

Subject to approval at the next meeting

ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE

24 July 2014 at 6.00 pm

Present:- Councillors Gammon (Chairman), L Brown (Vice-Chairman), Bower, Brooks and Mrs Brown.

Councillors English and Mrs Oakley were also present.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Oppler.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

3. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2014 were approved by the Sub-Committee as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. MEETING START TIMES

The Committee

RESOLVED

That its start times for meetings during 2014/2015 be 6.00 pm.

5. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

The Head of Policy and Partnerships presented the report on the outcomes of the consultation on the Community Governance Review. It was made clear that no decision would be made at this meeting but that the meeting had been convened so that Members could receive consultation results prior to recommendation required at the next meeting on 18 September 2014.

Members were referred to the Electoral Sub-Committee Minutes on 20 March 2014, Proposal A – from Yapton Parish Council affecting Middleton On Sea Parish Council, where the committee had been keen to know what the rateable value was of plots of land in the area and the position of ecclesiastical boundaries. In response to this, it was explained that there was no identifiable rateable value as there were no affected properties and the office of the Bishop of Chichester could not identify ecclesiastical boundaries and thought Parish Boundaries were used.

Subject to approval at the next meeting

It was noted that a key part of the review was to consult on the proposals with the community and interested parties. This consultation had taken place over the period 28 May 2014 to 3 July 2014. The Head of Policy and Partnerships informed the Sub-Committee that the following people and organisations were directly asked for their views; West Sussex County Council Members and Officers, Arun District Council Members, Parish Clerks and Flansham (Hoe Lane) Residents.

The Policy and Research Officer presented the results of the survey to the Sub-Committee as follows:

Community Governance Review for the boundary between Yapton Parish and Middleton-on-Sea Parish [Proposal A]

- 5 of the 8 interested parties (invited consultees) responded
- 2 in favour moving the boundary and 3 for the boundary remaining unchanged
- Preferences are in line with the parish or ward each respondent represents.

Summary of reasons given for changing to Yapton

- Wishes of Flansham (Hoe Lane) residents to ultimately be placed in the Yapton ward/division for District and County Council election purposes. [N. B. The Local Government Boundary Commission requires direct road access to Yapton village from Hoe Lane for this to happen].

Summary of reasons given for remaining as Middleton-on-Sea.

- Three issues over which Middleton residents must retain Parish representation are: the capped oil well at the north east corner of the site; Comet Corner road improvement proposals; and surface water flooding problems - 90% of this water goes into Ryebank Rife." [This is at the northern edge of the existing parish boundary].

Community Governance Review for the boundary between Yapton Parish and Ford Parish [Proposal B]

- 3 of the 6 interested parties (invited consultees) responded
- All 3 support this becoming part of Yapton Parish.

Summary of reasons given for changing to Yapton.

- Existing parish boundaries can become anomalous as new houses are built across them resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours. A review of parish boundaries is an opportunity to put in place boundaries tied to firm ground detail.

Subject to approval at the next meeting

Community Governance Review for Flansham (Hoe Lane) [Proposal C]

- This review directly affected existing residents, so in addition to consulting interested parties, all residents living in the Flansham (Hoe Lane) area were consulted
- 7 of the 11 interested parties (invited consultees) responded. In addition, the Flansham Residents' Association submitted a response
- Apart from one ADC Member, preferences are in line with the parish or ward each respondent represents
- The survey of interested parties (invited consultees) shows 50% in favour of becoming part of Felpham Parish and 50% in favour of remaining part of Yapton Parish
- The survey of Hoe Lane residents was overwhelmingly in favour of remaining part of Yapton Parish, with 96% expressing this view.

Summary of reasons given for changing to Felpham

- Parish boundaries should follow District and County boundaries
- Hoe Lane has been served well by Felpham at District and County level
- Felpham Parish Council recognises that Hoe Lane will be a rural community in its own right if it becomes part of Felpham Parish
- If Yapton does not succeed in gaining direct road access to Hoe Lane it will only be directly accessible from Felpham.

Summary of reasons for remaining as Yapton

- The wishes of Hoe Lane residents to remain within the Parish of Yapton
- The new North Bognor Relief Road is a clearly defined boundary between Flansham (Hoe Lane) and Felpham
- Flansham is rural, not urban. Felpham is urbanised
- Flansham has long ties with Yapton

The Sub-Committee noted the consultation results and briefly discussed the outcomes. Comment was made that a Parish should not include an area that has no direct links to it. An alternative view was put forward that it is irrelevant if an area like Hoe Lane is detached from Yapton as there are important historical links.

Following Member's questions on the administration of the survey which were responded to at the meeting the Committee noted the report.

The Head of Policy and Partnerships outlined the next steps. At the next meeting of the Sub-Committee, Members would receive a report on all parts of the Community Governance Review. Members were informed that the conclusions to that report would provide a range of options on what recommendations could be made to Full Council.

(The meeting concluded at 6.34pm)