

# Final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Lincolnshire County Council

Electoral review

August 2016

## **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	6
Division patterns	7
Draft recommendations	7
Further limited consultation	
Final recommendations	11
Boston	12
East Lindsey	14
Lincoln	19
North Kesteven	21
South Holland	25
South Kesteven	27
West Lindsey	31
Conclusions	34
Parish electoral arrangements	34
3 What happens next?	41

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council	42
B Submissions Received	49
C Glossary and Abbreviations	53



# 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 Lincolnshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Lincolnshire 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 Lincolnshire. Overall, 33% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. The divisions of Lincoln Park and Stamford West have 35% and 34% fewer electors than the average for Lincolnshire, respectively.

## Our proposals for Lincolnshire

Lincolnshire County Council currently has 77 councillors. Based on the evidence received during the preliminary phase of the review, we were minded to reduce the council size by six to 71, and invited proposals for division patterns based on that number.

However, when formulating the draft recommendations, we considered that a council size of 70 would provide for a better allocation of members across the districts in the county and achieve a better balance between the statutory criteria. We considered that a reduction in council size by seven to 70 members would not adversely affect the Council in discharging its roles and responsibilities effectively. We therefore based our draft recommendations for Lincolnshire on a council size of 70 members. We continue to believe that 70 members is the appropriate council size for Lincolnshire and our final recommendations for the county are based on a council size of 70 members.

## Electoral arrangements

Lincolnshire County Council elects by wholes. The Council has expressed the wish to retain single-member divisions. We therefore produced a pattern of single-member divisions as our final recommendations.

Our final recommendations propose that Lincolnshire County Council's 70 councillors should represent 70 single-member divisions across the county. None of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Lincolnshire by 2021.

**We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Lincolnshire.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review has been conducted following our decision to review Lincolnshire 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 legislation<sup>1</sup> 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](http://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 three periods of consultation: first on division patterns for the Council, secondly on our draft recommendations and finally on our further draft recommendations in North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven and West Lindsey. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
12 May 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for division patterns to LGBCE
22 July 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 December 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
9 February 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
10 May 2016	Further limited consultation in North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven and West Lindsey
16 August 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

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council 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:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)  
Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
Peter Maddison QPM  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>2</sup> 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 division 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.

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Lincolnshire	558,455	580,447
Number of councillors	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	7,978	8,292

10 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Lincolnshire.

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 Lincolnshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The 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 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices (by appointment). All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and

---

<sup>2</sup> Electors refer to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 4% to 2021.

15 The initial set of electorate forecasts provided by the Council were not supported by all the political groups on the County Council. We received comments on the electorate forecasts being compiled as part of submissions relating to council size. We decided to meet the Group Leaders of the Council to discuss the electorate forecasts and agreed for a revised set of electorate data to be compiled. Having received this revised data, we used this as the basis for the invitation of division patterns.

16 During consultation on the division patterns for Lincolnshire, it was identified that the electorate data included some anomalies. We informed the Council of the issues identified and they were able to provide us with a further revised set of electorate forecasts that addressed the issues.

17 We are now satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

18 During the preliminary phase of the review we received four submissions on council size. These were from Lincolnshire County Council, the Conservatives & Administration Group for Lincolnshire County Council, the Labour Group for Lincolnshire County Council and Councillor Overton, the Leader of the Lincolnshire Independents. These proposed council sizes of 71, 71, 77 and 75, respectively. As part of the Council's submission they notified us that they had passed a resolution for a single-member division review.

19 We carefully considered the representations received during this preliminary phase. Each of the groups had provided us with conflicting evidence to justify their proposed council size.

20 We decided to meet with the Group Leaders to discuss the issue of council size. Following this meeting we gave the opportunity for the Council and political groups to submit any further evidence. We received three further submissions on council size. These were made by Lincolnshire County Council, the Conservatives & Administration Group for Lincolnshire County Council and the Labour Group for Lincolnshire County Council. They all supported their initial proposals for council sizes of 71, 71 and 77, respectively.

21 Having considered the evidence received, we were of the view that the Council had made a persuasive case to support a reduction in council size. We therefore invited proposals for division patterns for Lincolnshire based on a council size of 71 members. In response to consultation on division patterns we received five submissions supporting the reduction in council size.

22 In formulating the draft recommendations, we identified that a council size of 70 would allow for a better allocation of members across the county, and provide for a pattern of divisions which would achieve a better balance between the statutory

criteria. We were of the view that a council size of 70 would not impact adversely on the governance arrangements of the Council. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 70 elected members, allocated across the districts as follows:

- Boston – six members
- East Lindsey – 13 members
- Lincoln – eight members
- North Kesteven – 11 members
- South Holland – nine members
- South Kesteven – 14 members
- West Lindsey – nine members

23 We remain of the opinion that 70 members is the appropriate council size for Lincolnshire County Council and our final recommendations are also based on this council size.

## Division patterns

24 During consultation on division patterns, we received 65 submissions, including one county-wide proposal from the Council, and five partial schemes. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

25 The county-wide scheme provided an arrangement of 71 single-member divisions for the county. The five partial division arrangements were one each for the districts of City of Lincoln, Stamford town, North Kesteven and two for the district of East Lindsey. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of division resulted in good levels of electoral equality in some areas of the county and generally looked to use clearly identifiable boundaries. However, substantial alterations were made to the proposals to achieve good electoral equality across the county as a whole and reflect a council size of 70 members.

26 Our draft recommendations were for 70 single-member divisions. We considered that our draft recommendations provided for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

## Draft recommendations

27 We received 214 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. The majority of submissions received were in relation to our proposals for East Lindsey, North Kesteven, South Kesteven and West Lindsey areas. We also received submissions for the three other areas (Boston, Lincoln and South Holland) in Lincolnshire. We received submissions from Lincolnshire County Council, Lincolnshire County Council Conservative Group, Lincolnshire County Council Labour Group, Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council majority group, North Kesteven District Council, South Holland District Council, South Kesteven District Council and West Lindsey District Council. We also received a district-wide scheme in East Lindsey from Councillor Pain of the

Independence from Europe group.

28 Having considered the evidence gathered during the consultation on our draft recommendations, we have decided to make changes to all districts except Lincoln. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

### **Boston**

29 We received 22 submissions regarding Boston. The County Council supported the draft recommendations but suggested alternative names for some of the divisions. Boston Borough Council supported the County Council's view and the remaining submissions from parish councils and local residents provided localised comments also on proposed division names. We confirm our draft recommendations as final subject to the name changes discussed on page 12.

### **East Lindsey**

30 We received 25 submissions regarding East Lindsey. The County Council supported the draft recommendations for the district. We also received alternative warding patterns from East Lindsey District Council majority group and Councillor Pain of the Independence from Europe group. We were unable to recommend these schemes as neither proposal provided for a better balance between the statutory criteria. One did not provide for good electoral equality across the district and the other created a parish ward with fewer than 50 electors which we consider would be an unviable parish ward. The alternative pattern supplied by the District Council majority group provided a warding arrangement that did not split the parishes of Mareham le Fen and Revesby. We propose that those parishes are not split as at draft recommendations but are included in the Horncastle & the Keals division. We received several submissions suggesting that Burgh le Marsh should not be included in a division with Skegness. This would create a division with an unacceptable variance and we are unable to recommend this. We received several localised comments regarding parishes but were unable to recommend any of these due to the poor electoral equality they would create. We confirm our draft recommendations as final subject to the changes to Mareham le Fen and Revesby parishes.

### **Lincoln**

31 We received six submissions relating to Lincoln. The County Council and a political group on the Council both supported the draft recommendations. Three other submissions from local residents did not support the proposed number of councillors for the city, nor the proposed divisions, but provided no further evidence. We confirm our draft recommendations as final.

### **North Kesteven**

32 We received 87 submissions relating to North Kesteven. We received an alternative warding patterns from the Lincolnshire Independents and Lincolnshire County Council. We considered both of these schemes and considered that the revised scheme from Lincolnshire County Council better reflected our statutory criteria than did the draft recommendations or the Independents submission. As this proposed pattern of wards had not previously had public exposure we carried out further consultation on this pattern of divisions, as discussed below. We also received localised comments on a number of areas, in particular the towns of Sleaford and North Hykeham, the parishes of Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard's Leap,

Washingborough, Heighington and the area known as the 'cliff villages'. The further draft recommendations, discussed below, deal with a number of the issues raised but we were unable to accede to all the issues raised as many were poorly evidenced and would result in poor electoral equality in the district.

### **South Holland**

33 We received 26 submissions relating to South Holland. The overwhelming majority opposed the inclusion of a part of the town of Spalding in a mostly rural Crowland division. As part of their response to the draft recommendations, Lincolnshire County Council provided us with persuasive evidence to justify the warding pattern they had submitted during an earlier consultation. As this proposed pattern of divisions had not previously had public exposure we carried out a further consultation on this pattern of wards, as discussed below.

### **South Kesteven**

34 We received 32 submissions relating to South Kesteven. Most of the submissions we received related to the division of the town of Market Deeping between divisions. We also received localised comments on a number of other areas. As part of the response to the draft recommendations we received persuasive evidence to justify a warding pattern submitted during an earlier consultation by South Kesteven District Council. As this proposed pattern of divisions had not previously had public exposure we carried out a further consultation on this pattern of wards, as discussed below.

### **West Lindsey**

35 We received 35 submissions relating to West Lindsey. The submission we received from West Lindsey District Council originally provided for a warding pattern of 10 members; however, under a council size of 70 members, West Lindsey was allocated nine members. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, West Lindsey District Council submitted a pattern of divisions for nine members. As this proposed pattern of divisions had not previously had public exposure we carried out a further consultation on this pattern of wards, as discussed below. We also received a number of submissions regarding the division of the parish of Welton between electoral divisions.

## **Further limited consultation**

36 During the draft recommendations consultation, we received several alternative patterns of divisions in Lincolnshire. We received an alternative pattern for North Kesteven, South Holland and South Kesteven from Lincolnshire County Council and for West Lindsey from West Lindsey District Council. As mentioned above, these division patterns had not been consulted on previously and we therefore carried out a further consultation in these districts from 10 May to 6 June 2016.

37 During this consultation we received 35 submissions. These were from Lincolnshire County Council, West Lindsey District Council, a number of local councillors, parish councils, local organisations and local residents. The majority group on Lincolnshire County Council supported the further draft recommendations in all four districts.

### **North Kesteven**

38 We received 13 submissions relating to North Kesteven. The further draft

recommendations were supported by the majority group on Lincolnshire County Council.

39 The Lincolnshire Independents resubmitted their previous suggested divisional arrangements. We do not consider that this proposal better meets our statutory criteria than our further draft recommendations for two reasons. Primarily, we consider the proposals in the Sleaford area did not reflect the community identity of electors in the south of Sleaford. Secondly, we consider that the division of the parish of Waddington, which results in a large number of electors in the north of the parish not having internal road access to the rest of the division, does not meet the criteria of effective and convenient local government.

40 We received a number of other submissions from parish councils that continued to object to the inclusion of their parish in a particular division. These submissions did not provide any further persuasive evidence to convince us to move away from the proposed divisional arrangements.

41 We also received a submission from Heighington Parish Council that objected to the division of their parish. This submission proposed an alternative division pattern for the parish and wider area. This submission was based on figures obtained from North Kesteven District Council and based on the electorate figures for 2015 rather than 2021, as per our proposals. For those reasons we are not able to use the figures provided in this submission. However, we have been able to use the proposed boundaries. We therefore place all of Heighington parish in the division of Potterhanworth & Coleby. We also received a suggested warding pattern from Sleaford Town Council. We were unable to adopt the modifications proposed by Sleaford Town Council as they related to the external boundaries of Sleaford Town Council and the number of councillors it elects, both of which are outside our remit.

42 Subject to the above changes we confirm the further draft recommendations as final.

### **South Holland**

43 We received 12 submissions relating to South Holland. All but one of these submissions supported the further draft recommendations.

44 The only submission that objected to the further draft recommendations was from Pinchbeck Parish Council, which continued to object to the division of the parish. To include Pinchbeck parish entirely in either Spalding Elloe or Donington Rural would result in very poor electoral equality in both divisions. We consider that our division of Pinchbeck parish best represents the three statutory criteria and we therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.

### **South Kesteven**

45 We received eight submissions relating to South Kesteven. Submissions from the majority group on Lincolnshire County Council, a Lincolnshire County Councillor, Thurlby Parish Council, and John Hayes MP were in support of the further draft recommendations. Other submissions made localised comments. We confirm our further draft recommendations as final.

### **West Lindsey**

46 We received four submissions relating to West Lindsey including submissions in

full support of the further draft recommendations from the majority group on Lincolnshire County Council, and from West Lindsey District Council. During the further draft recommendations consultation, we identified that the proposed boundaries in Gainsborough required redrawing to take account of the parish warding that had recently come into effect. Subject to this amendment we confirm our further draft recommendations as final.

## Final recommendations

25 The tables on pages 12–33 detail our final recommendations for each area of Lincolnshire. Where we have moved away from our draft and further draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

## Boston

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Boston Coastal</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Benington, Butterwick, Freiston, Leverton, Old Leake and Wrangle and part of the parish of Fishtoft.	We received 22 submissions regarding Boston. The County Council supported the draft recommendations as far as the boundaries were concerned but did not support the chosen names and submitted alternatives. Boston Borough Council supported this. Of the other submissions, all concerned the proposed names for the divisions. The County Council proposed the following name changes: Boston South to Boston West; Butterwick & Wrangle to Boston Coastal; Holland Fen & Sutterton to Boston Rural; and Wyberton & Marshes to Boston South. We confirm our draft recommendations as final subject to these name changes.
<b>Boston North</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the area to the north of the town including part of the town centre and the ground of Boston United Football Club.	
<b>Boston Rural</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Algarkirk, Amber Hill, Bicker, Fosdyke, Holland Fen with Brothertoft, Sutterton, Swineshead and Wigtoft and the northern part of the parish of Kirton.	
<b>Boston South</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Wyberton and Frampton parishes, the southern part of Kirton parish and the St Thomas' Quarter of Boston.	
<b>Boston West</b>	1	1%	This division includes the area to the west of the River Witham and north of the South Forty Foot Drain.	

<b>Skirbeck</b>	1	4%	This division includes the area east of Boston College to the Fishtoft parish boundary and beyond to the Bladon Estate.	
-----------------	---	----	---	--

## East Lindsey

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Alford &amp; Sutton</b>	1	0%	This division comprises of the parishes of Aby with Greenfield, Alford, Beesby with Saleby, Bilsby, Farlesthorpe, Hannah cum Hagnaby, Huttoft, Markby and Rigsby with Ailby and the southern part of the parish of Mablethorpe & Sutton.	We received two submissions regarding this division. Both submissions were district-wide schemes from Councillor Pain of the Independence from Europe group and East Lindsey District Council majority group, respectively. Councillor Pain suggested that the small area around Hall Leas Drive be included in Mablethorpe. The boundary of our proposed division is coterminous with the district ward boundary and we consider that this better represents convenient and effective local government. East Lindsey District Council majority group created a division that split the village of Sutton-on-Sea between divisions. For reasons discussed in paragraph 30 we did not consider that this submission provided a good balance of its statutory criteria.
<b>Horncastle &amp; the Keals</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bolingbroke, Claxby with Moorby, East Keal, East Kirkby, Haltham, Hameringham, High Toynton, Horncastle, Hundleby, Low Toynton, Lusby with Winceby, Mareham le Fen, Mareham on the Hill, Mavis Enderby, Raithby, Revesby, Scrivelsby, West Keal and Wood Enderby.	We received one submission that concerned this division. East Lindsey District Council majority group suggested that the parishes of Mareham le Fen and Revesby that were divided under the draft recommendations be removed from this division and included in a neighbouring division. We are unable to do this due the unacceptable variance that would be left in this division. We do, however, recommend that both parishes are wholly included in this division which we consider provides for better electoral equality in the area and avoids splitting parishes.
<b>Ingoldmells Rural</b>	1	-5%	This division includes the parishes of Addlethorpe,	We received two submissions that concerned this division. One supported the proposals. The other was a district-wide

			Anderby, Ashby with Scremby, Candlesby with Gunby, Chapel St Leonards, Claxby St Andrew, Cumberworth, Dalby, Hogsthorpe, Ingoldmells, Mumby, Orby, Partney, Skendleby, Ulceby with Fordington, Well, Welton le Marsh and Willoughby with Sloothby.	scheme that did not provide good electoral equality for the district and therefore we confirm our draft recommendations as final.
<b>Louth North</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Alvingham, Brackenborough with Little Grimsby, Covenham St Bartholomew, Covenham St Mary, Fotherby, Fulstow, Keddington, North Cockerington, South Cockerington, Utterby and Yarburgh as well as the northern part of the parish of Louth.	We received three submissions for Louth. One submission suggested that Louth should not be divided between divisions. As this review is, at the request of the County Council, a single-member review, we will endeavour where possible to provide a uniform pattern of single-member wards. Another submission supported the proposals for Louth but suggested very small amendments to both the Louth South and Louth North divisions. We are unable to make these suggested amendments as they would create an unviable parish ward of fewer than 100 electors. The third submission supported the boundaries for Louth South and suggested a different warding pattern for the north of the town but, as discussed, does not provide for good electoral equality. We have therefore decided not to modify the boundaries of these divisions and confirm them as final.
<b>Louth South</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Legbourne, Little Cawthorpe, Stewton and the southern part of the parish of Louth.	
<b>Louth Wolds</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Asterby, Aswardby, Belchford, Binbrook, Brinkhill, Burgh on	We received six submissions regarding this division. Councillor Pain's district-wide scheme supported the draft recommendations. East Lindsey District Council majority group proposed a scheme that would divide this division

			Bain, Burwell, Calcethorpe with Kelstern, Donington on Bain, Elkington, Fulletby, Gayton le Wold, Goulceby, Grainsby, Greetham with Somersby, Hagworthingham, Hallington, Harrington, Haugh, Haugham, Holton le Clay, Langton by Spilsby, Ludborough, Ludford, Maidenwell, North Ormsby, North Thoresby, Raithby cum Maltby, Sausthorpe, Scamblesby, South Ormsby cum Ketsby, South Thoresby, Stenigot, Swaby, Tathwell, Tetford, Waithe, Walmsgate, Welton le Wold, Withcall and Wyham cum Cadeby.	between four proposed new divisions. As discussed earlier, this scheme did not provide good electoral equality for the district as a whole and we did not consider that the required consequential changes were supported by persuasive evidence. We received a number of localised comments about including a number of parishes in this division but we are unable to recommend these due to the poor electoral equality they would provide. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our Louth Wolds ward as final.
<b>Mablethorpe</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Authorpe, Belleau, Claythorpe, Maltby Le Marsh, Strubby with Woodthorpe, Theddlethorpe St Helen, Withern with Stain and part of the parish of Mablethorpe & Sutton.	We received two submissions regarding this division. As mentioned above, we received a proposal from Councillor Pain to include a small area around Hall Leas in this division. As mentioned our division is coterminous with the ward boundary in this area. We were also unable to recommend the scheme from East Lindsay District Council majority group due to its poor electoral equality. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our Mablethorpe division as final.
<b>Saltfleet &amp; the Cotes</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Conisholme, Gayton le Marsh, Grainthorpe, Great Carlton,	We received four submissions referring to this division. Councillor Pain's district-wide scheme supported this division. The scheme from East Lindsey District Council majority group provided a revised enlarged division named

			Grimoldby, Little Carlton, Manby, Marshchapel, Muckton, North Cotes, North Somercotes, Reston, Saltfleetby, Skidbrooke with Saltfleet Haven, South Somercotes, Tetney and Theddlethorpe All Saints.	Louth Marsh. We are unable to recommend this scheme for the reasons detailed in paragraph 30. We also received a submission from a local resident suggesting the name of Louth Marsh and another suggesting Muckton parish not be included in this division but neither offered any supporting evidence. Therefore, we confirm our draft recommendation for this division as final
<b>Skegness North</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the northern part of Skegness parish.	We received seven submissions regarding these divisions. Councillor Pain's district-wide scheme proposed including the area centred on the Clock Tower be included in Skegness South and that Skegness South division should extend beyond Gibraltar Point as far as Wainfleet Sand and should split the parish of Croft with Croft village being included in a neighbouring division. This was supported by Croft Parish Council. We are unable to recommend this division pattern as it would create a parish ward within Croft Parish Council with an electorate of fewer than 50 which we consider unviable. As mentioned earlier, we do not propose the scheme suggested by East Lindsey District Council majority group due to its poor electoral equality and the changes that it suggests have not been supported by persuasive evidence.
<b>Skegness South</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Burgh le Marsh, Croft and the southern extent of Skegness parish.	
<b>Tattershall Castle</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of Carrington, Coningsby, Frithville & Westville, Langrville, Sibsey, Tattershall, Tattershall Thorpe, Thornton le Fen, Tumby, West Fen and Wildmore.	This proposed division was supported by Councillor Pain in his proposed scheme. East Lindsey District Council majority group suggested different pattern of divisions in this area but their proposals had poor electoral equality in a neighbouring division. We do, however, accept their suggestion to not split the parishes of Mareham le Fen and Revesby, as discussed earlier, and we confirm this division as final subject to that change.

<b>Wainfleet</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Bratoft, Eastville, Firsby, Friskney, Great Steeping, Halton Hologate, Irby-in-the-Marsh, Little Steeping, Midville, New Leake, Spilsby, Stickford, Stickney, Thorpe St Peter, Toynton All Saints, Toynton St Peter, Wainfleet All Saints and Wainfleet St Mary.	As discussed above, the scheme from East Lindsey District Council majority group provided poor electoral equality for this division and the scheme suggested by Councillor Pain relied on a parish ward that we consider would be unviable. We therefore confirm this division as final.
<b>Woodhall Spa &amp; Wragby</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Baumber, Benniworth, Bucknall, East Barkwith, Edlington with Wispington, Gautby, Great Sturton, Hainton, Hatton, Hemingby, Horsington, Kirkby on Bain, Langton, Langton by Wragby, Market Stainton, Minting, Ranby, Roughton, Sotby, South Willingham, Stixwoud and Woodhall, Thimbleby, Tupholme, Waddingworth, West Ashby, West Barkwith, West Torrington, Woodhall Spa and Wragby.	This division was supported by Councillor Pain in this district-wide scheme. East Lindsey District Council majority group's scheme provided an alternative division pattern for the area which we do not propose as we considered it was not supported by persuasive evidence. Therefore, we confirm this division as final.

## Lincoln

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2121	Description	Detail
<b>Birchwood</b>	1	-3%	This division is bounded by the district boundary to the west and the Fen Plantation to the north. The eastern boundary includes Foal Close and Birchwood.	We received seven submissions for Lincoln. Three submissions agreed with the draft proposals. Four submissions disagreed with the proposals of which two of these disagreed with the number of county councillors allocated to Lincoln and two disagreed with some of the boundaries in the city. None of these four submissions suggested an alternative. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final.
<b>Boultham</b>	1	-2%	This division extends east from Swanpool to include Boultham and South Common.	
<b>Carholme</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the area south and west of Long Leys Road, Carholme Common and the area between the castle and Alderman's Walk.	
<b>Ermine &amp; Cathedral</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the area east of the Ermine playing fields and west of Our Lady of Lincoln playing fields.	
<b>Hartsholme</b>	1	8%	This division includes Swanholme Lakes and Boultham Moor.	
<b>Park</b>	1	3%	This division comprises New Boultham to the east and the area north and south of the Spires & Steeples trail, extending from the city centre to the district boundary.	

<b>St Giles</b>	1	0%	This division includes the St Giles area of Lincoln to the north and Greetwell Hollow nature reserve to the south.	
<b>Swallow Beck &amp; Witham</b>	1	1%	This division includes Swallow Beck, the properties either side of the River Witham along Hykeham Road and Brant Road.	

## North Kesteven

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bassingham &amp; Welbourn</b>	1	4%	This division consists of the parishes of Aubourn with Haddington, Bassingham, Beckingham, Boothby Graffoe, Brant Broughton & Stragglethorpe, Carlton le Moorland, Leadenham, Navenby, Norton Disney, Stapleford, Thurlby, Welbourn, Wellingore and Witham St Hughs and part of the parish of South Hykeham.	During our consultation on draft recommendations we received six submissions commenting on the parishes of Harmston and Coleby and their exclusion from this division. We received evidence of the community identity shared by the 'cliff villages'; however, we received no alternative proposals that would not result in a division in the area having poor electoral equality or unclear boundaries. During our consultation on further draft recommendations, we received further submissions commenting on the exclusion of Harmston and Coleby from this division but no alternative proposals. We confirm our further draft recommendation for this division as final.
<b>Eagle &amp; Hykeham West</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of the parishes of Doddington & Whisby, Eagle & Swinethorpe, North Scarle, Skellingthorpe, Swinderby, Thorpe on the Hill and parts of the parishes of North Hykeham and South Hykeham.	We received no submissions regarding these divisions during either consultation other than a suggested name change and subject to that name change we confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Heckington</b>	1	6%	This division consists of the parishes of Anwick, Asgarby & Howell, Billingham, Burton Pedwardine, Dogdyke, Ewerby & Evedon, Great Hale, Heckington, Helpringham	

			Kirkby la Thorpe, Little Hale, North Kyme, South Kyme and Swaton.	
<b>Hykeham Forum</b>	1	-8%	This division consists of parts of the parishes of North Hykeham and South Hykeham.	During our draft recommendations consultation, we received two submissions relating to this division. Both submissions objected to the division of the parish between divisions but provided no viable alternative. There are too many electors in North Hykeham to be represented by a single councillor and we consider that the proposed pattern of wards best represents the three statutory criteria. One of the two submissions made a number of suggested changes to parish ward names which we agree to.
<b>Metheringham Rural</b>	1	-7%	This division consists of the parishes of Ashby de la Launde & Bloxholm, Blankney, Digby, Dorrington, Dunston, Martin, Metheringham, Rowston, Scopwick & Kirkby Green, Temple Bruer with Temple High Grange, Timberland and Walcott.	We received one submission in support of our revised Metheringham Rural division. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendation as final.
<b>Potterhanworth &amp; Coleby</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of the parishes of Branston & Mere, Coleby, Harmston, Heighington, Nocton and Potterhanworth.	We received six submissions directly relating to this division. A number of submissions objected to the inclusion of Harmston and Coleby in this division but did not provide any alternative division pattern. We received a submission from Heighington Parish Council during our consultation on further draft recommendations that raised a number of issues including its separation from the parish of Washingborough as well as the division of the parish. The submission proposed an alternative division pattern for the area that included the whole of the parish

				of Heighington in this division. Having considered this, we recommend that this division should include the whole of the parish of Heighington and we have amended our further draft recommendations accordingly. Subject to this amendment we confirm this division as final.
<b>Ruskington</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of the parishes of Cranwell Brauncewell & Byard's Leap, Leasingham, North Rauceby, Roxholm Ruskington and South Rauceby.	During the consultation we received over 40 submissions regarding our decision to divide the parish of Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard's Leap between this division and the Rowson division (now renamed Metheringham Rural). Our further draft recommendations placed the whole of the parish in this division and this was supported by two further submissions. We therefore confirm this division as final.
<b>Sleaford</b>	1	6%	This division consists of the northern part of Sleaford parish including the town centre.	During the consultation on draft recommendations we received five submissions, and during the consultation on further draft recommendations we received two submissions directly relating to Sleaford. All of these submissions related to the town council warding within Sleaford. It was suggested that both the number of town councillors increase and that the external boundaries of the parish be altered. We also received opposition to our proposed Quarrington parish ward that returned eight members to Sleaford Town Council. We do not have the power to make these changes. The revised parish warding for Sleaford is detailed on page 36.
<b>Sleaford Rural</b>	1	-3%	This division consists of the southern part of Sleaford parish and the parishes of Aswarby & Swarby, Aunsby & Dembleby, Culverthorpe & Kelby, Newton & Haceby, Osbournby, Screddington, Silk	We received no submissions directly relating to this division during the consultation and we therefore confirm this division as final.

			Willoughby, Threekingham, Walcot near Folkingham and Wilsford.	
<b>Waddington &amp; Hykeham East</b>	1	1%	This division consists of the parish of Waddington and part of the parish of North Hykeham.	As mentioned above, we received a number of submissions that objected to the inclusion of part of North Hykeham in this division and also the separation of the parish from Bracebridge Heath. None of these submissions suggested any alternative division patterns that we considered represented a better fit of the three statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final subject to a suggested name change.
<b>Washingborough</b>	1	-8%	This division consists of the parishes of Bracebridge Heath, Canwick and Washingborough.	As discussed above, we received a number of submissions regarding the exclusion of Heighington from this division. However, as a result of the submission from Heighington Parish Council suggesting their inclusion in a Potterhanworth & Coleby division, we recommend that this division be considered final.

## South Holland

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Crowland</b>	1	1%	This division consists of the parishes of Cowbit, Crowland, Gedney Hill, Sutton St Edmund and parts of the parishes of Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet, Holbeach, The Moultons and Whaplode.	During the consultation on draft recommendations we received 21 submissions for South Holland. Sixteen of these objected to the inclusion of part of the town of Spalding in Crowland division. After further discussion with the County Council we published further draft recommendations based on a pattern of divisions submitted by the Council. This created a division of Crowland that was entirely rural in character. During the consultation on further draft recommendations we received 11 submissions in support of this division. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Donington Rural</b>	1	-7%	This division consists of the parishes of Donington, Gosberton, Quadring, Surfleet and part of the parish of Pinchbeck.	During both consultations we received submissions from Pinchbeck Parish Council objecting to the parish being divided between this division and Spalding Elloe. We received no viable alternatives to the division of Pinchbeck parish and we considered that the division pattern in this area best meets our statutory criteria.
<b>Holbeach</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of the northern part of Holbeach parish including Holbeach town and part of the parish of Whaplode.	During our consultation on draft recommendations we received one submission regarding Holbeach. This was from Holbeach Parish Council, which objected to the way the parish had been divided. This submission supported the proposal from the County Council that maintained most of the parish in the divisions of Holbeach and Holbeach Rural. Due to the shape of the parish, which runs from the northern boundary of the district to the southern boundary, it is near impossible to not divide the
<b>Holbeach Rural</b>	1	5%	This division consists of the parishes of Gedney, Luton, Sutton St James, Tydd St Mary and part of the parishes of	

			Fleet, Holbeach and Whaplode.	parish. We therefore recommend the further draft recommendations for these two divisions be considered final.
<b>Spalding East</b>	1	0%	This division consists of the unparished eastern part of Spalding, the parish of Weston and part of the parish of The Moultons.	We received no submissions that related to any other aspect of divisions in Spalding other than that mentioned under Crowland above during the draft recommendations consultation. During the further draft recommendations consultation, we received general support for the revised division arrangement and we therefore confirm these as final.
<b>Spalding Elloe</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of the unparished parts of Spalding town around Little London and to the north of the town including the town centre as well as parts of the parishes of Deeping St Nicholas and Pinchbeck.	
<b>Spalding South</b>	1	7%	This division included the unparished southern part of Spalding town.	
<b>Spalding West</b>	1	2%	This division consists of the unparished western part of Spalding town.	
<b>The Suttons</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of the parishes of Little Sutton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge.	

## South Kesteven

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bourne North &amp; Morton</b>	1	6%	This division consists of the northern part of Bourne parish and the Morton part of Morton & Hanthorpe parish.	During the consultation on the draft recommendations we received two submissions for this division. It was suggested that this division should incorporate Haconby & Stainfield parish. To achieve this would require consequential changes that would produce a division with a high level of electoral inequality. After further consideration we carried out further consultation based on a division pattern suggested by South Kesteven District Council. This was supported by Lincolnshire County Council. We also received two responses from Morton & Hanthorpe and Haconby & Stainfield parish councils in opposition to the division. Neither suggested an alternative that would produce electoral equality for the division. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendation as final.
<b>Bourne South &amp; Thurlby</b>	1	7%	This division consists of the southern part of Bourne parish and the parishes of Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe and Thurlby.	During both stages of consultation, we received a number of submissions relating to the exclusion of both Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe and Thurlby parishes from this division. Our further draft recommendations proposed that Thurlby be included. We have made a further modification and our final recommendations for this division now also includes Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe parish.
<b>Colsterworth Rural</b>	1	-10%	This division consists of the parishes of Bitchfield & Bassingthorpe, Boothby Pagnell, Burton Coggles, Careby Aunby & Holywell,	During our draft recommendations we received submissions opposing this division on the grounds of its large geographical size. Despite containing a high number of parishes, this division still has one of the smallest electorates in the county due to the sparseness of the

			Carlby, Castle Bytham, Colsterworth, Couthorpe & Creeton, Denton, Easton, Great Ponton, Gunby & Stainby, Harlaxton, Little Bytham, Little Ponton & Stroxton, North Witham, Old Somerby, Skillington, South Witham, Stoke Rochford, Swayfield, Swinstead, Witham-on-the-Hill and Wyville-cum-Hungerton.	population in this area. We received no suitable alternatives for the division pattern in the area and, subject to the proposed change above regarding Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe parish, we confirm this division as final.
<b>Deepings East</b>	1	-5%	This division consists of the parishes of Deeping St James and Langtoft and part of the parish of Market Deeping.	The majority of the submissions we received in South Kesteven concerned these two divisions. We received widespread opposition during the consultation on draft recommendations to our proposed division of the area. We received an alternative suggestion to the division of the area from Market Deeping Town Council that had strong local support. We proposed this division as part of our further draft recommendations and received further support for this. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Deepings West &amp; Rural</b>	1	-3%	This division consists of the parishes of Barholm & Stowe, Baston, Braceborough & Wilsthorpe, Greatford, Tallington, Uffington, West Deeping and part of the parish of Market Deeping.	We also received a suggestion that the names of these divisions contain the name Market Deeping. We consider that the names Deepings East and Deepings West & Rural better represent the various communities in the divisions.

<b>Folkingham Rural</b>	1	-6%	This division consists of the parishes of Aslackby & Laughton, Billingborough, Braceby & Sapperton, Corby Glen, Dowsby, Dunsby, Edenham, Folkingham, Haconby, Heydour, Horbling, Ingoldsby, Irnham, Kirkby Underwood, Lenton Keisby & Osgodby, Pickworth, Pointon & Sempringham, Ripplingale, Ropsley & Humby, Welby and the Hanthorpe part of Morton & Hanthorpe parish.	We received no submissions directly relating to this division and we therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Grantham Barrowby</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of the parishes of Allington, Barrowby, Sedgebrook, Woolsthorpe-by-Belvoir and the south-western part of Grantham town including Earlesfield.	During the draft recommendations consultation, we received a number of objections to our proposed division names in Grantham. The further draft recommendations reinstated the existing names for Grantham and made one small change to the divisions in central Grantham. We received no further submissions in Grantham and we therefore confirm the further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Grantham East</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of most of the parish of Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without and the north-eastern part of Grantham town including the Harrowby estate.	
<b>Grantham North</b>	1	6%	This division consists of the northern part of Grantham town including Gonerby Hill Foot, the parishes of Ancaster, Barkston, Belton & Manthorpe,	

			Honington, Syston and a very small part of the parish of Great Gonerby.	
<b>Grantham South</b>	1	-5%	This division consists of the southern part of Grantham town and a small part of the parish of Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without.	
<b>Grantham West</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of the western part of Grantham town including Green Hill.	
<b>Hough</b>	1	-8%	This division consists of the parishes of Carlton Scroop, Caythorpe, Claypole, Fenton, Foston, Fulbeck, Hougham, Hough-on-the-Hill, Long Bennington, Marston, Normanton, Stubton, Westborough & Dry Doddington and the vast majority of the parish of Great Gonerby.	We received one submission directly relating to Hough. This suggested that Sedgebrook, Allington and Honington be included in Hough, and that Great Gonerby should not be in the division. This would result in a high level of electoral inequality in Hough. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Stamford East</b>	1	1%	This division consists of the eastern part of Stamford parish.	We received one submission at the draft recommendations consultation supporting the draft recommendations in Stamford. We therefore made no change during further draft recommendations and we confirm these divisions as final.
<b>Stamford West</b>	1	-8%	This division consists of the western part of Stamford parish.	

## West Lindsey

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bardney &amp; Cherry Willingham</b>	1	3%	This division consists of the parishes of Apley, Bardney, Barlings, Bullington, Cherry Willingham, Fiskerton, Fulnetby, Goltho, Greetwell, Holton-cum-Beckering, Newball, Rand, Reepham, Stainfield and Stainton-by-Langworth.	During the consultation on draft recommendations we received 30 submissions for West Lindsey. The majority focused on the decision to split the parish of Welton. West Lindsey District Council submitted an alternative division pattern, which did not divide Welton between divisions. We considered this to better meet the statutory criteria and so used this pattern as the basis for our further draft recommendations.
<b>Gainsborough Hill</b>	1	8%	This division consists of the eastern part of Gainsborough parish.	During our consultation on our further draft recommendations we received three submissions for West Lindsey. These were all in support of the further draft recommendations.
<b>Gainsborough Rural South</b>	1	-5%	This division consists of the parishes of Aisthorpe, Brampton, Brattleby, Cammeringham, Fenton, Fillingham, Gate Burton, Ingham, Kettlethorpe, Kexby, Knaith, Lea, Marton, Newton-on-Trent, Scampton, Stow, Sturton-by-Stow, Thorpe-in-the-Fallows, Torksey, Upton and Willingham.	During the further draft recommendations consultation, we identified that the proposed boundaries in Gainsborough required redrawing to take account of the parish warding that had recently come into effect. Subject to this amendment we confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Gainsborough Trent</b>	1	2%	This division consists of the southern and western part of Gainsborough parish.	
<b>Market Rasen Wolds</b>	1	3%	This division consists of the parishes of Bishop Norton,	

			Caenby, Claxby, Glentham, Kirmond-le-Mire, Legsby, Linwood, Market Rasen, Middle Rasen, Normanby-by-Spital, Normanby-le-Wold, North Willingham, Osgodby, Owersby, Owmbly, Saxby, Sixhills, Snitterby, Stainton-le-Vale, Tealby, Waddingham, Walesby, West Firsby and West Rasen.
<b>Nettleham &amp; Saxilby</b>	1	1%	This division consists of the parishes of Broadholme, Broxholme, Burton, Grange-de-Lings, Hardwick, Nettleham, North Carlton, Riseholme, Saxilby-with-Ingleby and South Carlton.
<b>North Wolds</b>	1	10%	This division consists of the parishes of Bigby, Brocklesby, Brookenby, Cabourne, Caistor, Grasby, Great Limber, Holton-le-Moor, Keelby, Nettleton, North Kelsey, Riby, Rothwell, Searby-cum-Owmbly, Somerby, South Kelsey, Swallow, Swinhope, Thoresway and Thorganby.
<b>Scotter Rural</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of the parishes of Blyborough, Blyton, Corringham, East Ferry, East Stockwith, Glentworth,

			Grayingham, Harpswell, Heapham, Hemswell, Hemswell Cliff, Laughton, Morton, Northorpe, Pilham, Scotter, Scotton, Springthorpe, Thonock, Walkerith, Wildsworth and Willoughton.
<b>Welton Rural</b>	1	5%	This division consists of the parishes of Buslingthorpe, Cold Hanworth, Dunholme, Faldingworth, Friesthorpe, Hackthorn, Lissington, Scothern, Snarford, Snelland, Spridlington, Sudbrooke, Toft Newton, Welton and Wickenby.

## Conclusions

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

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	70	70
Number of electoral divisions	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	7,978	8,292
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	4	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Final recommendation**

Lincolnshire County Council should comprise 70 councillors serving 70 single-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 divisions for Lincolnshire. You can also view our final recommendations for Lincolnshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## Parish electoral arrangements

48 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 divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

49 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, the district councils in Lincolnshire County have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

50 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements as described below within the districts of Boston, East Lindsey, North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven and West Lindsey.

**Boston**

51 As result of our proposed division 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 Fishtoft parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Fishtoft Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Fishtoft (returning one member), Hawthorn Tree (returning six members) and Willoughby Hills (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

52 As result of our proposed division 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 Kirton parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Kirton Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Kirton Meeres (returning six members) and The Cots (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**East Lindsey**

53 As a result of our proposed division 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 Skegness parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Skegness Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Clock Tower (returning one member), St Clement's (returning seven members), Winthorpe (returning five members) and Woodlands (returning eight members), The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**North Kesteven**

54 As a result of our proposed division 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 North Hykeham parish.

**Final recommendation**

North Hykeham Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Forum (returning two members), Grange (returning four members), Meadow (returning two members), Memorial (returning three members), Moor (returning three members), Post Mill (returning one member) and Witham (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

55 As a result of our proposed division 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 Sleaford parish.

**Final recommendation**

Sleaford Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Castle (returning two members), Holdingham (returning three members), Navigation (returning three members), Quarrington (returning eight members) and Westholme (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

56 As a result of our proposed division 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 South Hykeham parish.

**Final recommendation**

South Hykeham Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Beacon (returning one member), Crow (returning four members) and Danker (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**South Holland**

57 As a result of our proposed division 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 Deeping St Nicholas parish.

**Final recommendation**

Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Deeping St Nicholas (returning 10 members) and Tongue End (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

58 As a result of our proposed division 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 Fleet parish.

**Final recommendation**

Fleet Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Fleet North (returning eight members) and Fleet South (returning one

members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

59 As a result of our proposed division 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 Holbeach parish.

**Final recommendation**

Holbeach Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Drove (returning one member), Hurn (returning four members), St John's (returning one member) and Town (returning 12 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

60 As a result of our proposed division 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 Moulton parish.

**Final recommendation**

The Moultons Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Moulton (returning nine members) and Moulton Chapel (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

61 As a result of our proposed division 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 Pinchbeck parish.

**Final recommendation**

Pinchbeck Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Crossgate (returning two members) and Pinchbeck (returning 13 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

62 As a result of our proposed division 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 Whaplode parish.

**Final recommendation**

Whaplode Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Drove (returning three members), St Catherine (returning three members), Saracen's Head (returning one member) and Village (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**South Kesteven**

63 As a result of our proposed division 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 Bourne parish.

**Final recommendation**

Bourne Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Cawthorpe (returning six members), Dyke Fen (returning two members), North Fen (returning two members) and South Fen (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

64 As a result of our proposed division 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 Market Deeping parish.

**Final recommendation**

Market Deeping Town Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Mill Field (returning 12 members) and Swine’s Meadow (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

65 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangement for Morton and Hanthorpe parish.

**Final recommendation**

Morton and Hanthorpe Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hanthorpe (returning four members) and Morton (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

66 As a result of our proposed division 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 Stamford parish.

**Final recommendation**

Stamford Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: All Saints North (returning three members), All Saints South (returning three members), St George’s (returning four members), St John’s (returning five members), St Mary’s (returning four members) and St Peter’s (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

## **West Lindsey**

67 As a result of our proposed division 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 Gainsborough parish.

### **Final recommendation**

Gainsborough Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Gainsborough Hill (returning eight members), Gainsborough North East (returning one member), Gainsborough North West (returning five members) and Gainsborough Trent (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.



### 3 What happens next?

26 We have now completed our review of Lincolnshire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

#### Equalities

27 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: Final recommendations for Lincolnshire 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 %
<b>Boston</b>							
1 Boston Coastal	1	8,360	8,360	5%	8,609	8,609	4%
2 Boston North	1	8,123	8,123	2%	8,591	8,591	4%
3 Boston Rural	1	8,475	8,475	6%	8,582	8,582	3%
4 Boston South	1	7,752	7,752	-3%	8,200	8,200	-1%
5 Boston West	1	7,502	7,502	-6%	8,393	8,393	1%
6 Skirbeck	1	8,426	8,426	6%	8,643	8,643	4%
<b>East Lindsey</b>							
7 Alford & Sutton	1	7,880	7,880	-1%	8,305	8,305	0%
8 Horncastle & the Keals	1	8,122	8,122	2%	8,302	8,302	0%
9 Ingoldmells Rural	1	7,622	7,622	-4%	7,894	7,894	-5%
10 Louth North	1	7,535	7,535	-6%	7,644	7,644	-8%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
11	Louth South	1	7,952	7,952	0%	7,918	7,918	-5%
12	Louth Wolds	1	8,664	8,664	9%	8,703	8,703	5%
13	Mablethorpe	1	7,494	7,494	-6%	7,874	7,874	-5%
14	Saltfleet & the Cotes	1	7,592	7,592	-5%	7,935	7,935	-4%
15	Skegness North	1	7,699	7,699	-3%	8,329	8,329	0%
16	Skegness South	1	7,852	7,852	-2%	7,917	7,917	-5%
17	Tattershall Castle	1	8,092	8,092	1%	8,239	8,239	-1%
18	Wainfleet	1	8,876	8,876	11%	8,938	8,938	8%
19	Woodhall Spa & Wragby	1	8,447	8,447	6%	8,599	8,599	4%
<b>Lincoln</b>								
20	Birchwood	1	8,010	8,010	0%	8,072	8,072	-3%
21	Boultham	1	7,641	7,641	-4%	8,159	8,159	-2%
22	Carholme	1	8,060	8,060	1%	8,220	8,220	-1%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Ermine & Cathedral	1	8,978	8,978	13%	9,043	9,043	9%
24	Hartsholme	1	8,743	8,743	10%	8,951	8,951	8%
25	Park	1	8,383	8,383	5%	8,578	8,578	3%
26	St Giles	1	7,878	7,878	-1%	8,262	8,262	0%
27	Swallow Beck & Witham	1	8,295	8,295	4%	8,370	8,370	1%
<b>North Kesteven</b>								
28	Bassingham & Welbourn	1	8,447	8,447	6%	8,595	8,595	4%
29	Eagle & Hykeham West	1	7,578	7,578	-5%	8,189	8,189	-1%
30	Heckington	1	8,796	8,796	10%	8,813	8,813	6%
31	Hykeham Forum	1	6,839	6,839	-14%	7,608	7,608	-8%
32	Metheringham Rural	1	7,629	7,629	-4%	7,745	7,745	-7%
33	Potterhanworth & Coleby	1	8,087	8,087	1%	8,132	8,132	-2%
34	Ruskington	1	8,160	8,160	2%	8,196	8,196	-1%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire 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 %
35 Sleaford	1	8,485	8,485	6%	8,759	8,759	6%
36 Sleaford Rural	1	7,213	7,213	-10%	8,052	8,052	-3%
37 Waddington & Hykeham East	1	7,657	7,657	-4%	8,340	8,340	1%
38 Washingborough	1	7,204	7,204	-10%	7,642	7,642	-8%
<b>South Holland</b>							
39 Crowland	1	8,244	8,244	3%	8,357	8,357	1%
40 Donington Rural	1	7,451	7,451	-7%	7,728	7,728	-7%
41 Holbeach	1	7,964	7,964	0%	8,110	8,110	-2%
42 Holbeach Rural	1	8,582	8,582	8%	8,737	8,737	5%
43 Spalding East	1	7,807	7,807	-2%	8,268	8,268	0%
44 Spalding Elloe	1	7,393	7,393	-7%	7,947	7,947	-4%
45 Spalding South	1	8,010	8,010	0%	8,889	8,889	7%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire 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 %
46 Spalding West	1	7,431	7,431	-7%	8,438	8,438	2%
47 The Suttons	1	8,055	8,055	1%	8,205	8,205	-1%
<b>South Kesteven</b>							
48 Bourne North & Morton	1	7,496	7,496	-6%	8,788	8,788	6%
49 Bourne South & Thurlby	1	8,360	8,360	5%	8,913	8,913	7%
50 Colsterworth Rural	1	7,492	7,492	-6%	7,483	7,483	-10%
51 Deepings East	1	7,906	7,906	-1%	7,862	7,862	-5%
52 Deepings West & Rural	1	7,724	7,724	-3%	8,010	8,010	-3%
53 Folkingham Rural	1	7,815	7,815	-2%	7,820	7,820	-6%
54 Grantham Barrowby	1	8,061	8,061	1%	8,220	8,220	-1%
55 Grantham East	1	8,141	8,141	2%	8,145	8,145	-2%
56 Grantham North	1	8,758	8,758	10%	8,770	8,770	6%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire 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 %
57 Grantham South	1	7,379	7,379	-8%	7,882	7,882	-5%
58 Grantham West	1	5,645	5,645	-29%	8,137	8,137	-2%
59 Hough	1	7,750	7,750	-3%	7,646	7,646	-8%
60 Stamford East	1	8,470	8,470	6%	8,374	8,374	1%
61 Stamford West	1	7,716	7,716	-3%	7,663	7,663	-8%
<b>West Lindsey</b>							
62 Bardney & Cherry Willingham	1	8,139	8,139	2%	8,551	8,551	3%
63 Gainsborough Hill	1	8,506	8,506	7%	8,973	8,973	8%
64 Gainsborough Rural South	1	7,857	7,857	-2%	7,914	7,914	-5%
65 Gainsborough Trent	1	7,921	7,921	-1%	8,453	8,453	2%
66 Market Rasen Wolds	1	8,611	8,611	8%	8,568	8,568	3%
67 Nettleham & Saxilby	1	7,818	7,818	-2%	8,336	8,336	1%
68 North Wolds	1	8,507	8,507	7%	9,097	9,097	10%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
69 Scotter Rural	1	8,198	8,198	3%	8,117	8,117	-2%
70 Welton Rural	1	8,702	8,702	9%	8,703	8,703	5%
<b>Totals</b>	70	558,455	–	–	580,447	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	7,978	–	–	8,292	–

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division 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/lincolnshire/lincolnshire-county-council>

### Local authority

- Boston Borough Council
- East Lindsey District Council majority group
- Lincolnshire County Council
- North Kesteven District Council
- South Kesteven District Council
- West Lindsey District Council

### Political parties

- Lincolnshire County Council Conservative Group
- Lincolnshire County Council Labour Group
- Lincolnshire Independents

### Councillors

- South Holland District Council (Councillor B Alcock)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor M Allan)
- South Holland District Council (Councillor J Astill)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor A Austin)
- South Kesteven District Council (Councillor A Baxter)
- North Kesteven District Council (Councillor I Carrington)
- South Kesteven District Council (Councillor F Cartwright)
- Burgh Le Marsh Town Council (Councillor Fenton)
- South Holland District Council (Councillor P Foyster)
- South Holland District Council (Councillor A Harrison)
- North Kesteven District Council (Councillor G Jackson)
- North Kesteven District Council (Councillor R Little)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor J Marriott)
- South Kesteven District Council (Councillor C Morgan)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor C Pain)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor N Pepper) (2 submissions)
- West Lindsey District Council (Councillor D Rodgers)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor C Strange)
- North Kesteven District Council (Councillor D Suiter)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor S Tweedale)
- West Lindsey District Council (Councillor N White)

- South Kesteven District Council (Councillor R Woolley)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor R Wootten)

### **Members of Parliament**

- Rt Hon J Hayes MP (2 submissions)
- Sir E Leigh MP
- Lord Porter of Spalding

### **Parish and town councils**

- Addlethorpe Parish Council
- Algarkirk Parish Council
- Amber Hill Parish Council
- Barkston & Syston Parish Council
- Benington Parish Council
- Bracebridge Heath Parish Council
- Branston & Mere Parish Council
- Burgh le Marsh Town Council
- Burton-by-Lincoln Parish Council
- Butterwick Parish Council
- Canwick Parish Council
- Coleby Parish Council
- Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard's Leap Parish Council
- Croft Parish Council
- Crowland Parish Council
- Deeping St James Parish Council
- Dunholme Parish Council
- Fishtoft Parish Council
- Freiston Parish Council
- Haconby & Stainfield Parish Council
- Harmston Parish Council
- Heighington Parish Council
- Holbeach Parish Council
- Holland Fen with Brothertoft Parish Council
- Honington Parish Meeting
- Horncastle Town Council
- Leverton Parish Council
- Market Deeping Town Council
- Market Rasen Town Council
- Metheringham, Sots Hole & Tanvats Parish Council
- Moulton Parish Council
- Nettleham Parish Council
- North Hykeham Town Council
- Pinchbeck Parish Council

- Riseholme Parish Council
- Sedgebrook Parish Council
- Sleaford Town Council
- Stamford Town Council
- Sturton by Stow Parish Council
- Sutterton Parish Council
- Swineshead Parish Council
- Thurlby Parish Council/Witham on the Hill Parish Council
- Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe Parish Council
- Uffington Parish Council
- Washingborough Parish Council
- Wellingore Parish Council
- Welton Parish Council
- West Rasen Parish Meeting
- Wigtoft Parish Council
- Withern with Stain & Tothill Parish Council
- Wrangle Parish Council
- Wyberton Parish Council

### **Local organisations**

- Deepings Heritage Civic Society
- St Andrew's Church Cranwell Village

### **Residents**

- 122 local residents

### **Further draft recommendations**

#### **Local authority**

- Lincolnshire County Council
- West Lindsey District Council

#### **Local councillors**

- South Holland District Council (Councillor B Alcock)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor J Astill)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor A Baxter)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor A Harrison)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor J Marriott)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor M Overton)
- Lincolnshire County Council (Councillor N Pepper)

## **Members of Parliament**

- Rt Hon J Hayes MP

## **Parish and town councils**

- Branston & Mere Parish Council
- Canwick Parish Council
- Carlton le Moorland Parish Council
- Coleby Parish Council
- Haconby & Stainfield Parish Council
- Harmston Parish Council
- Heighington Parish Council
- Morton & Hanthorpe Parish Council
- Pinchbeck Parish Council
- Sleaford Town Council
- Sturton by Stow Parish Council
- Thurlby Parish Council
- Toft cum Lound & Manthorpe Parish Council
- Washingborough Parish Council

## **Political organisations**

- South Holland & The Deepings Conservative Association

## **Local residents**

- Nine 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 <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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