

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	8
Blaby District	9
Charnwood Borough	11
Harborough District	14
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough	16
Melton Borough	19
North West Leicestershire District	20
Oadby & Wigston Borough	23
Conclusions	25
Parish electoral arrangements	25
3 Have your say	28

Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council	30
B Submissions received	36
C Glossary and abbreviations	38

Summary

Who we are?

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

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

Why Leicestershire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Leicestershire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in the county. Overall, 33% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. Loughborough South division currently has 23% more electors than the average for Leicestershire. Leicestershire County Council also recognised this level of electoral imbalance and asked us to address it by conducting a review.

Our proposals for Leicestershire

Leicestershire County Council currently has 55 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that maintaining the council size of 55 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

As Leicestershire County Council is elected by whole council, the Commission may produce a pattern of mixed divisions. Our draft recommendations propose that the Council's 55 councillors should represent 51 single member and two two-member divisions. One of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Leicestershire by 2021.

You have until 11 January 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 28 for how to have your say.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Leicestershire County Council's ('the Council's) electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

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

3 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

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the district. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 April 2015	Council size decision
12 May 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
21 July 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
17 November 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
12 January 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
5 April 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council

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

wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 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)
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2016	2021
Electorate of Leicestershire	520,616	549,129
Number of councillors	55	55
Average number of electors per councillor	9,466	9,984

10 Under our draft recommendations, one of our proposed 53 divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2021. This is more divisions with variances greater than 10% than we would normally recommend. However, we consider that our recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We consider that we have achieved satisfactory levels of electoral fairness for Leicestershire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Leicestershire or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

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

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our draft recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5.5% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by new housing developments in Blaby, Harborough and North West Leicestershire.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

16 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to us to retain the existing council size of 55 members. This was the only proposal made to us in relation to council size.

17 We carefully considered the Council's submission. We consider that its proposal for a council size of 55 members is supported by adequate evidence to justify a maintenance of the existing council size. We are content that the Council has sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under this council size and ensure effective representation of local residents.

18 We therefore invited proposals on electoral arrangements for Leicestershire based on a council size of 55 members. In response to that consultation, we received no proposals for a different number of councillors. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 55 elected members.

Division patterns

19 During consultation on warding patterns, we received 63 submissions, including three county-wide proposals. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county or supported in whole the Council's proposal.

20 The Council's scheme provided for an arrangement of one two-member division and 53 single-member divisions for the county. The Council's Labour group proposed a similar scheme, differing from the Council's proposal in respect of boundaries in the Melton and Coalville areas. The Council's Liberal Democrat group also supported much of the County Council's proposal, but took a different view in Oadby.

21 We received representations from a number of individual county councillors in support of the Council's scheme, and one on behalf of two councillors in support of the Liberal Democrat group's variation on the Council's scheme.

22 The Council undertook a local consultation on a draft submission. This attracted a number of representations about localised areas to the Council. Many of those making representations to us commented on merits of the Council's draft scheme.

23 We received a further submission which proposed electoral divisions in Harborough and which proposed single-member divisions in Oadby divided by the A6. Those proposals would result in greater electoral inequality than we would normally recommend in Broughton Astley which would have 21% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county by 2021, Lutterworth (19% fewer), Market Harborough (56% more) and Oadby, where one ward would have 33% fewer and one ward 26% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We are not persuaded that those levels of electoral inequality would be justified in this case.

Draft recommendations

24 Having carefully considered all the proposals received, and the expressions of support or opposition to the Council's consultative scheme, we are of the view that the Council's proposed patterns of wards resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. However, we considered that other locally produced proposals for particular parts of the county also had merit. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a combination of locally made proposals but, having visited the county, recommend modifications to those proposals in some areas in order to improve electoral equality and to maintain local ties.

25 In the south eastern part of Charnwood, we considered that the Council's scheme did not provide for good electoral equality in Thurmaston or community identity in Syston. We have therefore made a number of modifications to the Council's proposals in south-east Charnwood in order to reflect a better balance of our statutory criteria.

26 Oadby and Wigston also presents particular issues. Dividing the total electorate of the borough by the average number of electors per councillor for the county would suggest that the borough would have 4.6 council seats. We can only allocate a whole number to each district and therefore allocate five to the borough. As a result, divisions in the borough will continue to have significant variances from the average number of electors per councillor. Each councillor in the borough will represent, on average, 8% fewer electors than the average for the county.

27 Our draft recommendations are for 51 single-member and two two-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

28 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table 1 (on page 25) and on the large map accompanying this report.

29 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Detailed divisions

30 The tables on pages 9–24 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Leicestershire. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Blaby District

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Blaby & Glen Parva	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Blaby and Glen Parva.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Braunstone	1	1%	This division comprises all of the parish of Braunstone except that part bounded to the north by Lubbesthorpe Brook and to east by Lubbesthorpe Way.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Cosby & Countesthorpe	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Cosby, Countesthorpe, Kilby and the southern part of Whetstone parish.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Enderby & Lubbesthorpe	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Enderby and Lubbesthorpe and that part of Braunstone parish bounded to the north by Lubbesthorpe Brook and to east by Lubbesthorpe Way.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe & Leicester Forests	2	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe, Leicester Forest East, Leicester Forest West, and Thurlaston	This two-member division was proposed locally. We received seven submissions proposing single-member divisions for the area. These representations asserted that Glenfields parish is a distinct community whilst Kirby Muxloe, Leicester Forest East and Leicester Forest West parishes together constitute a distinct area. However, a

				single-member division for Glenfields would have 17% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county which we are not persuaded is acceptable. Electoral equality in a single-member division for Glenfields could only be improved by adding a part of Kirby Muxloe which we consider would break local ties, especially in light of the M1 which would separate that small part of Kirby Muxloe from Glenfields. We consider that including all of these parishes together would not break local ties and that it would also have clear boundaries and a good level of electoral equality.
Narborough & Whetstone	1	7%	This division comprises the parish of Narborough together with the northern part of Whetstone parish	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Stoney Stanton & Croft	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Aston Flamville, Croft, Elmesthorpe, Huncote, Potters Marston, Sapcote, Sharnford, Stoney Stanton and Wigston Parva.	This division was proposed and supported locally. Thurlaston Parish Council argued, however that Thurlaston parish be included in this division. Including Thurlaston in this division would result in our Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe & Leicester Forests division having 10% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county and 9% more electors than the average for the Stoney Stanton & Croft division We are not persuaded that such a level of electoral inequality is justified in this case. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

Charnwood Borough

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Birstall	1	9%	This division comprises the parish of Birstall.	The local proposal for this area was a single-member division comprising the parish of Birstall alone, having 9% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We consider that this proposal provides a reasonable balance of electoral equality and community identity.
Bradgate	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Anstey, Newtown Linford, Swithland, Thurcaston & Cropston, Ulverscroft and Woodhouse.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Loughborough East	1	-3%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Hastings and Loughborough Lemyngton.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Loughborough North	1	3%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Dishley & Hathern and Loughborough Storer.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Loughborough North West	1	1%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Ashby and Loughborough Garendon.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Loughborough South	1	7%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Southfields and that part of	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

			Loughborough Shelthorpe ward lying to the east of, and including the Shelthorpe Golf Course.	
Loughborough South West	1	8%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Nanpantan and Loughborough Outwoods, together with that part of Loughborough Shelthorpe ward lying to the west of the golf course.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Quorn & Barrow	1	6%	This division comprises the parishes of Barrow upon Soar and Quorndon together with that part of the parish of Mountsorrel which lies to the west of Bond Lane and the minerals conveyer.	We received a proposal for a division in this area which was proposed and supported locally. However, we consider the inclusion of the Mountsorrel North End area in this division will provide for a better level of electoral equality in the neighbouring Rothley & Mountsorrel division. Our recommended division has clear boundaries whilst maintaining a good level of electoral equality.
Rothley & Mountsorrel	1	5%	This division comprises the parish of Rothley together with that part of the parish of Mountsorrel which lies to the east of Bond Lane and the minerals conveyer.	The local proposal for this area was a division comprising the parishes of Rothley and Mountsorrel which would have over 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We looked to improve this level of electoral equality and considered that the Mountsorrel North End area, which we propose to include in our Quorn & Barrow division, has sufficiently good access and links to that area.
Shepshed	1	14%	This division comprises the parish of Shepshed.	This division was proposed locally. We received only expressions of support for this proposal. Whilst it gives a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we consider that the division is clearly separated from Loughborough by the M1 and the open area between the two towns.

Sileby & The Wolds	1	-9%	This division comprises the parishes of Burton on the Wolds, Cotes, Prestwold, Hoton, Seagrave, Walton on the Wolds, Wymeswold, and that part of the parish of Sileby lying to the north of Flaxland Crescent.	We have based our draft recommendation on the division proposed locally. However, we have modified the local proposals by recommending that the part of Sileby served by the southern part of Cossington Road be excluded in order to provide for a pattern of divisions in Charnwood which have a reasonable level of electoral equality.
Syston Fosse	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of East Goscote, Queniborough, Ratcliffe on the Wreake, Rearsby and Thrussington together with the eastern part of the parish of Syston.	We have based our draft recommendation on the division proposed locally. We have modified the local proposals however by recommending that only the eastern part of Syston parish be included in this division..
Syston Ridgeway	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Cossington and Wanlip, together with the parish of Syston except that part which lies to the south of Melton Road and to the east of Barkby Road and the southern part of Sileby parish where access is given by Cossington Road.	We have based our draft recommendation on the division proposed locally. However, we have modified the local proposals by recommending that the whole of the part of the parish lying to the west of the railway and all of that part lying to the north of Melton Road be included in a single division. We consider that our recommended division will best maintain local ties in Syston. As a further modification, the inclusion of part of the parish of Sileby contributes to a pattern of divisions having reasonable levels of electoral equality in the area.
Thurmaston Ridgemere	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Beeby, South Croxton and Thurmaston together with the southern part of of the parish of Syston where access is given by Barkby Lane and	We have based our draft recommendation on the division proposed locally. However, we have modified the local proposals by recommending that a southern part of the parish of Syston be included. This part of Syston is contiguous with and of similar character to the part of Thurmaston parish also served by Melton Road. Our modification improves electoral equality in this division.

			the southern part of Melton Road.	
--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--

Harborough District

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Broughton Astley	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashby Magna, Ashby Parva, Broughton Astley, Dunton Bassett, Frolesworth and Leire.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Bruntingthorpe	1	6%	This division comprises the parishes of Arnesby, Bruntingthorpe, Catthorpe, Cotesbach, Fleckney, Gilmorton, Gumley, Husbands Bosworth, Kimcote & Walton, Knaptoft, Laughton, Misterton with Walcote, Mowsley, North Kilworth, Peatling Magna, Peatling Parva, Saddington, Shawell, Shearsby, South Kilworth, Swinford, Theddingworth, Westrill & Starmore and Willoughby Waterleys.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Gartree	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Burton Overy, Carlton Curlieu, Cranoe, Gaulby, Glooston, Goadby, Great Glen, Illston on the Hill,	We have based our draft recommendation on a division proposed locally but which would have over 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We propose to provide a better level of electoral equality in the eastern part of the district by modifying the local proposal.

			Kibworth Beauchamp, Kibworth Harcourt, Kings Norton, Little Stretton, Noseley, Rolleston, Shangton, Slawston, Smeeton Westerby, Stonton Wyville, Tugby and Keythorpe, Tur Langton, Welham and Wistow.	Our draft recommendation includes the parish of Tugby & Keythorpe and excludes those of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Launde	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Allexton, Billesdon, Blaston, Bringhurst, Cold Newton, Drayton, East Norton, Frisby, Great Easton, Hallaton, Horninghold, Houghton on the Hill, Hungarton, Keyham, Launde, Loddington, Lowesby, Marefield, Medbourne, Nevill Holt, Owston & Newbold, Scraftoft, Skeffington, Stockerston, Stoughton, Thurnby & Bushby, Tilton on the Hill & Halstead and Withcote.	We have based our draft recommendation on a division proposed locally but which would have over 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We propose to provide a better level of electoral equality in the eastern part of the district by modifying the local proposal for this division. In our draft recommendation the parish of Tugby & Keythorpe is included in the neighbouring Gartree division. Our recommended Launde division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Lutterworth	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bitteswell with Bittesby, Claybrooke Magna, Claybrooke Parva, Lutterworth and Ullesthorpe.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Market Harborough East	1	8%	This division comprises the Harborough District Council wards of Market Harborough–	We have based our draft recommendation on a division proposed locally. We propose to provide a better level of electoral equality in neighbouring divisions in the eastern

			Little Bowden and Market Harborough–Great Bowden & Arden together with the parishes of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton.	part of the district by modifying the local proposal for this division. Our draft recommendations includes the parishes of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and results in good electoral equality.
Market Harborough West & Foxton	1	9%	This division comprises the Harborough District Council wards of Market Harborough–Logan and Market Harborough–Welland together with the parishes of Foxton and Lubenham.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Burbage	1	-2%	This division comprises the parish of Burbage except for its Lash Hill parish ward.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
De Montfort	1	5%	This division comprises the Hinckley & Bosworth District Council ward of Hinckley De Montfort and that part of the Hinckley Trinity ward which lies to the east of Stroke Road and Hollycroft.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Earl Shilton	1	4%	This division comprises the parish of Earl Shilton together with the Barwell parish ward of Redhall and that part of the	We received a local proposal for an Earl Shilton division comprising the parish of Earl Shilton together with a part of Barwell parish. This proposal was supported locally. Whilst the proposal would give a good level of electoral equality in

			parish ward of St Mary's which lies on Charnwood Road and to the north of Charnwood Road, between Kirby Road and the Earl Shilton parish boundary.	Earl Shilton, it would result in a Mallory division with over 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We consider that electoral equality can be improved in Mallory without detriment to Earl Shilton by including more of Barwell parish in our Earl Shilton division. We propose to include all of the properties on Charnwood Road and lying to the north of Charnwood Road, between Kirby Road and the Earl Shilton parish boundary in this division. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Groby & Ratby	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Groby and Ratby.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Hollycroft	1	2%	This division comprises that part of the Hinckley & Bosworth District Council ward of Hinckley Clarendon which lies to the north of Coventry Road and to the west of King George's Way and that part of the Hinckley Trinity ward which lies to the west of Stoke Road and Hollycroft.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Mallory	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Barleston, Newbold Verdon and Peckleton together with the Barwell parish ward of Charnwood and that part of the parish ward of St Mary's which lies to the south of	We received a local proposal for a Mallory division comprising a number of parishes together with a part of Barwell parish. We received only expressions of support for the proposal. The division proposed would, however, have over 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We are not persuaded that such a level of inequality is justified in this case. We consider that electoral equality can be improved in Mallory without detriment to Earl Shilton by including more of Barwell parish in the Earl Shilton

			Charnwood Road and to the west of Kirby Road.	division. We propose to include all of the properties on Charnwood Road and lying to the north of Charnwood Road, between Kirby Road and the Earl Shilton parish boundary in the Earl Shilton division. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Market Bosworth	1	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Cadeby, Carlton, Higham on the Hill, Market Bosworth, Nailstone, Osbaston, Shackerstone, Sheepy, Stoke Golding, Sutton Cheney, Twycross and Witherley.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Markfield, Desford & Thornton	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bagworth & Thornton, Desford, Markfield and Stanton-under-Bardon.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
St Marys	1	-7%	This division comprises the Hinckley & Bosworth District Council ward of Hinckley Castle and that part of the Hinckley Clarendon ward which lies to the south of Coventry Road and to the east of King George's Way together with the Burbage parish ward of Lash Hill.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

Melton Borough

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Asfordby	1	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Ab Kettleby, Asfordby, Broughton & Old Dalby, Burton & Dalby, Freeby, Frisby on the Wreake, Gaddesby, Grimston, Hoby with Rotherby, Kirby Bellars, Knossington & Cold Overton, Somerby, Twyford & Thorpe and Wymondham.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We also received an alternative proposal that part of Melton town be added to the current Asfordby division. However, we were not persuaded either by the submissions or by our visit to the area that such an arrangement would reflect community identities in the borough. Our recommended division would have clear boundaries and good electoral equality.
Belvoir	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Belvoir, Bottesford, Buckminster, Clawson Hose & Harby, Croxton Kerrial, Eaton, Garthorpe, Redmile, Scalford, Sproxton, Stathern, and Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We recommend it as part of our draft recommendations. We also received an alternative proposal to retain the existing division. This would have only 3% more electors per councillor than the average for the county by 2021. However, we are recommending a change to this division, by including the parishes of Freeby and Wymondham in our recommended Asfordby division. This change is necessary in order to provide a good level of electoral equality in Asfordby whilst maintaining community ties and electoral equality in Melton Mowbray. Our recommended division would have clear boundaries and good electoral equality.
Melton East	1	5%	This division comprises the Melton Borough Council wards of Melton Craven, Melton Newport and Melton Warwick together with that part of	This division was proposed and supported locally. We recommend it as part of our draft recommendations. We also received an alternative proposal that would include part of the town of Melton Mowbray in the Asfordby division. However, we were not persuaded either by the submissions

			Melton Sysonby ward which lies to the east of Scalford Road.	or by our visit to the area that such an arrangement would reflect community identities in the borough. Our recommended division would have clear boundaries and good electoral equality.
Melton West	1	4%	This division comprises the Melton Borough Council wards of Melton Dorian and Melton Egerton together with that part of Melton Sysonby ward which lies to the west of Scalford Road.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We recommend it as part of our draft recommendations. We also received an alternative proposal that would include part of the town of Melton Mowbray in the Asfordby division. However, we were not persuaded either by the submissions or by our visit to the area that such an arrangement would reflect community identities in the borough. Our recommended division would have clear boundaries and good electoral equality.

North West Leicestershire District

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Ashby de la Zouch	1	3%	This division comprises the parish of Ashby de la Zouch with the exception of the parish ward of Ashby Castle.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We recommend it as part of our draft recommendations. The division would give a good level of electoral equality. We received objections to the exclusion of the Ashby Castle parish ward from this division. The consequences of including the Castle parish ward are described in detail below, in our comments on the Valley division. We are not persuaded that resulting levels of electoral inequality are justified.
Castle Donington & Kegworth	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Castle Donington, Kegworth and Lockington-Hemington.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

Coalville North	1	-2%	This division comprises the North West Leicestershire District Council wards of Coalville East, Coalville West, Hugglescote St Mary's and Snibston South, together with the unparished part of the Snibston North ward.	We received two different proposals for boundaries of divisions in the Coalville area. However, when we visited the area, it appeared that neither proposal would maintain local ties in the centre of Coalville. We accept that Snibston North and Snibston South district wards should be combined in a single division. We have, however, modified the locally made proposals by including the whole of the Coalville East and Coalville West wards in the same division. Our recommended division provides a good level of electoral equality.
Coalville South	1	3%	This division comprises the North West Leicestershire District Council wards of Bardon, Greenhill, Ellistown & Battleflat and Hugglescote St John's, together with the unparished part of the Castle Rock ward and the part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the south of Meadow Lane.	We received two different proposals for boundaries of divisions in the Coalville area. However, when we visited the area, it appeared that neither proposal would maintain local ties in the centre of Coalville. We accept that Bardon and Greenhill district wards be combined in a single division. Having visited the area we recommend boundaries which, we consider will maintain local ties. Our recommended division provides a good level of electoral equality.
Forest & Measham	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashby Woulds, Measham, and Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe.	This division was proposed locally. We received expressions of support for this proposal. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Ibstock & Appleby	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Appleby Magna, Chilcote, Heather, Ibstock, Ravenstone with Snibston, Snarestone, Stretton en le Field and Swepstone.	This division was proposed and supported locally. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We received an objection to the exclusion of Ellistown & Battleflat from this division. However, including that parish in this division would result in the division having 25% more electors per councillor

				than the average for the county. We are not persuaded that such a degree of electoral inequality is justified in this case.
Valley	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Belton, Bredon on the Hill, Coleorton, Isley cum Langley, Long Whatton & Diseworth, Normanton Le Heath Osgathorpe, Packington, Staunton Harold Swannington and Worthington, together with the Ashby Castle parish ward.	This division was proposed and supported locally. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We received objections to the inclusion of the Ashby Castle parish ward in this division. Excluding that parish ward from the Valley division would mean that there would be 27% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the division, a degree of electoral inequality we are not persuaded to recommend. We received a proposal that the Ashby de la Zouch Blackfordby parish ward be added to the Valley division in order to mitigate electoral inequality. However in such an approach, Blackfordby would be detached from the remainder of the Valley division and Valley would have 13% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county. We do not recommend detached wards (other than in exceptional circumstances such as islands) and are not persuaded by the evidence we have received that departing from our normal approach is justified in this case.
Whitwick	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Charley and Whitwick together with the borough council ward of Thringstone and that part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the north of Meadow Lane.	We received two different proposals for boundaries of divisions in the Whitwick area. Our draft recommendations for this area reflect our proposals for neighbouring Coalville. Having visited the area we recommend boundaries which, we consider reflect the evidence of community identity which we received and which maintain local ties. Our recommended division provides a good level of electoral equality.

Oadby & Wigston Borough

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Oadby North	1	-9%	This division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council wards of Oadby Grange and Oadby Uplands.	Oadby is currently served by a two-member division. We received a proposal that Oadby form two single-member divisions, each composed of complete district council wards. This would result in two Oadby divisions having 9% fewer and 2% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We also received a proposal for the current two-member ward to be retained. This would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county by 2021. Because of the relatively high average variance across the borough, we consider that the proposal for a division comprising the Oadby Grange and Oadby Uplands wards with 9% fewer electors than the average provides the best opportunity for a fair pattern of electoral equality across the borough.
Oadby South & Wigston East	2	-7%	This two-member division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council wards of Oadby Brocks Hill, Oadby St Peter's, Oadby Woodlands and Wigston Meadowcourt together with the eastern part of Wigston All Saints ward and that part of Wigston St Wolstan's ward served by Wigston Road.	Local proposals for Wigston were for three divisions, each having electoral variances greater than 10%. However, we propose a two-member division which combines the southern part of Oadby with the eastern part of Wigston in a two-member division, having 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county. This facilitates a consistent approach to electoral equality throughout the borough.
Wigston Poplars	1	-9%	This division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council ward of Wigston	We have modified a local proposal for this area by including the whole of Aylestone Lane in this division. We consider that this provides a good level of electoral equality in the

			Fields together with that part of Wigstone All Saints lying between Aylestone Lane and Central Avenyue, and that part of Wigston St Wolstan's ward lying to the West of Cleveland Road	context of the average electoral ratio in the borough, whilst also reflecting community identity.
Wigston South	1	-9%	This division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council ward of Wigston South together with that part of Wigston All Saints ward lying to the west of Horsewell Lane and north of Truro Drive	We have modified a local proposal for this area by excluding Ayleston Lane but including Amesbury Road and Britford Avenue in this division. This provides a better balance of our statutory criteria. We consider that this provides a criteria good level of electoral equality in the context of the average electoral ratio in the borough, whilst also reflecting community identity.

Conclusions

31 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	55	55
Number of electoral divisions	53	53
Average number of electors per councillor	9,466	9,984
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	10	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation

Leicestershire County Council should comprise 55 councillors serving 53 divisions representing 51 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Leicestershire. You can also view our draft recommendations for Leicestershire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

32 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

33 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, each district and borough council in Leicestershire has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

34 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Barwell, Braunstone, Mountsorrel, Sileby and Syston parishes.

35 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Barwell parish.

Draft recommendation

Barwell Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Charnwood (returning four members), Redhall (returning four members) and St Marys (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

36 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Braunstone parish.

Draft recommendation

Braunstone Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Braunstone Millfield (returning three members), Braunstone Ravenhurst & Fosse (returning nine members), Braunstone Thorpe Astley (returning five members) and Braunstone Winstanley (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

37 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Mountsorrel parish.

Draft recommendation

Mountsorrel Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Mountsorrel (returning 11 members), Mountsorrel Castle (returning one member) and Mountsorrel North End (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

38 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Sileby parish.

Draft recommendation

Sileby Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Sileby South (returning two members), Sileby Village (returning 12 members) and Sileby West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

39 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Syston parish.

Draft recommendation

Syston Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Syston Merton (returning six members), Syston New Barkby (returning eight members), Syston Roundhill (returning one member), Syston St Peter's East (returning four members) and Syston St Peter's West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 Have your say

40 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole district or just a part of it.

41 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Leicestershire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

42 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/>

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

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

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Leicestershire which delivers:

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

A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

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

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?

- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed ward? Is there any form of public transport?

44 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

45 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

46 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

47 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Leicestershire County Council in 2017.

Equalities

48 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.

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Blaby District								
1	Blaby & Glen Parva	1	9,339	9,339	-1%	9,773	9,773	-2%
2	Braunstone	1	10,142	10,142	7%	10,111	10,111	1%
3	Cosby & Countesthorpe	1	9,496	9,496	0%	10,504	10,504	5%
4	Enderby & Lubbethorpe	1	7,703	7,703	-19%	9,155	9,155	-8%
5	Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe & Leicester Forests	2	17,345	8,673	-8%	18,578	9,289	-7%
6	Narborough & Whetstone	1	10,415	10,415	10%	10,698	10,698	7%
7	Stoney Stanton & Croft	1	9,144	9,144	-3%	10,222	10,222	2%

Table A1 (Cont): Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Charnwood Borough							
8 Birstall	1	10,415	10,415	10%	10,922	10,922	9%
9 Bradgate	1	10,129	10,129	7%	10,678	10,678	7%
10 Loughborough East	1	9,544	9,544	1%	9,732	9,732	-3%
11 Loughborough North	1	10,343	10,343	9%	10,312	10,312	3%
12 Loughborough North West	1	10,485	10,485	11%	10,093	10,093	1%
13 Loughborough South	1	9,967	9,967	5%	10,730	10,730	7%
14 Loughborough South West	1	10,476	10,476	11%	10,782	10,782	8%
15 Quorn & Barrow	1	9,966	9,966	5%	10,617	10,617	6%
16 Rothley & Mountsorrel	1	9,468	9,468	0%	10,469	10,469	5%

Table A1 (Cont): Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
17	Shepshed	1	10,886	10,886	15%	11,371	11,371	14%
18	Sileby & The Wolds	1	8,459	8,459	-11%	9,092	9,092	-9%
19	Syston Fosse	1	8,695	8,695	-8%	9,363	9,363	-6%
20	Syston Ridgeway	1	8,774	8,774	-7%	9,138	9,138	-8%
21	Thurmaston Ridgemere	1	8,894	8,894	-6%	9,215	9,215	-8%
Harborough District								
22	Broughton Astley	1	8,734	8,734	-8%	9,786	9,786	-2%
23	Bruntingthorpe	1	10,512	10,512	11%	10,596	10,596	6%
24	Gartree	1	9,874	9,874	4%	10,644	10,644	7%
25	Launde	1	9,892	9,892	5%	10,719	10,719	7%
26	Lutterworth	1	9,079	9,079	1%	10,000	10,000	0%
27	Market Harborough East	1	10,406	10,406	10%	10,799	10,799	8%

Table A1 (Cont): Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
28	Market Harborough West & Foxton	1	9,933	9,933	5%	10,909	10,909	9%
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough								
29	Burbage	1	9,100	9,100	-4%	9,748	9,748	-2%
30	De Montfort	1	9,782	9,782	3%	10,515	10,515	5%
31	Earl Shilton	1	10,382	10,382	10%	10,415	10,415	4%
32	Groby & Ratby	1	9,561	9,561	1%	9,774	9,774	-2%
33	Hollycroft	1	9,901	9,901	5%	10,179	10,179	2%
34	Mallory	1	10,352	10,352	9%	10,389	10,389	4%
35	Market Bosworth	1	8,947	8,947	-5%	9,285	9,285	-7%
36	Markfield, Desford & Thornton	1	9,444	9,444	0%	10,008	10,008	0%
37	St Marys	1	8,482	8,482	-10%	9,288	9,288	-7%

Table A1 (Cont): Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Melton Borough							
38 Asfordby	1	9,342	9,342	-1%	9,319	9,319	-7%
39 Belvoir	1	9,513	9,513	0%	9,590	9,590	-4%
40 Melton East	1	10,353	10,353	9%	10,510	10,510	5%
41 Melton West	1	10,131	10,131	7%	10,384	10,384	4%
North West Leicestershire District							
42 Ashby de la Zouch	1	8,622	8,622	-9%	10,276	10,276	3%
43 Castle Donington & Kegworth	1	8,424	8,424	-11%	9,509	9,509	-5%
44 Coalville North	1	8,741	8,741	-8%	9,754	9,754	-2%
45 Coalville South	1	9,394	9,394	-1%	10,272	10,272	3%
46 Forest & Measham	1	8,653	8,653	-9%	9,902	9,902	-1%
47 Ibstock & Appleby	1	9,261	9,261	-2%	10,401	10,401	4%

Table A1 (Cont): Draft recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
48 Valley	1	9,086	9,086	-4%	9,341	9,341	-6%
49 Whitwick	1	9,390	9,390	-1%	9,351	9,351	-6%
Oadby & Wigston Borough							
50 Oadby North	1	9,030	9,030	-5%	9,085	9,085	-9%
51 Oadby South & Wigston East	2	18,680	9,340	-1%	18,642	9,321	-7%
52 Wigston Poplars	1	8,790	8,790	-7%	9,101	9,101	-9%
53 Wigston South	1	8,740	8,740	-8%	9,082	9,082	-9%
Totals	55	520,616	-	-	549,129	-	-
Averages	-	-	9,466	-	-	9,984	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Leicestershire County Council.

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/leicestershire/leicestershire-county-council>

Local Authority

- Leicestershire County Council

Borough and District Councils

- Charnwood Borough Council
- Melton Borough Council
- Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

Town Councils

- Ashby De La Zouch Town Council
- Shepshed Town Council

Parish Councils

- Anstey Parish Council
- Barwell Parish Council
- Carlton Parish Council
- Clawson Hose & Harby Parish Council
- Glenfield Parish Council
- Kirby Muxloe Parish Council
- Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
- Market Bosworth Parish Council
- Markfield Parish Council
- Osbaston Parish Council
- Sheepy Parish Council
- Sileby Parish Council
- Somerby Parish Council
- Stoke Golding Parish Council
- Thurlaston Parish Council
- Thurmaston Parish Council
- Whitwick Parish Council
- Woodhouse Parish Council

Political Parties

- Charnwood UKIP
- Leicestershire County Council Conservative Group
- Leicestershire County Council Labour Group
- Leicestershire County Council Liberal Democrats Group
- North West Leicestershire Labour Party
- Oadby Wigston Liberal Democrats Party (1)
- Oadby Wigston Liberal Democrats Party (2)
- Rutland & Melton Labour Party

MP

- Rt Hon Sir Edward Garnier MP

Councillors

- Councillor M. Ball (Ashby de la Zouch Town Council)
- Councillor R. Blunt (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor L. Breckon (Blaby District Council)
- Councillor J. Coxon (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor T. Culley (Melton BC)
- Councillor K. Feltham (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor M. Hall (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council)
- Councillors Kaufman & Gamble (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor A.M. Kershaw (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor J. Orson (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor I. Ould (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor R. Page (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor B. Rhodes (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor N. Rushton (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor R. Shepherd (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor D. Snartt (Leicestershire County Council)
- Councillor M. Wright (Blaby District Council)

Local Organisations

- Ashby De La Zouch Civic Society
- East Leicestershire & Rutland CCG
- Saxon Paddock Committee

Residents

- 10 Local Residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
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
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