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Summary

Who we are and what we do

1. 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.

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

Electoral review

3. 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 Windsor and Maidenhead?

4. We are conducting a review of Windsor and Maidenhead at the request of the Council in order to examine the appropriate number of councillors to represent the area. The value of each vote in borough elections varies depending on where you live in Windsor and Maidenhead. Some councillors currently represent many more or fewer voters than others. This is ‘electoral inequality’. Our aim is to create ‘electoral equality’, where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

Our proposals for Windsor and Maidenhead

- Windsor and Maidenhead should be represented by 42 councillors, 15 fewer than there are now.
- Windsor and Maidenhead should have 19 wards, four fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of 13 wards should change, five will stay the same.

Have your say

5. We are consulting on our draft recommendations for a nine-week period, from 6 March 2018 to 7 May 2018. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to contribute to the design of the new wards – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the views we received.
6 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

You have until 7 May 2018 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 29 for how to send us your response.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

8 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Sir Tony Redmond (Deputy Chair)
- Alison Lowton
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Steve Robinson
- Andrew Scallan CBE

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

This electoral review will seek to ensure that:

- The wards in Windsor and Maidenhead are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

What is an electoral review?

Our three main considerations are to:

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

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 http://www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Windsor and Maidenhead. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 September 2017</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 September 2017</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March 2018</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 2018</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

14 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 cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation\(^2\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^3\) there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

16 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

17 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>108,893</td>
<td>118,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>2,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. Of our 19 proposed wards for Windsor and Maidenhead will have good electoral equality by 2023.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

20 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

21 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2023, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2018. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 9% by 2023.

---

\(^3\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
However, at the end of the consultation, when the Council submitted its proposed warding arrangements, we noted that the forecast figures used by the Council did not reflect the previously agreed forecast numbers by polling district. Specifically, while the overall forecast figure for the borough remained the same, when examining each polling district, there had been a significant reallocation of electors between polling districts by the Council.

Following discussions with the authority, significant differences were noted. For example, in polling district SA (which is in the Maidenhead area), the Council forecasted a decline of approximately 800 electors over the five years to 2023, whereas in the originally agreed forecast, this area was forecast to see an increase in electors of approximately 300. We understand that the Council has estimated the overall number of houses (including new developments) in each of its proposed wards and applied the average 1.7 electors per household ratio for the borough in every polling district. The application of this ratio resulted in many differences when compared to the originally agreed forecast.

We have reservations about this approach, particularly given that these revised forecasts are not grounded in the current electorate per polling district. We also have some reservations in respect of applying the elector per household ratio in the way described by the Council. We have concluded that the Council’s original electorate forecast agreed at the start of the review is the soundest basis on which to proceed. Therefore, while we have used the Council’s scheme as a basis for some of our draft recommendations, we have made some significant alterations in certain wards to create a warding pattern that provides for good electoral equality across the borough. We would particularly welcome comments on this aspect of the review during the current consultation.

**Number of councillors**

The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead currently has 57 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by the Council, and by Hurley Parish Council. We concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by 14 to 43 would make sure that the Council could carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 43 councillors – for example, 43 one-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

As we developed our warding pattern for Windsor and Maidenhead, we found that a 42-member pattern would ensure a more even spread of councillors across the borough than 43 members. Therefore, our draft recommendations are based on a 42-member council. This approach is consistent with our guidance where we explain that it may be necessary to make a small alteration to council size to secure better and more clearly identifiable boundaries

We received nine submissions that referred to the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. The submissions generally argued that a larger council size of 47 would represent community identities better than the 43-member warding pattern proposed by the Council. However, we have based our
draft recommendations on a 42-member council as we are confident this will reflect the way in which the Council operates and ensure the effective representation of local residents.

Ward boundaries consultation

29 We received 55 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included one detailed borough-wide proposal from the Council, which was based on a pattern of wards to be represented by 43 elected members. We also received partial schemes from the Windsor Conservative Association, Windsor Labour Party and a local resident. Localised submissions were received from various parish councils, political groups, residents' associations and local residents.

30 When we formulated our draft recommendations, we decided to use the Council's submission as a basis for our new warding pattern for the area. This was the only full borough-wide scheme we received during the consultation and was supported by evidence of community identities. However, as stated above, it soon became apparent that the Council had used different electorate forecasts to those agreed at the beginning of the review and published online. This meant that the Council's warding pattern did not produce acceptable variances in certain wards. Therefore, while we have used the Council's scheme as a basis for our warding pattern, we have made some significant alterations in certain wards to ensure good electoral equality across the borough.

31 In some areas of the borough we have also considered alternative proposals received, which provided evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas, we considered that the proposals would not provide the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries. We also visited the area to look at the various different proposals on the ground. This tour of Windsor and Maidenhead helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

32 Our draft recommendations are for four three-councillor wards and 15 two-councillor wards. 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.

33 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on page 31–2 and on the large map accompanying this report.

34 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.
Draft recommendations

35 The tables and maps on pages 10–24 detail our draft recommendations for each area of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyn Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furze Platt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkneys Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belmont

36 Our only submission for Belmont ward came from the Council. The Council proposed that the existing Belmont ward should include the northern part of the North Town area between Moor Lane and Ray Mill Road West, which currently sits in Riverside ward. This was to improve electoral equality for Riverside ward. Furthermore, the Council argued that Norfolk Road and its immediate environs should be transferred into the newly created St Mary’s ward.

37 We have based our draft recommendations on the Council’s proposal. However, we have moved the area in between the railway line and the A308, Australia Avenue and the residential properties north of Cordwallis Road into our proposed St Mary’s ward to improve electoral equality. For the same reason, we have decided to include roads north of Moor Lane, which comprises Laggan Road, Laggan Square and North Town Moor, into Belmont ward. Our proposed Belmont ward will have an electoral variance of 9% by 2023.

Boyn Hill

38 The Council proposed that this ward should remain unchanged. We agree with the Council and the Maidenhead Liberal Democrats that that the railway line and A404 form strong and identifiable boundaries for Boyn Hill ward. However, for the ward to have an acceptable variance under our 42-member scheme, we decided to move the eastern part of the ward, which lies between the railway line and A308, into the St Mary’s ward. This would reduce the electoral variance of the ward to -2% by 2023.

39 We also received a submission from a local resident who argued that Boyn Grove Park, which contains Boyne Hill Cricket Club and Boyn Grove Library, should be moved from Pinkneys Green ward into the proposed Boyn Hill ward. We were persuaded by the evidence that the park should be within the ward it primarily serves and have therefore placed it in our proposed Boyn Hill ward.

Cox Green

40 We have based our draft recommendations for Cox Green ward on the Council’s proposals, where there are no boundary changes proposed. Submissions from Cox Green Parish Council and Maidenhead Liberal Democrats stated that Cox Green ward should remain unchanged. The current ward will have good electoral equality in 2023 and reflects community identities.

41 A submission from a local resident stated that the ward should continue to be represented by three councillors due to the ward’s high population. This would create an unacceptably high variance of -29% under a 42-member council, and we therefore propose that two councillors should represent the Cox Green ward in the future.

Furze Platt

42 The Council proposed that Furze Platt ward be extended to take in the area west of the Maidenhead Ditch waterway, which included several streets north of Moor Lane. However, by including this area, the electoral variance for the Furze Platt ward would be 16%. As the current ward will have good electoral equality in 2023,
and allows the Furze Platt community to remain intact, our draft recommendations make no change to the existing Furze Platt ward.

Oldfield
43 The Council’s Oldfield ward had an electoral variance of 18%. Therefore, under our 42-member scheme, we propose that Oldfield ward broadly follows the Council’s proposed boundaries with an amendment in the north-east to improve electoral equality in both Oldfield and St Mary’s wards. This would transfer properties east of Oldfield Road and north of the railway line from Oldfield to St Mary’s ward. While we note that local councillors requested that this area remain in Oldfield ward, we considered that the railway line would form a strong ward boundary. It also appeared the most logical area to include in adjoining wards to ensure good electoral equality.

44 Consequently, while we have decided to base our draft recommendations on the proposals of the Council, we have made this modification to the proposed boundary to improve electoral equality.

Pinkneys Green
45 We have based our draft recommendations for Pinkneys Green ward on the Council’s proposals. The only boundary change we have made is the transfer of the Boyn Grove Park area to Boyn Hill ward as stated in paragraph 39. Under our proposals, this ward will have good electoral equality in 2023 and will, in our view, reflect community identities.

Riverside
46 We have followed the Council’s proposals for Riverside ward, which uses the Maidenhead Ditch waterway down to Ray Mill Road West as a strong, identifiable boundary.

47 As mentioned earlier, the Council’s proposal to move the North Town area (between Moor Lane and Ray Mill Road West) from the existing Riverside ward and our amendment to include the roads north of Moor Lane to Belmont ward have been adopted. Our proposed Riverside ward will ensure that the proposed ward has good electoral equality and uses identifiable ward boundaries.

St Mary’s
48 St Mary’s ward was proposed by the Council as a new ward for Maidenhead town centre, taking in parts of the existing Oldfield and Belmont wards. This ward had support from the current Oldfield ward councillors. However, under the Council’s proposals, St Mary’s ward had an extremely high electoral variance. We have an obligation to ensure that electors in Windsor and Maidenhead have a vote of broadly equal weight and consider that such a high variance would not provide for sufficient electoral equality.

49 We have therefore based our St Mary’s ward on the Council’s proposals, but with the inclusion of parts of the existing Boyn Hill and Belmont wards to ensure good electoral equality. As previously stated, we have moved Norfolk Road and the surrounding residential properties from Belmont ward and have moved the eastern part of Boyn Hill ward into St Mary’s. As discussed in paragraph 43, we have also moved the north-eastern part of the existing Oldfield ward, north of the railway line,
into St Mary’s ward. With these changes, our proposed St Mary’s ward will have an electoral variance of -8% by 2023.
### Maidenhead rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisham &amp; Cookham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley &amp; Walthams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bisham & Cookham**

50 The Council did not propose any changes to the existing Bisham & Cookham ward. The current ward will have good electoral equality in 2023 and reflects community identities, based on the evidence received. The ward will remain coterminous with parish boundaries.

51 We received one submission from a local resident who wished to be moved from Bisham parish to Cookham parish. This, however, falls outside the scope of an electoral review and a community governance review would be required for this change.

**Bray**

52 We received eight submissions relating to Bray ward. The Council proposed the ward remain unchanged, while one submission from a local resident stated that Bray ward should not increase in size due to the rural nature of the ward.

53 A partial scheme from a local resident proposed that the existing ward of Bray be split into three single-member wards, creating a Holyport village ward, a Bray St Michael ward named after the Bray village church, and a ward incorporating parts of the Bray, White Waltham and Shottesbrooke parishes. Whilst the electoral variances for these wards were good, we were not persuaded that the wards effectively reflected community identity and have therefore not adopted these proposals as part of our draft recommendations.

54 Bray Parish Council, the Fisheries Residents’ Association and a local resident argued that the Fisheries estate, which has recently transferred into the Bray parish as part of a community governance review, should also be placed within an enlarged Bray ward. However, placing the Fisheries estate into Bray ward would result in an electoral variance of 13%.

55 Similarly, Bray Parish Council and a local resident also argued that the eastern ward boundary should be coterminous with the Bray parish boundary to aid effective and convenient local government. However, moving these electors from the existing Clewer North and Clewer South wards would result in an electoral variance of 26%, which is unacceptably high.

56 The Oakley Green & Fifield Residents’ Association proposed that electors south of Maidenhead Road and north of Dedworth Road, up to the Bray parish boundary, be moved into Bray ward from the existing Clewer North ward on the grounds of community identity. Moving these electors would create a Bray ward with an electoral variance of 12%.

57 We do not consider the evidence is sufficiently persuasive to justify any of the above electoral variances for Bray ward. We therefore propose that Bray ward remains unchanged, as proposed by the Council.

**Hurley & Walthams**

58 We received six submissions that specifically related to the Hurley & Walthams area. The Council proposed that the ward should not change, stating that parishes within the ward work well together and have a shared community identity. One
A submission from a local resident stated that Hurley & Walthams ward should not increase in size due to the rural nature of the ward.

59 Four other submissions argued against reducing the number of councillors to two for this ward. They emphasised the size and predominantly rural nature of the area, with poor transport links across the ward. However, increasing the number of councillors to three for this ward would create an unacceptably high electoral variance of -39%.

60 Both Hurley Parish Church and White Waltham Parish Council proposed that the ward be split into two single-member wards. Hurley Parish Church’s proposal of splitting the wards across the Hurley parish boundary created electoral variances of 28% and -44%.

61 White Waltham Parish Council’s proposal included the parish of Waltham St Lawrence in a ward with Hurley parish, alongside a ward with Shottesbrooke and White Waltham parishes. This resulted in acceptable electoral variances of -7% and -9% respectively. However, we were not persuaded that the proposed Waltham St Lawrence & Hurley ward would have good transports links, with no direct access between either parish. We therefore recommend retaining the existing Hurley & Walthams ward with two councillors and a forecast electoral variance of -8% by 2023.
## Windsor town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clewer &amp; Dedworth East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewer &amp; Dedworth West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewer East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datchet, Horton &amp; Wraysbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eton &amp; Castle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Windsor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clewer & Dedworth East and Clewer & Dedworth West

We have decided to base our draft recommendations for Clewer & Dedworth East ward on the proposals of the Council and the West Windsor Conservative Association. We have used Smiths Lane, Wolf Lane and Hemwood Road as the ward boundary on the western side of the ward. However, we have made changes to the Council’s proposal on the eastern side of the ward to improve electoral equality for this ward and Clewer East.

Whereas the Council ran the boundary for Clewer & Dedworth East down the A332 and B3173, we have decided to run the boundary west of the roads adjoining Mill Lane, Parsonage Lane and Hatch Lane. This is similar to the boundary proposed by a local resident, who suggested the boundary run through St Andrew’s Avenue and Bell View. Our draft recommendations result in a Clewer & Dedworth East ward with an electoral variance of 1%.

This is a variation of the boundary proposed by Councillor Da Costa and West Windsor Residents’ Association who argued that the separate Clewer and Dedworth communities could be split down Mill Lane, Parsonage Lane and Hatch Lane. We could not accept this boundary, however, as the electoral variance for the resulting Clewer & Dedworth East ward would be 24%.

We have based our Clewer & Dedworth West ward on the Council’s proposal, with the addition of Washington Drive from Clewer & Dedworth East. We included this road in our Clewer & Dedworth West ward as it has better road links with this area rather than with Clewer & Dedworth East. This ward will have an electoral variance of 3% by 2023. We have also included the Legoland Estate within this ward, as per a local resident’s submission which suggested that the theme park should be incorporated within a Windsor-centric ward.

Clewer East

Our Clewer East ward is built upon a submission from the Windsor Labour Party, which proposed additions to the north of the existing ward by including Parsonage Lane and its adjoining roads, as well as Clewer Village north of the A308. We consider this expanded Clewer East ward will reflect community identities in that the Clewer Town and Clewer Village communities will remain intact and not divided between wards.

We have also transferred properties on the south side of Winkfield Road from the existing Park ward. We considered these properties were better placed in Clewer East than within our proposed Old Windsor ward as they are geographically closer to Windsor town than Old Windsor village.

Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury and Eton & Castle

The submissions we received for this area proposed significantly different boundaries to the Datchet, Horton & The Etions ward proposed by the Council. A clear majority of the submissions opposed the parishes of Datchet and Horton being placed in a ward with the parish of Eton. Datchet Parish Council, Horton Parish Council, the Windsor Conservative Association, as well as several local residents, all stated that Datchet and Horton parishes share more in common with Wraysbury
parish geographically, historically, and culturally, and thus proposed an alternative Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury ward.

69 We consider that creating a Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury ward would better represent community identities north of the River Thames, and the parishes are well connected by the B376 road. We therefore propose a three-member Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury ward based on the evidence received during consultation.

70 We received six submissions that related to the Eton area. Eton Town Council, Eton Community Association and Eton Wick Village Association all opposed the Council’s Datchet, Horton & The Etons ward, arguing that Eton and Eton Wick are self-contained communities with no relationship to the parishes of Datchet or Horton. It was also argued that the parish of Eton could continue to be linked to Windsor town to create a ward with good electoral equality. The Windsor Labour Party and a local resident proposed an Eton & Eton Wick ward, while the Windsor Conservative Association proposed an Eton, Eton Wick & Agars ward alongside a Central Windsor ward. However, we do not consider these proposals would either result in good electoral equality or effectively reflect local communities.

71 We have carefully considered all the submissions received and have decided to recommend an Eton ward that extends south into Windsor. Our proposed three-member Eton & Castle ward thus broadly reflects the existing arrangements with the addition of the current Eton Wick and Castle Without areas. Furthermore, the south-eastern boundary of the ward instead runs along Queen Elizabeth’s Walk rather than the A308. We consider that this ward reflects community identities better than the Council’s proposed Datchet, Horton & The Etons ward. Our tour of the area found that the Royal Windsor Way and Windsor Bridge provide a good transport link between the two communities.

Old Windsor
72 The submissions we received from Old Windsor Parish Council and the Old Windsor Residents’ Association objected to the Council’s proposal for creating a ward made up of Old Windsor and Wraysbury parishes. This was also proposed by the Windsor Labour Party. The basis for this opposition came from the argument that there are no transport links or shared facilities between the two parishes, which are separated by the River Thames with no bridge or boat service between the two. We were persuaded by this evidence and have placed Wraysbury parish in a ward with Datchet and Horton and kept Old Windsor parish separate.

73 However, we could not propose an Old Windsor ward which followed the existing ward and parish boundaries as it would either have too many or too few electors for a single- or two-member ward. Old Windsor Parish Council, Old Windsor Residents’ Association and Cllr Jones suggested that we absorb the whole Crown Estate, which runs up to edge of Windsor town, in a revised ward. This, however, provided an electoral variance of -15%. We have therefore decided to incorporate the extreme south-eastern part of Windsor town into our proposed Old Windsor ward, which includes roads east of the Combermere Barracks, south of Osborne Road and west of Kings Road. We have decided that this area is the most logical to include in Old Windsor ward, as it has good transport links with Old Windsor village via the A308. We consider that this is a better alternative to the Windsor
Conservative Association’s proposal to combine Old Windsor village with south Datchet.

74 Our Old Windsor ward therefore includes the village of Old Windsor and the south-eastern part of Windsor town. The southern part of the ward boundary, however, runs through Crimp Hill as opposed to following Old Windsor’s parish boundary. We have chosen to run the boundary here instead to create improved electoral equality in our proposed Ascot & Sunninghill ward which is described in more detail in the next section of this report.
Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascot &amp; Sunninghill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ascot &amp; Sunningdale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ascot & Sunninghill and South Ascot & Sunningdale

75 Due to the isolated nature of this area in relation to the rest of the borough, we were unable to provide a warding pattern which was able to both reflect community identities and minimise electoral variances under a 42- or 43-member warding scheme. Our draft recommendations for the area are broadly based on the proposals of the Council and the Windsor Conservative Association, with some amendments to improve electoral equality. While these proposals were not supported by some locally, we consider that our draft recommendations for this area best satisfy our statutory criteria when taking account of the geography of the area. We are nonetheless particularly interested to hear local views relating to the proposed wards during this consultation.

76 In addition to the Council’s and Windsor Conservative Association proposals for the area, we also received a partial scheme from the Windsor Labour Party and Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council. Both schemes were based on a five-member warding pattern for this area. While these schemes provided for reasonable electoral equality, the consequential effects of adopting a five-member scheme for the area on proposed wards across the rest of the borough was significant. For this reason, we decided not to adopt these proposals.

77 A joint submission from the area’s local councillors requested three wards for the area, with two members each. This had the support of Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council and Sunningdale Parish Council. In consideration of this, we tried to formulate various combinations of wards based on these proposals. We could not identify a warding pattern that minimised electoral variances while reflecting community identities and interests.

78 The Council and the Windsor Conservative Association both suggested an Ascot & Sunninghill ward with an electoral variance of -16%. To reduce this electoral variance, we have decided to extend the ward boundary north into Windsor Great Park. By running the northern boundary of the ward along Crimp Hill road and the B3022, we can reduce the variance of this ward to a more acceptable -13%. We consider that the A332 and Sunninghill Road represent clear transport links from Ascot and Cheapside villages towards the north of the ward.

79 We examined the option of creating an Ascot, Cheapside & South Sunninghill ward, and a North Sunninghill, Sunningdale & Windsor Great Park ward that went further north to take roads in the south of Windsor, such as St Leonard’s Hill and Woodland Avenue. However, while this proposal would minimise electoral variances, we concluded it would not reflect community identities and would arbitrarily link disparate settlements in the same ward.

80 The Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group and Sunningdale Parish Council requested areas surrounding Sunningdale Park, Lynwood Village and Blacknest Park be placed in Sunningdale ward, as the existing ward and parish boundary currently cuts through these areas. We have, however, decided not to adopt this change as this would create an arbitrary parish ward. A community governance review would be the most appropriate starting point for addressing any existing anomalies in parish or community boundaries.
A submission from a local resident suggested that the whole area of Ascot, Sunninghill, Sunningdale and Cheapside be incorporated into one single ward. We decided not to adopt this proposal as this ward would require five councillors. We consider this would not aid effective and convenient local government and potentially dilute the accountability of councillors to the electorate.

We also had one submission from a local resident which requested that the borough boundary which runs through North Ascot be amended so that North Ascot is wholly contained in one local authority. This, however, falls outside the scope of the current electoral review.
Conclusions

83 The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2017 and 2023 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>2,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft recommendation**
The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead should be made up of 42 councillors serving 19 wards representing 15 two-councillor wards and four three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

**Mapping**
Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
You can also view our draft recommendations for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk

**Parish electoral arrangements**

84 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.

85 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, the Royal
Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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.

86 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 Bray Parish Council, Old Windsor Parish Council and
Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council.

87 As 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 Bray parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bray Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Green &amp; Fifield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fisheries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88 As 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 Old Windsor parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Windsor Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 As 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 Sunninghill & Ascot parish.
**Draft recommendation**

Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascot &amp; Sunninghill</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ascot</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Have your say

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

91 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for Windsor and Maidenhead, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

92 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

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

Review Officer (Windsor and Maidenhead)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

94 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Windsor and Maidenhead 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

95 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

96 Electoral equality:

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

97 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?

98 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 wards? Is there any form of public transport?

99 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 Millbank (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.

100 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.

101 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.

102 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 all-out elections for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead in 2019.

**Equalities**

103 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

### Draft recommendations for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2017)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average (%)</th>
<th>Electorate (2023)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ascot &amp; Sunninghill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Belmont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bisham &amp; Cookham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,353</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5,912</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Boyn Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,102</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>5,532</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6,144</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Clewer &amp; Dedworth East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,248</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Clewer &amp; Dedworth West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5,912</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Clewer East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cox Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,695</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6,038</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Datchet, Horton &amp; Wraysbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,812</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Eton &amp; Castle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9,038</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Furze Platt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2017)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
<td>Electorate (2023)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hurley &amp; Walthams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Old Windsor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oldfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>6,006</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pinkneys Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,596</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,209</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 South Ascot &amp; Sunningdale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,618</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>7,345</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 St Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,893</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>118,838</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,593</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead at the start of the review.

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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Appendix B

Outline map
**Key**

1. Ascot & Sunninghill  
2. Belmont  
3. Bisham & Cookham  
4. Boyn Hill  
5. Bray  
6. Clewer & Dedworth East  
7. Clewer & Dedworth West  
8. Clewer East  
9. Cox Green  
10. Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury  
11. Eton & Castle  
12. Furze Platt  
13. Hurley & Walthams  
14. Old Windsor  
15. Oldfield  
16. Pinkneys Green  
17. Riverside  
18. South Ascot & Sunningdale  
19. St Mary's

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: [http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/berkshire/windsor-and-maidenhead](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/berkshire/windsor-and-maidenhead)
Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/berkshire/windsor-and-maidenhead

Local Authority

- The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Political Group

- Maidenhead Labour Party
- Maidenhead Liberal Democrats
- Windsor Conservative Association
- Windsor Labour Party

Councillors

- Councillor Beer
- Councillor Da Costa
- Councillors Hilton, Bateson, Luxton, Evans, J. Sharpe, Story, Yong & A. Sharpe
- Councillor Hollingsworth
- Councillor Jones
- Councillors Hill, Majeed & Wilson

Local Organisations

- Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group
- Eton Community Association
- Eton Wick Village Association
- Fisheries Residents’ Association
- Hurley Parish Church
- Oakley Green & Fifield Residents’ Association
- Old Windsor Residents’ Association
- West Windsor Residents’ Association

Parish and Town Council

- Bray Parish Council
- Cox Green Parish Council
- Datchet Parish Council
- Eton Town Council
- Horton Parish Council
- Old Windsor Parish Council
• Sunningdale Parish Council
• Sunninghill and Ascot Parish Council
• White Waltham Parish Council
• Wraysbury Parish Council

Local Residents

• 26 local residents
### Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council size</td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fairness</td>
<td>When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral inequality</td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-represented</td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish council</strong></td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish ward</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town council</strong></td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance (or electoral variance)</strong></td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government areas.