

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 62

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 62

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISTRICT
OF CHILTERN IN THE COUNTY OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of Chiltern in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and of Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 19 August 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Chiltern District Council, copies of which were circulated to the Buckinghamshire County Council, Parish Councils in the district, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and to the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Chiltern District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the District Council had exercised an option for a system of whole council elections.
5. On 28 February 1975 the Chiltern District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 30 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a council of 51, the same number as at present.
6. Following publication by the District Council of their draft scheme comments were received from the Chalfont St Giles Parish Council objecting to the inclusion of the Jordans ward of the parish in the proposed Seer Green & Jordans ward rather than in the proposed Chalfont St Giles ward. However, the Management Committee of a Jordans estate company expressed the view that the Jordans ward of the parish should form a district ward on its own but that if this were not possible, the Jordans should be grouped with the parish of Seer Green as the District Council had proposed. The Chesham Town Council and a local ratepayers' association suggested amendments to the proposed wards in the parish of Chesham and there were comments from a local political party which referred mainly to the county electoral arrangements in Chesham but which had some relevance to the present district review. Amersham Town Council and a local political party wrote objecting to the District Council's proposal to group the Weedon Hill ward of the parish of Amersham with the parish of Chesham Bois to form the proposed Chesham Bois & Weedon Hill ward.
7. We considered the draft scheme together with all the comments which had been received. We noted that the draft scheme offered a generally even standard of representation but that there were one or two wards where the possibility of some improvement in the councillor/elector ratios might be investigated. A number of possible boundary changes were examined but we concluded, having regard to the pattern of local ties in the district, that none should be adopted.

8. We noted that the District Council had proposed the allocation of three councillors to the proposed Amersham Town ward. Even on the Council's estimate of the growth in the electorate by 1979 it was clear that the ward is not and will not be entitled to more than two councillors and we decided that it should be represented accordingly.
9. We thought that four of the names of the wards proposed by the Council were unduly long and cumbersome and decided that they should be abbreviated.
10. We noted that the issues raised in the comments had all been considered by the District Council and that in each case they had seen fit to reject the representations which had been made. We reviewed each of the Council's decisions in detail taking into account any further points which had been made direct to us. In every case we formed the view that the Council's decision had been an appropriate one and we resolved that the representations should be rejected.
11. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 8 and 9 above we decided that the District Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements of the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.
12. On 9 May 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 7 July 1975.

13. The District Council objected to our proposed abbreviation of four of the ward names and to our proposed reduction in the number of councillors allocated to the proposed Amersham Town ward. On the first point the Council submitted alternative names which were rather shorter than the ones which they had originally proposed. We accepted these and resolved to modify our draft proposals accordingly. We noted that our acceptance of the revised names satisfied a submission from the Chenies Parish Council who objected to the proposed deletion of the name of the parish from the name of the ward. On the question of the number of councillors to be allocated to the proposed Amersham Town ward the Council provided further information which suggested that the electorate of the ward by 1979 might be higher than they had originally forecast. It was also argued that the geographical size of the ward, its position at the administrative centre of the district and the need for the councillors representing the ward to maintain special vigilance to preserve its mediaeval character all pointed to the need for an extra councillor. Bearing in mind the statutory requirement for equality of representation we found the latter arguments of little relevance. We did, however, consider the issue again in the context of the Council's revised forecast of the electorate by 1979. We found that the ward's share of the electorate of the district in that year would still be insufficient to justify the allocation of more than two councillors and we resolved that our previous decision should stand.

14. The Chalfont St Giles Parish Council reiterated their objection to the inclusion of the Jordans ward of the parish in the proposed Seer Green and Jordans ward. We noted that compliance with the Parish Council's request that the Jordans ward should be included in the proposed Chalfont St Giles ward would imply the allocation of an additional councillor to that ward making four in all. Such a ward would not comply with our guidelines and we could find no strong reason to make an exception in this case. Moreover, on the evidence

8. We noted that the District Council had proposed the allocation of three councillors to the proposed Amersham Town ward. Even on the Council's estimate of the growth in the electorate by 1979 it was clear that the ward is not and will not be entitled to more than two councillors and we decided that it should be represented accordingly.
9. We thought that four of the names of the wards proposed by the Council were unduly long and cumbersome and decided that they should be abbreviated.
10. We noted that the issues raised in the comments had all been considered by the District Council and that in each case they had seen fit to reject the representations which had been made. We reviewed each of the Council's decisions in detail taking into account any further points which had been made direct to us. In every case we formed the view that the Council's decision had been an appropriate one and we resolved that the representations should be rejected.
11. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 8 and 9 above we decided that the District Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements of the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.
12. On 9 May 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 7 July 1975.

13. The District Council objected to our proposed abbreviation of four of the ward names and to our proposed reduction in the number of councillors allocated to the proposed Amersham Town ward. On the first point the Council submitted alternative names which were rather shorter than the ones which they had originally proposed. We accepted these and resolved to modify our draft proposals accordingly. We noted that our acceptance of the revised names satisfied a submission from the Chenies Parish Council who objected to the proposed deletion of the name of the parish from the name of the ward. On the question of the number of councillors to be allocated to the proposed Amersham Town ward the Council provided further information which suggested that the electorate of the ward by 1979 might be higher than they had originally forecast. It was also argued that the geographical size of the ward, its position at the administrative centre of the district and the need for the councillors representing the ward to maintain special vigilance to preserve its mediaeval character all pointed to the need for an extra councillor. Bearing in mind the statutory requirement for equality of representation we found the latter arguments of little relevance. We did, however, consider the issue again in the context of the Council's revised forecast of the electorate by 1979. We found that the ward's share of the electorate of the district in that year would still be insufficient to justify the allocation of more than two councillors and we resolved that our previous decision should stand.

14. The Chalfont St Giles Parish Council reiterated their objection to the inclusion of the Jordans ward of the parish in the proposed Seer Green and Jordans ward. We noted that compliance with the Parish Council's request that the Jordans ward should be included in the proposed Chalfont St Giles ward would imply the allocation of an additional councillor to that ward making four in all. Such a ward would not comply with our guidelines and we could find no strong reason to make an exception in this case. Moreover, on the evidence

available to us it appeared that the Jordans area of the parish has at least as much, if not more, affinity with the neighbouring parish of Seer Green as it does with Chalfont St Giles in which parish it appears to have an identity of its own. We resolved to make no change in the draft proposals.

15. The Amersham Town Council reiterated their earlier representations in which they objected to the proposed inclusion of the Weedon Hill ward of the parish in the proposed Chesham Bois and Weedon Hill ward, requesting instead that the present arrangements, whereby Weedon Hill forms a part of the Amersham-on-the-Hill ward, should be retained. We considered this proposal again but concluded, as we had earlier, that the advantages of our draft proposals in terms of equality of representation were such as to outweigh the arguments advanced by the Town Council in support of their case. In rejecting their submission we noted the assurance which they had been given by the District Council that they had no intention of seeking an alteration of the parish boundaries so as to include the Weedon Hill area in the parish of Chesham Bois.

16. Finally we received a letter from a ratepayers' association pressing for one of the amendments which they had put forward earlier, namely the inclusion of a new road known as Hillside in the proposed ~~Pond Park~~ ward of Chesham ^{ASHGRIDGE VALE} instead of in the proposed ~~Asheridge Vale~~ ward as we had proposed. ^{POND PARK} Because of the provisions of paragraph 3(2)(b) of Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act it would have been necessary, if we had been minded to agree to the transfer for district electoral purposes, for the District Council to undertake a new review of the parish electoral arrangements. We noted that the District Council had only just completed such a review and that this proposed change had been considered as part of that review and rejected. We reviewed the proposal and concluded that we would not be justified in pursuing the matter any further. We decided therefore to confirm our rejection of the association's submission.

17. Subject, therefore to the four revised names mentioned at paragraph 13 above we decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

18. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 1 and 2 to this report. Schedule 1 defines the areas of the new wards and Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each ward. The boundaries of the new wards are illustrated on the map.

PUBLICATION

19. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Chiltern District Council and will be made available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without maps) are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH

31 July 1975

CHILTERN DISTRICT - DESCRIPTION OF WARDS

NEWTOWN WARD

The Newtown Ward of the parish of Chesham

POND PARK WARD

The Pond Park Ward of the parish of Chesham

HILLTOP WARD

The Hilltop Ward of the parish of Chesham

ASHERIDGE VALE WARD

The Asheridge Vale Ward of the parish of Chesham

TOWNSEND WARD

The Townsend Ward of the parish of Chesham

ST MARY'S WARD

The St Mary's Ward of the parish of Chesham

WATERSIDE WARD

The Waterside Ward of the parish of Chesham

LOWNDES WARD

The Lowndes Ward of the parish of Chesham

AMERSHAM-ON-THE-HILL WARD

The Amersham-on-the-Hill Ward of the parish of Amersham

AMERSHAM TOWN WARD

The Amersham Town Ward of the parish of Amersham

AMERSHAM COMMON WARD

The Amersham Common Ward of the parish of Amersham

LITTLE CHALFONT WARD

The Little Chalfont Ward of the parish of Amersham

ASHLEY GREEN AND LATIMER WARD

The Parishes of Ashley Green and Latimer

CHALFONT ST GILES WARD

The Chalfont St Giles Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Giles

AUSTENWOOD WARD

The Austenwood Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Peter

CHALFONT ST PETER CENTRAL WARD

The Central Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Peter

CHALFONT COMMON WARD

The Chalfont Common Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Peter

GOLD HILL WARD

The Gold Hill Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Peter

CHOLESBURY AND THE LEE WARD

The parishes of Cholesbury-cum-St Leonards and The Lee

CHARTRIDGE WARD

The parish of Chartridge

CHENIES WARD

The parish of Chenies and the North Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Peter

CHESHAM BOIS AND WEEDON HILL WARD

The parish of Chesham Bois and the Weedon Hill ward of the parish of Amersham

COLESHILL AND PENN STREET

The parish of Coleshill and the Penn Street and Winchmore Hill ward of the parish of Penn

PENN WARD

The Penn and Hazlemere Wards of the parish of Penn

BALLINGER AND SOUTH HEATH WARD

The Ballinger and South Heath Ward of the parish of Great Missenden

PRESTWOOD AND HEATH END WARD

The Prestwood and Heath End Ward of the parish of Great Missenden

GREAT MISSENDEN WARD

The Great Missenden Ward of the parish of Great Missenden

LITTLE MISSENDEN WARD

The Little Missenden, the Little Kingshill and the Hyde Heath Wards of the parish of Little Missenden

HOLMER GREEN WARD

The Holmer Green Ward of the parish of Little Missenden

SEER GREEN AND JORDANS WARD

The parish of Seer Green and the Jordans Ward of the parish of Chalfont St Giles

CHILTERN DISTRICT: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO.OF COUNCILLORS</u>
AMERSHAM COMMON	2
AMERSHAM-ON-THE-HILL	3
AMERSHAM TOWN	2
ASHERIDGE VALE	1
ASHLEY GREEN AND LATIMER	1
AUSTENWOOD	1
BALLINGER AND SOUTH HEATH	1
CHALFONT COMMON	2
CHALFONT ST GILES	3
CHALFONT ST PETER CENTRAL	2
CHARTRIDGE	1
CHENIES	1
CHESHAM BOIS AND WEEDON HILL	2
CHOLESBURY AND THE LEE	1
COLESHILL AND PENN STREET	1
GOLD HILL	2
GREAT MISSENDEN	1
HILLTOP	1
HOLMER GREEN	2
LITTLE CHALFONT	2
LITTLE MISSENDEN	1
LOWNDES	1
NEWTOWN	2
PENN	2
POND PARK	2
PRESTWOOD AND HEATH END	3
ST MARY'S	1
SEER GREEN AND JORDANS	2

NAME
TOWNSEND
WATERSIDE

N°
2
2