Council	Agenda Item 2
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:		**Patcham Ward and Stanford Ward – Change of Name consultation**	
Date of Meeting:		**28 January 2009**	**Special Council**
		17 November 2009	Governance Committee
Report of:		**Chief Executive**	
Contact Officer:	**Name:**	**Paul Holloway**	**Tel: 29-2005**
	E-mail:	**paul.holloway@brighton-hove.gov.uk**	
Wards Affected:		**Patcham Ward; Stanford Ward**	

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 The Governance Committee meeting of 22 September 2009 approved a consultation exercise to explore changing the name of two council wards:

(i) the current Patcham Ward to become Patcham and Hollingbury Ward.

(ii) the current Stanford Ward to become Hove Park Ward

1.2 The proposal to change the name of the current Patcham Ward arose following the change of name in the Hollingdean and Stanmer Ward in November 2008.

1.3 The proposal to change the name of the current Stanford Ward arose when a petition signed by 21 residents was presented to Council on 4 December 2008.

1.4 A four week consultation period between 28 September and 26 October 2009, gave residents living in the two wards, the opportunity to register their support, or otherwise to the proposals.

2. RECOMMENDATION:

2.1 That the Governance Committee notes the result of the consultation.

2.2 That the Governance Committee recommends Council to give approval for the name of Stanford Ward to be changed to Hove Park Ward.

2.3 That the Governance Committee recommends Council to agree that Patcham Ward retains its current name.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION / CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 In November 2008 the Council approved the change of name for Hollingbury and Stanmer, to Hollingdean and Stanmer Ward. The loss of reference to Hollingbury resulted in local residents raising the need to continue to recognise Hollingbury as a district.

3.2 It was therefore proposed to put forward a change of Ward name as Patcham and Hollingbury, for consultation. This proposed name change accurately reflects there is no significant change to the current Patcham Ward, and also recognises that Patcham forms the greater part of the geographical area of the ward.

3.3 The proposal to re-name Stanford Ward to Hove Park Ward was put forward in a petition signed by 21 residents, to Council on 4 December 2008.

3.4 Governance Committee on 22 September 2009 approved a 4 week consultation exercise between 28 September and 26 October 2009 in each Ward and requested a report on the findings of the exercise to be submitted to the17 November Governance Committee meeting.

3.5 Any subsequent resolution to agree the proposed ward name changes, following the consultation exercise, must be passed at a specially convened meeting of Full Council, where two thirds of members voting need to support the proposal.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 By law, a local authority may not pass a resolution to change the name of a ward unless it has taken reasonable steps to consult with such persons as it considers appropriate on the proposed new name(s).

4.2 Patcham and Stanford Ward Councillors, the council's main political groups, local community groups and organisations within the wards, together with the electorate, were consulted on the proposals in the following way:

- Notices in community magazines in both wards.
- Council Website survey question regarding the proposed changes
- Information on the Electoral Services website.
- Notices in libraries and community centres
- Notices in parks
- Publicity in The Argus

4.3 The results of the consultation exercise are detailed below together with information regarding the breakdown of responses received:

Table 1

Ward Name	Total number of responses	Number in favour of proposed change	Number against proposed change
Patcham	102	39	63
Stanford	576	307	269

Table 2

Ward name	Number of web responses	Number of emails to Electoral Services inbox	Number of other responses (petition and letters)
Patcham	76	6	20
Stanford	70	14	492

4.4 Ten additional signatures in support of the retention of Stanford Ward were also received just after the deadline for the consultation, but have not been included in the figures above.

4.5 In line with a previous Governance Committee report recommending the consultation exercise, this report has detailed the findings of the consultation and has made recommendations based on the findings, using the democratic approach of recommending in favour of the greatest number of responses.

4.6 If the Governance Committee accepts the recommendation of a change of Ward name in Stanford Ward, Members will be asked to make a decision at a specially convened meeting of Full Council on 10 December 2009.

4.7 The Council has at all times during this process remained in a neutral position, neither supporting nor opposing the proposed changes. It has simply invited the affected electorate to indicate their support or opposition to the proposals.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications

5.1 The costs for carrying out the consultation were £2,000. By accepting the recommendations within this report the Council will incur costs in the region of £1,000 to amend the current ward.

Finance Officer Consulted: Alasdair Ridley Date: 06/11/09

Legal Implications

5.2 The legal requirements set out in paragraphs 3.5 and 4.1 above are provided for in section 59 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

5.3 By virtue of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities)(England) Regulations 2000, functions carried out under section 59 of the 2007 Act, which include the passing of a resolution to change the name of an electoral area, are reserved to Full Council.

Lawyer Consulted: Oliver Dixon Date: 6 November 2009

Equalities Implications

5.4 As this is just a change of name, which does not impact directly on any individual, an Equalities Impact Assessment has not been carried out.

Sustainability Implications

5.5 There are no implications.

Crime & Disorder Implications

5.6 There are no implications.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications

5.7 There are no implications.

Corporate / Citywide Implications

5.8 The recommendations are in line with council priorities, specifically for open and effective city leadership.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

None

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

None