

Hendry, Angela

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 July 2018 12:51
To: FOI
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Freedom of Information Request (FOI) on East Hampshire Boundary Review
Importance: High

Dear Professor Mellors

I would like information under the FOI Act on the following:

Could you please explain why the planned programme to place the final recommendations on East Hampshire's recent ward boundary review in front of parliament in January 2019 was suddenly accelerated to May 2018 without the public knowing? The decision to do so is not recorded in any minutes.

The Commission has a lengthy 3-level complaints procedure taking at least 60 working days. Allowing complainants the same courtesy that's 120 working days. So why are submissions to parliament made before this time has elapsed?

Could you please explain why formal complaints on boundary reviews are not discussed or recorded in any minutes? If they are recorded elsewhere could I please have copies or online access to them?

Could you please provide the names and numbers of the individuals and organisations in East Hampshire who objected to the Commission's final recommendations?

At one of its meetings the Commission questioned how preferences for largely single member patterns should be considered in the context of the 'effective and convenient' criterion. How does the Commission.

1. Reconcile 'equality of representation' against 'effective and convenient' local government? Currently the latter seems to carry too much weight.
2. Plans to address this thorny issue, and
3. What action can the public take to formally request a single-member review?

I should add that your 'Transparency' button does not appear to be working, hence this submission.

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Hendry, Angela

From: Hendry, Angela
Sent: 31 July 2018 15:14
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Response to FOI request

Dear [REDACTED]

FOI Ref: 4998/18

Thank you for your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 which we received on 27th July 2018.

You requested:

Could you please explain why the planned programme to place the final recommendations on East Hampshire's recent ward boundary review in front of parliament in January 2019 was suddenly accelerated to May 2018 without the public knowing? The decision to do so is not recorded in any minutes.

The Commission has a lengthy 3-level complaints procedure taking at least 60 working days. Allowing complainants the same courtesy that's 120 working days. So why are submissions to parliament made before this time has elapsed?

Could you please explain why formal complaints on boundary reviews are not discussed or recorded in any minutes? If they are recorded elsewhere could I please have copies or online access to them?

Could you please provide the names and numbers of the individuals and organisations in East Hampshire who objected to the Commission's final recommendations?

At one of its meetings the Commission questioned how preferences for largely single member patterns should be considered in the context of the 'effective and convenient' criterion. How does the Commission.

- 1. Reconcile 'equality of representation' against 'effective and convenient' local government? Currently the latter seems to carry too much weight.**
- 2. Plans to address this thorny issue, and**
- 3. What action can the public take to formally request a single-member review?**

I should add that your 'Transparency' button does not appear to be working, hence this submission.

Some of your queries above do not fall under FOI and these will be responded to in due course.

We hold information on the following:

Could you please provide the names and numbers of the individuals and organisations in East Hampshire who objected to the Commission's final recommendations?

The Commission aims to respond promptly and within the statutory deadline of 20 working days set by the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Please expect a response by 24th August 2018.

In some cases a fee may be payable and if that is the case I will let you know. A fees notice will be issued to you, and you will be required to pay before I will proceed to deal with your request.

If you have any queries or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me on the details provided below. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

Regards,

Angela Hendry
Office Manager and HR Lead

1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

0330 500 1264

The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to give us your views.

Privacy Statement

When we receive a complaint from a person we make up an electronic file containing the details of the complaint. This normally contains the identity of the complainant and any other individuals involved in the complaint.

We will only use the personal information we collect to process the complaint and to check on the level of service we provide. We do compile and publish statistics showing information like the number of complaints we receive, but not in a form which identifies anyone.

We will keep personal information contained in complaint files in line with our retention policy. This means that information relating to a complaint will be retained for three years from closure. It will be retained in a secure environment and access to it will be restricted according to the 'need to know' principle.

Similarly, where enquiries are submitted to us we will only use the information supplied to us to deal with the enquiry and any subsequent issues and to check on the level of service we provide.

Emails - Any email sent to us, including any attachments, may be monitored and used by us for reasons of security and for monitoring compliance with office policy. Email monitoring or blocking software may also be used. Please be aware that you have a responsibility to ensure that any email you send to us is within the bounds of the law.

You can find out more about how we collect and use personal information here (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/about-us/privacy>). If you don't want us to handle your information, please email us to let us know.

Hendry, Angela

From: Hendry, Angela
Sent: 20 August 2018 13:58
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Response to FOI request

Dear [REDACTED]

Our ref: 4998/18

You request:

Could you please explain why the planned programme to place the final recommendations on East Hampshire's recent ward boundary review in front of parliament in January 2019 was suddenly accelerated to May 2018 without the public knowing? The decision to do so is not recorded in any minutes.

It has never been our intention to lay the East Hampshire Statutory Instrument before Parliament in January 2019. At the beginning of the review, we had intended to lay the Order in Parliament in February 2018 and this was indicated in the briefing materials made available to councillors, as well as parish and town council representatives, when we briefed them. Because the Commission decided to conduct a period of further limited consultation in part of the District, the date of publication of our final recommendations was delayed until April 2018. Therefore the date on which we laid the Order was delayed. It is sometimes difficult to give an accurate date on which we intend to lay a statutory instrument in Parliament as recess and sitting days can change at relatively short notice. However we seek to lay an Order in Parliament as soon as is reasonably possible after the final recommendations are published.

The Commission has a lengthy 3-level complaints procedure taking at least 60 working days. Allowing complainants the same courtesy that's 120 working days. So why are submissions to parliament made before this time has elapsed?

Its important to stress that once the final recommendations for an electoral review are published, they cannot be modified. We work to tight timescales and it is important we ensure an Order is laid before Parliament in a reasonably timely fashion. This allows a local authority sufficient time to prepare fully for elections under new ward boundaries. In terms of our complaints procedure, we consider it important to allow sufficient time for us to prepare a comprehensive response to those making a complaint. Furthermore, its important to allow those making a complaint time to digest our response and consider whether they wish to escalate that complaint. It is not reasonable to wait for all complaints to be concluded before laying Orders in Parliament as this could delay or prevent an election from taking place.

Could you please explain why formal complaints on boundary reviews are not discussed or recorded in any minutes? If they are recorded elsewhere could I please have copies or online access to them?

We have a three stage complaints process. The first two stages do not have Commissioner involvement in order that they can view all the evidence afresh if a complainant wishes to escalate a complaint to the third stage. A stage three complaint is considered by the Chair of the Commission. Indeed, our Commissioners have recently requested that, at their monthly meeting, our operational update include all FOI and complaints received over the preceding month. A minuted discussion on a specific complaint would only arise if the Chair decided that a third stage

complaint should have formal Commission consideration. I note your comment on publishing complaints. I am minded to agree with you that complaints that reach the third stage should be published (but redacted to remove any personal identifiers) on our website. Accordingly, from now on, all such complaints will be published on our website.

Could you please provide the names and numbers of the individuals and organisations in East Hampshire who objected to the Commission’s final recommendations?

We hold information on the names and number of individuals and organisations who objected to the Commission’s final recommendations. We received the objection from yourself and one other submission was received that opposed the final recommendations. In terms of the identity, I am afraid I cannot provide you with that information. This is because of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provides a legal framework with regard to the handling of personal information. In practice, our approach is that personal identifiers are redacted to withhold information such as their names and addresses.

At one of its meetings the Commission questioned how preferences for largely single member patterns should be considered in the context of the ‘effective and convenient’ criterion. How does the Commission.

- 1. Reconcile ‘equality of representation’ against ‘effective and convenient’ local government? Currently the latter seems to carry too much weight.**
- 2. Plans to address this thorny issue, and**
- 3. What action can the public take to formally request a single-member review?**

I have attached a link to our technical guidance which addresses the points you raise:

[http://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/lgbce/Corporate%20Documents/technical-guidance-2014%20\(reduced\).pdf](http://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/lgbce/Corporate%20Documents/technical-guidance-2014%20(reduced).pdf)

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our decision, you should write to:

Lynn Ingram
Finance Director
Local Boundary Commission for England
1st Floor
Windsor House
50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <https://ico.org.uk/> .

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Yours sincerely,

Angela Hendry

Angela Hendry
Office Manager and HR Lead
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

0330 500 1264

The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to give us your views.