

CABINET – 18 MARCH 2015

THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 23 MARCH 2015

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND – DRAFT
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINCHESTER

REPORT OF CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Contact Officer: Stephen Whetnall Tel No: 01962 848220
swhetnall@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

CAB2567 – Governance Review – Options for the Council's Electoral Cycle – 19 March 2014

CAB2593 - Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission on the future size of the Council – 2 July 2014

CL101- Electoral Review – submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England regarding proposed Ward Boundaries – 6 November 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At its meeting held on 6 November 2014, the Council was not in a position to agree a full submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission on proposed warding arrangements at Stage 1 of the Commission's review process. However, the Council did agree a suggested approach, rather than a full scheme. This is set out in Appendix 1 to this Report.

A suggested future approach for dealing with the emerging communities, as set out in Appendix 2 to this report, was also agreed by Council and forwarded to the Commission to assist in formulating their proposals.

Following submissions from the political parties, parish councils and others, on 10 February 2015 the Commission issued its draft recommendations on new wards, ward boundaries and ward names across the Winchester District. Appendix 3 sets out the draft proposals and a timetable for the review. If the Council wishes to make any representations, it will have to be considered at full Council on 1 April 2015.

Appendix 4 is a map which outlines the proposals. Copies of the map have also been placed in the Members' Library area.

The Commission's report and maps are [available electronically here](#). A hard copy has been made publically available in the City Office's reception and also in the Winchester Discovery Centre Library.

RECOMMENDATIONS to Cabinet and The Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

That Cabinet and The Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider whether any recommendations are to be made to Council on any further representations to be made to the Commission.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

- 1 COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):
- 2 Reviewing the arrangements for the political leadership and electoral accountability of the City Council are a key aspect of ensuring the Council is efficient and effective in the arrangements it makes for the conduct of business.
- 3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
 - 3.1 There are no particular resource implications associated with this element of the review process.
- 4 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES
 - 4.1 If the Council does not take a proactive approach to the Commission Review the new arrangements (numbers/wards) will determined by the Commission in any event.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDICES:

- Appendix 1 – Winchester City Council's submission to the Commission on a suggested approach for devising new ward boundaries – as agreed by Council on 6 November 2014
- Appendix 2 – Winchester City Council's submission to the Commission on a approach for dealing with emerging communities and future Community Governance Reviews – as agreed by Council on 6 November 2014
- Appendix 3 - The Local Government Boundary Commission for England – draft recommendations report for Winchester
- Appendix 4 - Outline map of Commission proposals

As agreed by the meeting of full Council held 6 November as the Council's formal submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England Regarding Proposed Ward Boundaries (Report CL101 refers)

SUGGESTED APPROACH FOR DEVISING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES

Following a meeting between the Leader of the Council, the Leader of the Principal Opposition and the Chairman of the Review Group, the following suggested approach is proposed for submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:-

1. The Winchester "Town" area should have five 3-member wards.
2. The Barton Farm development should be part of the "Town" wards
3. Harestock should be part of the "Town" wards.
4. Existing parishes must not be split between different wards unless absolutely necessary
5. Established communities, should not be split between different wards unless absolutely necessary
6. The new development at the West of Waterlooville (WoW) should be split between two different wards to allow the existing and expected growth over the next 5 years to be represented acceptably following the Boundary Commission Review.
7. The existing Denmead Ward should have a proportion of the WOW development added to it to form one new Ward.
8. The remainder of the WoW development should be placed with the existing Southwick & Boarhunt Ward and Wickham and Knowle.
9. The Whiteley Ward and the North Whiteley development should be placed together in a separate ward to Wickham.
10. Durley or Upham parishes should be joined with Bishops Waltham to make a new single ward.
11. The two parts of the Soberton parish separated at the last review should be placed in the same new ward.
12. The parishes of Bishops Sutton, Tichborne, Old Alresford, Bighton and Itchen Stoke all look towards New Alresford as their local community hub, so should be placed in the same ward, if at all possible.
13. The parishes of Otterbourne and/or Compton & Shawford are a good fit with the existing Colden Common & Twyford Ward.
14. Colden Common and Twyford parishes share many community connections, so should remain in the same ward.
15. Littleton and Harestock communities could be placed in separate wards
16. Headbourne Worthy parish should be placed in the same ward as Kings Worthy.

APPENDIX 2**COMMENTS REGARDING THE APPROACH FOR DEALING WITH EMERGING COMMUNITIES AND FUTURE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS**

Each of the three areas set out below will accommodate significant numbers of electors in the coming years and the following comments will hopefully assist the Commission in planning future representation.

West of Waterlooville (WoW)

The WoW area did not develop at the rate envisaged by the last review process in 2002 and the consequent electoral imbalance was the main reason that the current review was commenced by the Commission. The Taylor Wimpey development (in Denmead Ward) is now progressing well and the Grainger 'Berewood' development (in Boarhunt & Southwick Ward) now has some occupants, together with a new primary school.

Both Denmead and Boarhunt & Southwick Parish Councils had considered for some time that the new community emerging from the above developments would be best served by establishing its own parish council. Therefore, the two Parishes were instrumental in setting up the West of Waterlooville Advisory Group, to monitor and advise on issues affecting the locality until such time as a parish council is formed. The Group consists of representatives from the two Parish Councils affected, City Councillors and others working with the community. The Group has performed a very useful role and will no doubt continue to do so, until there are sufficient residents to enable an effective parish council to be established through a Community Governance Review.

Bearing this in mind, the proposal to split the WoW area between two Wards needs to be configured in such a way as to enable the easy amalgamation of the new development areas in the future, as a potential separate parish. The best way to achieve this is for both new District wards to have parish wards of a similar size. In that way, the boundaries of a potential parish council covering both new development sites can be formed.

Barton Farm

The first residents are not anticipated until late 2015 but it is already clear that this development should come within the Winchester Town area. Headbourne Worthy Parish is very small and it would not be appropriate to place it with a scheme that will eventually produce 2,000 dwellings. The Parish Council is keen to be in the same ward as Kings Worthy Parish as this would be a far more appropriate solution and this view is supported by the Council.

Again, with suitable warding arrangements, it will be possible to define the Barton Farm area in such a way as to make the establishment of any Parish Council in the future a relatively straightforward exercise, in terms of a clear and sensible boundary. A Community Governance Review will be required to change the boundary for Headbourne Worthy Parish.

North of Whiteley

This development is the least advanced of the three but, again, there is already an apparent case to change boundaries to facilitate a sensible community solution for the future. In this instance, the development falls within the parish of Curdrige but the Parish Council has been clear from the outset that a large, new development would not sit appropriately with a small, rural settlement.

Curdrige Parish Council contends that it would be a far better solution to amend the joint parish boundary with Whiteley Parish, so that Whiteley is extended to embrace the new development, as that is a parish made up of relatively recent residential estates. Whiteley Town Council is in agreement with this approach and would be happy to extend their boundary accordingly.

A Community Governance Review is required to amend a parish boundary, but it would be sensible to devise warding arrangements as part of this exercise to facilitate that later work.

Bakeland Gardens, New Alresford

This is a recently completed development of 34 dwellings and so is not in the same category as those above. However, there is a clear boundary anomaly here as whilst the development technically sits within Tichborne Parish, it is so close to Alresford that from both the visual and practical aspects it would be appropriate to amend the boundary and have the development within New Alresford Parish.

Again, a Community Governance Review is required to amend a parish boundary, but it would be sensible to devise warding arrangements as part of this exercise to facilitate that later work.

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Warding patterns	6
Detailed wards	7
Winchester	8
Northern parishes	10
Southern parishes	12
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 Have your say	17

Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Winchester City Council	19
B Submissions received	21
C Glossary and abbreviations	22

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Winchester City?

We are conducting an electoral review of Winchester City Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in city council elections varies depending on where you live in Winchester. Overall, seven wards currently have a variance of more than 10%, and one ward, Boarhunt & Southwick, has a variance of 35% below the average for the city.

Our proposals for Winchester City

Winchester City Council currently has 57 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a decrease in council size by 12 to 45 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that Winchester City Council's 45 councillors should represent a total of 15 three-member wards, across the district. None of our proposed wards have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Winchester City by 2020.

You have until 6 April 2015 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 17 for how to have your say.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Winchester City Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the city.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns. The submissions received during the consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
19 August 2014	Decision on council size
26 August 2014	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
4 November 2014	Analysis of submissions and formulation of draft recommendations
10 February 2015	Publication of draft recommendations
7 April 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
30 June 2015	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your ward name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2014	2020
Electorate of Winchester City	93,886	100,501
Number of Councillors	45	45
Average number of electors per councillor	2,086	2,233

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Winchester City.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between city wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into city wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single city ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Winchester City Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 7% to 2020. The growth will largely be driven by substantial new housing developments at Barton Farm and the West of Waterlooville Development Area.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

16 A single submission was received, from Winchester City Council, during the preliminary period. The submission proposed a council size of 45 (a decrease of 12). The Council argued that this decrease was appropriate given the way the public seeks information from the Council has changed considerably since the last review of the authority. The Council also stated it would make a significant cost saving by reducing the number of members.

17 On the basis of the Council's submission, which was supported by clear evidence, we are minded to recommend a council size of 45 elected members for Winchester.

Warding patterns

18 During consultation on warding patterns, we received 33 submissions. These included a submission from Winchester City Council which stated that there was no agreement between the major parties and therefore it could only provide a suggested approach. In particular, it suggested that the Winchester city area should be represented by five wards. We also received city-wide warding patterns from the Conservative Group on Winchester City Council (the Conservatives), the Liberal Democrat Group on Winchester City Council (the Liberal Democrats) and a personal submission from Councillor Godfrey (Wonston & Micheldever) who also submitted the Conservative scheme. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the city.

19 The city-wide schemes provided by each of the political parties were significantly different from each other and reflected some of the suggestions made in the Council's submission. The Conservative's warding proposals provided for a mixed pattern of single- and three-member wards. The Liberal Democrat's warding proposals provided for a pattern of two- and three-member wards. Councillor Godfrey's proposals contained a uniform pattern of three member wards. As Winchester City Council elects by thirds, there is a presumption in legislation that the authority should have a uniform pattern of three-member wards. We are of the view that compelling evidence is required to justify departing from this presumption.

20 We have carefully considered each of the proposals received and have visited

Winchester in order to observe the proposed ward boundaries on the ground. In some areas of the city the proposed patterns of wards have resulted in good levels of electoral equality and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. Where this is the case we have looked to incorporate these patterns into our recommendations. We did not consider that sufficient evidence had been received to justify departing from a uniform pattern of three-member wards.

21 Our draft recommendations are therefore based on the proposals put forward by Councillor Godfrey for 15 three-member wards. We have recommended amendments in some areas to ensure that wards reflect clear transport and communication links between communities. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

22 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 19–20) and on the large map accompanying this report.

23 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Detailed wards

24 The tables on pages 8–14 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Winchester City. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

⁴ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Winchester City

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
St Barnabas	3	4%	This ward comprises part of the residential area to the north of the city centre, including the areas of Weeke and Harestock.	The Council suggested that Winchester 'town' should have five wards. Of the other submissions relating to this area, one included the development site at Barton Farm in this ward and named it Winchester North. The other three respondents did not include the Barton Farm area and proposed the ward be named St Barnabas. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that it is more appropriate that the Barton Farm development remains outside of the 'town' wards. This is to ensure good electoral equality across the town and its surrounding area. All of the proposed warding patterns submitted to us included the Harestock area in this ward. Another submission was based on six wards in Winchester, which we are unable to accede to given the need to ensure good electoral equality across the town. Accordingly, our recommended St Barnabas ward will ensure good electoral equality as well as reflecting community identities in this area.
St Bartholomew	3	-7%	This ward comprises part of the residential area to the north-east of the city, including Abbott's Barton, Hyde and Winnall as well as part of the city centre.	During consultation, two respondents proposed a ward that was based on the existing St Bartholomew ward with the addition of the area of Winnall and suggested the existing ward name be retained. One of the respondents suggested a very similar boundary and the ward name of Winchester Riverside. We also received a submission which stated that the boundaries of the current ward require very little amendment. Given that the overall number of councillors for Winchester is being reduced by 12, it is not possible to retain the existing ward and ensure good electoral equality. Our draft recommendations will provide an effective balance

				between the statutory criteria and ensure that electoral variances are kept to a minimum.
St Luke	3	-3%	This ward comprises part of the residential area to the south-west of the city including Sleepers' Hill, Stanmore and the separate parish of Badger Farm.	In response to consultation, two respondents proposed a ward based mainly on the existing St Luke ward with the addition of the parish of Badger Farm and a small area around St Cross Road. This area is to the east of the main railway line which has established road and pedestrian access with the rest of the ward. Another suggested a ward that consisted of the current St Luke ward plus a much larger area around St Cross Road. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that a small area around St Cross Road should be included in St Luke ward to ensure good electoral equality for the area. Accordingly, our proposed St Luke ward includes the small area to the south of Lower Stanmore Lane and east of St Cross Road.
St Michael	3	6%	This ward comprises the city centre of Winchester and the residential areas to the south-east of the city centre including St Cross and Highcliffe.	During consultation, two respondents proposed a ward based mainly on the existing St Michael ward with the addition of the Highcliffe and St Giles's Hill areas from St John & All Saints ward and the transfer of West Hill to St Paul ward. One submission proposed a ward based mainly on the existing ward but with the addition of the St Giles's Hill area. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that West Hill should be included in St Paul ward instead of St Michael to ensure good electoral equality.
St Paul	3	1%	This ward comprises the residential areas to the west of the city centre, including West Hill.	In response to consultation, two respondents based their proposals on the existing ward but with the addition of the West Hill area. One respondent made a proposal based on the existing ward plus the Teg Down Estate. Another submission was based on six wards in Winchester, which we are unable to accede to if we are to achieve good electoral equality. Having visited the area, and given our decision to ward Barton Farm with areas outside of the town and the Teg

				Down estate in St Barnabas ,we are of the view that West Hill should be included in this ward. We are confident we have achieved good electoral equality for this area and that our proposed ward reflects community identity and has clear and identifiable boundaries.
--	--	--	--	--

Northern parishes

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Alresford & Itchen Valley	3	6%	This ward consists of the town of New Alresford and the parishes of Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Itchen Stoke & Ovington, Itchen Valley, Northington, and Old Alresford.	In response to consultation, three respondents proposed a three-member ward based on Alresford and the surrounding villages. Two of these were identical and split the parish of Itchen Valley between wards. The other submission included all of Itchen Valley parish in a proposed ward named Alresford & Villages. Having considered the evidence received and having visited the area, we are not persuaded that splitting the parish of Itchen Valley between wards would reflect community identities. We have decided to include the parish of Tichborne in a Twyford & Upper Meon Valley ward to allow for more identifiable ward boundaries and therefore ensure convenient and effective local government.
Colden Common & Otterbourne	3	-2%	This ward consists of the parishes of Colden Common, Hursley, Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne	In response to consultation one respondent suggested a three-member ward for this area with the inclusion of the Twyford area. Another suggested that Colden Common be included in a two-member ward with Twyford. Furthermore, they proposed that Otterbourne be included in a three-member ward with Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery to the south-west of the Winchester town area. Having considered the evidence and visited the area, we are of the view that a three-member ward containing Colden Common, Hursley, Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne best reflects our statutory

				criteria.
Kings Worthy	3	-3%	This ward consists of the parishes of Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy and part of the parish of South Wonston.	In response to consultation, two respondents suggested a three-member ward that included part of the parish of Itchen Valley and the military housing at Worthy Down. Another suggested a two-member ward consisting of the parishes of Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy, less the development site at Barton Farm. The parish councils of Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy both stated their desire for Headbourne Worthy to be included in a ward with Kings Worthy. Having considered the evidence received, we propose a Kings Worthy ward comprising the parishes of Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy and part of South Wonston parish. As well as minimising electoral variances, we consider the proposed ward will provide an accurate reflection of community identities and interests in this area.
Twyford & Upper Meon Valley	3	8%	This ward consists of the parishes of Chilcomb, Compton & Shawford, Owslebury and Twyford as well as the parishes of Beauworth, Bramdean & Hinton Ampner, Cheriton, Corhampton & Meonstoke, Droxford, Exton, Kilmeston, Tichborne, Warnford and West Meon in the Upper Meon Valley.	In response to consultation, one respondent suggested that this area be covered by two single-member wards and that Twyford be included in a three-member ward with Colden Common & Otterbourne. Another two respondents suggested three-member wards for the area. One suggested a ward with the Upper Meon Valley and Itchen Valley parishes paired together. Another suggested a ward with the Upper Meon Valley paired with Twyford and surrounding parishes. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that pairing the Upper Meon Valley parishes and Twyford best meets the statutory criteria. However, we are concerned that this ward does not reflect clear transport links between the east and west of the proposed ward. We therefore propose that the parish of Tichborne be included in the proposed ward to provide a more identifiable boundary.

Wonston & Micheldever	3	-4%	This ward consists of the parishes of Crawley, Littleton & Harestock, Micheldever, Sparsholt and Wonston, and part of the parish of South Wonston.	In response to consultation, one respondent proposed a single-member ward of Dever Valley. Two others proposed a three-member ward in this area with slightly different boundaries around the military housing at Worthy Down. Having considered the evidence received, we propose a ward that adds Crawley and Sparsholt to the existing ward.
----------------------------------	---	-----	--	---

Southern parishes

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2019	Description	Detail
Bishop's Waltham	3	4%	This ward consists of the town of Bishop's Waltham and the parishes of Durley and Upham.	In response to consultation, the Council suggested that either Durley or Upham be added to Bishop's Waltham to form a viable ward. Two respondents suggested that Upham be added and one respondent suggested that Durley be added. The parish councils of Durley and Upham both expressed a preference to remain in their current ward. We are of the view that adding both Durley and Upham to Bishop's Waltham creates a ward that best meets the statutory criteria and ensures good electoral equality.
Central Meon Valley	3	-2%	This ward consists of the parishes of Hambledon, Soberton, Swanmore and the Waltham Chase area from Shedfield parish.	In response to consultation, the Council suggested that Soberton parish, which is currently split between wards, should be united in a new ward. Three respondents proposed a three-member ward and put forward the ward names of Central Meon Valley or Swanmore & Hambledon. A number of local residents wrote and asked that Soberton parish be reunited in one ward and a submission from the local councillor from Shedfield asked that Shedfield parish not be divided between wards. Two submissions, from a local councillor and Swanmore Parish Council, suggested a similar three-member ward that also included Droxford. We are of the view that to create a pattern of wards in the south of the

				district it is necessary to split a parish. Waltham Chase in Shedfield parish has good transport links with Swanmore and we are of the view that it could be placed in that ward. We considered we have received sufficient evidence to justify placing Soberton in a single ward in order to reflect community identities.
Denmead	3	-3%	This ward consists of the town of Denmead and a small part of the parish of Southwick & Widley around the West of Waterlooville Development area.	In response to consultation, the Council suggested that Denmead ward should include a portion of the West of Waterlooville development which straddles Denmead and Southwick & Widley parishes. Three respondents also proposed that Denmead ward should contain a part of Southwick & Widley parish but differed as to which specific area. Having visited the area, we subsequently sought clarification on the electorate in the development and the pattern of proposed development. We are of the view that a viable parish ward should be created within Southwick & Widley to ensure good electoral equality in time for elections in 2016 and that this parish ward be part of Denmead ward.
Whiteley & Shedfield	3	-7%	This ward consists of Curdrige, Whiteley and the Shedfield part of Shedfield parish.	In response to consultation, the Council suggested that Whiteley and Wickham be placed into separate wards due to expected development in Whiteley. Two respondents suggested that Durley parish and Shedfield be included in this ward. One submission suggested a two-member ward of Whiteley & Curdrige. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that a three-member ward including part of Shedfield parish best reflects the statutory criteria.
Wickham	3	3%	This ward consists of the town of Wickham, Boarhunt and the remainder of Southwick & Widley parish.	In response to consultation, three respondents proposed a three-member ward comprising Wickham, Boarhunt and part of Southwick & Widley parish. Southwick & Widley Parish Council requested that it either be in a three-member ward with Swanmore or that the existing two-member ward be

				<p>retained. We are unable to accede to either of these requests given our recommendations for the wider area and the need to accommodate the increased electorate in adjoining areas of development. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that a three-member ward containing Wickham, Boarhunt and part of Southwick & Widley parish best reflects the statutory criteria and will ensure good electoral equality in the long-term.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Conclusions

25 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2020 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	45	45
Number of electoral wards	15	15
Average number of electors per councillor	2,086	2,233
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

Draft recommendation

Winchester City Council should comprise 45 councillors serving 15 wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Winchester City. You can also view our draft recommendations for Winchester City on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

26 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

27 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Winchester City Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

28 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littleton & Harestock, Shedfield, South Wonston and Southwick & Widley. We have given consideration to our proposed ward boundaries and the existing ward boundaries, but have not taken into account the existing parish ward boundaries. We therefore welcome comments on these parish arrangements.

29 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littleton & Harestock.

Draft recommendation

Littleton & Harestock Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Harestock (returning eight members) and Littleton (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

30 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Shedfield.

Draft recommendation

Shedfield Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Shedfield (returning six members) and Waltham Chase (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

31 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for South Wonston.

Draft recommendation

South Wonston Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards: South Wonston (returning six members) and Worthy Down (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

32 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Southwick & Widley.

Draft recommendation

Southwick & Widley Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Southwick & Widley (returning eight members) and North East (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 Have your say

33 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole city or just a part of it.

34 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Winchester City, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

35 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

36 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Winchester)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

37 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Winchester City which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed ward? Is there any form of public transport?

38 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

39 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

40 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

41 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Winchester City Council in 2016.

Equalities

42 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Winchester City Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alresford & Itchen Valley	3	7,058	2,353	13%	7,085	2,362	6%
2	Bishop's Waltham	3	6,876	2,292	10%	6,954	2,318	4%
3	Central Meon Valley	3	6,641	2,214	6%	6,561	2,187	-2%
4	Colden Common & Otterbourne	3	6,589	2,196	5%	6,538	2,179	-2%
5	Denmead	3	5,827	1,942	-7%	6,471	2,157	-3%
6	Kings Worthy	3	4,441	1,480	-29%	6,530	2,176	-3%
7	St Barnabas	3	7,014	2,338	12%	6,980	2,327	4%
8	St Bartholomew	3	6,287	2,096	0%	6,257	2,086	-7%
9	St Luke	3	6,410	2,137	2%	6,521	2,174	-3%
10	St Michael	3	6,747	2,249	8%	7,070	2,357	6%
11	St Paul	3	7,374	2,458	18%	6,742	2,247	1%
12	Twyford & Upper Meon Valley	3	7,135	2,378	14%	7,255	2,418	8%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Winchester City Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13	Whiteley & Shedfield	3	4,874	1,625	-22%	6,210	2,070	-7%
14	Wickham	3	4,462	1,487	-28%	6,889	2,296	3%
15	Wonston & Micheldever	3	6,151	2,050	-2%	6,440	2,147	-4%
	Totals	45	93,886	–	–	100,501	–	–
	Averages	–	–	2,086	–	–	2,233	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Winchester City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/hampshire/winchester>

Local authority

- Winchester City Council

Political parties

- Winchester City Council Liberal Democrat Group
- Winchester Conservative Association, Meon Valley Conservative Association and Winchester City Council Conservative Group (Joint Submission)

Councillors

- Councillor R. Huxstep, District Councillor for Shedfield
- Councillor C. Dibden, District Councillor for Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon
- Councillor F. Mather, District Councillor for St Michael
- Councillor S. Godfrey, District Councillor for Wonston & Micheldever
- Councillor V Weston, District Councillor for Swanmore & Newtown

Parish councils

- Boarhunt Parish Council
- Colden Common Parish Council
- Compton & Shawford Parish Council
- Denmead Parish Council
- Durley Parish Council
- Headbourne Worthy Parish Council
- Kings Worthy Parish Council
- Oliver's Battery Parish Council
- Southwick & Widley Parish Council
- Swanmore Parish Council
- Twyford Parish Council
- Upham Parish Council
- Councillor J. Taylor, Wickham Parish Council

Residents

- 12 local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

