages.

Analysis

1. The proposal only covers that part of Harwell Campus within the Harwell Oxford campus ward of Harwell Parish Council transferring from the existing Hendreds ward to the proposed Harwell and Western Valley ward. Any proposal to include the whole of Harwell campus within one parish would need to be considered as part of a community governance review.

2.As set out in the LGBCE draft recommendations document, a single member Western Valley ward would have a forecast electoral variance of 13% in 2029. During the previous electoral review this council argued against linking Blewbury with Harwell.

Recommendation

To agree a response.

Drayton

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Hendreds

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

At the briefing the view was expressed that Harwell Campus sits better with Chilton parish than Harwell or the Hendreds, is better aligned with Chilton (children on the campus go to school in Chilton) and is not a priority for Harwell Parish Council.

Analysis

As covered in the text on the Harwell & Western Valley proposal, this review is not looking at parish boundaries. Such a review would need to be undertaken as part of a community governance review.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Steventon & East Hanney

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Sutton Courtenay

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

None received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Grove

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal.

Councillor comments

Differing views expressed at councillor briefing. Those opposed did not support the splitting of East and West Hanney parishes. Suggestion to include East Challow in a Grove ward are covered and discounted in the LGBCE document on the grounds of electoral equality. Another member spoke in support of the proposal and expressed the view that West Hanney had similar priorities to Grove.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Wantage Wantage Charlton and Wantage Segsbury Wards

LGBCE proposal

Reflects the council's proposal for two two-member wards.

LGBCE proposal is for the boundary to follow the A338 (Grove Street), Seesen Way, Wallingford Street, the B4057 and B4494

LGBCE invite submissions on the proposed ward names – Wantage Charlton and Wantage Segsbury

Councillor comments

View expressed that naming the wards east and west would be easier to understand.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposed ward boundary.

To agree a response in respect of the ward names.

Faringdon & Stanford

LGBCE proposal

Differs to that proposed by council - retention of a two-member Faringdon ward covering the parish of Great Faringdon with the addition of Littleworth parish and the retention of a single member Stanford ward. LGBCE does not consider that the Council proposal is satisfactory in terms of equality of representation.

LGBCE proposal is for a three-member ward covering the parishes of Great Faringdon and Stanford comprising Buscot, Coleshill, Eaton Hastings, Great Coxwell, Great Faringdon, Hatford, Little Coxwell, Shellingford and Stanford in the Vale.

Councillor comments

Councillor Coleman sees merits in proposal. View expressed at the briefing that Stanford objects to inclusion within a ward with Faringdon.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Watchfield & Shrivenham

LGBCE proposal

Differs to that proposed by council.

The Commission proposal is for a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Ashbury, Bourton, Compton Beauchamp, Fernham, Longcot, Shrivenham, Uffington, Watchfield and Woolstone.

Councillor comments

No comments received.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal.

Ridgeway

LGBCE proposal

Match the council's proposal with the addition of Baulking parish. The reasons for this are set out in the LGBCE's draft recommendations document around electoral equality.

Councillor comments

Opposition to inclusion of Baulking in the proposed ward. There is a shared community and links with Uffington within same school catchment area and parishes working together.

Recommendation

To consider whether to raise an objection to the inclusion of Baulking in the proposed Ridgeway ward and if so agree an alternative arrangement.