

Oxfordshire

Personal Details:

Name: Kieron Mallon
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: (District or county councillor)

Comment text:

To whom it may concern
Please find attached my response to the latest consultation.
Please could you acknowledge receipt of this document
Yours faithfully
Kieron Mallon

Attached Documents:

- latest-proposals-for-banbury.docx

Latest Proposals for Banbury – Local Government Boundary Commission
Consultation. From Kieron Mallon

To whom it may concern.

I support the latest boundaries to be consulted and thank the commission for accepting the recommendations of Banbury Town, Cherwell District and Oxfordshire County Councils and the individual submissions that supported the original OCC proposals. The latest proposals recommending an enlarged Calthorpe Division, into the town centre are sound and even take in the former medieval (still standing) Calthorpe Manor and estate lands. (Victorian and later housing developments).

I strongly suggest that these reformed Banbury Divisions, as consulted on now, form the basis of the imminent Cherwell District re-warding (2026/7). Using these county proposals which take into account future housing projections and current allocated housing sites and as you state, recognise historic hamlets, boundaries, and sense of place, we could achieve co-terminosity at all levels of local government in Banbury for the 2028 Town Council elections.

Using your county proposals, electing one (1) county Cllr, three (3) District Cllrs and four (4) Town Cllrs for each area will at last achieve your criteria and our aims of

- Electoral equality, - each Cllr representing a similar number of electors (at all levels of local government).
- Community identity and community links.
- Effective and convenient local government based on strong identified boundaries.

This would also avoid the confusion of 1-2-3-4-in one current case 5 member town council wards, from a few hundred electors in one instance to eight thousand in the other extreme.

On the issue of Town wards. I oppose the Blackwell Drive single ward. If you, the Commission, are to be consistent and as you propose include the former Drayton Parish land West of the Warwick Rd. into Hardwick as agreed by the recent community governance report and endorsed by yourselves, then you should be consistent and include the brand new housing estate at the Banbury Cricket Club at Blackwell Drive into Easington.

Blackwell Drive is not a recognised area but a new link road to be extended through the large Banbury 17 housing site west of the Salt Way in Easington proper. It will link the main Oxford Rd to the main Bloxham Rd. The current small development at Blackwell Drive has been added to/included into the Easington area for District Council, so again to be consistent with the community governance review (CDC) this area should be part of Easington South for Banbury Town Council. If my suggestion that this OCC boundary review forms the proposed CDC review then the whole of Blackwell Drive link road would be in Easington proper and not, as now proposed, an outlier without of Easington South surrounding it to the North and East. The Salt Way is almost all in Easington with only a very short section in the Broughton Parish miles away from Blackwell Drive. This area (Blackwell Drive) will vote at the Easington

Methodist Church, Grange Road, Easington, a short walk from the estate itself crossing the Salt Way at any of the many paths linking Blackwell Drive to Easington. This small housing estate will use the parks, open spaces and new school in Easington South, it therefore should be in Easington South.

If this area was in Easington South for Town elections it would meet your criteria of

- Community identity and community links

Ironically Blackwell Drive is not only part of Easington the road through Easington, the link between two main roads (A361 Bloxham Rd. and the A4260 Oxford Rd) it is named after Alderman Fred Blackwell who represented Easington on the Banbury Borough Council, Cherwell District Council, Banbury Town Council and was a former Mayor of Banbury. Fred Blackwell, if he was still alive, would have been petitioning for this area to all be in Easington and not two separate wards.

I understand there may be a proposal to split the CAU polling district, currently whole in your amended proposals and in the original proposals as agreed/proposed by Banbury Town, Cherwell District and Oxfordshire County Council, and put a large section into Hardwick Division. This whole estate is currently not in Hardwick for town and District and so the new proposal is unnecessary. The bottom end of the Town and District ward follows your proposed lines. If the CAU polling district was split for county you would be taking from your stated aims especially

- Effective and convenient local government.
- Community identity and community links

This CAU polling district was part of the Grimsbury County Division in the recent past so a precedent has been set by your predecessors. I strongly suggest that you keep to your proposals as written and now consulted on.

Hardwick will and is still expanding to the North, some of it will be speculative and not in the local plan. Not to follow your amended proposals and the OCC original proposals, I suggest will lead to Hardwick to go well over tolerance before the next County review if the CAU polling district is added to it in its Southern boundary.

I understand that someone said that the proposed Grimsbury Division is very large, no, it is within the voter tolerance and its geographically large because it contains a reservoir, country park and most of the many Banbury industrial estates where no one lives. If with local knowledge, you take these non residential areas out of the current proposals there is a clear link from the town to this estate.

I ask that your boundary between the Ruscote Division and the Hardwick Division using the Stratford Rd (A422) as the boundary should remain. The only reason I can see why anyone should propose it to be changed is an attempt to make the aforementioned CAU polling district proposal work to keep Hardwick voter numbers down then add CAU to it (Hardwick). Unnecessary and would go against your stated objectives as it would mean that Ruscote for District and Town would be different to Ruscote County Division.

Yours sincerely
Kieron Mallon 19-03-2024