

## **MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MINUTES** of a **MEETING** of the **ELECTORAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** held on 7 November 2022 at 5.30 pm

### **Present**

**Councillors** S J Clist, Mrs F J Colthorpe, D R Coren, R Evans, L D Taylor, B G J Warren and J Wright

### **Apologies**

**Councillor(s)** R J Chesterton, R M Deed and R F Radford

### **Councillor(s)**

### **Present**

**Officer(s):** Jill May (Director of Business Improvement and Operations), James Stevens (Consultant) and Jackie Stoneman (Electoral Services Manager)

## **13 Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor R Chesterton
- Councillor B Deed
- Councillor R Radford

## **14 Public Question Time**

There were no members of the public present.

## **15 Declarations of Interest under the Code of Conduct**

Members were reminded of the need to make declarations where appropriate.

## **16 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 November were agreed as a true record and duly SIGNED by the Chairman.

## **17 Community Governance Review (JM)**

The Committee had before it a report of the Returning Officer / Director of Business Improvement and Operations providing Members with an opportunity to review submissions from the second public consultation and to make final recommendations Electoral Review Committee to full Council for changes to parish boundaries and the numbers of parish councillors in each parish council.

The Consultant resumed their presentation from the meeting that had taken place on the 1 November, which discussed the number of parish councillor as set out in appendix 2 of the report.

## Parish Council Numbers

### Sandford Parish Council –

The Consultant summarised that comments had asked for the number of councillors to be reduced. It was noted that there were just under 1000 electors for that area, to which the Consultant suggested that 12 Parish Councillors was quite a high number. However, he also noted that Parish Councils such as Cadbury had 10 Parish Councillors for 796 electors and that part of Uffculme had 11 Parish Councillors with nearly 2,000 electors.

The Chair thanked the consultant for their presentation and opened the floor to the Committee, where the following was considered:

- Sandford was one of the biggest Parish Councils geographically.
- That this number of Councillors might be needed so that workload is covered.
- The housing development at Peddlarspool needed to be considered.

It was **AGREED** that the number of Parish Councillors remain as set out in appendix 2 (which included amendments from the 1 November 2022 meeting) subject to the following additional amendments:

- Sandford Parish Council remained at 12 Parish Councillors.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

### Hittisleigh – Submission 33

The Consultant explained that Hittisleigh had asked to take over an area towards the northern edge of their boundary from Colebrooke so that it followed the road as well as land transferred from Credition Hamlets so that the parish border followed the river Yeo. In addition, there was land towards the southeast that was proposed to be transferred from Cheriton Bishop to Hittisleigh, so that the proposed boundary followed the river Yeo.

The Chair opened the floor to Members for comments which were as follows:

- Credition Hamlets Parish Council were happy with the boundary change and that the land transferred from Colebrooke to Hittisleigh only included Road Down Farm and a bungalow, so would not lose much in terms of council tax.
- Concern was raised over not hearing from Colebrooke Parish Council on this matter, however, Colebrooke Parish Council would have been sent these proposals.
- This would follow the natural boundary of the road.

The Consultant was invited to speak on the proposed transfer of The Orchard from Hittisleigh to Cheriton Bishop.. It was highlighted that The Orchard property and West Ford Farm shared the same postcode. However, the later was in Hittisleigh. In addition, this change would mean that the road would be used as the boundary as opposed the river. This ensured that The Orchard moved to Cheriton Bishop Parish Council.

It was **AGREED** that the boundary changes proposed as per submission 33 be accepted with the amendment that the boundary followed the road north of The

Orchard so that The Orchard be part of Cheriton Bishop Parish Council, as a recommendation to full Council.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

#### Nymet Rowland: Submission 18

The Consultant explained that this submission had requested that the parish be merged with another parish as it was too small, the only suitable Parish it could be part of was Lapford Parish Council, however, consultation had not taken place with Lapford Parish Council. The Consultant added that this submission could be considered at a later date because there was not enough time for this to be discussed with Lapford Parish Council.

The Chair noted that neither Parish had submitted their opinion on this matter.

#### Cruwys Morchard and Thelbridge (Nomansland)

The Consultant explained that Nomansland was split in two and straddled two wards. Those two wards were now a single ward so it would not impact the District Council election, however, Nomansland remained split between two Parish Council boundaries.

The Consultant highlighted the following:

- That both Parish Councils (Cruwys Morchard and Thelbridge) voted for no change over this boundary, the two parish councils believed that there was no issue.
- The parish clerks of each parish mentioned that it would make sense if Nomansland was in one parish area.
- Both sides would have quite a distance to travel to vote from either side.
- Nomansland would be placed into one of the Parish Councils, which would be a substantial increase in electors.
- That the boundary of Nomansland would need to be established.

The Chair opened the floor to Members for comments which were as follows:

- Thelbridge was not currently part of Way Ward until the next District Council elections, and that it may be best to leave the Parish boundaries alone for now until the District Boundaries had settled.
- Preferred to see Nomansland together but agreed that this was not the right time.

#### Wembworthy: Submission 79

The Consultant explained that Wembworthy Parish Council would like the review to consider combining the Parish to include Eggesford and Brushford parish meetings, as it was explained that these two areas were not Parish Councils. This would give them better representation and a chance to benefit from the precept to improve their communities.

The Chair noted that due to time constraints, there was a need for the Committee to make recommendations to full Council on 1 December 2022. In addition, there had not been responses from Eggesford or Brushford which would make it difficult for the

Committee to recommend that they fall under Wembworthy Parish Council and that perhaps a 'mini review' took place next year for this particular matter.

The Committee noted the following:

- That Eggesford and Brushford were in the Upper Yeo & Taw Ward, Wembworthy Parish Council was in Taw Vale Ward but that this would not cause any problems.
- That this could be discussed at a further date.

**RECOMMENDED to COUNCIL** that the number of Parish Councillors remain as set out in appendix 2 (which included amendments from the 1 November 2022 meeting) subject to the following additional amendments:

- Sandford Parish Council remained at 12 Parish Councillors.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

Further **RECOMMENDED to COUNCIL** that the boundary changes proposed as per submission 33 be accepted with the amendment that the boundary followed the road north of The Orchard so that The Orchard be part of Cheriton Bishop Parish Council.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

(The meeting ended at 6.40 pm)

**CHAIRMAN**