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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 their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole?

4 The Secretary of State has decided to create a new authority of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. We are conducting a review of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole to ensure that the new unitary council has appropriate electoral arrangements. Our aim is to create ‘electoral equality’, where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal. We also seek to ensure that wards reflect local communities and ensure effective and convenient local government.

Our proposals for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole

- Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole should be represented by 76 councillors.
- Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole should have 33 wards.

Have your say

5 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for an eight-week period, from 3 July to 27 August 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 receive.

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 27 August 2018 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 23 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)
- Susan Johnson OBE
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Andrew Scallan CBE

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

9 In February 2018, the Government agreed in principle to the establishment of a new unitary council to take over the responsibility for all local government services which were formerly provided Bournemouth Borough Council, Christchurch Borough Council and Poole Borough Council. A Structural Changes Order\(^2\) was subsequently made by Parliament on 25 May 2018, establishing a new Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole unitary authority from 1 April 2019. It is the view of the Commission that an electoral review of the area was appropriate at the earliest opportunity. This will ensure the new council has electoral arrangements that reflect its functions and responsibilities in time for its first elections in May 2019.

10 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole 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 district.

What is an electoral review?

11 Our three main considerations are to:

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

12 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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

13 This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 May 2018</td>
<td>Existing local authorities submit proposals for warding arrangements and the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2018</td>
<td>Commission agrees its draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2018</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 October 2018</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole (Structural Changes) Order 2018 (S.I 2018/648).
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 and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation\(^3\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^4\) 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>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole</td>
<td>301,183</td>
<td>309,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>4,076</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’. All of our proposed wards for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2023.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the new council – these have been decided by Parliament and we cannot amend them. Our recommendations will not result in changes to postcodes. They do not take parliamentary constituency boundaries into account. The recommendations will not affect 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 warding submission received. The submission may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

21 The Bournemouth, Christchurch & Poole Joint Committee (‘the Joint Committee’) submitted electorate forecasts for 2023, a period five years on from the

---

\(^3\) Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

\(^4\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
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 3% by 2023.

22 We considered the information provided by the Joint Committee and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

**Number of councillors**

23 In January 2018, representatives of existing councils in the area submitted a proposal to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government that the new council have 76 councillors. In developing its proposal, the new authority was encouraged by the Ministry to follow our Guidance in developing its proposals. The Secretary of State subsequently laid a Structural Changes Order in Parliament to create the new authority with 76 councillors.

24 As part of its submission on warding arrangements, the Joint Committee confirmed its preference for a council size of 76. We note that the proposal for a 76-member council for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole would constitute a reduction of 39% in terms of the overall number of councillors representing the area to be covered by the new authority. We have looked at evidence provided by the Joint Committee and have concluded that the proposed number of councillors will make sure the Council can carry out its new roles and responsibilities effectively.

25 We have therefore formulated these draft recommendations based on a 76-member council.

**Ward boundaries consultation**

26 We received one submission on ward boundaries for the new council. This was a detailed district-wide warding proposal for 76 elected members. The proposal was made by the Joint Committee formed by the local authorities which initially proposed the change in the local government structure.

27 The submitted scheme provided for a pattern of 29 two-councillor wards and six three-councillor wards. We carefully considered this proposal and concluded that the proposed wards would have good levels of electoral equality. We also considered that they generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

28 Our draft recommendations are based on the Joint Committee’s proposal. However, for some areas of the district, we considered that the proposal did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we have identified alternative boundaries.

29 Our draft recommendations are for 23 two-councillor wards and 10 three-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.
30 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on page 22 and on the large map accompanying this report.

31 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

32 The tables and maps on pages 8–21 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory\(^5\) criteria of:

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

Littledown & Iford, Moordown and Winton East

33 The Joint Committee proposed that the Bournemouth borough wards of Littledown & Iford, Moordown and Winton East be replicated. Littledown & Iford is broadly triangular. The eastern boundary is formed by a combination of the River Stour and the edge of Hurn parish, with the western boundary broadly following the A338 Wessex Way, King’s Park Drive and part of Ashley Road. The railway line forms most of the southern boundary.

34 The eastern boundary of Winton East ward runs along Charminster Road. To the west of Bingham Road, the ward’s southern boundary follows Talbot Road and Alma Road, whilst to the east of Bingham Road it follows St Luke’s Road and King’s Road. The western boundary broadly follows Stanfield Road and Edgehill Road whilst Castle Road and Strouden Road mark the northern boundary.
We propose to include Littledown & Iford and Winton East, as suggested by the Joint Committee, in our draft recommendations. We propose a minor change to the boundary of the Moordown ward proposed by the Joint Committee. The Committee’s ward would include 43 Haverstock Road. We propose that this property join 45 and 47 Haverstock Road in our Muscliff & Strouden Park ward. The northern boundary of our Moordown ward is Castle Lane West. The western edge runs along Redhill Avenue and Wimborne Road whilst to the east, the ward goes as far as Charminster Road. To the south, Moordown ward adjoins our Winton East ward.

Muscliff & Strouden Park and Queen’s Park

The Joint Committee proposed a Muscliff & Strouden Park ward which would combine the current Throop & Muscliff ward with the northern part of Strouden Park ward. The Joint Committee argued that the part of Strouden Park ward which lies immediately to the north of Queen’s Park Avenue has similar connections with the properties in Queen’s Park and is described as having previous association with that ward. The Joint Committee therefore proposed that it be combined with the part of Queen’s Park ward which is to the north of Lowther Road to form a ward retaining the Queen’s Park name. Both wards would have good electoral equality.

We propose to base our draft recommendations on the Joint Committee’s proposal. We propose to use the ward name Muscliff & Strouden Park. We note that the name Strouden Park is used by business and service providers which are located in the vicinity of Castle Lane West and consider that the name will continue to be relevant to the new ward. We would particularly welcome comment on our proposed ward name during consultation on these draft recommendations.

We note that the lodge which stands at the southern entrance to North Cemetery is occupied by electors who we consider should be represented in the same ward as residents of Strouden Avenue. We therefore propose to include the cemetery and crematorium in Queen’s Park ward. We propose that all of the properties on Mount Pleasant Drive be included in our Muscliff & Strouden Park ward to better reflect the road layout of the area. Finally, we note the Joint Committee’s proposal to include Wood Farm, off Holdenhurst Village Road, in the same ward as Holdenhurst Village. Wood Farm lies in Hurn parish, however, and the Joint Committee’s proposal would require the creation of a parish ward consisting only of Wood Farm. We would not recommend the creation of such a parish ward and therefore propose that the whole of Hurn parish be included in a single ward of the new authority.

The northern edge of our Muscliff & Strouden Park ward is the Hurn parish boundary, with the A338 Wessex Way forming the eastern boundary. To the south, the boundary is formed by properties on Normanhurst Avenue as well as North Cemetery and East Way.

Our proposed Queen’s Park ward lies to the south of Muscliff & Strouden Park ward and to the north of Lowther Road. The ward is bounded to the west and east by Charminster Road and Wessex Way respectively.
### Bournemouth West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderney &amp; Bourne Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinson North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhil &amp; Northbourne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot &amp; Branksome Woods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallisdown &amp; Winton West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kinson North, Redhill & Northbourne and Wallisdown & Winton West**

41 The Joint Committee proposed modest changes to the Bournemouth borough wards of Kinson North and Redhill & Northbourne and proposed that the Wallisdown & Winton West ward be replicated in the new council’s arrangements. We agree with the Joint Committee’s proposal for Wallisdown & Winton West and include it as part of our draft recommendations.

42 The southern boundary of Wallisdown & Winton West ward would be Wallisdown Road whilst Columbia Road would form the northern boundary. The ward would extend westwards as far as Turbay Common and would, in the east, adjoin our Winton East and Moordown wards.

43 We agree with the Joint Committee’s proposal that mobile home parks at New Road and Whitelegg Way should be included in Kinson North and Muscliff & Strouden Park wards respectively. We also agree that the Milford Drive area should form part of Kinson North ward, noting the road layout of this and the Roundhay Road areas. However, we propose to include Cherry Tree Nursery in Redhill & Northbourne ward, having regard to its access from Northbourne Roundabout. We also propose to include the Bear Cross Avenue area in our proposed Bearwood & Kinson South ward, noting that access to the area is from Magna Road to the west of Bear Cross Roundabout. The Joint Committee proposed that South Kinson Drive form the southern boundary of Kinson North ward, bringing Paget Road, West Howe Close and even-numbered properties on South Kinson Drive into that ward. We consider that these addresses will better relate to our Bearwood & Kinson South ward and make that proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

44 The northern boundary of Kinson North ward follows the River Stour and forms part of the northern border of the new authority area. The ward would extend southwards as far as Holloway Avenue and include Kinson Common and Kinson Cemetery. Ringwood Road would form the western boundary whilst East Howe Lane and Northbourne Avenue would form the eastern boundary.

45 Our Redhill & Northbourne ward also extends northwards to the River Stour and the boundary of the new council area whilst Columbia Road would form the southern boundary. The ward would adjoin Kinson North to the west, with Kinson Road, between East Howe Lane and Columbia Road, also forming part of the western boundary. Finally, Redhill Avenue would form the eastern boundary of this ward.

**Alderney & Bourne Valley, Newtown and Talbot & Branksome Woods**

46 The Joint Committee proposed three two-councillor wards and one three-councillor ward for this area. However, we propose a pattern of three three-councillor wards which we consider better reflects the nature of the area.

47 The Joint Committee proposed that the existing Bournemouth borough wards of Branksome East and Branksome West be combined, with the addition of the area between Poole Road and Lindsay Road, to form a three-councillor ward. They also proposed that the borough wards of Alderney, Newtown and Talbot & Branksome Woods be largely replicated as two-councillor wards in the arrangements for the new council.
48 Notwithstanding the current ward boundaries, we consider that the proposed Branksome ward would both combine disparate areas and split identifiable communities. We propose that this Branksome ward be divided into four parts, and that each part be added to the proposed Alderney, Newtown and Talbot & Branksome Woods wards.

49 Our Alderney & Bourne Valley ward would combine areas either side of Alder Road with the current Alderney ward. By including the Bourne Valley nature reserve, this ward would extend eastwards as far as the railway.

50 We consider that the Talbot Heath area and Bournemouth University Talbot Campus is likely to relate better to the Talbot Woods area than to the Yarmouth Road area. Our Talbot & Branksome Woods ward would include this area and unite the whole of the Surrey Road area in the south of the ward. The northern boundary of the ward would be Wallisdown Road and Talbot Road. Charminster Road and the eastern edge of Meyrick Park would form the eastern boundary of the ward with parts of Lindsay Road, Poole Road and Wessex Way forming the southern boundary.

51 It does not appear to us that Churchill Road marks a boundary between communities and we do not consider that it should form a ward boundary as proposed by the Joint Committee. We do consider, however, that the part of Herbert Avenue to the west of Stanfield Road should form a boundary, as it would to the east of Stanfield Road as proposed by the Joint Committee. Further, we consider that the area around Albert Road should be combined with the areas of similar housing in our Newtown ward. We also consider that it would be more appropriate to include Haymoor Road and Hythe Road along with the rest of the Foxholes area in Oakdale ward. Finally, we propose to include the housing, retail and leisure facilities at Yarrow Road in our Canford Heath ward.
Burton Grange, Christchurch Central, Commons, Mudeford and Walkford & Highcliffe

52 The Joint Committee proposed a pattern of wards for Christchurch which are almost wholly contained within the existing borough of Christchurch. As discussed in paragraph 38, we differ from the Joint Committee’s approach by including Wood Farm, which lies in Hurn parish, in the pattern of wards for the Christchurch area.

53 The Joint Committee proposed that there be five two-councillor wards in this area. We similarly propose five two-councillor wards, but with some significant boundary differences.

54 Our draft recommendations for Commons ward matches that proposed by the Joint Committee, save that we include Wood Farm. The ward would be bounded to the north by the new council’s external boundary and by the rivers Stour and Avon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton Grange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudeford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkford &amp; Highcliffe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We note that this ward would extend as far south as the railway line but exclude the Barrack Road area to the north of the railway.

55 The Christchurch Central ward proposed by the Joint Committee lies broadly between the railway line and the estuary but includes the Barrack Road area described in paragraph 54. We have decided to base our draft recommendations on this proposal but would particularly welcome comments about the boundary between the proposed Commons and Christchurch Central wards and evidence about the nature and extent of community identities in this area.

56 The Joint Committee’s proposed Burton Grange ward essentially combined the Christchurch borough wards of Burton & Winkton and Grange, but with the addition of the Nelson Drive and Rodney Drive areas. We broadly accept this proposal but have included the whole of the development site which lies broadly to the north of Christchurch By-pass. The Joint Committee’s proposal would split this area of new development in two. With no information regarding the layout of the proposed development, it is difficult for us to identify a boundary that would run through it and be tied to clear ground detail. We further consider that future occupiers of new housing are likely to develop their own sense of community identity. We have therefore decided to include the whole of this development area in our proposed Burton Grange ward.

57 The Joint Committee’s proposals broadly re-create the Dorset County Council electoral divisions of Walkford and Mudeford & Highcliffe. However, we consider that the area should be divided by a boundary which runs largely from north to south, rather than one which runs from east to west.

58 As part of our draft recommendations we propose a Walkford & Highcliffe ward bounded to the north, east and south by the boundary of the new authority area. Our ward would combine the areas covered by the existing borough wards of Highcliffe and North Highcliffe & Walkford. It would also include the area between Hinton Wood Avenue and Parkside. Its western boundary would be the edge of the Highcliffe Castle Golf Club course and the footway that runs from Smugglers Lane North to Lyndhurst Road.

59 Lastly, we propose a Mudeford ward which combines the Highcliffe Road and Hoburne Lane area with Friars Cliff, Mudeford and Stanpit.

60 Given the changes we have made to the Joint Committee’s proposals, we would particularly welcome local views as to how our recommendations reflect community identities in this area.
### Ward name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boscombe East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boscombe West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canford Cliffs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cliff &amp; Springbourne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Southbourne &amp; Tuckton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Southbourne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne &amp; West Cliff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Cliff & Springbourne, East Southbourne & Tuckton and West Southbourne
61 The Joint Committee proposed a series of seafront wards along Poole Bay which would largely replicate Bournemouth and Poole borough wards. The proposed three-councillor East Cliff & Springbourne ward would include the area between the railway and East Overcliff Drive, between Wessex Way and the railway and between the railway and Lowther Road to the north of the station. We consider that these are distinct areas, each with their own characteristics but note that these areas would not provide a single-councillor or two-councillor ward which would have good levels of electoral equality. However, we also do not consider it appropriate to split any of those areas between wards. We therefore propose to include East Cliff & Springbourne as a three-councillor ward in our draft recommendations.

62 The Joint Committee’s proposed the two-councillor wards of East Southbourne & Tuckton and West Southbourne which would be bounded to the north by the railway line and divided, broadly, by Seafield Road. Both wards would have good levels of electoral equality and we are including them as part of our draft recommendations.

Boscombe East and Boscombe West
63 The Joint Committee proposed that the Bournemouth borough wards of Boscombe East and West should be replicated. We propose to modify the proposed boundaries by including Byron Road and Grovely Avenue in our Boscombe West ward. We consider that this is likely to better reflect the nature of the immediate area and ensure good electoral equality in the two wards by 2023.

Bournemouth Central, Canford Cliffs and Westbourne & West Cliff
64 The Joint Committee proposed modest changes to these Bournemouth borough wards in order to provide three two-councillor wards in this area. We have decided to base our draft recommendations on these proposals with some modifications.

65 The Joint Committee proposed that Exeter Crescent and Exeter Park Road should form part of Bournemouth Central ward. We note, however, that the orientation of these roads is towards Westbourne & West Cliff and that housing developments on either side of Exeter Road are anticipated. We consider that the area around Exeter Road would be likely to relate better to Westbourne & West Cliff than to Bournemouth Central ward and propose that The Bourne, as it runs through Lower Gardens, should mark the boundary between the two wards.

66 We propose to modify the Joint Committee’s Canford Cliffs ward by including Lagoon Road, Salterns Way and Salterns Marina in our Penn Hill ward. We note that housing development is expected to take place at the Marina. We consider that our proposal will provide a stronger ward boundary than that put forward by the Joint Committee.
### Poole Harbour & Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamworthy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakdale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hamworthy
67 Hamworthy is a distinct area lying between Holes Bay and the western boundary of the new council’s area. It provides a three-councillor ward having strong boundaries and a good level of electoral equality by 2023 and we include this as part of our draft recommendations.

Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town
68 The Joint Committee proposed a pattern of ward boundaries for this area based on, but with some significant amendments to, Poole Borough ward boundaries. We have based our recommendations on the Joint Committee’s scheme but, in turn, have modified it. Our intention is to better reflect communities in this area.

69 The Joint Committee proposed a significant alteration to the Oakdale ward. In the scheme we received, Johnston Road and Kenyon Road would be included with the area to the north of Dorset Way in Canford Heath ward. We consider that Dorset Way should form the northern boundary of our Oakdale ward.

70 We propose that the Oakdale ward be extended eastwards and southwards to a significant degree. As described in paragraph 51, we consider that Haymoor Road and Hythe Road form part of the Foxholes area and propose to include them in our Oakdale ward. We also propose to include the whole of Fernside Road and Constitution Hill Road, extending the ward as far as North Road.

71 We agree with the Joint Committee that the Longfleet area should be represented in a single ward but consider that it is likely to relate better to Oakdale than to Parkstone. We therefore propose to include the area from Tatnam Road to the cricket ground in our Oakdale ward. The effect of these changes is to make Oakdale a three-councillor ward and Parkstone a two-councillor ward.

72 We propose further changes to the Joint Committee’s proposed Parkstone ward boundaries. We consider that properties on both sides of Parkstone Heights should be included in a single ward and propose to include them in our Newtown ward. Similarly, all the properties on Conifer Avenue should lie in a single ward and so we propose to include them in our Parkstone ward. Including Jennings Road in our Parkstone ward will provide a stronger ward boundary. This change, together with our proposal to include the Salterns Marina area in Penn Hill ward (described in paragraph 66) represent the only changes to the Joint Committee’s Penn Hill ward which involve electors. A minor change to provide a clear ward boundary will mean that the wooded area at Links Road will lie in our proposed Penn Hill ward.

73 The Joint Committee proposed a two-councillor Poole Town ward which would extend from Poole Harbour through the town centre to the northern side of Poole High School and to the centre-line of Kingston Road. We propose to include properties on both sides of Kingston Road in our Poole Town ward as we consider that this is likely to provide for clearer reflection of the community in this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bearwood &amp; Kinson South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone &amp; Merley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canford Heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekmoor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bearwood & Kinson South and Broadstone & Merley**

74 The Joint Committee’s boundary scheme proposed three two-councillor wards for this area. We consider that the Joint Committee’s proposed Bearwood & Kinson South ward would be likely to divide the Bearwood area unsatisfactorily. We also consider that housing development sites on the western edge of Bearwood, which were reflected in the agreed electoral forecast, will give rise to a significant increase in the size of the community in Bearwood. We consider that this area is likely to relate better to the adjacent Bearwood community than to the Merley area. We therefore propose to include the area around King John Avenue and the new development sites in a three-councillor Bearwood & Kinson South ward.

75 We could not provide a ward consisting solely of Merley and the area immediately surrounding it without causing high levels of electoral inequality. We therefore propose to combine Merley with the Joint Committee’s proposed Broadstone ward to form a three-councillor ward which embraces both communities.

**Canford Heath**

76 The Joint Committee proposed a three-councillor Canford Heath ward which would include Johnston Road and Kenyon Road, both of which lie to the south of Dorset Way. We consider these areas are likely to have strong community linkages with the adjoining Oakdale area and that Dorset Way presents a strong ward boundary and better reflects the extent of communities. We also propose that Canford Heath ward include the housing, retail and leisure facilities at Yarrow Road.

**Creekmoor**

77 We have based our Creekmoor ward on the Joint Committee’s scheme but propose to include the Lytham Road and Edwina Drive areas which we consider to be part of the local road network of Creekmoor rather than of Broadstone. We also propose the A350 as the southern boundary of our proposed Creekmoor ward. We consider that this provides a strong boundary with Oakdale ward.
Conclusions

The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2018 and 2023 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>4,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</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**

Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council should be made up of 76 councillors serving 33 wards, representing 23 two-councillor wards and 10 three-councillor wards. The details and names of wards are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

**Mapping**

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council on our interactive maps at [http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)
3 Have your say

79 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 district just a part of it.

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

81 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.

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

Review Officer (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

83 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole which delivers:

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

84 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; and
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

85 Electoral equality:

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

86 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?

87 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?

88 Please note that the consultation stage of an electoral review is a public consultation. 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 Windsor House (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

89 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 your name, postal or email addresses, signature or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

90 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.

91 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Electoral Changes 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 Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council in 2019.

Equalities

92 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.
## Appendix A

### Draft recommendations for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2018)</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 Alderney &amp; Bourne Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12,373</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bearwood &amp; Kinson South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>12,193</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Boscombe East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,314</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Boscombe West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8,238</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bournemouth Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,853</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,782</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Broadstone &amp; Merley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>4,013</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12,626</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Burton Grange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>8,402</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Canford Cliffs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>3,703</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>8,067</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Canford Heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,844</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>10,947</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Christchurch Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8,502</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Commons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,019</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2018)</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>12 Creekmoor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8,788</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 East Cliff &amp; Springbourne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 East Southbourne &amp; Tuckton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Hamworthy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,314</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kinson North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,016</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Littledown &amp; Iford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>7,601</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Moordown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,817</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,657</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mudeford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,711</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>8,036</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Muscliff &amp; Strouden Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,064</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Newtown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,577</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Oakdale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Parkstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>7,742</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Penn Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Poole Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2018)</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>26 Queen’s Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,521</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8,591</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Redhill &amp; Northbourne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Talbot &amp; Branksome Woods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,163</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,752</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Walkford &amp; Highcliffe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,216</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8,519</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Wallisdown &amp; Winton West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7,784</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 West Southbourne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>4,044</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Westbourne &amp; West Cliff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,086</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Winton East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,013</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7,780</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,183</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>309,971</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,963</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,076</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the Bournemouth, Christchurch & Poole Joint Committee.

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 district. 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. Alderney & Bourne Valley
2. Bearwood & Kinson South
3. Boscombe East
4. Boscombe West
5. Bournemouth Central
6. Broadstone & Merley
7. Burton Grange
8. Canford Cliffs
9. Canford Heath
10. Christchurch Central
11. Commons
12. Creekmoor
13. East Cliff & Springbourne
14. East Southbourne & Tuckton
15. Hamworthy
16. Kinson North
17. Littledown & Iford
18. Moordown
19. Mudeford
20. Muscliff & Strouden Park
21. Newtown
22. Oakdale
23. Parkstone
24. Penn Hill
25. Poole Town
26. Queen’s Park
27. Redhill & Northbourne
28. Talbot & Branksome Woods
29. Walkford & Highcliffe
30. Wallisdown & Winton West
31. West Southbourne
32. Westbourne & West Cliff
33. Winton East

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/all-reviews/south-west
Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/south-west

Local Authority

- Bournemouth, Christchurch & Poole Joint Committee
# Appendix D

## 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</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Changes Order</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the local government structure of an area.</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>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>Parish</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>Parish council</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>Parish (or Town) council electoral</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>Parish ward</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>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</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.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street, London
SW1H 0TL

Telephone: 0330 500 1525
Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Online: www.lgbce.org.uk or www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk
Twitter: @LGBCE