

Draft Recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire

December 1999

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the borough.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire.

© Crown Copyright 1999

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>41</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Rushcliffe: Detailed Mapping	<i>43</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from: – Rushcliffe Borough Council – Rushcliffe Borough Council Labour Group – Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrats – Bingham Labour Party	<i>51</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>61</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for West Bridgford is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Rushcliffe on 18 May 1999.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Rushcliffe:

- **In 14 of the 29 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **By 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 13 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 133 and 134) are that:

- **Rushcliffe Borough Council should have 50 councillors, four fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 29 wards, as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 22 of the existing wards should be modified, and seven wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In two of the proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in no wards expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Bingham, Cotgrave, Keyworth and Radcliffe-on-Trent;**

- **the redistribution of councillors for Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for 10 weeks from 14 December 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 21 February 2000:

**Review Manager
Rushcliffe Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
e-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Abbey (in West Bridgford)	2	Abbey ward (part); Lady Bay ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
2	Ash Lea (in Cotgrave)	2	Ash Lea ward (part – Ash Lea ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part)); Manor ward (part – Manor ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part))	Maps 2 and A3
3	Bingham East	2	Bingham ward (part – Bingham East ward of Bingham Town Council as proposed)	Maps 2, A4 and A5
4	Bingham West	2	Bingham ward (part – Bingham West ward of Bingham Town Council as proposed)	Maps 2, A4 and A5
5	Compton Acres (in West Bridgford)	2	Lutterell ward (part); Musters ward (part)	Large map
6	Cranmer	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Aslockton, Scarrington and Whatton parishes)	Map 2
7	Dayncourt (in Radcliffe-on-Trent)	2	Dayncourt ward (part – Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council (part)); Lamcote ward (part – Lamcote ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council)	Maps 2 and A6
8	Edwalton Village (in West Bridgford)	2	Abbey ward (part); Edwalton ward (part); Melton ward (part)	Large map
9	Gamston	2	Abbey ward (part – Gamston parish and unparished area); Edwalton ward (part); Lamcote ward (part – Holme Pierrepont parish)	Map 2 and large map
10	Gotham	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Barton in Fabis, Gotham and Thrumpton parishes)	Map 2
11	Keyworth North	2	North Keyworth ward (North ward of Keyworth parish); South Keyworth ward (part – South ward of Keyworth parish (part))	Maps 2 and A2
12	Keyworth South	2	Rancliffe ward (part – Bradmore parish); South Keyworth ward (part – South ward of Keyworth parish (part))	Maps 2 and A2
13	Lady Bay (in West Bridgford)	2	Abbey ward (part); Lady Bay ward (part)	Large map
14	Leake	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (East Leake and West Leake parishes)	Map 2
15	Lutterell (in West Bridgford)	2	Lutterell ward (part); Musters ward (part)	Large map
16	Malkin	2	Dayncourt ward (part – Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council (part)); Malkin ward (Malkin ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council and Shelford & Newton parish)	Maps 2 and A6

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
17	Manor (in Cotgrave)	1	Ash Lea ward (part – Ash Lea ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part)); Manor ward (part – Manor ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part))	Maps 2 and A3
18	Melton (in West Bridgford)	2	Abbey ward (part); Edwalton ward (part); Melton ward (part)	Large map
19	Musters (in West Bridgford)	2	Edwalton ward (part); Lutterell ward (part); Melton ward (part); Musters ward (part)	Large map
20	Nevile	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Hickling, Kinoulton, Owthorpe and Upper Broughton parishes)	Map 2
21	Oak	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Car Colston, East Bridgford, Kneeton and Screveton parishes)	Map 2
22	Ruddington	3	Leys ward (Flawford and Manor wards of Ruddington parish); Packman ward (Camelot and Easthorpe wards of Ruddington parish)	Map 2
23	Soar Valley	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Kingston on Soar, Ratcliffe on Soar and Sutton Bonington parishes)	Map 2
24	Stanford	1	Rancliffe ward (part – Bunny parish); Stanford ward (Costock, Normanton on Soar, Rempstone and Stanford on Soar parishes)	Map 2
25	Thoroton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Elton, Flawborough, Flintham, Granby, Hawksworth, Orston, Shelton, Sibthorpe and Thoroton parishes)	Map 2
26	Tollerton	1	Manor ward (part – Clipston parish); Tollerton ward (Tollerton parish)	Map 2
27	Trent Bridge (in West Bridgford)	2	Abbey ward (part); Lady Bay ward (part); Musters ward (part)	Large map
28	Wiverton	2	Bingham ward (part – Saxondale parish); Bishop ward (Cropwell Bishop parish); Wiverton ward (Colston Bassett, Cropwell Butler, Langar cum Barnstone, Tithby and Wiverton Hall parishes)	Map 2
29	Wolds	1	Rancliffe ward (part – Thorpe in the Glebe, Willoughby on the Wolds and Wysall parishes); Wolds ward (Normanton on the Wolds, Plumtree, Stanton on the Wolds and Widmerpool parishes)	Map 2

Notes: 1 West Bridgford is the only unparished part of the borough and comprises the proposed wards of Abbey, Edwalton Village, Lady Bay, Lutterell, Melton, Musters and Trent Bridge as indicated above.

2 Map 2, Appendix A and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Rushcliffe

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Abbey (in West Bridgford)	2	3,497	1,749	7	3,532	1,766	5
2	Ash Lea (in Cotgrave)	2	3,638	1,819	11	3,685	1,843	9
3	Bingham East	2	3,093	1,547	-5	3,665	1,833	9
4	Bingham West	2	3,054	1,527	-7	3,713	1,857	10
5	Compton Acres (in West Bridgford)	2	3,464	1,732	6	3,499	1,749	4
6	Cranmer	1	1,557	1,557	-5	1,583	1,583	-6
7	Dayncourt (in Radcliffe-on-Trent)	2	3,154	1,577	-4	3,486	1,743	3
8	Edwalton Village (in West Bridgford)	2	3,091	1,546	-5	3,122	1,561	-7
9	Gamston	2	3,191	1,596	-2	3,223	1,611	-4
10	Gotham	1	1,681	1,681	3	1,696	1,696	1
11	Keyworth North	2	3,065	1,533	-6	3,079	1,540	-9
12	Keyworth South	2	3,027	1,514	-7	3,041	1,520	-10
13	Lady Bay (in West Bridgford)	2	3,542	1,771	8	3,577	1,789	6
14	Leake	3	4,618	1,539	-6	4,862	1,621	-4
15	Lutterell (in West Bridgford)	2	3,470	1,735	6	3,505	1,752	4
16	Malkin	2	3,418	1,709	5	3,418	1,709	1
17	Manor (in Cotgrave)	1	1,825	1,825	12	1,841	1,841	9
18	Melton (in West Bridgford)	2	3,322	1,661	2	3,355	1,678	-1
19	Musters (in West Bridgford)	2	3,097	1,549	-5	3,128	1,564	-7
20	Nevile	1	1,559	1,559	-5	1,576	1,576	-7
21	Oak	1	1,725	1,725	6	1,751	1,751	4
22	Ruddington	3	5,168	1,723	5	5,215	1,738	3

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23	Soar Valley	1	1,623	1,623	-1	1,674	1,674	-1
24	Stanford	1	1,709	1,709	5	1,725	1,725	2
25	Thoroton	1	1,547	1,547	-5	1,611	1,611	-5
26	Tollerton	1	1,565	1,565	-4	1,579	1,579	-6
27	Trent Bridge (in West Bridgford)	2	3,472	1,736	6	3,507	1,753	4
28	Wiverton	2	2,948	1,474	-10	3,030	1,515	-10
29	Wolds	1	1,595	1,595	-2	1,675	1,675	-1
	Totals	50	81,715	-	-	84,353	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,634	-	-	1,687	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on Rushcliffe Borough Council's submission.*

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

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the eight districts in Nottinghamshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Rushcliffe. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in June 1975 (Report No. 24). The electoral arrangements of Nottinghamshire County Council were last reviewed in May 1980 (Report No. 383). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In undertaking these reviews we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the borough.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance* we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the borough as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in the borough concerned, but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a borough’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, or that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the borough and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the borough council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Nottinghamshire districts, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

12 Stage One began on 18 May 1999, when we wrote to Rushcliffe Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Nottinghamshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the borough, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough and the Members of the European Parliament for the East

Midlands Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 13 September 1999.

13 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

14 Stage Three began on 14 December 1999 and will end on 21 February 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire covers an area of some 41,000 hectares to the south and east of Broxtowe borough and Nottingham city, stretching from the River Trent in the west to the Leicestershire border in the south and east, and to Gedling borough and Newark & Sherwood district in the north. The borough's major settlement is the urban area of West Bridgford in the north. The remainder of the borough is largely rural in character, providing some of Nottinghamshire's richest farmland. The borough contains 58 parishes, ranging in size from a population of 24 in Saxondale to 6,148 in Bingham. The town of West Bridgford, which comprises 36 per cent of the borough's total electorate, is unparished.

17 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

18 The electorate of the borough is 81,715 (February 1999). The Council presently has 54 members who are elected from 29 wards, six of which, in West Bridgford, are essentially urban in character. The remainder of the borough is predominantly rural, although there are larger concentrations of population in the towns of Bingham, Cotgrave, Keyworth and Radcliffe-on-Trent. Of the 29 wards, 10 are each represented by three councillors, five are each represented by two councillors and a further 14 are single-member wards. Elections are of the whole council.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Rushcliffe borough, with around 26 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Lutterell ward of West Bridgford and in Bingham ward, which currently have approximately 55 per cent and 36 per cent more electors than the borough average respectively.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,513 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,562 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades the number of electors per councillor in 14 of the 29 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average and in five wards by more than 30 per cent. The most significant imbalances are in Lutterell ward, where each of the three councillors represents 55 per cent more electors than the borough average, and in Wolds ward, where the councillor represents 38 per cent fewer electors than the borough average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Rushcliffe

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Abbey (in West Bridgford)	3	6,004	2,001	32	6,096	2,032	30
2 Ash Lea (in Cotgrave)	3	4,213	1,404	-7	4,261	1,420	-9
3 Bingham	3	6,171	2,057	36	7,405	2,468	58
4 Bishop	1	1,451	1,451	-4	1,455	1,455	-7
5 Cranmer	1	1,557	1,557	3	1,583	1,583	1
6 Dayncourt (Radcliffe-on-Trent)	2	2,491	1,246	-18	2,822	1,411	-10
7 Edwalton (in West Bridgford)	3	4,598	1,533	1	4,619	1,540	-1
8 Gotham	1	1,681	1,681	11	1,696	1,696	9
9 Lady Bay (in West Bridgford)	3	4,229	1,410	-7	4,299	1,433	-8
10 Lamcote	2	2,048	1,024	-32	2,049	1,025	-34
11 Leake	3	4,618	1,539	2	4,862	1,621	4
12 Leys	2	2,604	1,302	-14	2,627	1,314	-16
13 Lutterell (in West Bridgford)	3	7,037	2,346	55	7,112	2,371	52
14 Malkin	2	2,468	1,234	-18	2,468	1,234	-21
15 Manor (in Cotgrave)	1	1,296	1,296	-14	1,311	1,311	16
16 Melton (in West Bridgford)	3	3,769	1,256	-17	3,789	1,263	-19
17 Musters (in West Bridgford)	3	4,074	1,358	-10	4,098	1,366	-13
18 Nevile	1	1,559	1,559	3	1,576	1,576	1
19 North Keyworth	1	1,481	1,481	-2	1,488	1,488	-5
20 Oak	1	1,725	1,725	14	1,751	1,751	12
21 Packman	2	2,564	1,282	-15	2,588	1,294	-17
22 Rancliffe	1	1,393	1,393	-8	1,420	1,420	-9

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23 Soar Valley	1	1,623	1,623	7	1,674	1,674	7
24 South Keyworth	3	4,373	1,458	-4	4,394	1,465	-6
25 Stanford	1	1,208	1,208	-20	1,218	1,218	-22
26 Thoroton	1	1,547	1,547	2	1,611	1,611	3
27 Tollerton	1	1,519	1,519	0	1,533	1,533	-2
28 Wiverton	1	1,473	1,473	-3	1,548	1,548	-1
29 Wolds	1	941	941	-38	1,000	1,000	-36
Totals	54	81,715	–	–	84,353	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,513	–	–	1,562	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Rushcliffe Borough Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, electors in Wolds ward are relatively over-represented by 38 per cent, while electors in Lutterell ward are relatively under-represented by 55 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

21 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Rushcliffe Borough Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received a total of 37 representations during Stage One, including five borough-wide schemes, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

Rushcliffe Borough Council

23 The Borough Council proposed reducing the number of councillors for the borough by four, to 50 members, serving 31 wards rather than the existing 29. Their proposal provided for a predominance of single-member wards in the rural areas of the borough, and for two-member wards in the larger settlements. As part of the review process, the Borough Council stated that it had invited views and representations from individuals, political organisations and parish and town councils, and had consulted locally on a number of options.

24 The Council's scheme would largely retain the existing ward structure in the more rural areas of the borough, and would modify the warding arrangements for the towns of Bingham, Radcliffe-on-Trent and West Bridgford in order to more accurately reflect the levels of representation to which those areas are entitled. Bingham would be represented by four members in two wards, while West Bridgford would be represented by nine two-member wards in place of the present six three-member wards.

25 The Council's proposed warding arrangements would result in an improved level of electoral equality in the borough. The number of electors per councillor in six of their proposed wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. By 2004 five wards would have electoral variances of more than 10 per cent, none of which would vary by more than 16 per cent. The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

Rushcliffe Borough Council Labour Group

26 The Labour Group on the Borough Council, in conjunction with Rushcliffe Constituency Labour Party ('the Labour Group'), also submitted a borough-wide scheme. The Labour Group addressed the issue of under-representation in West Bridgford by creating an additional two-member ward for the area, increasing the council size to 56. Under their scheme almost all ward boundaries in the borough would be modified. The number of councillors for Bingham would increase by two, while West Bridgford would be represented by 10 two-member wards in place of the existing six three-member wards. The remainder of the borough would broadly retain existing levels of representation, although modifications would be made to ward boundaries.

27 The Labour Group's proposals would also lead to improved levels of electoral equality in the borough, albeit with the number of electors per councillor in 11 of their 33 proposed wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. By 2004 six wards would have electoral variances of more than 10 per cent, and one ward would vary from the borough average by more than 20 per cent. The Labour Group's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrats

28 Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrats ('the Liberal Democrats') proposed a scheme based on one of the three draft options upon which the Council had consulted locally. This borough-wide scheme would provide for a significant reduction in council size, to 45 members representing 26 wards, with eight two-member wards in West Bridgford, and two two-member wards in Bingham.

29 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposed scheme the number of electors per councillor in only two wards would vary from the borough average by more than 10 per cent in 2004. The Liberal Democrats provided only projected 2004 electorate data for their proposed wards. Their proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

Bingham Labour Party

30 Bingham Labour Party also submitted a borough-wide scheme based on a council size of 45, taking into account the growth in population in both Bingham and West Bridgford, although they provided only projected 2004 electorate data for their proposed wards. Under their scheme four councillors would represent Bingham and there would be eight two-member wards in West Bridgford. The number of electors per councillor in none of their proposed 25 wards would vary from the average for the borough by more than 10 per cent in 2004. Bingham Labour Party's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

Local Political Parties

31 We received representations from a further four local political groups. Bingham Branch of the Rushcliffe Conservative Association agreed with the Borough Council's proposal to increase the number of councillors for Bingham to four, and to divide the town between two wards. East Leake Conservative Association, while agreeing in principle to a reduction in council size to 45 members, objected to any division of the village between two wards and argued that the current three-member ward should be expanded to include Costock and Rempstone parishes. Radcliffe-on-Trent Branch of the Labour Party agreed with the Labour Group's proposed 56-member scheme, but suggested some minor modifications to ward boundaries in the Radcliffe-on-Trent area. Finally, South Rushcliffe Branch of the Labour Party also welcomed a reduction in council size to 45 members in order to address existing over-representation in rural areas, but suggested that West Bridgford would benefit from an additional two councillors under a council size of 47.

Parish and Town Councils and Community Organisations

32 We received 17 representations from parish and town councils in Rushcliffe and two representations from community organisations in West Bridgford. Many submissions commented on the issue of council size, with Bingham Town Council, East Leake Parish Council, Ruddington Parish Council and the Labour Group on East Leake Parish Council all supporting a council size of 45, and Cotgrave Town Council, Cropwell Bishop Parish Council and Kinoulton Parish Council supporting the retention of the existing council size of 54. Central West Bridgford Community Association supported an increase in council size to 56, while Tithby & Wiverton Parish Meeting expressed concern at the potential effect of a reduction in council size on the smaller parishes in the borough.

33 Elton Parish Meeting submitted a borough-wide proposal for a council size of 50 members which would largely retain existing ward boundaries. Under their scheme West Bridgford would have 17 councillors and Bingham would have four councillors. The Borough Council based its submission on the Elton Parish Meeting scheme.

34 Other representations from parish councils at Stage One commented on warding arrangements. Colston Bassett Parish Council requested no change to the existing Wiverton ward. Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council requested that it remain linked with neighbouring areas rather than with areas to the north of the A52 trunk road. Bradmore Parish Council stated that, while it was not opposed to the composition of the Borough Council's proposed Stanford ward, the ward name of Rancliffe should be retained. Stanton on the Wolds Parish Council objected to any change to the existing Wolds ward. Ruddington Parish Council argued that the parish area should be represented by a single three-member ward. Finally, three parishes commented on ward boundaries. Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council argued that the parishes of Holme Pierrepont and Gamston should be contained in a single borough ward. Lady Bay Community Association objected to some aspects of the Borough Council's proposed Lady Bay ward, and Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council supported the Borough Council's proposed two wards for the Radcliffe area.

Other Representations

35 We received a further 10 representations from local councillors and residents of the borough. The three borough councillors for Leake ward opposed the Borough Council's proposals for East Leake, which would divide the parish between two wards, and the loss of the name Leake from the ward title. Three residents of East Leake also opposed the division of the existing Leake ward. Councillor Boote, member for North Keyworth, reiterated his support for a 45-member scheme, and objected to the Council's proposed 50-member scheme. Councillor Venes, a member for Packman ward, objected to the Borough Council's proposals for Ruddington, and supported a single three-member ward for the area. A resident of Ruddington objected to the council's 50-member scheme, while a resident of West Bridgford argued against any reduction in council size. Finally, Councillor Stockwood of Bingham ward supported the Borough Council's proposal to create two Bingham wards and increase the number of councillors for the town to four.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

36 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Rushcliffe is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

37 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

38 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

39 Our *Guidance* states that while we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

Electorate Forecasts

40 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 3 per cent from 81,714 to 84,353 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Bingham, although a significant amount is also expected in Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent parish.

41 The Council stated that it had considered whether the potential impact of the structure plan requirements for housing development in the borough should be taken into account in its electorate forecast. It concluded that the plan, which would cover a period up to 2011, could not be taken into consideration as it had not yet been finalised and any developments which it identified would take place over the period of the plan, and not within the five-year projection period. Cotgrave Town Council, on the other hand argued that, with significant development planned for the borough as part of the Structure Plan, considered this should be taken into account when formulating new warding arrangements.

42 We concur with the Borough Council's views in relation to considering changes to electorate resulting from structure plan housing allocations. Under the 1972 Local Government Act we can only have regard to expected changes in electorate over a five-year period. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

43 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council's figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

44 Rushcliffe Borough Council is currently represented by 54 councillors. At Stage One the Council established a cross-party working group to consider the most appropriate warding arrangements for the borough. This working group identified three options for consideration, two of which were based on the current council size of 54 and one on a reduction in council size to 45. The working group considered that with the introduction of revised political management structures the number of councillors for the borough could be reduced to 45 without reducing the ability of members to carry out an effective representational role, and indicated that this option was their preference.

45 As part of its own consultation process, the Council invited comments on its three options from parish and town councils, and from community organisations within the borough. The main issues raised as part of this consultation were concerns that a reduction in the number of borough councillors would diminish the ability of ward members to carry out an effective representational role, and that the options failed to adequately reflect community identities and historical links. As a result of the Council's consultations, a revised warding proposal was produced for 45 members which was then subject to yet further consultation.

46 In response to this further consultation a revised proposal was submitted by Elton Parish Meeting, based upon a council size of 50. The Council considered that this proposal met the concerns raised by parishes about new electoral arrangements adequately reflecting community identities and historical links. It also considered that with a less significant reduction in council size, to 50 councillors, the proposals would to some extent address the concerns expressed about diminishing the effectiveness of local representation, particularly in the rural area.

47 Cotgrave Town Council, Cropwell Bishop and Kinoulton parish councils and Tithby & Wiverton Parish Meeting all supported retaining the current council size, or options based upon the current council size for their areas. The Labour Group proposed an increase in council size to 56, which was supported by Radcliffe on Trent Branch Labour Party and Central West Bridgford Community Association. The Labour Group argued that this increased council size would address the issue of under-representation in West Bridgford and would be in line with the projected growth in the borough forecast over the next five years.

48 Rushcliffe Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party proposed schemes based upon a council size of 45. Bingham Town Council, East Leake and Ruddington parish councils, East Leake Labour Party and Councillors Boote and Venes supported a reduction in council size or options based on a reduced council size of 45.

49 As previously explained, the Commission's starting point in its PER work is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government. We are, however, willing to look at arguments why this might not be the case. We note that in Rushcliffe the Council has introduced new political management structures in line with the Government's White Paper *Local Leadership, Local Choice* and that this has led to a reduction in the number of committees and the development of the scrutiny role of members. On this basis, the Council argued that reducing council size would not affect the ability of members to carry out an effective representational role. We also note the concern expressed by some respondents, in particular by parish councils, that a large reduction in council size would not best reflect community identities in the borough and would impair the effectiveness of councillor representation.

50 We are satisfied that, in the light of evidence presented to us at Stage One, a significant reduction in council size, for example to 45 members, would not be detrimental to the internal management of the local authority. However, there is clearly some local concern, which should not be lightly dismissed, that such a decrease might not allow for sufficient attention to be paid to the community identities and interests in the borough, and might in turn provide less effective and convenient local government. Conversely, we have not been persuaded that there is significant evidence to support an increase in council size to 56. We consider that a reduction in council size to 50 would, by largely retaining the existing ward structure in the rural area, address the concerns over the adequacy of councillor representation, would enable the proper level of representation to be afforded to both rural and urban areas and would reflect the majority view that a reduction in council size would be desirable.

51 We recognise that the Borough Council's scheme was based on a proposal which it received at a late stage in its own consultation exercise. While this meant that a number of respondents had insufficient time to comment on it in detail, we consider that it has met most of the concerns raised in response to the Borough Council's initial consultations. We also consider that its adoption by the Council has demonstrated a willingness by them to consider alternative proposals. Additionally, the consultation period on these draft recommendations will allow local interests the opportunity to make their views known.

52 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, as well as the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 50 members.

Electoral Arrangements

53 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the borough-wide schemes from the Council, the Labour Group, Rushcliffe Liberal Democrats, Bingham Labour Party and Elton Parish Meeting. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have informed our draft recommendations.

54 First, as outlined above, our proposals for Rushcliffe are based on a council size of 50 which we consider to be the most appropriate council size for the borough having regard to the evidence submitted and to the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area.

55 Second, we note that the Borough Council has proposed a mixed pattern of one- and two-member wards while the Labour Group, Rushcliffe Liberal Democrats, Bingham Labour Party and Elton Parish Meeting proposed a pattern consisting of one, two and three-member wards. We consider that there may be an argument that one and two-member wards would better reflect legislative proposals for elections every two years in two-tier areas contained in the Government's White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*. However, we consider that maintaining a mixed pattern of one, two and three-member wards would best reflect the diverse nature of the borough, electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

56 Third, we have noted the arguments put to us about community identities in the borough. We have tried to reflect such considerations in our draft recommendations where it would be consistent with our objective of electoral equality, although we note that there is no consensus locally on the precise boundaries of such communities.

57 Our draft recommendation for a council size of 50 has meant we have been unable to reflect all of the different views expressed to us. Our draft recommendations are based primarily upon the Borough Council's proposals. However, we have sought to build on those proposals in order to put forward electoral arrangements which would achieve yet further improvements in electoral equality, while also seeking to reflect the statutory criteria. As a result, we have decided to move away from the Borough Council's proposals in several areas.

58 For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton wards;
- (b) Bingham ward;
- (c) Bishop, Nevile and Wiverton wards;
- (d) Gotham, Leake and Soar Valley wards;
- (e) Leys and Packman wards;
- (f) Rancliffe, Stanford and Wolds wards;
- (g) North Keyworth and South Keyworth wards;
- (h) Ash Lea, Manor and Tollerton wards;
- (i) Dayncourt, Lamcote and Malkin wards;
- (j) Abbey and Lady Bay wards;
- (k) Edwalton and Melton wards;
- (l) Lutterell and Musters wards.

59 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton wards

60 The wards of Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton cover the largely rural north-east part of the borough. Cranmer ward contains the parishes of Aslockton, Scarrington and Whatton, and Oak ward consists of Car Colston, East Bridgford, Kneeton and Screveton parishes. Thoroton ward comprises the parishes of Elton, Flawborough, Flintham, Granby, Hawksworth, Orston, Shelton, Sibthorpe and Thoroton. Under the current arrangements each ward is represented by a single councillor. Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton wards currently have 3 per cent, 14 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively and 1 per cent, 12 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2004.

61 The Borough Council and Elton Parish Meeting proposed no change to these wards. Elton Parish Meeting argued that this proposal would reflect community ties between Car Colston and Screveton parishes, and would maintain the present links between Screveton and East Bridgford. It considered that the proposal would also reflect the natural links between Flintham and parishes to its south, and would enable Elton to maintain its links with Granby and Orston. Under a council of 50 members Cranmer and Thoroton wards would each have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (6 per cent and 5 per cent fewer in 2004), and Oak ward would contain 6 per cent more electors than the borough average (4 per cent more by 2004). As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, four other parishes in this area made comments. Flintham and Granby-cum-Sutton parish councils requested no change to the existing Thoroton ward. Screveton Parish Meeting argued that it should be linked with Car Colston and Flintham parishes, while Whatton-in-the-Vale Parish Council preferred to remain linked with Aslockton parish, arguing that the A52 separates the parish from areas to its west.

62 The Labour Group proposed a greater degree of change in this area, enlarging Thoroton ward to include the parishes of Kneeton and Screveton, currently in Oak ward, and removing the parish of Granby, although Cranmer ward would remain unchanged. Under their proposals Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton wards would contain variances of no more than 8 per cent from the borough average based on a council size of 56.

63 The Liberal Democrats also proposed changes to the warding arrangements in this area. They proposed that Car Colston parish be transferred to Cranmer ward, Flintham parish to Oak ward and Langar cum Barnstone parish to Thoroton ward. In 2004 their Cranmer ward would have 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, while Oak and Thoroton wards would have 11 per cent and 1 per cent more electors per councillor respectively based on a council size of 45. Bingham Labour Party proposed substantially enlarging Cranmer ward to include Car Colston and Screveton parishes from Oak ward and all but Granby and Flintham parishes of Thoroton ward. Flintham parish would be included in Oak ward, and Granby and Whatton parishes would form part of an expanded Wiverton ward. Their Cranmer ward would have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004, and Oak ward would contain 5 per cent more electors, based on a council size of 45.

64 We received only one further representation regarding this area at Stage One, from Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council, who argued that their main connections lie with the current Wiverton group of parishes, and not with those of Thoroton ward.

65 We consider that the current arrangements for this area reflect community ties well, and note a significant degree of local support for their retention among parish councils as part of the Borough Council's consultation exercise. Under a council size of 50 the current wards would also achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality. Our proposed Cranmer, Oak and Thoroton wards would contain 5 per cent fewer, 6 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, and 6 per cent fewer, 4 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer respectively by 2004.

Bingham ward

66 Bingham ward comprises the town council area of Bingham together with Saxondale parish to its west. The ward has one of the highest levels of electoral inequality in the borough, with each of its three councillors currently representing 36 per cent more electors than the borough average. This inequality is forecast to increase significantly over the next five years, with each councillor representing 58 per cent more electors than the borough average by 2004.

67 All four borough-wide schemes acknowledged the need to provide increased representation for Bingham. However, while the Borough Council, Elton Parish Meeting, the Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party proposed an increase of one councillor for the town, the Labour Group proposed increasing the number of councillors by two. The Borough Council proposed dividing the town between two wards, each to be represented by two councillors, with Saxondale parish forming part of the proposed Bingham West ward. The boundary between the two proposed wards would run south down Chapel Lane, from the current ward boundary in the north to the Nottingham to Bingham railway line, to the rear of properties on the west side of Kirkhill and Fairfield Street, and between Chestnut Avenue and Brewsters Close. It would then follow the centre of Nottingham Road to the west before running southwards along the dismantled Bingham to Barnstone railway line, along Mill Hill and finally down Tithby Road to the southern boundary of the parish. Under the council's proposals Bingham East and Bingham West wards would currently have 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. Due to considerable growth forecast for the town over the next five years, however, the wards are expected to have 9 per cent and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004.

68 The Liberal Democrats, Elton Parish Meeting and Bingham Labour Party also proposed increasing the number of councillors for Bingham to four, and dividing the current ward between two new wards. Bingham Labour Party proposed combining Saxondale parish with Shelford & Newton parish and part of Radcliffe-on-Trent parish. Elton Parish Meeting also stated that Saxondale parish could be combined with the current Bishop and Wiverton wards to improve electoral equality. The Labour Group proposed a two-member Bingham East ward and a three-member Bingham West ward. Saxondale parish would, under their proposal, be combined with Shelford & Newton parish and part of Radcliffe-on-Trent parish. None of these submissions provided detailed proposals for boundaries within the town.

69 We also received submissions relating to this area from Bingham Branch of the Rushcliffe Conservative Association, Bingham Town Council and Councillor Stockwood, all supporting the creation of two two-member wards in Bingham.

70 We recognise that achieving electoral equality in Bingham presents us with a number of problems. Bingham is a growing town and we recognise that its electorate may continue to increase beyond a five-year period. However, we are unable to have regard to changes which may take place beyond this period, and we therefore have to achieve the best level of electoral equality having regard to changes forecast for the next five years. On this basis, in the context of our proposed council size of 50, we propose that Bingham should be represented by four councillors instead of three. In view of the substantial support for the creation of two wards in Bingham each to be represented by two councillors, and in the absence of any alternative detailed proposals for warding arrangements, we have decided to adopt the Borough Council's proposed warding arrangements as part of our draft recommendations, subject to one minor amendment. We propose transferring Saxondale parish from Bingham to a revised Wiverton ward. Our proposed Bingham East ward would contain 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor (9 per cent more in 2004), and Bingham West ward would have 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (10 per cent more by 2004).

Bishop, Nevile and Wiverton wards

71 Bishop, Nevile and Wiverton wards cover the area to the south of Bingham and east of the A46, and are each represented by a single councillor. Bishop ward is coterminous with the parish of Cropwell Bishop, Nevile ward consists of Hickling, Kinoulton, Owthorpe and Upper Broughton parishes, and Wiverton ward comprises the parishes of Colston Bassett, Cropwell Butler, Langar cum Barnstone, Tithby and Wiverton Hall. Currently, Bishop and Wiverton wards have 4 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (7 per cent and 1 per cent fewer in 2004), and Nevile ward contains 3 per cent more than the average (1 per cent more in 2004).

72 The Borough Council and Elton Parish Meeting proposed combining Bishop and Wiverton wards within a two-member ward, and retaining the current Nevile ward. Elton Parish Meeting argued that a combined ward would improve electoral equality and reflect ecclesiastical links. Their proposed two-member Wiverton ward would contain 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average both now and in five years' time, while Nevile ward would have 5 per cent fewer than the average (7 per cent fewer by 2004).

73 The Labour Group proposed a number of changes to these wards, transferring Granby parish from Thoroton ward as detailed above, combining Cropwell Butler parish with part of Radcliffe-on-Trent parish in a revised Dayncourt ward and combining Owthorpe parish with Cropwell Bishop parish in a revised Bishop ward. Their Bishop, Nevile and Wiverton wards would, based on a council size of 56, have 4 per cent more, 2 per cent more and 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1 per cent more, equal to and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average by 2004).

74 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the current Wiverton ward be abolished as detailed above, and proposed a revised Thoroton ward comprising the existing ward less Flintham parish together with Granby and Langar cum Barnstone parishes. Colston Bassett parish would be combined with Nevile ward in a revised ward. Tithby, Wiverton Hall and Cropwell Butler parishes would be combined with Cropwell Bishop parish in a revised Bishop ward. In 2004 their

proposed Bishop ward would contain 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, and their revised Nevile ward would have 5 per cent fewer than the average, based on a council size of 45.

75 Bingham Labour Party proposed combining Cropwell Bishop and Cropwell Butler parishes in a revised Bishop ward, adding Colston Bassett parish to Nevile ward, and combining Granby and Whatton parishes with the remaining part of Wiverton ward. Their proposed single-member Bishop, Nevile and Wiverton wards would have variances of no more than 5 per cent from the average in 2004 based on a council size of 45.

76 We received representations from five parish councils concerning warding arrangements in this area. Colston Bassett Parish Council asserted that their links are with the other parishes of Wiverton ward. They contended that “Colston Bassett has no link whatsoever with Kinoulton and surrounding villages in Nevile ward”. Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council argued that it should remain linked with parishes to the south of the A52 and east of the A46. It argued that it has no social, political or economic links with the other villages in Thoroton ward. Tithby & Wiverton Parish Meeting requested no change to the current warding arrangements. It argued, however, that if there was to be change they should retain their current link with Cropwell Butler parish. Cropwell Bishop Parish Council objected to being combined with Cropwell Butler parish in a single-member Bishop ward, preferring to be linked with Owthorpe parish in a single-member ward. Kinoulton Parish Council supported retaining the existing Nevile ward. As part of the Borough Council’s own consultation exercise, Granby-cum-Sutton Parish Council argued that it should remain part of Thoroton ward.

77 We consider that the Borough Council’s scheme would provide the best balance between electoral equality and community identities and interests in this area. In particular, it would reflect the significant physical boundaries of the A46 and A52 trunk roads and, to a large extent, the preferences of Kinoulton, Colston Bassett and Langar cum Barnstone parish councils and Tithby & Wiverton Parish Meeting. However, in order to improve electoral equality further we propose one minor amendment. We propose that Saxondale parish, currently in Bingham ward, should form part of a revised Wiverton ward as discussed above. The resultant Nevile and Wiverton wards would contain 5 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (7 per cent and 10 per cent fewer by 2004).

Gotham, Leake and Soar Valley wards

78 Gotham, Leake and Soar Valley wards in the western part of the borough form the south-western corner of the borough of Rushcliffe. Gotham ward comprises the three parishes of Barton in Fabis, Gotham and Thrumpton; Leake ward consists of East Leake and West Leake parishes; and Soar Valley ward comprises Kingston on Soar, Ratcliffe on Soar and Sutton Bonington parishes. Currently, the single-member Gotham and Soar Valley wards have 11 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (9 per cent and 7 per cent more in 2004), while the three-member Leake ward contains 2 per cent more electors than the average (4 per cent more by 2004).

79 The Borough Council proposed no change to the current Gotham and Soar Valley wards, but proposed dividing the current Leake ward between a two-member Castle ward, comprising Castle and Woodgate wards of East Leake parish and the parish of West Leake, and a single-member Stonebridge ward comprising Stonebridge ward of East Leake parish. The Council's proposed Gotham and Soar Valley wards would contain 3 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively based on a council size of 50 (1 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer by 2004). The proposed Castle and Stonebridge wards would have 4 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (6 per cent fewer than and equal to the borough average in 2004). Elton Parish Meeting proposed maintaining the existing warding arrangements of all three wards. They argued that this proposal would minimise change and would maintain the current links between West Leake and East Leake. The proposed Leake ward would contain 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average currently, and 4 per cent fewer by 2004.

80 The Labour Group also proposed no change to Gotham and Soar Valley wards, but proposed that West Leake parish be transferred from Leake ward to a revised Stanford ward. Under their scheme, based on a council size of 56, the single-member wards of Gotham and Soar Valley would have 15 per cent and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (13 per cent and 11 per cent more by 2004), and their proposed three-member Leake ward would contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (5 per cent more by 2004).

81 The Liberal Democrats proposed a greater degree of change in this area. They proposed transferring the parish of Ratcliffe on Soar from Soar Valley ward to Gotham ward and the parish of Normanton on Soar to their proposed Soar Valley ward. Their proposed Leake ward would consist of West Leake and Stanford on Soar parishes together with Woodgate and Stonebridge wards of East Leake parish. Castle ward of East Leake parish would be combined with Costock and Rempstone parishes in a new Castle ward. Their proposed single-member Gotham and Soar Valley wards would have 4 per cent fewer and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2004, while their two-member Leake ward would contain 3 per cent fewer electors than the average, based on a council size of 45. Bingham Labour Party proposed adopting identical warding arrangements to the Liberal Democrats in relation to their proposed Gotham and Soar Valley wards, but proposed a three-member Leake ward consisting of East Leake, West Leake, Costock, Rempstone and Stanford on Soar parishes, which would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004, based on a council size of 45.

82 We received several other representations relating to this area. East Leake Conservative Association objected strongly to the division of the current Leake ward and East Leake parish under the Borough Council's proposals, arguing that Leake is a cohesive and unified village which should remain represented together in a single ward with the possible addition of Costock and Rempstone parishes. East Leake Parish Council argued for a ward combining West Leake, Costock and Rempstone parishes with East Leake in its entirety. It argued that this proposal would not divide the village of East Leake and would, under a council size of 45, provide reasonable electoral equality. East Leake Parish Council Labour Group supported the reduction in council size to 45 and a revised Leake ward consisting of East Leake, West Leake, Costock

and Rempstone parishes. One resident supported the combination of East Leake, West Leake, Costock, Rempstone and Stanford-on-Soar parishes in a new ward. Councillors Dale, Males and O'Toole, who represent Leake ward, opposed the Borough Council's proposal to divide East Leake parish between wards and the proposed ward names of Stonebridge and Castle. As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, Costock Parish Council opposed being combined with East Leake in a new ward and argued that it should remain linked with a grouping of similar sized parishes. West Leake Parish Meeting opposed being grouped with parishes in Stanford ward and argued that the current Leake ward should be retained.

83 Having given consideration to the representations received for this area, we propose endorsing the Borough Council's proposal to retain the existing Gotham and Soar Valley wards. In relation to the current Leake ward, we have noted the concerns expressed by a number of respondents about dividing East Leake parish between wards. We have also noted the preference of West Leake Parish Meeting to remain linked with East Leake for warding purposes. We therefore propose to retain the existing Leake ward. Our proposed Gotham, Soar Valley and Leake wards would currently have 3 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, and 1 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer and 4 per cent fewer respectively by 2004.

Leys and Packman wards

84 The two two-member Leys and Packman wards lie to the south of West Bridgford in the west of the borough, and together cover the parish of Ruddington. Currently both wards are over-represented: Leys ward has 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average while Packman ward contains 15 per cent fewer electors than the average. Over the next five years these poor levels of electoral equality are forecast to worsen further to 16 per cent and 17 per cent fewer electors than the average respectively.

85 The Borough Council proposed addressing the degree of electoral inequality in this area by reducing the number of councillors by one to three, and modifying the boundary between Leys and Packman wards. The Council proposed that the revised boundary should run to the rear of properties on the west side of Wilford Road, behind properties on Brookside Gardens and the north side of Brookside Road, to meet the western boundary of the borough north of Camelot Street. Their proposed two-member Leys ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (equal to the borough average in 2004), and the revised single-member Packman ward would be renamed Easthorpe ward, and would contain 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (9 per cent by 2004), based on a council size of 50.

86 The Labour Group proposed a greater degree of change in this area, enlarging the existing Leys ward to include the parishes of Bradmore and Bunny, and including the parish of Plumtree in a revised Packman ward. Under their scheme the two-member Leys ward would contain 15 per cent more electors than the borough average (12 per cent more in five years' time), and the revised two-member Packman ward would have 6 per cent fewer electors than the average (7 per cent fewer by 2004), based on a council size of 56.

87 The Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party both proposed combining the current Leys and Packman wards to form a three-member Ruddington ward which, under their proposed 45-member council, would contain 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004. Elton Parish Meeting also proposed combining Leys and Packman wards to form a new Ruddington ward which would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004, based on a council size of 50.

88 We received three further representations relating to this area. Ruddington Parish Council, Councillor Venes, who represents Packman ward, and a resident of Ruddington all argued that Leys and Packman wards should be combined in a three-member Ruddington ward based on a council size of 45. Councillor Venes expressed concern that under a council size of 50 urban areas would be under-represented.

89 We note that in this area we have received significant support for uniting Ruddington parish to form a single ward, and that neither the Borough Council nor the Labour Group has provided significant evidence or argumentation to support their proposed division of the parish between borough wards. We also note the concerns expressed locally that a three-member ward for Ruddington based on a council size of 50 will leave the village slightly under-represented. However, we consider that this option would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality, and we are therefore content to put this option forward for consultation. Our proposed Ruddington ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (3 per cent more by 2004), based on a council size of 50.

Rancliffe, Stanford and Wolds wards

90 The wards of Rancliffe, Stanford and Wolds cover a large rural area surrounding the village of Keyworth extending to the southern edge of the borough, and are currently represented by one councillor each. Rancliffe ward comprises the parishes of Bradmore, Bunny, Thorpe in the Glebe, Willoughby on the Wolds and Wysall, and contains 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (9 per cent fewer in 2004). Stanford and Wolds wards are more significantly over-represented at present. Stanford ward contains Costock, Normanton on Soar, Rempstone and Stanford on Soar parishes and has 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (22 per cent fewer by 2004), while Wolds ward, which comprises the parishes of Normanton on the Wolds, Plumtree, Stanton on the Wolds and Widmerpool, has 38 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (36 per cent fewer by 2004).

91 The Borough Council and Elton Parish Meeting proposed creating two single-member wards for this area. They proposed expanding the current Stanford ward to include the parishes of Bradmore and Bunny. The existing Wolds ward would be expanded to include Thorpe in the Glebe, Willoughby on the Wolds and Wysall parishes. Elton Parish Meeting initially proposed to combine Bradmore parish with part of Keyworth parish in order to improve electoral equality. However, it considered that Bradmore parish would be better combined with the neighbouring smaller parishes. Under these proposals Stanford ward would contain 19 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average and Wolds ward would have 2 per cent fewer than the average, based on a council size of 50 (16 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer respectively by 2004).

92 The Labour Group proposed combining part of Ruddington parish with Bradmore and Bunny parishes from Rancliffe ward to form a revised Leys ward, and combining Plumtree parish (from Wolds ward) with part of Ruddington parish to form a revised Packman ward, as discussed previously. They proposed combining the remaining parts of Rancliffe and Wolds wards with Clipston parish from Manor ward to form a revised single-member Wolds ward, with equal to the borough average number of electors per councillor both now and in 2004, based on a council size of 56. Under the Labour Group's proposals the parish of West Leake would be combined with the current Stanford ward to form a revised single-member Stanford ward which would contain 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (12 per cent fewer by 2004), based on a council size of 56.

93 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposal the parishes of Stanton on the Wolds and Widmerpool would be combined with the current Rancliffe ward to form a single-member Wolds ward. The proposed ward, based on a council size of 45, would contain 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004. Costock and Rempstone parishes would be combined with Castle ward of East Leake parish to form a single-member Castle ward with 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004. Stanford on Soar parish would be included in their Leake ward, as discussed previously. Finally, the Liberal Democrats proposed including Normanton on the Wolds and Plumtree parishes in a revised Tollerton ward, to be discussed below. Bingham Labour Party's proposals for Tollerton and Wolds wards were identical to the Liberal Democrats', and would divide the parishes of Stanford ward between revised Leake and Soar Valley wards as discussed previously.

94 We also received representations regarding the warding arrangements for this area from Bradmore and Stanton on the Wolds parish councils. Bradmore Parish Council argued that, while it did not object to the Borough Council's proposal to include the parish in a revised Stanford ward, it would be preferable that the ward be named Rancliffe. Stanton on the Wolds Parish Council requested no change to the existing Wolds ward. As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, Costock Parish Council argued that it should remain linked with parishes of a similar size. Normanton-on-Soar Parish Council argued that it has many common interests with Sutton Bonington and would prefer to form part of a revised Soar Valley ward. Stanford on Soar Parish Council, on the other hand, preferred largely retaining the existing Stanford ward. Wysall and Widmerpool parish councils preferred to be linked with similar rural communities, expressing a preference for the Borough Council's Option 3 (which would link Stanton on the Wolds and Widmerpool parishes from Wolds ward with Radcliffe ward).

95 We have received widely varying proposals for these wards. On the basis of our proposed council size of 50, we consider that the amalgamation of the three existing wards to form two new wards, as proposed by the Borough Council, is the most appropriate solution. This proposal would build upon existing arrangements in this area, providing two wards with a distinct rural focus. We consider, however, that the Borough Council's proposals would result in an unacceptable level of electoral inequality in Stanford ward, which we should address as part of our draft recommendations. We therefore propose combining Bradmore parish with part of Keyworth parish to form a revised Keyworth South ward, discussed in more detail below. Our proposed single-member Stanford ward would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while our proposed single-member Wolds ward would have 2 per cent

fewer than the average (2 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004). We would welcome comments on these proposals at Stage Three.

North Keyworth and South Keyworth wards

96 The wards of North Keyworth and South Keyworth cover the village of Keyworth, and are currently represented by one councillor and three councillors respectively. At present, North Keyworth ward contains 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average and South Keyworth ward has 4 per cent fewer than the average, although these levels of inequality are predicted to increase to 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer respectively by 2004.

97 The Borough Council and Elton Parish Meeting proposed altering the boundary between these two wards and creating revised Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards, each represented by two councillors. The Borough Council's proposed boundary would follow the existing boundary from its western extremity, but would deviate from it by running south down the centre of Wolds Drive, and east behind properties to the north of Selby Lane, where it would rejoin the existing boundary. The proposed Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards would have 9 per cent and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (12 per cent and 13 per cent fewer by 2004).

98 The Labour Group proposed no change to the existing warding arrangements; under a council of 56 members their North Keyworth ward would contain 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, and their South Keyworth ward would be equal to the borough average (1 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor respectively in 2004).

99 Both the Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party proposed combining the two existing wards to form a three-member Keyworth ward, which would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004 under their proposed council size of 45. Councillor Boote, who represents North Keyworth, argued that there had been insufficient consultation on the Borough Council's proposals. As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, Keyworth Parish Council requested no change to the current arrangements.

100 Under a council size of 50 Keyworth parish would be entitled to between three and four councillors, both now and in five years' time. Consequently, the Borough Council's proposal to create two two-member wards for Keyworth would result in relatively high levels of electoral inequality. We have therefore given further consideration to the most appropriate warding arrangements in this area. We propose, in order to improve electoral equality, combining Bradmore parish with part of Keyworth and modifying the Borough Council's proposed boundary between Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards. Our proposed boundary would run along the centre of Wynbreck Drive before running south down the centre of Wolds Drive, with Bradmore parish forming part of the new Keyworth South ward.

101 We recognise that our proposal for two two-member wards, and combining Bradmore parish with part of Keyworth, is a departure from the existing arrangements, and we would particularly welcome views on this proposal at Stage Three. Our proposed Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards would have 6 per cent and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than

the borough average respectively (9 per cent and 10 per cent fewer respectively by 2004). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map A2 at Appendix A.

Ash Lea, Manor and Tollerton wards

102 Tollerton ward is represented by a single councillor, and is coterminous with the parish of Tollerton while Ash Lea and Manor wards cover the Cotgrave Town Council area together with Clipston parish. Currently, the three-member Ash Lea ward and single-member Manor ward contain 7 per cent and 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (9 per cent and 16 per cent fewer by 2004), while Tollerton ward has equal to the average number of electors per councillor (2 per cent fewer in 2004) based on the current council size of 54.

103 The Borough Council proposed relatively few changes in this area. It proposed that the more rural parish of Clipston be transferred to a revised Tollerton ward, and that the boundary between Ash Lea and Manor wards be modified in order to take account of new housing developments on the west side of Cotgrave. Its proposed ward boundary would run eastwards from the parish boundary to the south of the Daleside, Westway and White Furrows developments, northwards on Owthorpe Road and Risegate to Bingham Road, before running to the rear of properties on Eastacres, The Old Park and Colston Gate before rejoining the current boundary along the centre of Colston Gate. Under the Borough Council's scheme Ash Lea ward would be represented by two councillors, and would contain 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (and 9 per cent more than average by 2004). The proposed Manor ward would be represented by a single councillor and would contain 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (and 9 per cent more by 2004). Tollerton ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors than the borough average (6 per cent fewer in 2004). Elton Parish Meeting proposed creating a three-member Cotgrave ward which would have 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004.

104 The Labour Group proposed a greater degree of change in this area. They proposed including the parish of Clipston in Wolds ward as discussed previously, and retaining the existing Tollerton ward which would, on the basis of a council size of 56, have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent more by 2004). They proposed broadly retaining the existing Ash Lea ward, and expanding the current Manor ward to include Holme Pierrepoint parish. Under their proposals, Ash Lea ward would contain 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (1 per cent fewer than the average in 2004), while Manor ward would contain 19 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (21 per cent fewer than the average by 2004). The Labour Group provided no details of their proposed boundary between Ash Lea and Manor wards.

105 The Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party both proposed creating a three-member Cotgrave ward to cover the Cotgrave Town Council area, and combining the parishes of Clipston, Normanton on the Wolds, Plumtree and Tollerton to form a single member Tollerton ward. Under their proposals, Cotgrave ward would contain 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004, while Tollerton ward would contain 7 per cent more than the average based on a council size of 45.

106 We received only one further representation concerning this area at Stage One. Cotgrave Town Council opposed the creation of a three- member Cotgrave ward, arguing that this would reduce representation for the town by one councillor and asserting that two separate wards were essential in order to ensure continued effective local government in Cotgrave. It considered that with Rushcliffe expected to have considerable development during the period of the next structure plan (2001-2011) and with Cotgrave a likely recipient of that, this development should be taken into account when considering new warding arrangements. Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council argued that Holme Pierrepont and Gamston parishes should be combined in a new ward. As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, Tollerton Parish Council opposed being combined with Clipston, Plumtree and Normanton on the Wolds parishes as proposed by the Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party.

107 Having regard to the proposals received, we are content to put forward the Borough Council's proposals for this area. We note that these proposals would maintain a single-member Tollerton ward and provide two wards for the town of Cotgrave. While these proposals would reduce the total representation for the town of Cotgrave, from four to three councillors, we note that this is the correct level of representation for the town. We recognise, as with other parts of the borough, that as part of the next structure plan, further development may take in the town. However, we are unable to have regard to changes which may take place beyond the five-year period, and we have therefore sought to achieve the best level of electoral equality having regard to changes forecast for the next five years. While both Ash Lea and Manor wards would have electoral variances in excess of 10 per cent from the average currently, we note that the level of electoral imbalance is expected to improve marginally in the period up to 2004. We consider that, on balance, this proposal would reflect the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. Our proposals are illustrated in Map A3 at Appendix A.

Dayncourt, Lamcote and Malkin wards

108 Dayncourt, Lamcote and Malkin wards are located in the north of the borough and cover the Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council area together with Holme Pierrepont and Shelford & Newton parishes. Malkin ward comprises Malkin ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council and Shelford & Newton parish; Lamcote ward comprises Lamcote ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council and Holme Pierrepont parish; and Dayncourt ward is coterminous with Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe Parish Council. All three wards are significantly over-represented at present, with both Dayncourt and Malkin wards containing 18 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (and 10 per cent and 21 per cent fewer respectively in 2004). Lamcote ward currently has 32 per cent fewer electors per councillor, which is forecast to deteriorate to 34 per cent fewer than average by 2004.

109 In order to address the significant level of over-representation the Borough Council proposed reducing the number of wards for this area from three to two, and the number of councillors from six to four. The Council proposed dividing the current Lamcote borough ward. Holme Pierrepont parish would be combined with Gamston parish and the Gamston development as discussed below, while Lamcote ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council would be combined with the majority of the current Dayncourt ward to form a revised Dayncourt ward. The existing Malkin ward would be expanded to include that part of Dayncourt ward bounded by

Wharf Lane, Main Road, the Cemetery and the playing fields and the A52 Grantham Road to its junction with Bingham Road. The Council's proposed Dayncourt and Malkin wards would contain 4 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively based on a council size of 50 (3 per cent more and 1 per cent more respectively by 2004).

110 The Labour Group also proposed considerable change in this area, dividing the constituent parts of the current three wards between four new wards. Holme Pierrepont parish would be combined with part of Cotgrave parish to form a revised Manor ward, as discussed above, while the remainder of the current Lamcote ward (Lamcote ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council) would form a single-member ward. Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council would be combined with Cropwell Butler parish to form a two-member Dayncourt ward, and Saxondale parish would be added to a two-member Malkin ward. Under a council size of 56, the proposed Dayncourt and Malkin wards would have 3 per cent more and 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (3 per cent fewer and 4 per cent fewer by 2004), while the revised Lamcote ward would have 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (7 per cent more in 2004). Radcliffe-on-Trent Branch Labour Party supported the Labour Group's proposals for Radcliffe-on-Trent, but suggested a number of minor amendments which would improve electoral equality. They argued that Malkin ward could be expanded southwards to include the part of Dayncourt ward to the north of Bingham Road, and Dayncourt ward could be expanded westwards to include the part of Lamcote ward to the east of Vicarage Lane and Orford Avenue.

111 The Liberal Democrats and Elton Parish Meeting both proposed warding arrangements similar to those of the Borough Council. Both proposed that Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council area should be united in a single borough ward as discussed below, and combining Lamcote ward and the majority of Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council together with Radcliffe Residential Park from Malkin ward to form a two-member Dayncourt ward. The majority of Malkin town council ward would be combined with an unspecified part of Dayncourt town council ward and Shelford & Newton parish in a two-member Malkin ward. On the basis of our proposed council size of 50, the proposed Dayncourt ward would contain equal to the average number of electors per councillor, while the proposed Malkin ward would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than average, by 2004.

112 Bingham Labour Party proposed creating two two-member Radcliffe-on-Trent wards covering the existing Dayncourt, Lamcote and Malkin wards and Saxondale parish. They did not provide detailed proposals for the warding arrangements for these wards, which would each contain 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average in 2004 based on a council size of 45.

113 We also received two representations from Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council at Stage One. The first submission commented on the Borough Council's options for consultation while in the second submission the Council argued in support of the Borough Council's proposed wards for the area. The Parish Council argued that properties either side of Henson Lane, currently divided between Cropwell Butler and Radcliffe-on-Trent parishes, should be in one ward. Similarly, they argued that the Adbolton area should be combined with part of West Bridgford in a new ward.

Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council argued that the current partition of the parish council area between wards leads to confusion and uncertainty about representation and supported the Borough Council's proposal to unite the area in a single ward.

114 We consider that the Borough Council's proposal would achieve reasonable electoral equality and reflect the preference of Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council for the area to be divided between two borough wards and Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council to unite the parishes of Holme Pierrepont and Gamston in one ward. We note the comments made regarding minor anomalies in parish boundaries in this area, but are unable to consider changes to parish boundaries as part of this review. We consider that such proposals would more appropriately be addressed as part of any future parish review. We recognise that in order to achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality in this area that a part of Dayncourt ward would have to be transferred to a revised Malkin ward and that we would therefore have to depart from the existing strong physical boundary of the railway line. We would therefore particularly welcome views at Stage Three as to the suitability of the proposed boundary between Malkin and Dayncourt wards. Our proposed Dayncourt and Malkin wards would have 4 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently respectively, improving to 3 per cent and 1 per cent more than average by 2004. Our proposals are illustrated in Map A6 at Appendix A.

Abbey and Lady Bay wards

115 Abbey and Lady Bay wards are each represented by three councillors and cover the north-eastern part of West Bridgford, south of the River Trent together with Gamston parish, which forms part of Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council. Abbey ward is significantly under-represented at present, with 32 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Lady Bay ward contains 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (30 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer respectively by 2004).

116 The Borough Council proposed dividing the area between three two-member wards. It proposed creating a new two-member Gamston ward, uniting the parish of Holme Pierrepont from Lamcote ward, the parish of Gamston and the new Gamston development from Abbey ward. The western boundary of the new Gamston ward would run along the centre of Brockley Road, Buckfast Way and Ruford Way before running to the rear of properties on Grange Park, Ridgway Close, Coxmoor Close and Seathwaite Close. The proposed Lady Bay ward would comprise that part of the current ward to the east of the A6011 Radcliffe Road together with the part of Abbey ward to the north of Dawes Road and east of Albert Road. The area to the west of Radcliffe Road would form part of a new Trent Bridge ward. The proposed Abbey ward would consist of the part of Melton ward to the east of Melton Road and north of Burleigh Road together with the part of Abbey ward to the north of Burleigh Road and Buckfast Way. The part of the current Abbey ward to the south of the revised ward would form part of a new Melton ward. The proposed Abbey and Lady Bay ward would contain 8 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, with both improving to 5 per cent more by 2004. The proposed Gamston ward would contain 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average both now and in five years' time.

117 The Labour Group also proposed substantial change to this area, creating four two-member wards in place of the two existing three-member wards. They proposed transferring the Adbolton area from Lamcote ward to a revised Lady Bay ward, the boundary of which would run along the centre of the Lady Bay Bridge and follow the course of the Grantham Canal before running east along the centre of the A6011 Radcliffe Road. They proposed a new Gamston ward bounded in the east by the A52 Gamston Lings Bar Road, in the north by the A6011 Radcliffe Road and in the west by the Grantham Canal and the rear of properties on Grange Park, Ridgway Close, Coxmoor Close and Seathwaite Close. Their proposed Abbey ward would consist the part of the existing ward to the south of Eltham Road, east of Gordon Road and Trevor Road and north of Valley Road and west of the Grantham Canal. Finally, the remaining western part of the current Lady Bay ward would be combined with the remaining northern part of the current Abbey ward to form a new Park ward. Based upon a council size of 56, the Labour Group's proposed Abbey, Lady Bay and Park wards would each contain 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent, 2 per cent and 1 per cent more by 2004), while Gamston ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors than the borough average (4 per cent fewer in 2004).

118 The Liberal Democrats and Bingham Labour Party proposed that West Bridgford be represented by 16 councillors, while Elton Parish Meeting proposed 17 councillors. However, none of these submissions provided detailed proposals for this area. We received three further representations concerning this area. Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council requested that its combined parish area be united within a single ward named Pierrepont Gamston. Lady Bay Community Association objected to the Borough Council's proposed Lady Bay ward, arguing that the Ella Road area shares many of the problems of Lady Bay area north of Radcliffe Road, while the Priory Road area has little in common with the main part of Lady Bay. Central West Bridgford Community Association argued that the number of councillors for West Bridgford should not be reduced.

119 We consider that, of two detailed submissions in relation to this area, the Labour Group's proposals more accurately reflect the community identities in the area and we are content to base our proposed Abbey, Gamston and Lady Bay wards on their proposed wards. However, as they are based on a council size of 56 rather than our preferred council size of 50, we propose to make a number of modifications. We consider that the development to the south of the Grantham Canal shares an affinity with Gamston parish and should form part of a new Gamston ward, but consider that in the west the Canal would provide a clearly identifiable boundary. Additionally, given the degree of support for the proposal to unite the parish council area of Holme Pierrepont & Gamston within a single ward, we are content to put this forward as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposed two-member Gamston ward would comprises the parish council area of Holme Pierrepont & Gamston together with those properties accessed from Beckside, including Kingfishers Court and Herons Court currently in Edwalton ward. The ward would contain 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (4 per cent fewer in 2004).

120 In relation to the Lady Bay area, we concur with the views expressed by the Lady Bay Community Association that the Ella Road area has greater affinity with the area to its north than the Priory Road area. We recognise that there is a case for considering the appropriateness of the boundary between the Lady Bay area and Holme Pierrepont parish in the Adbolton area.

However, we consider that this should be considered as part of a future parishing review. Our proposed ward of Lady Bay would contain the part of the existing ward to the north of Grantham Canal and east of Lady Bay Bridge together with the Ella Road area. Our proposed two-member Lady Bay ward would have 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently, and 6 per cent more by 2004.

121 Finally, we propose a revised Abbey ward represented by two councillors. The revised ward would consist of the part of the current ward to the west of the Grantham Canal, north of Leahurst Road and to the rear of properties on Stamford Road and east of Albert Road and Gordon Road together with Kendal Court from Lady Bay ward. Our proposed Abbey ward would contain 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to 5 per cent more by 2004. The part of Abbey ward to the west of Albert Road and Rectory Road would be combined with the parts of Lady Bay and Musters ward to form a new Trent Bridge ward, as discussed in more detail below. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Edwalton and Melton wards

122 The existing three-member Edwalton and Melton wards cover the southern and central areas of West Bridgford respectively. Edwalton ward currently has 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (1 per cent fewer in 2004), while Melton ward contains 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (19 per cent fewer by 2004).

123 The Borough Council proposed that the existing Edwalton ward remain largely unchanged. It proposed transferring Robina Court and Rydal Gardens from Melton ward and uniting the whole of Valley Road and Leahurst Road in Edwalton ward. They proposed that the parts of Edwalton ward to the north of Leahurst Road and the Willow Road area south of Boundary Road and to the west of Rushcliffe Comprehensive School should form part of a revised Melton ward. The southern part of the current Melton ward would be combined with parts of Abbey and Edwalton wards in the east, and with parts of Edwalton and Lutterell wards in the west. This revised Melton ward would be bounded by Old Road and Repton Road to the west, and by Malvern Road and the boundary with their proposed Abbey ward in the north. Both the proposed Edwalton Village and Melton wards abut Gamston ward in the east, and the two two-member wards would contain 2 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (1 per cent and 7 per cent fewer respectively by 2004).

124 The Labour Group's proposed Melton ward would be based largely on the current ward, bounded by Rectory Road in the north, Gordon Road and Trevor Road in the east, Valley Road in the south and Musters Road and the disused railway line to the west. The western part of the current Melton ward, between Musters Road and the disused railway line would be combined with the part of Lutterell ward to the east of Loughborough Road, a small part of the current Musters ward and the part of Edwalton ward to the south of Boundary Road to form a new Harrow ward. The Group's proposed Edwalton ward would reflect the current ward less the area transferred to a new Harrow ward and the area to the east of Grange Park and Ridgway Close (which would form part of Gamston ward) and the area to the north of Valley Road (which would form part of Melton ward). On the basis of their proposed council size of 56, the three two-

member wards of Edwalton, Harrow and Melton would have variances of no more than 3 per cent currently and 5 per cent by 2004.

125 We have not been persuaded that the Borough Council's proposed Melton ward would best reflect community ties in this area. The proposed ward would combine areas, stretching from Repton Road in the west to the edge of the Gamston development in the east, which would appear to have little affinity and are divided by the disused railway line across its centre. Our proposed Melton ward is based on the proposals put forward by the Labour Group. The ward would be bounded by the disused railway line in the west, Rectory Road in the north, Gordon Road and Trevor Road and Stamford Road in the east and Valley Road in the south. We are content to largely retain the current Edwalton ward as proposed by both the Borough Council and the Labour Group. Our proposed ward would be bounded by Leahurst Road and Leahurst Gardens in the north and Rushcliffe Comprehensive School in the west. As discussed earlier, we propose including Kingfishers Court, Herons Court, Belfry Way and Ashridge Way in Gamston ward. The remainder of the current Melton ward and the Boundary Road area of Edwalton Road would form part of a revised Musters ward as discussed below. Our proposed Edwalton Village and Melton wards would contain 5 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (7 per cent and 1 per cent fewer by 2004). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Lutterell and Musters wards

126 Lutterell and Musters wards, in the western part of West Bridgford, are bounded by the River Trent in the north, the A52 Nottingham Ring Road in the south, and borough boundary to the west and the disused railway line and Musters Road to the east. Both are currently represented by three councillors. Lutterell ward currently has the worst level of electoral equality in the borough, with 55 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Musters ward currently has 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (52 per cent more and 13 per cent fewer respectively by 2004).

127 The Borough Council proposed substantially reorganising the warding arrangements of these two wards, creating revised two-member Lutterell and Musters wards and new two-member Rivermead and Trent Bridge wards. It proposed reducing the size of Lutterell ward, which would be bounded in the west by Wilford Road, Landmere Lane and Compton Acres. The northern boundary of the ward would run to the rear of properties south of Rugby Road and to the south of those roads accessed from Rugby Road, including Uppingham Crescent, Stowe Avenue, Kingswood Road and Burnside Road. It proposed that the eastern boundary of the ward should be Loughborough Road, Eton Road, Repton Road and Old Road. A new Rivermead ward would combine the northern part of Lutterell ward with the western part of the current Musters ward, bounded in the east by Loughborough Road, Chestnut Grove and Elmtree Avenue, and in the north by Welbeck Road. The Council's proposed Musters ward would comprise the eastern part of Lutterell ward, the area of Musters ward between Loughborough Road, Melton Road, George Road and Musters Road, and that part of the current Melton ward to the west of Melton Road and north of Malvern Road. The proposed Trent Bridge ward would be formed by combining the remaining northern part of the current Musters ward together with the parts of Abbey and Lady Bay wards to the west of Rectory Road, Albert Road, Grantham Canal and Lady Bay Bridge as

discussed previously. Under the Borough Council's proposals, Lutterell, Rivermead and Trent Bridge wards would contain 4 per cent, 7 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (3 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer respectively by 2004). Musters ward would have 3 per cent more electors than the borough average (and 1 per cent more in 2004).

128 The Labour Group also proposed creating four two-member wards in this area, including new Compton Acres and Harrow wards. The Group's proposed Harrow ward would comprise parts of the current Edwalton, Lutterell, Musters and Melton wards and would be bounded by Old Road and Loughborough Road in the west, North Road in the north and Musters Road and the disused railway line in the east. The proposed Lutterell ward would lie to the west of Old Road and Loughborough Road, and its western boundary would run along Europa Way and to the west of all roads accessed from Walcote Drive, including Knights Close, Glebe Farm Close and Worwood Drive. The boundary would then run to the west of Collington Way and Northwold Avenue before rejoining Loughborough Road to the north of Springfields. A new Compton Acres ward would lie to the west of Lutterell ward, and its northern boundary would be formed by Bruce Drive. The Labour Group's revised Musters ward would comprise the remaining northern part of the current Musters ward. Compton Acres, Lutterell and Musters wards would contain 6 per cent, 11 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor respectively than the borough average based on a council size of 56 (and 3 per cent, 8 per cent and 1 per cent more by 2004). The proposed Harrow ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (4 per cent fewer in 2004).

129 We consider that the Labour Group's proposed warding arrangements for this area most accurately reflect the various community areas in the western part of West Bridgford, and are content to largely base our proposals for these wards on their proposals subject to a number of modifications to reflect our proposed council size of 50. We propose a new Trent Bridge ward combining their proposed Musters ward together with the parts of the current Abbey and Lady Bay wards to the west of Rectory Road, Albert Road, the rear of properties on Edward Road and Lady Bay Bridge. We consider that this proposal would unite the areas around the two bridges across the River Trent, and would reflect communities well. Our proposed Musters ward would cover the area to the west of the disused railway line from Melton Road to Boundary Road in the south. The southern boundary of the ward would run to the rear of properties on the southern side of Boundary Road and Willow Rise as discussed previously.

130 We propose adopting the Labour Group's Lutterell and Compton Acres wards with only minor amendments, with the western boundary of our revised Lutterell ward following Loughborough Road to the A52 Nottingham Ring Road in the south, and its eastern boundary running along the centre of Loughborough Road as far as Welbeck Road in the north. Our proposed Compton Acres ward would contain all the properties on both sides of Wilford Road. Compton Acres, Lutterell and Trent Bridge wards would each contain 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to 4 per cent more in each ward by 2004, while Musters ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (7 per cent fewer in 2004). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Electoral Cycle

131 We received five representations regarding the Borough Council's electoral cycle. The Borough Council itself stated that it "affirmed its opposition to any proposal to introduce annual elections and wishes to retain the present discretion for districts to opt for whole election". The Labour Group, Colston Bassett Parish Council, Cotgrave Town Council and Elton Parish Meeting also supported retaining the present four-year cycle of whole council elections. Cotgrave Town Council argued that annual elections may tend to increase voter fatigue, and that continuous campaigning might reduce the efficacy of councillors.

132 We have carefully considered all these representations. At present there appears to be no demand for a change to the present electoral cycle, and we are therefore proposing no change to the current electoral cycle of whole-council elections for the borough.

Conclusions

133 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- (i) there should be a reduction in council size from 54 to 50;
- (ii) there should be 29 wards, as at present;
- (iii) the boundaries of 22 of the existing wards should be modified;
- (iv) elections should continue to be held for the whole council every four years.

134 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- (i) In West Bridgford we have put forward our own proposals which are based, in part, on the Labour Group's proposals;
- (ii) We propose that Saxondale parish should form part of Wiverton ward;
- (iii) We propose retaining a three-member Leake ward;
- (iv) We propose a three-member Ruddington ward, combining the current Leys and Packman wards;
- (v) We propose that Bradmore parish should form part of a new Keyworth South ward, and that the boundary between Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards should be amended in order to improve electoral equality in both wards.

135 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	54	50	54	50
Number of wards	29	29	29	29
Average number of electors per councillor	1,513	1,634	1,562	1,687
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	14	2	13	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	7	0

136 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Rushcliffe Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 14 to two. By 2004, no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough.

Draft Recommendation

Rushcliffe Borough Council should comprise 50 councillors serving 29 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

137 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Holme Pierrepont & Gamston, Keyworth and Radcliffe-on-Trent and the towns of Bingham and Cotgrave to reflect the proposed borough wards.

138 The parish of Keyworth is currently served by 17 councillors representing two wards: North ward returns four parish councillors and South ward returns 13 councillors. In our draft recommendations, we have proposed two wards, Keyworth North and Keyworth South, each represented by two borough councillors. As a consequence of our proposal, we propose to modify the existing parish wards and to redistribute the number of councillors for each ward.

Draft Recommendation

Keyworth Parish Council should continue to be represented by 17 councillors, representing two wards. North parish ward would return nine parish councillors, five more than at present, while South parish ward would return eight councillors, five fewer than at present. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundary between Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards, as illustrated on Map A2 in Appendix A.

139 Cotgrave Town Council is currently served by 16 councillors, who represent the two parish wards of Ash Lea and Manor. Ash Lea ward is currently represented by 12 town councillors and Manor is represented by four town councillors. As part of our draft recommendations we propose modifications to the boundary between Ash Lea and Manor borough wards, and therefore propose that the two town council wards should be amended to reflect the revised borough warding arrangements, and that the number of councillors for each ward should be modified.

Draft Recommendation

Cotgrave Town Council should continue to be represented by 17 councillors, representing two wards. Ash Lea town ward would return 11 town councillors, one fewer than at present, while Manor town ward would return five councillors, one more than at present. The two parish wards should reflect the proposed borough wards of Ash Lea and Manor wards, as illustrated on Map A3 in Appendix A.

140 Bingham Town Council is currently served by 13 councillors and is not warded. In order to facilitate the increase in representation for the town from three borough councillors to four, the Borough Council, the Liberal Democrats, Elton Parish Meeting and Bingham Labour Party all proposed dividing the town between two borough wards.

141 At Stage One, Bingham Town Council stated that, while it supported in an increase in borough representation, it would not seek any increase in the number of town councillors. Bingham Labour Party argued that dividing the town between wards “would increase the identity of individual councillors with particular areas of the town”. It also considered that in view of the heavy workload of councillors, the number of town councillors should be increased to 17. Councillor Stockwood argued that warding can be divisive and that there is no public support for an increase in the number of town councillors. On this basis, she considered that there was no need for a change to the number of town councillors. Bingham Branch of Rushcliffe Conservative Association opposed any increase in the number of parish councillors arguing that it would increase the amount of administrative work. They argued that the current number of councillors should be retained, with Bingham West ward being represented by seven town councillors and Bingham East ward being represented by six town councillors.

142 As part of our draft recommendations we have proposed the creation of two borough wards, Bingham East and Bingham West. As stated above, Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards. We therefore propose to also divide the town between two town council wards which would be coterminous with the new borough wards. We note that the two proposed borough wards will have similar electorates, and consider that each ward should therefore be represented by the same number of town councillors. We recognise that at Stage One there was no consensus on the appropriate number of town councillors but we note that we received no submissions supporting a decrease. For the purposes of consultation, we propose increasing the number of town councillors by one to 14, and that the two proposed town council wards should be each be represented by seven town councillors. We would, however, particularly welcome further views on this issue at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation
Bingham Town Council should be represented by 14 councillors, one more than at present, representing two wards. Bingham East and Bingham West town wards would each be represented by seven town councillors. The two town council wards should reflect the proposed borough wards of Bingham East and Bingham West, as illustrated on Maps A4 and A5 in Appendix A.

143 Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council is currently served by 18 councillors, who represent the three parish wards of Dayncourt, Lamcote and Malkin. Dayncourt and Malkin parish wards are coterminous with the borough wards of the same name, while Lamcote parish ward is combined with Holme Pierrepont parish in the current Lamcote borough ward. Each of the three wards is represented by six parish councillors. As part of our draft recommendations, we propose that the parish should in future be divided between two borough wards, Dayncourt and Malkin.

144 At Stage One, we received no submissions on the issue of parish warding for Radcliffe-on-Trent. Therefore, for the purposes of consultation, we propose that the parish should be divided between two parish wards whose representation and boundaries should be amended to reflect the revised borough warding arrangements.

Draft Recommendation
Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council should continue to be represented by 18 councillors, but should be divided between two wards instead of three as at present. Dayncourt and Malkin parish wards would each return nine parish councillors. The two town council wards would reflect the proposed Dayncourt and Malkin wards, as illustrated on Maps A6 in Appendix A.

145 At Stage One, we received a number of comments in relation to Holme Pierrepont and Gamston parishes. The Borough Council stated that there had been some local support for the

Adbolton area being combined with the Lady Bay area of West Bridgford rather than Holme Pierrepont. The Labour Group also proposed such a change as part of its Stage One proposal. As discussed above, we recognise that there is a case for considering the appropriateness of the boundary between the Lady Bay area and Holme Pierrepont parish in the Adbolton area. However, we consider that this should be considered as part of a future parishing review.

146 Similarly, Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council argued that “the presently existing artificial administrative boundary between the ‘parish meeting’ of Gamston, and the parish of Holme Pierrepont be dissolved”, and that the parishes be combined, reflecting the practical working relationship between the 10 councillors which presently exists. We are not able to undertake such changes as part of a periodic electoral review , and we consider that this issue could be better addressed as part of a future parishing review.

147 However, in view of the significant growth in the Gamston area we consider that there is some merit in redistributing parish councillors between the two parish areas to reflect their current electorates. We therefore, for the purposes of consultation, propose that the number of parish councillors for Gamston be increased to seven and the number for Holme Pierrepont be reduced to three. We would particularly welcome any views on this issue at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation
Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council should comprise 10 parish councillors, as at present. Gamston parish should be represented by seven parish councillors, four more than at present, and Holme Pierrepont parish should be represented by three councillors, four fewer than at present.

148 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the borough.

Draft Recommendation
For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the Borough Council.

149 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Rushcliffe and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Rushcliffe

5 NEXT STEPS

150 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Rushcliffe. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 21 February 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

151 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Rushcliffe Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142
e-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

152 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to 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 our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Rushcliffe: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Rushcliffe area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 to A6 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed boundary between Keyworth North and Keyworth South wards.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundary between Ash Lea and Manor wards.

Maps A4 and A5 illustrate the proposed boundary between Bingham East and Bingham West wards.

Map A6 illustrates the proposed boundary between Dayncourt and Malkin wards.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for the town of West Bridgford.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Rushcliffe: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Boundary between Keyworth North and Keyworth South Wards

Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Ash Lea and Manor Wards

Map A4: Proposed Boundary between Bingham East and Bingham West Wards (part)

Map A5: Proposed Boundary between Bingham East and Bingham West Wards (part)

Map A6: Proposed Boundary between Dayncourt and Malkin Wards

APPENDIX B

Rushcliffe Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B1: Rushcliffe Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Abbey	Abbey ward (part); Melton ward (part)
Ash Lea	Ash Lea ward (part – Ash Lea ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part)); Manor ward (part – Manor ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part))
Bingham East	Bingham ward (part)
Bingham West	Bingham ward (part and Saxondale parish)
Castle	Leake ward (part – Castle ward of East Leake parish , Woodgate ward of East Leake parish and West Leake parish)
Cranmer	<i>Unchanged</i> (Aslockton, Scarrington and Whatton parishes)
Dayncourt	Dayncourt ward (part – Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council (part)); Lamcote ward (part – Lamcote ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council)
Easthorpe	Packman ward (part – Camelot ward of Ruddington parish (part) and Easthorpe ward of Ruddington parish)
Edwalton Village	Edwalton ward (part); Gamston ward (part); Melton ward (part)
Gamston	Abbey ward (part – Gamston parish and unparished area); Lamcote ward (part – Holme Pierrepont parish)
Gotham	<i>Unchanged</i> (Barton in Fabis, Gotham and Thrumpton parishes)
Keyworth North	North Keyworth ward (North ward of Keyworth parish); South Keyworth ward (part – South ward of Keyworth parish (part))
Keyworth South	South Keyworth ward (part – South ward of Keyworth parish (part))
Lady Bay	Abbey ward (part); Lady Bay ward (part)
Leys	Leys ward (part – Camelot ward of Ruddington parish (part), Flawford and Manor wards of Ruddington parish)
Lutterell	Lutterell ward (part)
Malkin	Dayncourt ward (part – Dayncourt ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council (part)); Malkin ward (Malkin ward of Radcliffe-on-Trent Town Council and Shelford & Newton parish)
Manor	Ash Lea ward (part – Ash Lea ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part)); Manor ward (part – Manor ward of Cotgrave Town Council (part))
Melton	Abbey ward (part); Edwalton ward (part); Lutterell ward (part); Melton ward (part)

Ward name	Constituent areas
Musters	Lutterell ward (part); Melton ward (part); Musters ward (part)
Nevile	<i>Unchanged</i> (Hickling, Kinoulton, Owthorpe and Upper Broughton parishes)
Oak	<i>Unchanged</i> (Car Colston, East Bridgford, Kneeton and Screveton parishes)
Rivermead	Lutterell ward (part); Musters ward (part)
Soar Valley	<i>Unchanged</i> (Kingston on Soar, Ratcliffe on Soar and Sutton Bonington parishes)
Stonebridge	Leake ward (part – Stonebridge ward of East Leake parish)
Stanford	Rancliffe ward (part – Bunny and Bradmore parishes); Stanford ward (Costock, Normanton on Soar, Rempstone and Stanford on Soar parishes)
Thoroton	<i>Unchanged</i> (Elton, Flintham, Flawborough, Granby, Hawksworth, Orston, Shelton, Sibthorpe and Thoroton parishes)
Tollerton	Manor ward (part – Clipston parish); Tollerton ward (Tollerton parish)
Trent Bridge	Abbey ward (part); Lady Bay ward (part); Musters ward (part)
Wiverton	Bishop ward (Cropwell Bishop parish); Wiverton ward (Colston Bassett, Cropwell Butler, Langar cum Barnstone, Tithby and Wiverton Hall parishes)
Wolds	Rancliffe ward (part – Thorpe in the Glebe, Willoughby on the Wolds and Wysall parishes); Wolds ward (Normanton on the Wolds, Plumtree, Stanton on the Wolds and Widmerpool parishes)

Figure B2: Rushcliffe Borough Council's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Abbey	2	3,521	1,761	8	3,529	1,765	5
2 Ash Lea	2	3,638	1,819	-11	3,685	1,843	9
3 Bingham East	2	3,093	1,547	-5	3,665	1,833	9
4 Bingham West	2	3,078	1,539	-6	3,740	1,870	11
5 Castle	2	3,151	1,576	-4	3,180	1,590	-6
6 Cranmer	1	1,557	1,557	-5	1,583	1,583	-6
7 Dayncourt	2	3,154	1,577	-4	3,486	1,743	3
8 Easthorpe	1	1,828	1,828	12	1,847	1,847	9
9 Edwalton Village	2	3,339	1,670	2	3,357	1,679	-1
10 Gamston	2	3,136	1,568	-4	3,223	1,612	-4
11 Gotham	1	1,681	1,681	3	1,696	1,696	1
12 Keyworth North	2	2,960	1,480	-9	2,963	1,482	-12
13 Keyworth South	2	2,894	1,447	-11	2,919	1,460	-13
14 Lady Bay	2	3,476	1,738	6	3,537	1,769	5
15 Leys	2	3,340	1,670	2	3,368	1,684	0
16 Lutterell	2	3,396	1,698	4	3,469	1,735	3
17 Malkin	2	3,418	1,709	5	3,418	1,709	1
18 Manor	1	1,825	1,825	12	1,841	1,841	9
19 Melton	2	3,094	1,547	-5	3,122	1,561	-7
20 Musters	2	3,374	1,687	3	3,392	1,696	1
21 Nevile	1	1,559	1,559	-5	1,576	1,576	-7
22 Oak	1	1,725	1,725	6	1,751	1,751	4
23 Rivermead	2	3,484	1,742	7	3,483	1,742	3
24 Soar Valley	1	1,623	1,623	-1	1,674	1,674	-1
25 Stanford	1	1,947	1,947	19	1,963	1,963	16
26 Stonebridge	1	1,467	1,467	-10	1,682	1,682	0
27 Thoroton	1	1,547	1,547	-5	1,611	1,611	-5

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
28 Tollerton	1	1,565	1,565	-4	1,579	1,579	-6
29 Trent Bridge	2	3,326	1,663	2	3,336	1,668	-1
30 Wiverton	2	2,924	1,462	-11	3,003	1,502	-11
31 Wolds	1	1,595	1,595	-2	1,675	1,675	-1
Totals	50	81,715	-	-	84,353	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,634	-	-	1,687	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Rushcliffe Borough Council's submission.

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

Rushcliffe Borough Council Labour Group's Proposal

Figure B3: Rushcliffe Borough Council Labour Group's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Abbey	2	3,041	1,521	4	3,072	1,536	2
2	Ash Lea	3	4,426	1,475	1	4,476	1,492	-1
3	Bingham A	2	2,459	1,229	-16	2,951	1,476	-2
4	Bingham B	3	3,688	1,229	-16	4,427	1,476	-2
5	Bishop	1	1,517	1,517	4	1,527	1,527	1
6	Compton Acres	2	3,084	1,542	6	3,115	1,558	3
7	Cranmer	1	1,557	1,557	7	1,583	1,583	5
8	Dayncourt	2	2,992	1,496	3	2,926	1,463	-3
9	Edwalton	2	3,012	1,506	3	3,043	1,522	1
10	Gamston	2	2,867	1,434	-2	2,896	1,448	-4
11	Gotham	1	1,681	1,681	15	1,696	1,696	13
12	Harrow	2	2,858	1,429	-2	2,887	1,444	-4
13	Lady Bay	2	3,036	1,518	4	3,067	1,534	2
14	Lamcote	1	1,613	1,613	11	1,614	1,614	7
15	Leake	3	4,523	1,508	3	4,750	1,583	5
16	Leys	2	3,343	1,672	15	3,372	1,686	12
17	Lutterell	2	3,228	1,614	11	3,261	1,631	8
18	Malkin	2	2,492	1,246	-15	2,895	1,448	-4
19	Manor	1	1,176	1,176	-19	1,189	1,189	-21
20	Melton	2	2,840	1,420	-3	2,869	1,435	-5
21	Musters	2	3,017	1,509	3	3,048	1,524	1
22	Nevile	1	1,493	1,493	2	1,504	1,504	0
23	North Keyworth	1	1,481	1,481	1	1,488	1,488	-1
24	Oak	1	1,581	1,581	8	1,599	1,599	6
25	Packman	2	2,751	1,376	-6	2,804	1,402	-7

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
26 Park	2	3,024	1,512	4	3,055	1,528	1
27 Soar Valley	1	1,623	1,623	11	1,674	1,674	11
28 South Keyworth	3	4,373	1,458	0	4,394	1,465	-3
29 Stanford	1	1,303	1,303	-11	1,330	1,330	-12
30 Thoroton	1	1,418	1,418	-3	1,473	1,473	-2
31 Tollerton	1	1,519	1,519	4	1,533	1,533	2
32 Wiverton	1	1,245	1,245	-15	1,334	1,334	-11
33 Wolds	1	1,454	1,454	0	1,505	1,505	0
Totals	56	81,715	-	-	84,357	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,459	-	-	1,506	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Rushcliffe Borough Council Labour Group's submission.

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

* The figures shown are indicative as no detailed proposals were received for these areas.

Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrats' Proposal

Figure B4: Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrats' Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Abbey	2	3,935	1,968	5
2	Bingham East	2	3,544	1,772	-5
3	Bingham West	2	3,861	1,931	3
4	Bishop	1	2,045	2,045	9
5	Castle	1	2,083	2,083	11
6	Cotgrave	3	5,526	1,842	-2
7	Cranmer	1	1,730	1,730	-8
8	Dayncourt	2	3,366	1,683	-10
9	Edwalton	2	3,710	1,855	-1
10	Gamston	2	4,115	2,058	10
11	Gotham	1	1,796	1,796	-4
12	Keyworth	3	5,882	1,961	5
13	Lady Bay	2	3,860	1,930	3
14	Leake	2	3,637	1,819	-3
15	Lutterell	2	3,470	1,735	-7
16	Malkin	2	3,538	1,769	-6
17	Melton	2	3,570	1,785	-5
18	Musters	2	4,070	2,035	9
19	Nevile	1	1,782	1,782	-5
20	Oak	1	2,077	2,077	11
21	Rivermead	2	3,718	1,859	-1
22	Ruddington	3	5,215	1,738	-7
23	Soar Valley	1	1,934	1,934	3

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24 Thoroton	1	1,890	1,890	1
25 Tollerton	1	2,014	2,014	7
26 Wolds	1	1,985	1,985	6
Totals	45	84,353	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,875	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on Rushcliffe Borough Council Liberal Democrat's submission. Electorate figures for 1999 were not provided.

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

Bingham Labour Party's Proposal

Figure B5: Bingham Labour Party's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Bingham A*	2	3,689	1,845	-2
2	Bingham B*	2	3,689	1,845	-2
3	Bishop	1	1,959	1,959	5
4	Cotgrave	3	5,526	1,842	-2
5	Cranmer	1	1,995	1,995	6
6	Gotham	1	1,796	1,796	-4
7	Keyworth	3	5,882	1,961	5
8	Leake	3	5,720	1,907	2
9	Nevile	1	1,782	1,782	-5
10	Oak	1	1,968	1,968	5
11	Radcliffe-on-Trent A*	2	3,683	1,842	-2
12	Radcliffe-on-Trent B*	2	3,683	1,842	-2
13	Ruddington	3	5,215	1,738	-7
14	Soar Valley	1	1,934	1,934	3
15	Tollerton	1	2,014	2,014	7
16	West Bridgford 1*	2	3,752	1,876	0
17	West Bridgford 2*	2	3,752	1,876	0
18	West Bridgford 3*	2	3,752	1,876	0
19	West Bridgford 4*	2	3,752	1,876	0
20	West Bridgford 5*	2	3,752	1,876	0
21	West Bridgford 6*	2	3,751	1,876	0
22	West Bridgford 7*	2	3,751	1,876	0

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23 West Bridgford 8*	2	3,751	1,876	0
24 Wiverton	1	1,820	1,820	-3
25 Wolds	1	1,985	1,985	6
Totals	45	84,353	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,875	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on Bingham Labour Party's submission. Electorate figures for 1999 were not provided.

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

** The figures shown are indicative as no detailed proposals were received for these areas.*

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

(f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

(h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.