

## **CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE – 6<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2021**

### **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - FORMAL CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PROPOSALS**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That the draft proposals attached at Appendix B to the report be formally agreed for the purposes of consultation and consulted upon for a 12-week period, subject to any amendments required to reflect the response of Holmes Chapel Parish Council to the pre-consultation survey.**

---

Extract from the Minutes of the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2021

#### **4 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - FORMAL CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PROPOSALS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report on the draft proposals for formal consultation.

At its meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020, the Sub-Committee had considered the pre-consultation survey responses and the next steps for the review. It had resolved that the pre-consultation survey responses be received and that the initiation of the development of the Council's proposals for all parish ward boundaries be approved. Since that meeting, six member workshops had taken place to develop draft proposals for consultation. The draft proposals were set out in Appendix B to the report. If approved, they would be the subject of a 12-week consultation exercise in accordance with the terms of reference for the review.

Dr M Humphreys of the Association of Electoral Administrators was in attendance at the meeting to provide an expert opinion on the consultation process and the further progress of the Community Governance Review.

Officers advised that the references to 'proposed expansion areas' in the maps attached to the report would be changed to 'potential expansion areas' before the consultation commenced.

Councillor L Gilbert referred to an administrative error in the report in that Holmes Chapel Parish Council had responded to the pre-consultation survey and that, if the Parish Council's response had been taken into consideration, the draft consultation proposals relating to Holmes Chapel could have been different. He therefore asked that the consultation proposals be reviewed before the consultation commenced, to take account of the Parish Council's response to the pre-consultation survey.

The Chairman asked officers to discuss the matter further with Councillor Gilbert after the meeting.

**RESOLVED**

That the Sub-Committee recommends to the Constitution Committee that the draft proposals attached at Appendix B to the report be formally agreed for the purposes of consultation and consulted upon for a 12-week period, subject to any amendments required to reflect the response of Holmes Chapel Parish Council to the pre-consultation survey.

**Changes made to Draft Recommendations report text, following 26/2/21 Sub Committee feedback. Page numbers refer to the footer of the report.**

<b>Parishes</b>	<b>Changes made to Draft Recommendations report text, following 26/2/21 Sub Committee feedback</b>	<b>Report section(s) affected</b>
Hatherton and Walghertocn	Wording amended to reflect the fact that the Parish Council <u>did</u> respond to the pre-consultation survey (the original wording indicated otherwise) and to note that it opposes the Borough Council’s proposed reduction in seats.	p41 in both original report and revised version
Congleton	<p>Geographical definitions and elector numbers/ proposed seats for the proposed new “Ward 4 (South West)” and “Ward 5 (North West)” were the wrong way round.</p> <p>It is actually “Ward 5 (North West)” – not “Ward 4 (South West)”, as originally stated - that would have 5,791 electors and 5 seats (a ratio of 1,158.2 electors per seats) and which consists of “polling districts CNW2 and CNW3, the part of Eaton Parish west of A536 that is recommended for transfer to Congleton and the parts of Hulme Walfield and Somerford Booths and Somerford</p>	pp106-107 and 224 in original report; pp105-107 and 226 in revised version

	<p>parishes that are recommended for transfer to Congleton”.</p> <p>Likewise, it is actually “Ward 4 (South West)” – not “Ward 5 (North West)”, as originally stated – that would have 4,865 electors and 4 seats (a ratio of 1,216.3 electors per seats) and which consists of “polling districts COW1, COW2, COW3 and COW4”.</p> <p>(Map 8a in Appendix 5, which displays the proposed new wards, had the correct ward labels and boundaries in the original report and so did not need amending.)</p>	
<p>Brereton and Holmes Chapel</p>	<p>Wording amended to reflect the fact that the pre-consultation survey responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• significant support for the potential boundary change (the transfer of the Bluebell Green development and the rest of the potential “expansion area” from Brereton to Holmes Chapel), including support from Holmes Chapel Parish Council and the local Ward Member. The original wording stated incorrectly that there were no responses from the Parish Council and did not mention Ward Member support.</li> <li>• opposition from Brereton Parish Council to a boundary change and an explicit request that Bluebell Green should remain within its parish. This was added to ensure that, for balance, the Draft Recommendations reported the views of both of the affected parish councils.</li> </ul>	<p>p139 in both original report and revised version</p>
<p>Adlington and Poynton</p>	<p>Wording amended to reflect the fact that the two houses affected by the proposed boundary change are already on the Poynton electoral roll and therefore already vote in Poynton Town</p>	<p>pp179-181 of original report; pp179-182 of</p>

	<p>Council elections (not in Adlington parish elections, as the original wording implied).</p> <p>This means the proposed boundary change would not involve the transfer of any electors (it was previously estimated that four electors would be moved). As a result, some of the future governance electorate figures and ratios for 2025 have been altered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Poynton Town Council West ward electorate figure is now estimated at 6,258 (previously 6,262) and its ratio is now 894 electors per councillor (previously 894.6).</li> <li>• for Poynton Town Council as a whole, the electorate figure is now 12,208 (previously 12,212) and its ratio is now 872 (previously 872.3).</li> <li>• the Adlington parish electorate figure is now 983 (previously 979) and its ratio is now 109.2 (previously 108.8).</li> </ul> <p>As a result, the “Adlington” section in Appendix 2 (explaining how the number of transferred electors was calculated) no longer applies and has been deleted. Footnote 10 in Appendix 2 amended for same reason.</p>	<p>revised version</p> <p>pp192-193 of original report; p194 of revised version</p>
<p>Wilmslow area</p>	<p>Wording amended to explain that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whilst the electorate forecasts for Handforth did not take account of potential new housing on the Garden Village site, these forecasts were based on the latest available information at the time they were produced (early 2019);</li> <li>• the Council’s latest <u>housing</u> forecast, as set out in its 2019/20 Housing Monitoring Update (HMU), now expects 150 houses to be built on the Garden Village site by the end of March 2025;</li> </ul>	<p>p182 of original report; pp183-184 of revised version)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 150 houses on the Garden Village site would equate to an estimated 250 electors (approximately);</li> <li>• the HMU evidence was published only in March 2021 and was not available in time to inform any updated electorate forecasts for the CGR, but it (and the 250 electors estimate derived from it) is cited as additional useful evidence to inform consultation responses.</li> </ul>	
<p>Maps</p>	<p>Legend text amended so that expansion areas described as “Potential Expansion Areas” (previously the maps incorrectly labelled these as “Proposed Expansion Areas”, even though in some cases boundary changes are not being proposed).</p> <p>Legend text also amended to correct 2 typing errors in “Strategy” and “Constituencies”.</p> <p>Maps amended so that they display all the potential expansion areas within each map view, rather than (as was previously the case for some maps) omitting or incorrectly defining some expansion area boundaries that were not the central focus of the map in question.</p>	<p>Appendix 5, which is after p227 (last page of Appendix 4) of original report and after p229 of revised report</p>