

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Norwich

Report to The Electoral Commission

July 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 313

CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|------|
| WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND? | 5 |
| SUMMARY | 7 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 11 |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS | 13 |
| 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS | 17 |
| 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION | 19 |
| 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS | 21 |
| 6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT? | 33 |

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for the City of Norwich is inserted at the back of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Collin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the City of Norwich in Norfolk.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of the City of Norwich's electoral arrangements on 31 July 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 26 February 2002, after which it undertook an eight-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, The Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations received by the LGCE during consultation on its draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

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

- **in two of the 16 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city and one ward varies by more than 20%;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in six wards and by more than 20% in two wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 85 - 86) are that:

- **Norwich City Council should have 39 councillors, nine fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 13 wards, instead of 16 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each city councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In all 13 of the proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 8% from the city average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in all 13 wards expected to vary by no more than 6% from the average for the city by 2006.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 10 September 2002:

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Constituent areas |
|----|------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Bowthorpe | 3 | part of Bowthorpe ward |
| 2 | Catton Grove | 3 | part of Catton Grove ward; part of Mile Cross ward; part of Coslany ward; part of Mousehold ward |
| 3 | Crome | 3 | Crome ward; part of Thorpe Hamlet ward |
| 4 | Eaton | 3 | Eaton ward; part of St Stephen ward |
| 5 | Lakenham | 3 | part of Lakenham ward; part of Town Close ward |
| 6 | Mancroft | 3 | part of Heigham ward; part of Lakenham ward; part of Mancroft ward |
| 7 | Mile Cross | 3 | part of Mile Cross ward; part of Coslany ward |
| 8 | Nelson | 3 | Nelson ward; part of Henderson ward |
| 9 | Sewell | 3 | part of Coslany ward; part of Mousehold ward |
| 10 | Thorpe Hamlet | 3 | part of Lakenham ward; part of Mancroft ward; part of Mousehold ward; part of Thorpe Hamlet ward |
| 11 | Town Close | 3 | part of Lakenham ward; part of St Stephen ward; part of Town Close ward |
| 12 | University | 3 | University ward; part of Bowthorpe ward |
| 13 | Wensum | 3 | part of Heigham ward; part of Henderson ward |

Notes: 1 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

2 We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Table 2: Final Recommendations for Norwich

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2001) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2006) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Bowthorpe | 3 | 6,949 | 2,316 | -5 | 7,696 | 2,565 | 4 |
| 2 | Catton Grove | 3 | 7,155 | 2,385 | -2 | 7,398 | 2,466 | 0 |
| 3 | Crome | 3 | 7,398 | 2,466 | 1 | 7,260 | 2,420 | -2 |
| 4 | Eaton | 3 | 7,319 | 2,440 | 0 | 6,999 | 2,333 | -5 |
| 5 | Lakenham | 3 | 7,916 | 2,639 | 8 | 7,676 | 2,559 | 4 |
| 6 | Mancroft | 3 | 7,113 | 2,371 | -3 | 7,538 | 2,513 | 2 |
| 7 | Mile Cross | 3 | 7,249 | 2,416 | -1 | 7,209 | 2,403 | -2 |
| 8 | Nelson | 3 | 7,518 | 2,506 | 3 | 7,282 | 2,427 | -1 |
| 9 | Sewell | 3 | 7,279 | 2,426 | -1 | 7,052 | 2,351 | -5 |
| 10 | Thorpe Hamlet | 3 | 6,897 | 2,299 | -6 | 7,101 | 2,367 | -4 |
| 11 | Town Close | 3 | 7,675 | 2,558 | 5 | 7,852 | 2,617 | 6 |
| 12 | University | 3 | 7,139 | 2,380 | -3 | 7,409 | 2,470 | 0 |
| 13 | Wensum | 3 | 7,680 | 2,560 | 5 | 7,544 | 2,515 | 2 |
| | Totals | 39 | 95,287 | - | - | 96,016 | - | - |
| | Averages | - | - | 2,443 | - | - | 2,462 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Norwich City Council.

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

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the City of Norwich in Norfolk. The seven districts in Norfolk have now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 Norwich's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in April 1977 (Report no. 204). Electoral arrangements of Norfolk County Council were last reviewed in June 1984 (Report no. 472). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Norwich was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10% in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 The LGCE was not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as Norwich is concerned, it started from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, the LGCE found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. In particular, it did not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 31 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Norwich City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Members of Parliament with constituencies in the city, Members of the European Parliament for the Eastern region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations was 22 October 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 26 February 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Norwich*, and ended on 22 April 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The City of Norwich lies at the heart of rural East Anglia, of which it is the regional capital. It has a population of 124,000 and covers an area of 3,907 hectares. It has a high population density of 3,205 persons per square kilometre, compared with 146 persons per square kilometre in Norfolk as a whole. Norwich has a thriving tourist industry with many historic buildings and landmarks, including Norwich castle and cathedral. The city has no parishes.

11 The electorate of the city is 95,287 (February 2001). The Council presently has 48 members who are elected from 16 three-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

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

13 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,985 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 2,000 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in two of the 16 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average and one ward by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in Bowthorpe ward where each councillor represents 44% more electors than the city average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Norwich

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2001) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2006) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Bowthorpe | 3 | 8,573 | 2,858 | 44 | 9,320 | 3,107 | 55 |
| 2 | Catton Grove | 3 | 5,472 | 1,824 | -8 | 5,792 | 1,931 | -3 |
| 3 | Coslany | 3 | 5,942 | 1,981 | 0 | 5,757 | 1,919 | -4 |
| 4 | Crome | 3 | 5,332 | 1,777 | -10 | 5,128 | 1,709 | -15 |
| 5 | Eaton | 3 | 6,404 | 2,135 | 8 | 6,084 | 2,028 | 1 |
| 6 | Heigham | 3 | 5,616 | 1,872 | -6 | 5,369 | 1,790 | -11 |
| 7 | Henderson | 3 | 5,630 | 1,877 | -5 | 5,666 | 1,889 | -6 |
| 8 | Lakenham | 3 | 5,583 | 1,861 | -6 | 5,465 | 1,822 | -9 |
| 9 | Mancroft | 3 | 6,930 | 2,310 | 16 | 7,561 | 2,520 | 26 |
| 10 | Mile Cross | 3 | 5,423 | 1,808 | -9 | 5,444 | 1,815 | -9 |
| 11 | Mousehold | 3 | 6,086 | 2,029 | 2 | 5,861 | 1,954 | -2 |
| 12 | Nelson | 3 | 5,605 | 1,868 | -6 | 5,369 | 1,790 | -11 |
| 13 | St Stephen | 3 | 5,610 | 1,870 | -6 | 5,937 | 1,979 | -1 |
| 14 | Thorpe Hamlet | 3 | 6,122 | 2,041 | 3 | 6,306 | 2,102 | 5 |
| 15 | Town Close | 3 | 5,444 | 1,815 | -9 | 5,172 | 1,724 | -14 |
| 16 | University | 3 | 5,515 | 1,838 | -7 | 5,785 | 1,928 | -4 |
| | Totals | 48 | 95,287 | - | - | 96,016 | - | - |
| | Averages | - | - | 1,985 | - | - | 2,000 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Norwich City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Crome ward were relatively over-represented by 10%, while electors in Bowthorpe ward were significantly under-represented by 44%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received four representations, including city-wide schemes from Norwich City Council and the Liberal Democrat Group on the City Council. It also received representations from Norwich North Liberal Democrats - North City Branch and Eaton Rise Residents' Association. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Norwich*.

15 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the City Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a uniform pattern of three-member wards. However, it moved away from the City Council's scheme and proposed two boundary amendments, affecting four wards. It proposed that:

- Norwich City Council should be served by 39 councillors, compared with the current 48, representing 13 wards, three less than at present;
- the boundaries of all 16 of the existing wards should be modified.

Draft Recommendation

Norwich City Council should comprise 39 councillors, serving 13 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

16 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all of the wards varying by no more than 8% from the city average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 6% from the average by 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

17 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 22 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Norwich City Council.

Norwich City Council

18 The City Council ‘unanimously agreed to support the draft recommendations’. However it proposed that Central ward be named Mancroft ward. It argued that the proposed name change would ‘reflect the historical name for the city centre ward’.

Norfolk County Council

19 The Labour Group on the County Council stated that it was ‘fully supportive of the scheme’. The Group supported the City Council’s proposal to rename Central ward and requested that consideration be given to ‘other requests, for example renaming Town Close as St Stephen’. The Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council opposed the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward on the grounds that it would not reflect community identity.

Labour Group on the City Council

20 The Labour Group supported the draft recommendations and supported the City Council’s proposal to rename Central ward. The Labour Group submitted further evidence in support of the LGCE’s proposed council size.

Norwich North Liberal Democrats – North City Branch

21 Norwich North Liberal Democrats – North City Branch (Norwich North Liberal Democrats) supported the draft recommendations in respect of the proposed council size, the number of wards and the proposed wards of Crome, Mile Cross and Thorpe Hamlet. However, they restated their opposition to the proposed wards of Catton Grove and Sewell.

Other Representations

22 A further 17 representations were received in response to the LGCE’s draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations and residents. Norwich Labour Party and Norwich North with Broadland Conservative Association supported the draft recommendations. In particular the Labour Party supported the City Council’s proposal to rename Central ward. Norwich South Conservative Association opposed the reduction in council size, but supported the proposed ward name of Town Close. Norwich Green Party and two local residents opposed the proposed reduction in council size.

23 The Cat ‘n’ Fiddle Community Partnership proposed an amendment to the boundary of the proposed Catton Grove ward. Three members of St Stephens Community Partnership proposed to rename the proposed Town Close ward St Stephen ward. Thorpe Hamlet Labour Party, Friends of Lion Wood, Thorpe Hamlet Community Forum and two local residents proposed to rename the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward Ketts ward. Thorpe Hamlet Labour Party and Thorpe Hamlet Community Forum also proposed that Britannia Road should be contained wholly within either Thorpe Hamlet ward or Crome ward. The City Centre Residents’ Forum proposed an alternative city-wide scheme. A local resident opposed the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward and supported this alternative scheme.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

24 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Norwich is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) – the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being ‘as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough’.

25 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

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

27 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

28 Since 1975 there has been around a 4% increase in the electorate of Norwich. The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of 0.7% from 95,287 to 96,016 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Bowthorpe, although a significant amount is also expected on brownfield sites in the city. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

29 At Stage Three St Stephen’s Community Partnership questioned whether the Council in formulating its electorate forecasts had taken the planned development on the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital site into account. We note that the City Council, in producing its electoral forecasts, accounted for the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital redevelopment and remain satisfied that the City Council’s forecast represents the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

30 Norwich City Council presently has 48 members. In its submission the City Council proposed a reduction in size, to 39 members. The Liberal Democrats also proposed a reduction in council size, to 45 members. Both of these proposed reductions would provide better levels of electoral representation across the city than the current arrangements. As explained earlier, the LGCE started its review by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and

convenient local government, although it was willing to look carefully at evidence and persuasive arguments as to why this might not be the case. In this instance, before reaching conclusions on what might be the most appropriate council size, the LGCE was of the opinion that it required further information and evidence. The Liberal Democrats, responding to the City Council's proposals, provided detailed justification for their small decrease rather than the larger one proposed by the City Council. The LGCE therefore invited the Council to provide further evidence in support of its proposed reduction in council size, and invited comments from the Conservative member and the Labour Group on the Council.

31 In its submission the City Council stated that its proposed number of council members reflected the changed emphasis on the role and responsibilities of councillors following the adoption of a leader and cabinet style of government, with a 10 member executive. In response to the request for further evidence, the City Council stated that its proposals were an attempt to establish a ratio of 1:3 between the executive and non-executive members on the council. In its opinion, the number of non-executive committee places would be just over 100. This number included the 76 committee places under the current arrangements, some of which would meet no more than four times a year, and further panels linked to scrutiny and overview functions. The City Council did not include working parties in this calculation because they would be of limited duration. A 39-member council would mean that, on average, each member would sit on three committees. The Council pointed out that this would be less than under the previous committee structure and in proportion to the workload of the executive members. The Council was of the opinion that the increased councillor:elector ratio, which would result from their proposals, would not be problematic due to the 'tight urban nature' of the city and its two-tier local government structure.

32 In their submission the Liberal Democrats stated that, although at present a 39-member council would seem to be workable, the new arrangements are not working well, with the scrutiny function being poor and the overview function 'non-existent'. They claimed that the large reduction in council size proposed by the City Council would reduce the opportunities for new people to serve on the council. The Liberal Democrats calculated that the number of non-executive places on the council would comprise 52 primary places, 27 secondary places, 30 working party places and another 30 secondary places for policy/overview panels. Allowing for one place per primary committee and 0.5 per secondary committee, this would mean approximately 100 committee places, which they considered would place too great a burden on councillors under the Council's scheme. The Liberal Democrats considered that a reasonable workload would be 2 - 2.5 places per councillor. They were also of the opinion that the 'constituency caseload workload' would require more than 39 councillors. Their preferred option, allowing for some flexibility, was for a range of 45 - 48 members. The Liberal Democrats stated that they had looked at 13, 14, 15 and 16-ward models, but came to the conclusion that a 15-ward, 45-member model would be best in terms of boundaries and in reflecting community identity.

33 In response to the LGCE's invitation to comment on council size, the Labour Group on the Council stated that it was in favour of a 39-member council because, in its opinion, it would provide good local government, was straightforward to understand and administer and provided for good community identity and electoral equality. It contended that a 39-member council size was 'more than adequate' for scrutiny and monitoring functions.

34 The Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the City Council's proposed reduction in council size. They stated that, given the changes to the internal political management in local government and the creation of cabinet government, the proposed reduction made sense. They were 'wholly unconvinced' that a larger number of councillors would be needed for the sake of proper democratic representation, and stated that 'what matters to the general public is the quality not the quantity of representation'.

35 Having considered the evidence put forward in support of the respective council sizes, the LGCE noted that the main differences between the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group concerned whether or not the workload on the councillors would be too great under a 39-member scheme. The City Council did not think so, whereas the Liberal Democrats did. However, the LGCE noted that both the Labour Group on the City Council and the Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the City Council's proposals with regard to council size. The LGCE further noted that the Council received a reasonable level of support when it consulted on its proposals. In the light of this, having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, the LGCE concluded that a council of 39 members would best meet the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

36 During Stage Three Norwich South Conservative Association, Norwich Green Party and two local residents opposed the proposed reduction in council size. Norwich South Conservative Association argued that 'the constituency caseload workload and indeed that of individual wards would require more than 39 councillors'. The Association contended that the LGCE had been unable to take into account its Stage One submission 'which would have added weight to some of the suggestions made by Norwich South Liberal Democrats'. However, it should be noted that while the LGCE considered all representations received, it only makes specific reference in its report to representations sent directly to it, whereas the Association submitted its comments on the City Council's Stage One scheme to the City Council, only. Norwich Green Party argued that any reduction in councillors would be 'a dilution of democracy' stating that 'it will result in even lower levels of councillor availability'. The Green Party argued that as some of the proposed wards are very large councillors would be 'less likely to be able to effectively cover whole wards and the electorate will lose out'. Two local residents argued that due to the proposed reduction, 'councillors are unlikely to be able to perform their democratic duties' and that 'enlarged electoral wards are unlikely to foster greater involvement in or respect for the democratic process on the part of the electorate'.

37 The Labour Group supported the proposed reduction in council size arguing that it did 'not share the view that the increase in the number of electors in each ward will increase the workload of individual councillors' and stated their support of the comment made by Norwich North Liberal Democrats 'that what matters is the quality of representation'. The Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the proposal for a 39-member council.

38 We have carefully considered the representations received and note that there is some opposition to the proposed council size. However, we judge that there has been a full and proper consideration of the most appropriate council size for the City through a close examination of its internal political management and the role of its councillors and we have not been persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations. We consider that the proposed reduction to 39 members has been justified, has received broad local support and would secure effective and convenient local government.

Electoral Arrangements

39 The LGCE carefully considered the two city-wide schemes received from the City Council and the Liberal Democrats. It noted that both would achieve an improved level of electoral equality, while proposing a reduction in the number of councillors. However, it was the LGCE's opinion that the City Council's proposals would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or the proposals put forward by the Liberal Democrats. In the light of the argumentation provided for the proposed reductions in council size, as described above, the LGCE was persuaded that a 39-member council could work efficiently and in the interests of the electorate. As a consequence, the LGCE was unable to give further consideration to the proposals from the Liberal Democrats as they were based on a different council size.

40 Accordingly, in view of the support given to large elements of the City Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, the LGCE based its draft recommendations on the City Council's scheme. However, bearing in mind local community identities and interests, the LGCE proposed minor modifications to two of the Council's proposed wards, in addition to a number of amendments where the proposed boundaries have been modified to adhere to ground detail.

41 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations report Norwich City Centre Residents' Forum proposed an alternative city-wide scheme which it stated would retain 'the integrity of the historic city centre Mancroft ward'. The Resident's Forum, in proposing this alternative scheme, were reacting to the fact that the City Council's initial proposals, which retained the existing Mancroft ward, were modified to account for issues raised during its consultation period, resulting in the proposed division of the existing Mancroft ward. However, we note that the Residents' Forum was made aware of the proposed division and was able to comment that it 'would strongly oppose this' due to 'historical and physical factors'. We consider that Stage Three is a period of consultation inviting comments on the LGCE's draft recommendations and not an opportunity to submit a new city-wide scheme. Although we recognise that the Forum was disadvantaged by the City Council amending its proposals before submitting them to the LGCE, we judge that the Residents' Forum has not provided sufficient evidence to consider comprehensive alteration to the draft recommendations.

42 At Stage Three the City Council 'agreed unanimously to support the draft recommendations subject to the request that the proposed Central ward be renamed Mancroft ward'. Norfolk County Council Labour Group, Norwich Labour Party, the Labour Group on the Council and Norwich North with Broadland Conservative Association supported the draft recommendations and the Norwich North Liberal Democrats submitted their support subject to an amendment to the proposed wards of Catton Grove and Sewell. A number of respondents proposed that Thorpe Hamlet ward should be renamed Ketts ward and that Central ward should be renamed Mancroft ward, and one respondent proposed amendments to the proposed ward of Catton Grove. A number of submissions were also received from local groups and residents commenting on their respective areas.

43 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For City warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Catton Grove, Coslany and Mousehold wards;
- (b) Crome, Mancroft and Thorpe Hamlet wards;
- (c) Heigham, Henderson, Mile Cross and Nelson wards;
- (d) Lakenham, St Stephen and Town Close wards;
- (e) Bowthorpe, Eaton and University wards.

44 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Catton Grove, Coslany and Mousehold wards

45 These three wards are situated in the north-east of the city and are each represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 8% below the city average in Catton Grove ward (3% below by 2006), equal to the average in Coslany ward (4% below by 2006) and 2% above in Mousehold ward (2% below by 2006).

46 At Stage One the City Council proposed extending Catton Grove ward by transferring to it parts of the existing Coslany and Mousehold wards. The relevant part of Coslany ward would be that to the north of Wall Road, and the relevant part of Mousehold ward would be that to the north of Gilman Road, including the western part of Mousehold Heath. The eastern boundary of

the ward would be Gurney Road. The Council proposed creating a new Sewell ward, which would comprise the eastern part of the existing Coslany ward and the central part of the existing Mousehold ward. The northern boundary would be the southern boundary of Catton Grove ward, while the western boundary would run along the rear of properties on the western side of Angel Road to Waterloo Road and Magpie Road in the south. The southern boundary would follow Magpie Road and Bull Close Road, while the eastern boundary would follow Silver Road to Mousehold Avenue before cutting through allotments to join Gurney Road on Mousehold Heath.

47 The Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the retention of the division of Mousehold Heath into two wards, but were opposed to the eastward extension of Catton Grove ward. They stated that the area around Mousehold Heath 'shares much more in terms of community links with the rest of the proposed Sewell ward to the south than with the bulk of the Catton Grove ward well to the west'. They proposed that the north-western part of Coslany ward should become part of Catton Grove ward, with the north-eastern part of Coslany ward and northern part of Mousehold ward being part of the proposed Sewell ward.

48 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the representations received for this area. It looked at the possibility of transferring the north-western part of the existing Coslany ward to Catton Grove ward, and transferring the northern part of Mousehold ward to the proposed Sewell ward. However, the LGCE concluded that to do so, and achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality, would not be in the best interests of community identity. Therefore it proposed to adopt the City Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations. However, it proposed to modify the south-eastern boundary of Sewell ward, where it crossed the allotments, and the south-western boundary of Catton Grove ward, where it crossed Pointers Field, in order to tie them to firm ground detail.

49 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1% below the city average in Catton Grove ward (1% above by 2006) and 2% below in Sewell ward (5% below by 2006).

50 At Stage Three the City Council supported the proposed wards of Catton Grove and Sewell. Norwich North Liberal Democrats opposed the proposed wards and reiterated their Stage One proposals. The Cat 'n' Fiddle Community Partnership proposed that a number of streets to the north of Waterloo Park, and the area surrounding St Lukes Church (excluding Angel Road School) be included in Catton Grove and that its south-eastern boundary should follow the rear of the properties on the east side of Clabon Road.

51 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for Catton Grove ward and Sewell ward as final. We consider that they would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We judge that the Norwich North Liberal Democrats have not provided sufficient new evidence at Stage Three to justify altering the draft recommendations for the proposed wards. We note that although the Cat 'n' Fiddle Community Partnership's proposed amendment would secure acceptable levels of electoral equality for the proposed Catton Grove ward, it would result in a high electoral variance in both of the proposed wards of Sewell and Mile Cross.

52 However, having examined the draft recommendations, we have noticed two boundary anomalies. We note that both Boston Street and Gilman Road are cul-de-sacs which have no access to the proposed Catton Grove ward. Therefore we propose that Gilman Road be transferred to Sewell ward (affecting 61 electors) and we propose to transfer Boston Street to Mile Cross ward (affecting 14 electors). We consider that these amendments would better reflect community identity and would have only a minor impact on electoral equality.

53 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed wards of Catton Grove and Sewell would be 2% below and 1% below the city average currently (equal to and 5% below by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of the report.

Crome, Mancroft and Thorpe Hamlet wards

54 Crome and Thorpe Hamlet wards are situated in the east of the city, whereas Mancroft ward includes the city centre. Each ward is currently represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 10% below the city average in Crome ward (15% below by 2006), 16% above in Mancroft ward (26% above by 2006) and 3% above in Thorpe Hamlet ward (5% above by 2006).

55 At Stage One the City Council proposed extending the existing Crome ward by transferring to it the northern part of the existing Thorpe Hamlet ward. The northern and eastern boundaries would follow the city boundary. The southern boundary would cut through the centre of Lion Wood and other open space before following Belsize Road and Britannia Road to join Gurney Road, which would comprise the western boundary. The Council proposed extending the remainder of the existing Thorpe Hamlet ward to include the southern part of Mousehold ward, the eastern part of Mancroft ward and the northern part of the existing Lakenham ward. The eastern boundary would follow the city boundary. The northern boundary would be the same as the southern boundary of the proposed Crome ward as far as Gurney Road, and would then cut through allotments to Silver Road. The western boundary would follow Silver Road and then utilise the river before taking a line east of Norwich Castle and along Rouen Road, King Street, Bracondale and Martineau Lane to join the city boundary at Trowse Millgate.

56 The City Council further proposed a new Central ward comprising the eastern part of Heigham ward and the western part of Mancroft ward. The northern boundary would follow the river and then run along Bakers Road, Magpie Road and Bull Close Road. The eastern boundary would be the same as the western boundary of Thorpe Hamlet ward as far as Carrow Hill. The southern and western boundaries would follow the inner ring road as far as Earham Road, and then run along Heigham Road, Dereham Road, Nelson Street and Northumberland Street to the river.

57 The Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the City Council's proposals to transfer the Pilling Park area from Thorpe Hamlet ward to Crome ward as 'the two areas have a similar social demographic make-up, sharing the same local shopping centre in the Plumstead Road'. They also supported the inclusion in Thorpe Hamlet ward of the eastern half of the city centre and the Heathgate area.

58 The LGCE carefully considered all the representations received for this area. It noted that the City Council's proposals would provide significant improvements to electoral equality while providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. The LGCE therefore decided to adopt the City Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations. However, it proposed to modify the proposed boundary between Crome and Thorpe Hamlet wards, where it crossed Lion Wood, in order to tie it to firm ground detail. The LGCE also proposed to modify the southern boundary of Thorpe Hamlet ward, to continue further south along Martineau Lane before following Trowse Bypass to the city boundary, in order to provide a stronger, more recognisable boundary.

59 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3% below the city average in Central ward (2% above by 2006), equal to the average in Crome ward (2% below by 2006) and 5% below in Thorpe Hamlet ward (3% below by 2006).

60 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations the City Council supported the proposed wards of Crome, Thorpe Hamlet and Central, subject to the proposal that Central ward be renamed Mancroft. The Labour Group of Norfolk County Council, Norwich Labour Party and the Leader of the Labour Group on the Council supported this proposal. Norwich North Liberal Democrats specifically supported the proposed wards of Thorpe Hamlet and Crome.

61 The Liberal Democrat Group on Norfolk County Council opposed the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward, which it argued would unite communities divided by the river who 'are distinct and separate'. A local resident argued that the part of the existing Mancroft ward which the LGCE proposed transferring to the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward is 'totally integrated with the rest of the city centre' sharing its community identities and interests, concluding that the area 'has no connection with Thorpe Hamlet ward on the other side of the river'. The resident also supported the City Centre Residents' Forum's alternative city-wide scheme for 'retaining the city centre as a single working unit'. Two local residents supported the inclusion of the area, currently in Mancroft ward, in the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward, and the proposal for part of the existing Thorpe Hamlet ward to comprise part of the proposed Crome ward.

62 Both Thorpe Hamlet Labour Party and Thorpe Hamlet Community Forum proposed that the whole of Britannia Road be contained in either Crome ward or Thorpe Hamlet ward. Both of these groups along with Friends of Lion Wood and two local residents proposed that the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward be renamed Ketts ward 'to reflect the historical links of the area'. Thorpe Hamlet Community Forum, Friends of Lion Wood and two local residents supported the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward for containing the whole of Lion Wood.

63 As described above the City Centre Residents' Forum proposed an alternative city-wide scheme which would retain the existing Mancroft ward. However, as detailed earlier we consider that the Residents' Forum has not provided sufficient evidence to justify comprehensive alteration to the draft recommendations.

64 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received at Stage Three. We note the City Council's proposal to rename Central ward as Mancroft ward and consider that this would secure a better reflection of its constituent communities. We note the opposition to the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward, but consider that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify moving away from the draft recommendations. We also note that the proposed ward has received support from a number of respondents. We agree with the proposal that Britannia Road be wholly contained in a single city ward. We judge that it should be contained in Crome ward (affecting 32 electors) to better reflect community identities. However, we have not been persuaded that the ward name of Ketts would better reflect the constituent area of the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward. Therefore, subject to the amendment to rename Central ward and the modification to the boundary between Thorpe Hamlet ward and Crome ward we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final.

65 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed wards of Mancroft, Crome and Thorpe Hamlet would be 3% below, 1% above and 6% below the city average initially (2% above, 2% below and 4% below by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted in the back of the report.

Heigham, Henderson, Mile Cross and Nelson wards

66 These four wards are situated in the north and west of the city and are each represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 6% below the city average in Heigham ward (11% below by 2006), 5% below in Henderson ward (6% below by 2006), 9% below in Mile Cross ward (unchanged by 2006) and 6% below in Nelson ward (11% below by 2006).

67 At Stage One the City Council proposed extending the existing Mile Cross ward by transferring to it the western part of Coslany ward. The south-eastern boundary of the proposed ward would run from Aylsham Road across Pointers Field, along Boston Street, southwards along the rear of properties to the west of Angel Road, along Waterloo Road and westwards along Bakers Road to the river. The other boundaries would be those of the existing Mile Cross ward. The Council also proposed extending the existing Nelson ward by including in it that part of Henderson ward east of Norwich cemetery. Its northern boundary would be Earlham Road, Heigham Road, Dereham Road and a diagonal line across the cemetery from Dereham Road to the cemetery entrance in Earlham Road. The other boundaries would be those for the existing Nelson ward. The Council also proposed a new Wensum ward comprising the western parts of Heigham and Henderson wards. The northern boundary would be the city boundary, while the western boundary would follow Dereham Road, Larkham Lane and Earlham Green Lane. The southern boundary would follow Earlham Road as far as the cemetery entrance, where it would cut across diagonally to Dereham Road and then run along Nelson Street and Northumberland Street to the river.

68 Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the Council's proposed Mile Cross ward, regarding it as 'the most logical choice'.

69 The LGCE carefully considered all the representations received for this area. It noted that the City Council's proposals would provide significant improvements to electoral equality while providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. The LGCE therefore decided to adopt the City Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations. However, it proposed to modify the proposed boundary between Nelson and Wensum wards to follow the cemetery boundary on its east and south sides as the Council's proposed boundary would not be tied to ground detail. The modified boundary would join Earlham Road between properties to the west of the cemetery entrance. It also proposed to modify the proposed boundary between Mile Cross ward and Catton Grove ward to follow the southern and eastern sides of Pointers Field in order to tie it to ground detail.

70 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations the City Council supported the proposed wards of Mile Cross, Nelson and Wensum. Norwich North Liberal Democrats supported the proposed Mile Cross ward as they had at Stage One. The Cat 'n' Fiddle Community Partnership proposed an amendment to the boundary between the proposed wards of Mile Cross and Catton Grove, as discussed in more detail above.

71 We have carefully considered all the representations received. In light of the support received for the proposed wards of Mile Cross, Nelson and Wensum we have decided to substantially confirm the draft recommendations as final. However, having examined the draft recommendations we note that Suffield Court has no access to the proposed Mile Cross ward. To address this anomaly we propose that Suffield Court be transferred to the proposed Sewell ward to provide a better reflection of local communities. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1% below the city average in Mile Cross ward (2% below by 2006), 3% above in Nelson ward (1% below by 2006) and 5% above in Wensum ward (2% above by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted in the back of the report.

Lakenham, St Stephen and Town Close wards

72 These wards are situated in the south of Norwich, with St Stephen ward being in the south-west, and Lakenham and Town Close wards in the south-east and each ward is represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 6% below the city average in Lakenham ward (9% below by 2006), 6% below in St Stephen ward (1% below by 2006) and 9% below in Town Close ward (14% below by 2006).

73 At Stage One the City Council proposed modifying the boundaries of Lakenham ward by transferring the northern part of the existing ward to its proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward, and a north-western section to its proposed Town Close ward. It also proposed transferring to Lakenham ward the southern part of the existing Town Close ward. The southern and eastern boundaries would be the same as the city boundary, which follows the River Yare. Its northern boundary would be the same as the southern boundary of the proposed Thorpe Hamlet ward as far as King Street, where it would follow Carrow Hill and Bracondale to Hall Road. The western boundary would run along Hall Road, around the edge of Lakenham Playing Fields and southwards along Ipswich Road to the river.

74 In addition to transferring to Town Close ward a north-western section of Lakenham ward, the Council also proposed that Town Close ward should take in the northern part of St Stephen ward. As detailed above, the southern part of the existing Town Close ward would be transferred to Lakenham ward. The northern boundary would be the inner ring road from Unthank Road to Hall Road, which would form its eastern boundary. The southern boundary would follow the edge of Lakenham Playing Fields, the outer ring road and Christ Church Road, while the western boundary would run along Unthank Road.

75 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the City Council's proposals for these wards. It noted that the Council's proposals would provide significant improvements in electoral equality while providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. However, the LGCE proposed to modify the south-eastern boundary of the Council's proposed Town Close ward to follow the rear of properties bordering the west of Lakenham Playing Fields in order to tie it to ground detail. It also proposed modifying the northern boundary of Lakenham ward to continue further south along Martineau Lane before following Trowse Bypass to the city boundary in order to provide a stronger, more recognisable boundary.

76 At Stage Three the City Council supported the proposed warding arrangement for this area. St Stephen's Community Partnership proposed that the proposed Town Close ward be renamed St Stephen ward 'to preserve the history of the area and to reflect the fact that there is more of St Stephen's ward in the new ward than Lakenham or Town Close wards'. Two of the Partnership's committee members proposed that the existing St Stephens ward should be retained. Another committee member opposed the proposed Town Close ward for not providing a satisfactory reflection of community identities and argued that modifying the boundary between St Stephen ward and Nelson ward would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria. Norwich South Conservative Association supported the proposed ward name of Town Close due to the 'historical significance of the Town Close Charity Estate'.

77 We have carefully considered the representations received. We note the proposal to rename Town Close ward, but we consider that the proposed name has received some support and reflects the comprising area. We also judge that we are unable to consider an area in isolation as our aim is to recommend electoral arrangements that give equality of representation throughout the review area. Therefore to achieve this objective we are unable to retain the existing St Stephen ward. We note the proposal to modify the boundary between the existing wards of Nelson and St Stephen, but we consider that we did not receive sufficient details or evidence of how this would better reflect the statutory criteria to move away from the draft recommendations.

78 We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 8% above the city average in Lakenham ward (4% above by 2006) and 5% above in Town Close ward (6% above by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Bowthorpe, Eaton and University wards

79 These three wards are situated in the west of the city and are each represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 44% above the city average in Bowthorpe ward (55% above by 2006), 8% above the average in Eaton ward (1% above by 2006) and 7% below in University ward (4% below by 2006).

80 At Stage One the City Council proposed modifying the boundary between Bowthorpe and University wards in order to improve electoral equality in Bowthorpe ward, where the greatest growth in Norwich is forecast. It proposed transferring from Bowthorpe ward to University ward the area north of Earlham Road bounded by the city boundary, Bridge Farm Lane, Rockingham Road, Hutchinson Road and Earlham Green Lane. The Council also proposed modifying the boundary of Eaton ward by transferring to it the southern part of St Stephen ward. The northern boundary of the proposed Eaton ward would follow the outer ring road and Christ Church Road to its junction with Unthank Road.

81 During Stage One Eaton Rise Residents' Association requested that Eaton Rise should remain in Eaton ward.

82 The LGCE carefully considered all the representations received for this area. It noted that the City Council's proposals would provide significant improvements to electoral equality while providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. The LGCE also noted that, under the Council's proposals, Eaton Rise would be retained in Eaton ward. The LGCE decided to adopt the City Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations.

83 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations the City Council supported the proposed wards of Bowthorpe, Eaton and University. Norwich Green Party opposed the proposal to divide the West Earlham estate between the proposed wards of Bowthorpe and University, but did not propose any alternative warding arrangements. We therefore consider that in the absence of any viable alternative we are unable to move away from the draft recommendations. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 5% below the city average in Bowthorpe ward (4% above by 2006), equal to the average in Eaton ward (5% below by 2006) and 3% below in University ward (equal to the average by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

84 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

85 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE's consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse its draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- we propose that the proposed Central ward should be renamed Mancroft ward;
- the whole of Britannia Road should be contained in Crome ward;
- there should be three minor boundary amendments to secure effective and convenient local government.

86 We conclude that, in Norwich:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 48 to 39;
- there should be 13 wards;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three.

87 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

| | 2001 electorate | | 2006 forecast electorate | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Current arrangements | Final recommendations | Current arrangements | Final recommendations |
| Number of councillors | 48 | 39 | 48 | 39 |
| Number of wards | 16 | 13 | 16 | 13 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 1,985 | 2,443 | 2,000 | 2,462 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

88 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10%, with no ward varying by more than 10% from the city average both now and by 2006. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation

Norwich City Council should comprise 39 councillors serving 13 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Norwich

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

89 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in the City of Norwich and submitted our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692).

90 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 10 September 2002

91 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW