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

Why Warwick?

4 We are conducting a review of Warwick District Council (the Council) following a request it made to us. Firstly, it wanted to address the reduced level of coterminosity between district wards and county divisions following the review of Warwickshire County Council (the County Council). Secondly, Warwick district is going through a period of considerable growth and the Council wanted its wards reviewed before electoral inequality became too high.

5 It is also the case that the value of each vote in district council elections varies depending on where you live in Warwick. 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 Warwick

- Warwick should be represented by 44 councillors, two fewer than there are now.
- Warwick should have 17 wards, five fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of all wards should change, none will stay the same.

Have your say

6 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 3 April 2018 to 11 June 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.

7 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to read this report first and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

You have until 11 June 2018 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 22 for how to send us your response.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

9 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Susan Johnson OBE
- Alison Lowton
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Steve Robinson
- Andrew Scallan CBE

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

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

- The wards in Warwick 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:

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

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

Consultation

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

14 This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2017</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November 2017</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation, we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April 2018</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation, we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2018</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

15 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 town council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

16 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.

17 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.

18 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>Election</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Warwick</td>
<td>109,155</td>
<td>123,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>2,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 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 Warwick will have good electoral equality by 2023.

20 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the district 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

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

Electorate figures

22 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 13% by 2023.


\(^3\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
We considered the information provided by the Council 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

Warwick District Council currently has 46 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by the Council and Warwick District Council Labour Group and have concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by two will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 44 councillors, for example, 44 one-councillor wards, 22 two-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

We received no submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a 44-member council.

Ward boundaries consultation

We received 19 submissions to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included three detailed district-wide proposals from the Council; Warwick District Council Green, Labour, Liberal Democrat & Whitnash Residents Association Groups (the opposition groups); and Warwick & Leamington Conservatives (the Conservatives). The Council and the Conservatives both proposed 20 wards represented by 44 councillors. The opposition groups proposed 17 wards to be represented by 44 councillors. The Conservatives also proposed a separate scheme of 20 wards to be represented by 45 councillors.

The three district-wide schemes each provided for a mixed pattern of wards for Warwick. We carefully considered the proposals received and noted that all three schemes proposed some wards that had high electoral inequality. We also considered that they generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

Many of the submissions we received stressed the importance of coterminosity, particularly between district wards and county divisions. This means the number of district wards that are wholly contained within county divisions. We agree that coterminosity can aid effective and convenient local government. However, this is not a requirement when we review district wards. In our draft recommendations we have sought to balance our criteria, and in some places we have concluded that the best balance is achieved by non-coterminous boundaries.

We also wish to make clear that this review is entirely separate from that of the County Council which ended in 2015. The issues considered in county and district reviews are different due to the different sizes of the electoral areas, the need for county divisions to be wholly within district council areas and the differing electoral forecasts. Finally, we wish to emphasise that our recommendations for Warwick will be based on the evidence we receive as part of this review only.
31 Our draft recommendations are based on a combination of the district-wide proposals that we received. In some parts of the district we have also taken into account local evidence, which provided evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries. We also visited the area to look at the different proposals on the ground. This tour of Warwick helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

32 Our draft recommendations are for one one-councillor ward, five two-councillor wards and 11 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 during consultation.

33 Eleven of our 17 wards (65%) are coterminous with their division, including five where the ward and division boundaries are identical. This is a considerable improvement on the current warding arrangement where seven of the 22 wards (32%) are coterminous, with no wards and divisions having identical boundaries.

34 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on pages 24–25 and on the large map accompanying this report.

35 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**

36 The tables and maps on pages 8–18 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Warwick. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory\(^4\) criteria of:

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

---

Kenilworth and rural Warwick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budbrooke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubbington &amp; Leek Wootton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth Park Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth St John’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapworth &amp; West Kenilworth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford Semele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lapworth & West Kenilworth and Budbrooke
37 The three district-wide schemes proposed identical Lapworth & West Kenilworth wards, which were supported by Kenilworth Town Council. The Council and the Conservatives proposed a Budbrooke ward that ran from Shrewley to Wasperton with a variance of 14%, arguing that it was the best way to ensure coterminous boundaries within the Budbrooke & Bishop’s Tachbrook division. The opposition groups proposed a similar ward but excluded Wasperton, giving their ward a variance of 12%. The only other submission was from a district councillor who objected to the opposition groups’ proposal to put Wasperton in Bishop’s Tachbrook as there is no direct road link between the two areas, Wasperton has strong links with Barford, and Wasperton is part of a grouped parish council with Barford and Sherbourne.

38 It is our policy not to split grouped parish councils between wards if possible, so for that reason alone we are not adopting the Budbrooke ward proposed by the opposition groups. However, we do not consider that the Council or the Conservatives have provided sufficiently strong evidence to justify creating a ward with a variance of 14%. We note that not only is the parish of Shrewley currently warded with parishes to its north and east, rather than to its south, but adding it to Lapworth & West Kenilworth ward will lead to good electoral equality across this area. While this breaks coterminosity with county divisions, we consider that it leads to a better balance of our criteria in this part of the district.

Kenilworth Park Hill and Kenilworth St John’s
39 The three district-wide schemes proposed identical wards in this area, both of which have identical boundaries to the divisions of the same name. Kenilworth Town Council said that it supported the Council’s submission. We have therefore adopted these wards as proposed.

40 The Town Council also requested that we create four town wards in this area rather than two, as they were concerned by the size of ballot papers at contested elections and the potential domination of the Abbey area by the two larger wards. While we appreciate the points the Town Council is making, we can only create new parish wards as a direct consequence of our recommendations for district wards. Warwick District Council has the power to create additional town wards, following consultation, as part of a community governance review.

Cubbington & Leek Wootton and Radford Semele
41 The Council and the Conservatives proposed identical Cubbington & Leek Wootton and Radford Semele wards, with the former having a variance of 16%. The Council justified this on the basis that it retained the current Radford Semele ward which had a strong community link along the Fosse Way. The opposition groups proposed a similar arrangement but put Weston-under-Wetherley parish in their proposed Radford Semele ward as it led to acceptable electoral equality. They also pointed out that Weston-under-Wetherley has been warded with parishes to its south and east in the past.

42 Cubbington Parish Council proposed several different warding options for the area; however, the only one that had acceptable electoral equality in all its wards used the same boundaries as those proposed by the opposition groups.
43 The only other submission for this area was from Leek Wootton & Guy’s Cliffe Parish Council, which requested that the parish was not split between wards.

44 We have considered the different proposals and are adopting that of the opposition groups in this area as it is the only one that has acceptable electoral equality. For us to create a ward with an electoral variance of 16%, as proposed by the Council and the Conservatives, requires an exceptionally high standard of evidence in relation to our other two criteria and we do not consider that this has been provided.
## Royal Leamington Spa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Clarendon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Milverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Willes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leamington Brunswick, Leamington Clarendon, Leamington Milverton and Leamington North

45 The Council and the Conservatives proposed one three-councillor, four two-councillor and one single-councillor wards in this area, although the Conservatives proposed different boundaries between their Manor and Crown, and Brunswick and Clarendon wards. When we analysed the proposals, four of the Council’s six wards had poor electoral equality as did two of the Conservatives’ six wards, with one, Clarendon, having a variance over 40%. The Council’s submission was supported by Royal Leamington Spa Town Council and a district councillor. The opposition groups proposed four three-councillor wards that had the same boundaries as the county divisions; two had poor electoral equality. Cubbington Parish Council proposed three different options for the wards in the north-eastern part of the town, only one of which had wards with good electoral equality.

46 We received three other submissions. A district councillor proposed that the current Manor ward be retained. A local resident pointed out that parts of Newbold are in the current Clarendon ward and vice versa. A second resident supported putting the Avenue Road area in Clarendon ward as it is an important part of the town centre. They also supported the inclusion of Newbold Comyn in the Council’s Newbold ward.

47 As noted above, none of the town-wide proposals had good electoral equality across the wards proposed. We do not consider that the level of electoral inequality proposed was justified by the evidence, including the very high variances in the Clarendon ward proposed by the Council and the Conservatives. We have therefore created a scheme that we consider leads to a better balance of our criteria.

48 We noted that the Council and the opposition groups included the Avenue Road area in their Brunswick ward. However, both the Conservatives and a member of the public argued that this area identifies much more strongly with the town centre to its north than Brunswick to its south. This argument seemed logical to us when we visited the area. Therefore, we have created a Brunswick ward that uses the railway line as its northern boundary. This ward has good electoral equality.

49 Moving the Avenue Road area into any of the three proposed Clarendon wards led to high electoral inequality and we were unable to identify a clear boundary in the Council’s or the Conservatives’ proposals that we could use to address that. However, moving the boundary between the opposition groups’ Clarendon and Milverton wards south to Lillington Avenue leads to good electoral equality. When we visited the area, Lillington Avenue appeared to be a clear boundary with the roads to its north looking relatively isolated. Therefore, we propose to use it as the boundary between Clarendon and Milverton wards in our draft recommendations.

50 As we have based our Milverton ward on that proposed by the opposition groups, we are unable to adopt the Manor or Crown wards proposed by the Council or Conservatives. In relation to the wards proposed by Cubbington Parish Council, when we visited the area we considered the proposed boundary which followed Melton Road, Highland Road, Kinross Road and Lonsdale Road was not only potentially confusing to residents but also split the community in that area. Therefore, we are proposing to adopt the Leamington North ward proposed by the opposition
groups, which we consider to be a coherent area for a three-councillor ward and which will have identical boundaries to the Leamington North county division.

**Leamington Willes**

51 The Council and the Conservatives, supported by Royal Leamington Spa Town Council, proposed identical two-councillor Willes and single-councillor Sydenham wards in this area, with variances of 8% and 9% respectively. Both submissions described the respective areas rather than providing any substantial community evidence. The opposition groups proposed a three-councillor Willes ward with identical boundaries to the Willes county division, without providing any additional evidence.

52 When we toured the area, it was quite clear to us, as the Council and Conservatives suggested, that there are different communities in this part of Leamington. However, we were concerned that the proposed boundary between their wards on Gainsborough Drive appeared to split a relatively cohesive area. Additionally, we note that even a small change to the Council’s proposal will result in one of the wards having poor electoral equality. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on the opposition groups’ proposed Willes ward. However, we would welcome alternative proposals for this area that are well-evidenced, and which have good electoral equality.
### Warwick and Whitnash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop’s Tachbrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Aylesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Myton &amp; Heathcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Saltisford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Woodloes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitnash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bishop’s Tachbrook, Warwick Aylesford, Warwick Myton & Heathcote, Warwick Saltisford and Whitnash

53 The Council and the Conservatives proposed two three-councillor and three two-councillor wards in this area. These were supported by Warwick Town Council, a district councillor and two local residents. While the Council’s Aylesford and Saltisford wards were not coterminous with county divisions, they and their supporters argued that the division boundary on Stratford Road split the community in that area and the Council’s proposal would reunite the residents who look to St Mary’s Lands and Castle Park. The submission stated that the Council’s Saltisford ward also reunited the town centre in one coherent ward, having been split by the division boundary. The Council’s Myton & Heathcote ward was coterminous with Warwick South division, but we noted that it contained a small area around Cliffe Way and Wharf Street to the north of the River Avon.

54 The opposition groups proposed three three-councillor, one two-councillor and one single-councillor wards in this area. However, their proposals were largely based on ensuring coterminosity and were supported by little community evidence. The opposition groups’ Warwick West ward was coterminous with the division of the same name but had an electoral variance of 12%. Their Warwick South ward used the division boundary on Stratford Road as its western boundary.

55 The electoral arithmetic makes this part of the district difficult to ward. This is because a ward solely south of the Avon consisting of Myton, Heathcote and Bridge End, which are currently warded together and are relatively isolated from the rest of Warwick, would have variances of -22% for a three-councillor ward or 17% for a two-councillor ward. As both variances are unacceptably high, the three district-wide proposals have added other areas to ensure electoral equality in a three-councillor ward. However, as stated above, we have received objections to using Stratford Road as a boundary, as proposed by the opposition groups. The Council’s Myton & Heathcote ward also included an area north of the Avon that is only linked to the rest of the ward by a pedestrian footbridge, although when we visited on a weekday afternoon in February it looked like the footbridge and the open space around it was well-used by local residents.

56 We considered whether there is any other arrangement that fits our criteria better than either of the two district-wide schemes. From our visit, there appeared to be links between Heathcote and the western part of Whitnash. However, as Whitnash’s variance is -9%, moving any part of it into a Warwick ward would lead to poor electoral equality. We also considered moving the boundary between Myton & Heathcote to Harbury Lane but this would lead to poor electoral equality in Bishop’s Tachbrook ward. Finally, we looked at whether we could create a two-councillor Myton & Heathcote ward by moving Bridge End into a ward north of the Avon and part of Heathcote into Bishop’s Tachbrook or Whitnash wards. However, such a proposal would have been based on little evidence and clearly split the communities in those areas.

57 When we visited Warwick, we considered that the Council’s Aylesford and Saltisford wards appeared to be accurate reflections of their communities and were supported by the community evidence we received. On the other hand, the opposition groups’ use of Stratford Road and the High Street as a boundary did
appear to split the communities in those areas. We are aware that this conflicts with the conclusions of the county review but, as we noted in our final recommendations report for the County Council, no objections were received to either the Warwick South or Warwick West divisions. Different evidence has been provided for this review.

Therefore, in spite of our concerns about including Cliffe Way and Wharf Street in Myton & Heathcote ward, we propose to adopt the Council’s proposals in this area, subject to a small change between the Aylesford and Woodloes wards discussed below. We consider that the Council’s scheme is better evidenced in relation to its Aylesford and Saltisford wards and leads to the best balance of our criteria across this part of the district.

Given the complexity of the scheme in this area, we would welcome alternative proposals that have good electoral equality, are reflective of community identity and which take account of the effect on neighbouring wards.

**Warwick Woodloes**

We received very similar proposals for this area. The opposition groups proposed a Warwick North ward that matched the Warwick North division, and which had a variance of -11%. The Council and Conservatives, supported by the Town Council, a district councillor and two local residents, proposed a Woodloes ward that included the Eastley Crescent, Wilmhurst Road and Mallory Drive areas. It was argued by the Town Council and both residents that the Eastley Crescent and Wilmhurst Road areas in particular are part of Woodloes and should be warded with it, even though this would break coterminosity.

We have based our draft recommendations on the Woodloes ward proposed by the Council and Conservatives. We accept the argument that the Eastley Crescent and Wilmhurst Road areas should be included in this ward. However, we note that the Mallory Drive area was not referred to in any of the submissions and when we visited Warwick, it seemed to relate more to our proposed Aylesford ward to the south than Woodloes to the north. We have therefore included it in our Aylesford ward, which also leads to slightly better electoral equality for both wards.
Conclusions

62 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></th>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft recommendation**
Warwick District Council should be made up of 44 councillors serving 17 wards representing one single-councillor ward, five two-councillor wards and 11 three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

**Mapping**
Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Warwick. You can also view our draft recommendations for Warwick on our interactive maps at [http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

Parish electoral arrangements

63 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 ward 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.
64 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, Warwick District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

65 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Kenilworth Town Council, Royal Leamington Spa Town Council and Warwick Town Council.

66 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 Kenilworth Parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Kenilworth Town Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 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 Royal Leamington Spa parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Royal Leamington Spa Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milverton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 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 Warwick parish.
Draft recommendation
Warwick Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leafield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myton &amp; Heathcote</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltisford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmhurst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodloes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Have your say

69 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.

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

71 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

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

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

73 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Warwick 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

74 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

75 Electoral equality:

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

76 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents’ association or other group that represents the area?
77 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?

78 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.

79 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.

80 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.

81 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 Warwick District Council in 2019.

Equalities

82 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 Warwick District Council

<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>Bishop’s Tachbrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budbrooke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubbington &amp; Leek Wootton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth Park Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9,155</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth St John’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapworth &amp; West Kenilworth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,032</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>8,707</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Clarendon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8,611</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington Milverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7,936</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,653</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8,653</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>3%</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>11 Leamington Willes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9,083</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Radford Semele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Warwick Aylesford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Warwick Myton &amp; Heathcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,675</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Warwick Saltisford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,299</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Warwick Woodloes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,922</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Whitnash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,386</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,155</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>123,335</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>2,481</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>2,803</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Warwick District Council.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the 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. Bishop's Tachbrook
2. Budbrooke
3. Cubbington & Leek Wootton
4. Kenilworth Park Hill
5. Kenilworth St John’s
6. Lapworth & West Kenilworth
7. Leamington Brunswick
8. Leamington Clarendon
9. Leamington Milverton
10. Leamington North
11. Leamington Willes
12. Radford Semele
13. Warwick Aylesford
14. Warwick Myton & Heathcote
15. Warwick Saltisford
16. Warwick Woodloes
17. Whitnash

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/west-midlands/warwickshire/warwick-fer](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/west-midlands/warwickshire/warwick-fer)
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Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/west-midlands/warwickshire/warwick-fer

Local Authority

- Warwick District Council
- Warwickshire County Council

Political Group

- Warwick District Council Green, Labour, Liberal Democrat & Whitnash Residents Association Groups
- Warwick & Leamington Conservatives

Councillors

- Cllr G. Cain (Warwick District Council)
- Cllr R. Edgington (Warwick District Council)
- Cllr J. Holland (Warwick Town Council)
- Cllr P. Phillips (Warwick District Council)
- Cllr A. Thompson (Warwick District Council)

Parish and Town Councils

- Cubbington Parish Council
- Kenilworth Town Council
- Leek Wootton & Guy’s Cliffe Parish Council
- Royal Leamington Spa Town Council
- Warwick Town Council

Local Residents

- Five local residents
### 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 (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>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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 arrangements</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>Town council</td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremomial ‘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>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.