

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	8
Broadstone, Creekmoor, Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West	8
Alderney, Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East, Canford Heath West, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown	10
Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town	11
Conclusions	11
3 What happens next?	13
4 Mapping	15
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Poole Borough Council	16
B Glossary and abbreviations	18

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We have conducted an electoral review of Poole Borough Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in July 2013.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
23 July 2013	Consultation on council size
22 October 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
8 January 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 April 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
25 June 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 42 members, comprising a pattern of six two-member ward and 10 three-member wards. Our draft recommendations for Poole Borough Council sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 246 submissions. The large majority of these submissions put forward a mixture of support and objections to our proposals for the Broadstone and Creekmoor area. We received submissions from Robert Syms MP and 13 local councillors. A large number of the responses were proforma slips in support of the draft recommendations and 'minimum change' to the boundary between Broadstone and Creekmoor. We received five submissions from political groups and one from a community group. The remainder were from local residents. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

Poole Borough Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3.6% over this period. During the consultation on warding patterns a resident queried whether the Council's figures had taken full account of development in Hamworthy East ward. Following discussions with the Council, it recommended that an additional 428 electors be included in its projections for this area. Having considered the evidence we accepted this revision.

In response to our draft recommendations a local resident queried whether projected growth in Broadstone would be achieved, however, we remain content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we are proposing to move away from our draft recommendations in Broadstone and Creekmoor and are retaining the existing wards for this area. Across the remainder of the borough we are not proposing any amendments to our draft recommendations.

Our final recommendations for Poole are that the Council should have 42 members, with six two-member ward and 10 three-member wards. Only one ward would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019 (Creekmoor with 11% fewer electors than the borough average).

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Poole Borough Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Poole Borough Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

You can also view our final recommendations for Poole Borough Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review was conducted following our decision to review Poole Borough Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submission received from Poole Borough Council during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Poole Borough Council*, which were published on 15 April 2014. We then undertook a period of consultation which ended on 24 June 2014.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents, reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Poole?

5 We decided to conduct this review because based on the December 2011 electorate figures, 38% of its wards had over 10% variance more or fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough.

How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change.

¹ Schedule 2 to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Poole Borough Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Poole Borough Council is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (‘the 2009 Act’)² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 The achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Poole Borough Council, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Poole Borough Council (the ‘Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. During the preliminary period the Council put forward proposals for the retention of the existing 42-member council. In addition, we received a joint submission from the Liberal Democrat and Poole People Party groups on the Council proposing 38 members. We received a further 31 submissions during consultation on council size.

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

14 During the consultation on ward boundaries we received 204 submissions, including submissions from the Council and the Conservative Group on the Council.

15 In response to our draft recommendations we received 246 submissions. The large majority of these submissions were from local residents and commented solely on the Broadstone and Creekmoor area. A large number of the responses were proforma slips in support of the draft recommendations and 'minimum change' to the boundary between the existing Broadstone and Creekmoor wards. We also received a large number of responses objecting to the draft recommendations in Broadstone and Creekmoor, particularly around the Twin Oaks Close, Edwina Drive and York Road area, with many arguing that the existing boundary between those wards should not be changed. We received submissions from Robert Syms MP (Poole) and 13 local councillors. We also received five submissions from political groups and one from a community group. All submissions can be viewed by appointment at our offices and on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2019. The Council forecast an increase of 3.6%, slightly lower than the Office for National Statistics forecasts for population.

17 However, during the consultation on warding patterns a resident queried whether the Council's forecasts had taken full account of the development of the Twin Sails regeneration area in Hamworthy East ward. We queried this with the Council which confirmed that since its initial forecasts, permission for additional properties on the Pilkington Tiles site had been granted. It also stated that if the current economic climate continued then an additional 1,400 electors might be expected in the development of the Hamworthy Power Station site. Having considered the evidence, we accepted a revision to the Council's electorate forecasts, with an additional 428 electors in Hamworthy East, but did not consider there to be sufficient evidence to support the inclusion of the Hamworthy Power Station site in the forecasts. With the inclusion of the additional electors, the Council forecast 4% growth. We were satisfied that these figures were the best available at the present time and these figures formed the basis of our draft recommendations.

18 In response to our draft recommendations a local resident questioned whether the growth projected for Broadstone would be achieved. However, we do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to suggest that this is not the case and we remain satisfied that these figures provided by the Council are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

19 The Council currently has 42 members elected from 16 borough wards, comprising six two-member and 10 three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, we received two submissions. These were from the Council (proposing the retention of 42 members) and a joint submission from the Liberal Democrat and Poole People Party groups on the Council (proposing a reduction to 38 members).

20 We noted the evidence and argument received was somewhat conflicting, particularly around the impact of changes in IT and partnership working on councillor workload. In addition, we noted that there was no agreement on whether the current governance and decision making and overview and scrutiny is appropriate. On this basis we decided to carry out consultation on council sizes of 38 and 42 members.

21 We received 31 submissions during consultation on council size which provided support for the existing council size and requests for a reduction. There was support for a specific reduction to 38 members and more general comments about a reduction in council size. However, we did not consider that any respondent put forward particularly strong evidence during the consultation and therefore revisited the evidence received during the preliminary stage from the Council and the Liberal Democrat and Poole People Party groups on the Council.

22 As stated above, we considered that the evidence received was somewhat conflicting, particularly around the impact of changes in IT and partnership working on councillor workload. However, while the Liberal Democrat and Poole People Party groups put forward some persuasive evidence to suggest that the Council may not be totally 'fit for purpose', we were not persuaded that they had fully considered how a reduction would work in practice. We noted that the Council suggested that workload will increase with the localism agenda. Therefore, on balance, we were not fully persuaded that a reduction in council size should be recommended. We therefore decided to retain the council size of 42 members as the basis for warding arrangements.

23 During consultation on the draft recommendations we received no substantial submissions relating to council size. We have therefore based our final recommendations on a council size of 42.

Electoral fairness

24 As discussed in the introduction to this report, the prime aim of an electoral review is to achieve electoral fairness within a local authority.

25 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

26 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (116,169 in 2013 and 120,809 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 42 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,766 in 2013 and 2,876 by 2019.

27 Under our final recommendations, only one ward (Creekmoor with 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough) would have an electoral variance from the borough average greater than 10% by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Poole.

General analysis

28 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 246 submissions. The large majority of submissions commented on the proposals for the Broadstone and Creekmoor area. We received a mixture of support and objections to our draft recommendations in this area, with the majority of submission supporting the draft recommendations or requesting minimal change. A large number of these submissions were proforma responses offering little supporting evidence. We also received submission from residents in the Edwina Drive, Twin Oaks Close and York Road areas objecting to our draft recommendations and providing evidence to suggest they use facilities in Broadstone. On balance, we consider this evidence is compelling and therefore are reverting to the existing wards for this area.

29 In the remainder of the borough, we confirm our draft recommendations as final.

30 Our final recommendations are for six two-member and 10 three-member wards. Under our final recommendations, only one ward (Creekmoor with 11% fewer electors) would have an electoral variance 10% from the borough average by 2019. A summary of the proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 16–17) and on Map 1 accompanying this report.

Electoral arrangements

31 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Poole. The following areas are considered in turn:

- Broadstone, Creekmoor, Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West (pages 8–10)
- Alderney, Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East, Canford Heath West, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown (pages 10–11)
- Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town (page 11)

32 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 pages 16–17 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Broadstone, Creekmoor, Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West

33 The existing wards of Broadstone, Creekmoor, Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West wards lie in the west of the borough, to the west of the A349 and Holes Bay. Our draft recommendations were for two-member Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West wards with 5% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Our three-member Broadstone and Creekmoor wards would have 3% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

34 In response to our draft recommendations we received 236 responses for this area. Around a fifth of the respondents objected to our draft recommendations for the Broadstone and Creekmoor wards. Respondents objected to the inclusion of roads including Twin Oaks Close, Edwina Drive and the York Road areas in our Creekmoor ward, arguing that they use facilities in the Broadmoor ward. Councillors Brooke, Slade and Godfrey submitted a revised version of their earlier proposal for three two-

member wards covering this area. Councillor Brooke also submitted proforma slips he had received in response to their initial proposal during consultation on warding patterns. Councillor Brookes had referred to the numbers received in his previous submission to us, but requested that we consider the individual comments put on some slips that we had not received in time for our deliberations on draft recommendations.

35 Around two-thirds of the respondents expressed support for our draft recommendations for a small change to the existing wards. They objected to any proposals for the creation of three two-member wards in the area. A large number of these responses were proforma slips providing limited supporting evidence. Councillors Adams, Atkinson, Burden, Butt, Evans, Potter, Pratt and Rampton expressed general support for the draft recommendations for this area. Councillor Haines expressed support for the retention of the existing wards. Councillor Pawlowski expressed general support for all of our draft recommendations. Broadstone Conservatives reiterated their support for their original proposals for minimum change to existing ward boundaries. These would result in only transferring Edwina Drive, York Close and parts of York Road to Creekmoor ward, while retaining Twin Oaks Close, Lytham Road and Ribble Close in Broadstone ward. This would result in a Creekmoor ward having 9% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019. In the event that we felt unable to accept its proposals, Broadstone Conservatives expressed support for our draft recommendations, rejecting the proposal for three two-member wards. Finally, it enclosed 37 proforma responses objecting to any proposal for three two-member wards.

36 Poole Conservative Association expressed support for the draft recommendations and objected to any proposal for three two-member wards for this area. Poole Conservatives submitted 99 proforma responses that supported the draft recommendations. We received a further batch of 66 slips objecting to any proposal to 'split Broadstone in two halves'. Creekmoor Community Association expressed support for the draft recommendations. Councillor White expressed support for the retention of the two two-member Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West wards.

37 We have given careful consideration to the evidence received. We note that a number of respondents reiterated concerns put forward during the previous consultation over the inclusion of some areas of the existing Broadstone ward in a revised Creekmoor ward. We also note that Councillors Brooke, Slade and Godfrey wished us to consider an amended option of three two-member wards. In addition, we note the comments put forward on a number of slips that Councillor Brooke received in response to their consultation on their original proposals. We note that a large number of these responses related to the inclusion of the Pinesprings area within Broadstone, which is where the area is located under our draft recommendations. We also note the concerns of residents in the Twin Oaks Close and York Road areas. We do not consider that these responses add sufficient new evidence to persuade us to revisit the original submission put forward by Councillors Brooke, Slade and Godfrey. In addition, we do not consider that Councillors Brooke, Slade and Godfrey put forward sufficient evidence to persuade us to modify the draft recommendations and propose a warding pattern for three two-member wards.

38 There was some general support for our draft recommendations, although a number of respondents stated they supported minimal change from the existing wards, with some expressing support for the Conservative Group's proposal to retain the Twin Oaks Close and some associated roads in a Broadstone ward. Much of the

support consisted of proforma responses and offered little evidence of communities. We note the concerns of residents in the Twin Oaks Close and Edwina Drive areas about being transferred from the existing Broadstone ward to Creekmoor ward and note the evidence that they use facilities in the Broadstone area. However, retaining these areas in the Broadstone ward, while reflecting the existing ward boundary, would create a Creekmoor ward with 11% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019. On balance, we consider that the evidence provided in relation to the Twin Oaks Close and Edwina Drive areas is sufficient to justify a Creekmoor ward with 11% fewer electors than the borough average. We are therefore recommending that the existing three-member Broadstone and Creekmoor wards are retained. These wards would have 3% more and 11% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019.

39 Broadstone Conservatives and a local resident both suggested that our Creekmoor ward be renamed Creekmoor & Broadstone South. We note this suggestion, but do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to persuade us to include this ward name as part of our final recommendations. We are therefore confirming our Broadstone and Creekmoor wards as final.

40 Councillor White supported our proposal to retain the existing two-member Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West wards. We received no other representations about these wards and therefore confirm them as part of our final recommendations.

41 Our final recommendations are for two-member Hamworthy East and Hamworthy West wards having 5% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Our three-member Broadstone and Creekmoor wards would have 3% more and 11% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

42 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 pages 16–17 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Alderney, Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East, Canford Heath West, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown

43 The existing wards of Alderney, Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East, Canford Heath West, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown are in the north-east of the borough, to the north of the A35, Ashley Road and Dorset Way. Our draft recommendations were for two-member Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East and Canford Heath West wards which would have 6% more, 2% more, equal to the average and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Our three-member Alderney, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown wards would have 2% more, equal the average and 4% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

44 In response to our draft recommendations we received very limited support and objections in this area. Bournemouth Labour Party put forward alternate proposals for Alderney, Branksome East and Newtown wards. However, there was limited evidence to support this amendment and the changes proposed would require a significant redrawing of our proposed boundaries. Therefore we have decided not to include this modification in our final recommendations.

45 Our final recommendations are for two-member Branksome East, Branksome West, Canford Heath East and Canford Heath West wards would have 6% more, 2% more, equal to the average and 4% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Our three-member Alderney, Merley & Bearwood and Newtown wards with 2% more, equal the average and 4% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 pages 16–17 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town

46 The existing wards of Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town lie to the south of the borough. Our draft recommendations were for three-member Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town wards which would have equal to the average, equal to the average, 6% more, 3% more and 1% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

47 In response to our draft recommendations we received very limited comments supporting or objecting to our draft recommendations. We received one comment that the Canford Cliffs ward had increased in size, however this ward has equal to the average number of electors and it therefore secures a good level of electoral equality. We are therefore confirming them as final. Our final recommendations are for three-member Canford Cliffs, Oakdale, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Poole Town wards which would have equal to the average, equal to the average, 6% more, 3% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table A1 pages 16–17 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

48 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	42	42
Number of electoral wards	16	16
Average number of electors per councillor	2,766	2,876
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	2	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

Poole Borough Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 16 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

3 What happens next?

49 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Poole Borough Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Poole Borough Council in 2015.

Equalities

50 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Poole

51 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Poole Borough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Poole Borough Council.

You can also view our final recommendations for Poole Borough Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lqbce.org.uk>

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Poole Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alderney	3	8,537	2,846	3%	8,843	2,948	2%
2	Branksome East	2	5,870	2,935	6%	6,078	3,039	6%
3	Branksome West	2	5,668	2,834	2%	5,887	2,944	2%
4	Broadstone	3	8,577	2,859	3%	8,871	2,957	3%
5	Canford Cliffs	3	8,279	2,760	0%	8,609	2,870	0%
6	Canford Heath East	2	5,551	2,776	0%	5,764	2,882	0%
7	Canford Heath West	2	5,318	2,659	-4%	5,509	2,755	-4%
8	Creekmoor	3	7,387	2,462	-11%	7,649	2,550	-11%
9	Hamworthy East	2	4,875	2,438	-12%	5,476	2,738	-5%
10	Hamworthy West	2	5,245	2,623	-5%	5,419	2,710	-6%
11	Merley & Bearwood	3	8,336	2,779	0%	8,610	2,870	0%
12	Newtown	3	8,631	2,877	4%	8,937	2,979	4%
13	Oakdale	3	8,313	2,771	0%	8,618	2,873	0%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Poole Borough Council

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
14 Parkstone	3	8,828	2,943	6%	9,147	3,049	6%
15 Penn Hill	3	8,537	2,846	3%	8,845	2,948	3%
16 Poole Town	3	8,217	2,739	-1%	8,547	2,849	-1%
Totals	42	116,169	-	-	120,809	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,766	-	-	2,876	-

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

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

Appendix B

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward or division, expressed in parishes or existing wards or divisions, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

