LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR WARWICK

May 1999
The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.
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We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective 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, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

This report sets out the Commission’s draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Warwick.
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SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Warwick on 3 November 1998.

- This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.

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

- in eight of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;
- by 2003 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in nine wards and by more than 20 per cent in six wards.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 88-89) are that:

- Warwick District Council should have 46 councillors, one more than at present;
- there should be 20 wards, the same as at present;
- the boundaries of 14 of the existing wards should be modified, and six wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to take place every four years.

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each district councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- In 17 of the proposed 20 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.
- Electoral equality is forecast to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards projected to vary by no more than six per cent from the average by 2003.

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- revised warding arrangements for Kenilworth town.

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 25 May 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.
- After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 19 July 1999.

Review Manager
Warwick Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphins Court
10/11 Great Tarnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgece.gov.uk
### Figure 1: The Commission’s Draft Recommendations: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Constituent areas</th>
<th>Map reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abbey (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abbey ward (part); Stoneleigh ward (part – the Burton Green parish ward of Stoneleigh parish)</td>
<td>Maps 2, A2 and A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bishop’s Tachbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bishop’s Tachbrook ward (part – the parishes of Bishop’s Tachbrook)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brunswick (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Budbrooke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop’s Tachbrook ward (part – the parishes of Barford and Wasperton); Budbrooke ward (part – the parishes of Budbrooke, Norton Lindsey and Sherbourne); Leek Wootton ward (part – the parish of Hatton)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clarendon (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clarendon ward (part)</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Crown (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cubbington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cubbington ward (part – the parishes of Blackdown, Bobbenthal, Cubbington, Old Milverton, Wappenbury and Weston under Wetherley)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lapworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lapworth ward (part – the parishes of Bushwood, Lapworth and Rowington)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Leek Wootton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lapworth ward (part – the parishes of Backlesley Clinton and Wroxtall); Leek Wootton ward (part – the parishes of Beausale, Haseley, Honiley, Leek Wootton &amp; Guy’s Cliffe and Shrewley)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Manor (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clarendon ward (part); Manor ward</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Milverton (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clarendon ward (part); Milverton ward</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Park Hill (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Park Hill ward; St John’s ward (part)</td>
<td>Maps 2 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Radford Semele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cubbington ward (part – the parish of Eathorpe); Radford Semele ward (the parishes of Hunningham, Offchurch and Radford Semele)</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St John’s (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abbey ward (part); St John’s ward (part)</td>
<td>Maps 2 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Stoneleigh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stoneleigh ward (part – the parishes of Ashow and Baginton, and the Stoneleigh parish ward of Stoneleigh parish)</td>
<td>Maps 2 and A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Warwick North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Warwick South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Warwick West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Whitnash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged (the parish of Whitnash)</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Willes (Leamington Spa)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clarendon ward (part); Willes ward</td>
<td>Map 2 and large map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The town of Leamington Spa is the only unparished part of the district.
1. INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Warwick on which we are now consulting.

2 We are reviewing the five districts in Warwickshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

3 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Warwick. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1979 (Report No. 332). We intend to review Warwickshire County Council's electoral arrangements in due course.

4 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

5 We also have regard to our Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties (second edition published in March 1998). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the District Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

7 First, we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configurations are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

8 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

9 Third, we are not prescriptive on council size but, as indicated in our Guidance, would expect the overall number of members on a district or borough council usually to be between 30 and 60. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a district’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.
10 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

11 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the district council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

12 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Warwickshire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 Guidance. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

13 Stage One began on 3 November 1998, when we wrote to Wewitness District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Warwickshire County Council, Warwickshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament and the Member of the European Parliament with constituency interests in the district, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 8 February 1999.

14 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

15 Stage Three began on 25 May 1999 and will end on 19 July 1999. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

16 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from the two areas in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Submission of proposals to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Commission’s analysis and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

17 The district of Warwick lies in the centre of Warwickshire. The district covers some 28,283 hectares, and has a population of approximately 116,500. It is predominantly urban in character, and is centred upon the three historic towns of Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick. Whitnash is the fourth largest town in the district, while the remainder of the district is predominantly rural. The district contains 33 parishes. Leamington Spa is the only unparished part of the district, and contains more than a third of the district’s total electorate.

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

19 The electorate of the district is 95,471 (February 1998). The Council presently has 45 members who are elected from 20 wards. Thirteen of the wards are relatively urban, encompassing the four main towns of the district, with the remainder being predominantly rural. Eleven of the wards are each represented by three councillors, three are each represented by two councillors and six are single-member wards. The whole council is elected together every four years.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Warwick district, with around 19 per cent more electors than two decades ago, primarily as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in the Warwick and Kenilworth areas. Further housing developments are underway at present in the parish of Hatton and between Warwick and Whitnash.
Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (1998)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Number of councillors (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (2003)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abbey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>6,634</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bishop's Tachbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>7,749</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bulbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clarendon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Crown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cubbington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lapworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Leek Wootton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Manor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Milverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>6,431</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Park Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>3,874</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Radford Semele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St John's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,537</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Stoneleigh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Warwick North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,681</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Warwick South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>6,293</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Warwick West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Whitchurch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Willes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95,471</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Warwick District Council’s submission.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows the low (−) or high (+) in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (−) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example in 1998, electors in Crown ward were significantly over-represented by 33 per cent, while electors in Stoneleigh ward were relatively under-represented by 22 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Warwick District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers from the District Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 11 direct representations during Stage One, including district-wide schemes from the District Council and the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council. All these representations may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission, by appointment.

Warwick District Council

24 The District Council submitted a scheme which proposed a council of 46 members, one more than at present, representing 20 wards, the same as at present. Under these proposals, the majority of the wards throughout the district would be altered, the exceptions being Brunswick and Crown in Leamington Spa and Warwick North and Warwick West. Although the Council did not propose to alter the boundaries of Crown ward, it did propose reducing its representation from three to two members. The unparished Leamington Spa area would be partially re-warded and be served by a pattern of two two- and four three-member wards, a total of 16 councillors. The existing district wards in Warwick would remain largely unchanged, with relatively minor modifications to the eastern boundary of Warwick South ward and an increase in councillors serving the ward to three. In Kenilworth the Council proposed increasing the overall level of representation from eight to nine members. The rural areas would continue to be served by a pattern of single- and two-member wards, with the majority of ward boundaries modified. The Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

Warwick District Council Liberal Democrat Group

25 The Liberal Democrat Group on the Council supported the Council's proposals for the rural area without modification, but submitted alternative warding arrangements for three of the towns; Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick. The Group's proposals would provide an increase in representation for the district from 45 to 47 councillors (one more than proposed by the District Council), with the additional councillor serving Leamington Spa.

Warwickshire County Council

26 Warwickshire County Council requested that "when considering the boundaries for district council wards the Commission should ensure that either the wards can be contiguous with county electoral divisions or the wards can serve as building blocks to make up coherent county electoral divisions".

Parish and Town Councils

27 We received representations direct from three parish councils: Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council submitted a proposal for a reduction in the area's representation from two to one district councillor. It felt that representation by one district councillor to cover the three parts of the parish would provide for clearer representation locally. Cubbington Parish Council objected to the Council's proposal to move the parish of Eashtorp from Cubbington district ward into Radford Semele district ward, arguing that Eashtorp had more in common with Cubbington ward than with Radford Semele. Norton Lindsey Parish Council commented that the District Council's proposals would lead to a poorer level of electoral equality (and therefore representation) for their parish. It also stated that...
4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Warwick is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors being "as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough".

In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for 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.

Our Guidance states that, while we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, such an objective should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

Electorate Forecasts

The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2003, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 6 per cent from 95,471 to 100,966 over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. It expects a large proportion of the growth to be in the Warwick South ward, although a significant amount is also expected in the town of Whitnash and in the more rural Leek Wootton district ward (Harton parish). 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 District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained. No other representations on electorate forecasts were received.

We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the District Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

We indicated in our Guidance that we would normally expect the number of councillors serving a district or borough council to be in the range of 30 to 60. As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government.

Warwick District Council presently has 45 members. The District Council proposed a council size of 46 members, representing an increase of one. The Liberal Democrat Group on the Council submitted a scheme based on an overall council size of 47 members. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and
other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received (see also paragraph 41 below), we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council size of 46 members. We would welcome any further evidence on council size during Stage Three.

Electoral Arrangements

38 We have carefully considered all the representations made to us during Stage One, including the districts wide schemes from the District Council and the Liberal Democrat Group. The Council proposed a pattern of two- and three-member wards throughout the towns of Kenilworth, Leamington Spa, Warwick and Whitchurch, and single- and two-member wards in the more rural areas of the district. These proposals would result in significant improvements to electoral equality; with no ward having an electoral variance greater than 9 per cent from the average by 2003.

39 The Liberal Democrat Group supported the District Council's proposals for the more rural parts of the district without modification. The Group supported the Council's proposals for Kenilworth and Warwick in respect of the overall number of councillors, although it put forward alternative ward boundaries. In Leamington Spa however, the Group proposed that overall 17 councillors should serve the town while the Council proposed that it should be served by 16.

40 Both submissions were broadly correct in their assumptions for the number of councillors serving Leamington Spa. Under an overall council size of 46, as proposed by the Council, Leamington Spa merits 16.82 councillors on 1998 figures but 16.21 councillors by 2003. Under a council size of 47 though, as put forward by the Liberal Democrat Group, the town merits 17.18 councillors initially, 16.57 councillors by 2003. In terms of the overall levels of electoral equality, there is little to choose between the schemes. In both cases no ward in Leamington Spa would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average by 2003.

41 However, in terms of the boundaries put forward, the Council's proposals involve minimal change to the good boundaries which already exist in Leamington Spa. Those changes that are proposed follow clearly identifiable boundaries.

The Liberal Democrat Group's proposals, in our view, would not secure such well defined boundaries and in some parts of the towns, particularly between the proposed wards of Manor and Clarendon, the proposals did not appear to best reflect local community identities. Therefore, while a case could be made for 17 councillors for Leamington Spa, we believe that the Council's proposals for 16 councillors in the town meet our statutory criteria.

42 In view of the degree of consensus between the Liberal Democrat Group and the Council over much of the latter's proposals, the good levels of electoral equality that would result and the consultation exercise which was undertaken with interested parties, we have concluded that we should base our draft recommendations on the Council's scheme. We consider that the scheme would generally provide a better balance between securing electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements, or that other schemes submitted at Stage One.

43 However, to improve electoral equality further and have regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to deviate from the Council's proposals in two areas; the Kenilworth town wards of Abbey, St John's and Park Hill, and the wards of Bishop's Tachbrook, Warwick South and Whitchurch. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- Leamington Spa town (six wards);
- Warwick town (three wards);
- Kenilworth town (three wards);
- The rural area (including the town of Whitchurch).

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

45 The scheme proposed by the District Council would result in an overall improvement in electoral equality for the six wards of Leamington, Warwick, and Whitchurch. However, the proposed number of councillors will be reduced from three to two. It also proposed relatively minor modifications to the boundaries of the Clarendon, Manor, Milverton and Willes wards in order to improve the overall levels of electoral equality, and that the number of councillors representing Clarendon ward be reduced from three to two.

46 The scheme proposed by the District Council would result in an overall improvement in electoral equality for the six wards of Leamington, Warwick, Crown, Manor, Milverton and Willes, with the respective wards initially varying by 3 per cent, 1 per cent, 3 per cent, 6 per cent, 7 per cent and 9 per cent from the district average (3 per cent, 1 per cent, 2 per cent, 1 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent from the average by 2003).

47 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that Leamington Spa be represented by 17 councillors, one more than under the Council's proposals, and this was supported by County Councillor Marshall. The Group proposed a scheme which was predominantly based on two-member wards, and included extensive revisions to existing wards. In our view, the Group's proposals could have a detrimental effect on local community identities and interests. Although we acknowledge that its proposal to use the river Leam as a ward boundary reflects community ties, we consider that the suggested boundaries elsewhere in the town may be somewhat artificial. For example, its proposals would move away from using the strong boundaries of Campion Road and the A452 road (Dale Street) as ward boundaries, and would create a somewhat artificial boundary in the south western part of the proposed Manor ward.

48 Although electoral equality would be similar under both the proposals from the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group, we consider that the Council's proposals have the advantage of using more clearly definable boundaries, and may also better reflect local communities. We are therefore putting the Council's proposals forward for consultation as our draft recommendations, as detailed in Map 2 and on the large map inserted at the back of the report. We would welcome views from all interested parties at Stage Three.

Warwick town (three wards)

51 Warwick town is currently represented by eight district councillors returned from three wards: North, South and West. Warwick North and Warwick West wards are each represented by three members, with Warwick South ward represented by two members. Warwick North and Warwick West are both well represented on the Council at present, varying by 5 per cent and 1 per cent from the average respectively (equal to the average and 2 per cent by 2003). However, Warwick South is one of the two most under-represented wards in the district at present, varying by 27 per cent above the average and projected to worsen to 40 per cent by 2003 as a result of large scale housing developments.

52 Both the Council and Liberal Democrat Group submitted warding proposals for the town. The Council proposed that there should be no modifications to the ward boundaries of either Warwick North or Warwick West wards. It proposed that in order to achieve better electoral equality for Warwick South ward and in view of the new housing developments which are currently under construction on the Warwick, Whitchurch and Bishop's Tachbrook boundary, modifications should be made between Warwick South ward and

Brunswick, Manor, Milverton and Willes are well represented, all varying by no more than 4 per cent from the average number of electors per councillor either initially or by 2003. However, the wards of Clarendon and Crown are both substantially over-represented, varying by 22 per cent and 33 per cent below the district average respectively (25 per cent and 36 per cent by 2003).
the parishes of Whinshill and Bishop's Tachbrook, in addition to allocating an additional (third) councillor to Warwick South to improve electoral equality in the area.

5. Under the Council's proposals, the unchanged Warwick North and Warwick West wards would vary by 7 per cent and 2 per cent from the district average respectively (2 per cent and 4 per cent by 2003). The modified three-member Warwick South ward would initially vary by 13 per cent below the average. However, because of the projected increase in electorate due to housing development, the ward was forecast to improve to 9 per cent below by 2003. The Liberal Democrat Group supported the Council's proposed boundary modification in this area.

6. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that Warwick be represented by four wards. It proposed that East, North and South wards should return two members each, with the fourth, Warwick West, returning three members. These proposals would produce levels of electoral equality comparable with the District Council's scheme. Under the Group's scheme (for 47 councillors overall) the four wards would vary from the average by 1 per cent, 3 per cent, 6 per cent and 2 per cent by 2003.

7. Given the relatively good levels of electoral equality that both sets of proposals would produce, we looked at the boundaries which the two schemes submitted for this area would result in. The Council's proposals in Warwick would involve minimal changes to the existing clear ward boundaries. The Liberal Democrat Group's proposals, by contrast, would involve substantial changes to the wards in Warwick. When looking in detail at the Liberal Democrats' proposed boundaries, it appeared that some of them were fairly arbitrary and could combine areas with relatively few ties, for example, in the centre of the town, placing electors to the south of the Grand Union Canal with those to its north. We are of the view that the canal provides a strong boundary in this area.

8. Although electoral equality would be broadly similar under either scheme, the Council's proposals appear to us to facilitate better boundaries. We are therefore putting its proposals forward, with one exception. Its proposal to alter parish boundaries in the area of new housing near the Warwick/Bishop's Tachbrook/Whinshill boundary is not supported. Under a Periodic Electoral Review, we are unable to propose changes to the administrative boundaries of civil parishes. The District Council is able to carry out such a review under the Local Government and Rating Act (1997).

9. To facilitate the Council's proposals in this area would require the re-warding of parishes and we are not convinced that such re-warding in an area of very new housing, still under construction, would result in effective and convenient local government. Additionally, better electoral equality can be achieved without parish re-warding. We are therefore putting forward for consultation the Council's proposals for three three-member wards for Warwick, but with no changes to the current ward boundaries. We would welcome further views from interested parties at Stage Three. See Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of the report for further details.

Kenilworth town (three wards)

10. The town of Kenilworth is presently served by eight district councillors representing three wards. The three-member Abbey ward is 3 per cent above the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent below by 2003). The three-member Park Hill ward is over-represented, varying by 9 per cent from the average (14 per cent by 2003). Conversely, the three-member St John's ward is under-represented, varying by 18 per cent from the average (15 per cent by 2003).

11. We received four specific representations regarding Kenilworth during Stage One; the District Council, the Liberal Democrat Group, and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups on Kenilworth Town Council. All of these representations argued that the neighbouring Burton Green parish of Stoneleigh parish (containing 540 electors) should be incorporated into the town for district council warding purposes. All four representations also proposed an overall increase in representation for Kenilworth from eight to nine district councillors. By including the Burton Green electors, Kenilworth is centred to this level of representation, although the case for an increase in representation for the town is dependent on the inclusion of these additional electors.

12. Given the local consensus for this proposal, and that it facilitates our proposals elsewhere in the district, we agree that an 'expanded' Kenilworth area should in future be represented by nine district councillors. The arguments in favour of the Burton Green area being included within Kenilworth for district warding purposes are strong; not only are there reasonable ties between the two areas but the electors in the rest of Stoneleigh parish are some distance from Burton Green. Additionally, the loss of Burton Green from the Stoneleigh district ward improves electoral equality in that area (see also later paragraphs).

13. The Council proposed that the Burton Green parish ward be added to a revised three-member Park Hill ward. Such a ward would initially equal the average number of electors per councillor, becoming 5 per cent below by 2003. It also proposed that there should be boundary changes within Kenilworth such that the three-member Abbey and St John's wards would also be revised. Under the Council's proposals, these two wards would initially vary from the district average by 1 per cent and 3 per cent (4 per cent and 7 per cent by 2003).

14. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that a revised Abbey ward remain represented by three councillors, the remainder of Kenilworth be represented by two-member wards. Like the Council, it proposed that the Burton Green parish ward be placed with the Park Hill area of the town. Under the Liberal Democrat scheme, which assumed a 47-member council size overall, the revised Abbey and Park Hill wards would respectively vary by 4 per cent and 1 per cent from the average by 2003. A revised St John's ward and a new Windy Arbour ward were also proposed, with these wards varying by 5 per cent below the average and equalling it by 2003 under a 47-member council size.

15. We received representations from the Liberal Democrat and Conservative groups on Kenilworth Town Council. The Liberal Democrat town councillors' submission was similar to that of the Liberal Democrat Group to the District Council in that it proposed three three-member wards for Kenilworth and one three-member ward. However, their exact boundary proposals differed from the Liberal Democrat Group in certain areas — for example, the Liberal Democrat town councillors proposed that the Burton Green parish ward be placed with a revised Abbey ward, rather than a revised Park Hill ward.

16. The Conservative town councillors in Kenilworth proposed three three-member wards for the town, their proposals being similar to those put forward by the District Council. However, they proposed an alternative boundary between the proposed Abbey and St John's wards. The Conservative town councillors also commented on Town Council electoral arrangements and the frequency of elections in Kenilworth. Overall, both the Liberal Democrat and Conservative town councillors' proposals would secure reasonable levels of electoral equality in Kenilworth.

17. We were therefore faced with four different sets of proposals for Kenilworth and we have examined them in the light of the statutory criteria. Although we concur with the representations in respect of the inclusion of Burton Green within Kenilworth for district council warding purposes, three of the four submissions proposed that the area should be included in a revised Park Hill ward. We do not agree with this proposal on the grounds of community identity; the main road from Burton Green to Kenilworth leads directly to housing within the Abbey ward (the north-western part of the town) rather than Park Hill ward.

18. In terms of the number of councillors to be elected per ward, the patterns put to us (to attain nine district councillors for Kenilworth) were three three-member, or three two-member wards plus one three-member ward. Both patterns would secure reasonable levels of electoral equality. Given the present predominance of three-member wards in the urban areas of Warwick district (i.e. the towns of Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick) and that Kenilworth presently has three district wards, we are of the view that three three-member wards would be the most appropriate warding pattern for the town. We would welcome further views on this issue during Stage Three.

19. We are therefore proposing to build upon elements of the local submissions received and put forward our own scheme for Kenilworth. We propose that the three-member Abbey district ward be modified by the addition of the Burton Green parish ward (540 electors) from Stoneleigh parish. We also propose that theKF polling district (containing 977 electors) in the south-west of Kenilworth be transferred from Abbey ward to St John's ward. Under our scheme, the revised three-member Abbey ward would vary by 2 per cent below the average initially, 6 per cent by 2003.
To attain optimum electoral equality between three-member Park Hill and St John's wards it is necessary to transfer nearly 2,500 electors from the latter to the former. In order to achieve this with minimum disruption to local community identities, we propose transferring polling districts MF and MG, together with the northern part of polling district MD, into the revised Park Hill ward. Under our proposals, the revised Park Hill and St John's wards would vary by 1 per cent above and 2 per cent below the district average, projected to be 4 per cent and 5 per cent below by 2003.

We believe our proposals best meet the need for electoral equality within Kenilworth, while reflecting local community identities as far as practicable. We would very much welcome views on our draft recommendations for Kenilworth, which are shown in more detail on Maps A2 and A3 in Appendix A. Proposals in respect of Kenilworth Town Council's electoral arrangements are detailed at the end of this chapter.

The rural area (eight wards)

The single-member Bishop's Tachbrook ward presently comprises the parishes of Barford, Bishop's Tachbrook and Waspton, and varies above the average number of electors per councillor by 27 per cent, increasing to 48 per cent by 2003 primarily due to projected house building in the area. The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group both proposed the establishment of a new single-member Bishop's Tachbrook district ward, comprising solely the parish of Barford. The Barford-Waspton parishes would be transferred to a revised Budbrooke ward, as detailed later in this chapter.

To take account of the planned house building in this area, the proposed Bishop's Tachbrook ward would initially be substantially over-represented by 24 per cent, but was projected to improve to just 1 per cent from the average by 2003. The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group also proposed minor changes to the northern boundary of the ward at its juncture with Whitmarsh and Warwick South. Such a change in the ward boundary would require the warding of Bishop's Tachbrook parish in this area, under Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

The Council, in its submission, reported that Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council had stated that "at present [it] wished to retain the isolated status of the parish". No reference was made to the desirability or otherwise of parish warding in the area. In view of this, and the good level of electoral equality that a single-member ward comprising solely the parish of Bishop's Tachbrook would result in (having regard to our proposals), the District council and the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals for neighbouring wards in this area have considerable merit, and to alter the proposed boundaries would have detrimental effect on the neighbouring wards, particularly in terms of electoral equality.

We considered whether the proposed two-member Budbrooke ward could be divided into two single-member wards, but the spread of electorate makes this impractical - we would need to divide the parish of Budbrooke between the two single-member wards to attain reasonable electoral equality, a proposition which does not appear to have local support and which would require parish wards being created in the area. We are therefore endorsing the proposed two-member Budbrooke ward as part of our draft recommendations, and would welcome any further views during Stage Three.

The two-member Cubbington ward currently consists of the parishes of Cubbington, Westover-under-Weatherley, Babbenhall, Wappenbury, Eathorpe, Blackdown and Old Milverton, and varies from the district average by 5 per cent (3 per cent by 2003). The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the ward should be revised, excluding the parish of Eathorpe which would be transferred into a modified Radford Semele ward. The modified Cubbington ward would vary by 5 per cent from the district average, 2 per cent by 2003. During Stage One, Cubbington Parish Council opposed the proposed alteration to the ward, arguing that Eathorpe residents have a greater affinity with Cubbington than with Radford Semele parish.

We acknowledge the views of Cubbington Parish Council, and accept that there may be good links between Cubbington and Eathorpe. However, if the present Radford Semele ward were to remain unchanged, the number of electors per councillor to this ward would vary from the district average by 8 per cent by 2003 under a 46-member council size. By transferring the parish of Eathorpe into Radford Semele ward, electoral equality is improved, and for both there and in the revised Cubbington ward, neither varying by more than 2 per cent from the average by 2003. We have concluded that as the proposal put forward by the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group for a modified Cubbington ward provides improved electoral equality, we should put it forward for consultation.

The single-member Radford Semele ward comprises the parishes of Radford Semele, Huntingdon and Oldchurch, and varies from the district average by 6 per cent (19 per cent by 2003). As stated above, the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the ward should be revised to include the parish of Eathorpe. The enlarged Radford Semele ward would vary from the district average by 1 per cent (2 per cent by 2003). While Cubbington Parish Council objected to the proposal, as detailed above, the scheme provides for an improved level of electoral equality without, on our understanding, having a particularly adverse effect on community identities. We are therefore putting forward the proposal for consultation and would welcome any further views during Stage Three.

The single-member Lapworth ward consists of the parishes of Baddeley Clinton, Bushwood, Lapworth, Rowington and Wossall, and varies from the district average by 15 per cent (11 per cent by 2003). The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed that, in order to improve electoral equality, Lapworth ward should be revised to comprise solely the parishes of Lapworth, Bushwood and Rowington, giving an electoral variance of 7 per cent (2 per cent by 2003). The parishes of Baddeley Clinton and Wossall would be transferred into a revised Leck Wootton ward (see below). Given the reasonable level of electoral equality secured and that we received no alternative representations, we are content to put the proposal for a revised Lapworth ward forward for consultation.

The single-member Leck Wootton ward comprises the parish of Leck Wootton, Hanley, Leck Wootton & Guy's Cliffe and Shrewley, and varies from the district average by 2 per cent. However, due to projected housing developments in the parish of Hanley, electoral equality is expected to worsen considerably by 2003, by which time Leck Wootton ward would be under represented by 41 per cent. The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed amendments to the ward in order to improve electoral equality (see also the earlier section relating to the neighbouring Budbrooke ward).
The revised Leek Wootton ward would comprise all the parishes from the present ward of that name, except for Hatton, and would additionally include the parishes of Baddestley Clinton and Wroxall from the current Lapworth ward. Hatton parish would, as described earlier, form part of a revised two-member Budbrooke ward. The revised single-member Leek Wootton ward would vary from the district average by 3 per cent (equal to the average by 2003). During Stage One, Beasly, Hasley, Honiley and Wroxall Joint Parish Council stated that it had no objections to the Council's proposals. We have concluded that the proposed Leek Wootton ward provides a good balance between the need for electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and we therefore put the proposal forward for consultation. We would welcome any further views during Stage Three.

The single-member Stoneleigh ward comprises the parishes of Ashop, Baginton and Stoneleigh, and has an electoral variance of 21 per cent above the district average (22 per cent by 2003). The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the present ward should be modified to comprise the parishes of Ashop and Baginton plus the Stoneleigh parish ward of Stoneleigh parish. The remaining part of Stoneleigh parish (the Burton Green parish ward) would be transferred into Kenilworth town for district warding purposes (as detailed earlier). Both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat town councillors in Kenilworth also proposed the inclusion of Burton Green with a Kenilworth-based ward.

The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group also proposed a minor modification to the boundary between Park Hill ward in Kenilworth and Stoneleigh parish, in order to tidy up an existing anomaly. However, this would involve changes to parish boundaries, which are not within our remit as part of this Periodic Electoral Review. We are of the view that such anomalies are best dealt with by the District Council, using its powers under the Local Government & Rating Act (1997). Given the reasonable levels of electoral equality that would be secured under the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group's proposal - the revised Stoneleigh ward would vary by 3 per cent from the average initially and equal it by 2003 - we have decided to put it forward for consultation, although without the amendment of the Park Hill/Stoneleigh boundary. We would welcome any further views on this proposal during Stage Three.

The three-member ward of Whitham consists solely of Whitham town and has an electoral variance of 11 per cent below the district average (1 per cent by 2003). The Council and Liberal Democrat Group proposed that in order to take account of large-scale local housing developments, a revision to the town's boundaries be made, as previously discussed in relation to Bishop's Tachbrook ward. As previously detailed, we are unable to amend the external boundaries of a parish or town as part of a Periodic Electoral Review, and the Council and Liberal Democrat Group's proposal would necessitate the warding of Bishop's Tachbrook parish.

We do not believe that a case for such warding has been justified, and are therefore proposing that the boundaries of the Whitham ward should be unchanged, particularly as a good level of electoral equality (by 2003) would be secured by such a proposal. The number of electors per councillor in an unchanged Whitham district ward would initially vary from the district average by 9 per cent (2 per cent by 2003) assuming a council size of 46. We therefore concur with the proposal for a three-member Whitham district ward, although without the suggested boundary change. We would welcome further views on this proposal during Stage Three. See Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of the report for further details.

Electoral Cycle

During Stage One of the review the District Council supported the continuation of whole council elections for the district, while Warwick and Leamington Green Party expressed a preference for elections by thirds. Kenilworth Town Council Conservative Group also commented on the electoral cycle although its suggestions are not permitted under current legislation. No other representations were received on this issue. In view of the lack of widespread support for change, we make no recommendation for change to the electoral cycle, but would welcome any further evidence.

Conclusions

Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

(a) there should be an increase in council size from 45 to 46;
(b) there should be 20 wards, the same as at present;
(c) the boundaries of 14 of the existing wards should be modified, whilst six wards should retain their existing boundaries;
(d) elections should continue to be held on a whole-council basis.

As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations to a large extent on the Council's proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

(i) in Kenilworth, we propose that the Burton Green parish ward of Stoneleigh parish should form part of a revised Ashop ward and that the St John's and Park Hill wards be modified to take account of this;
(ii) there should be no change to the boundaries of Warwick South ward or to the parishes of Bishop's Tachbrook and Whitham;
(iii) there should be no change to the parish boundary between Stoneleigh parish and Kenilworth.

Draft Recommendation

Warwick District Council should comprise 46 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report. There should be no change to the electoral cycle.

Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1998 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2003.

As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Warwick District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 4 to 3. By 2003, no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for Kenilworth town to reflect the proposed district wards.

As a consequence of our recommendations for the town of Kenilworth, the parish warding arrangements within Kenilworth should be altered to reflect the new district ward boundaries. We
propose that a revised Abbey parish ward (less the Burton Green parish ward of Stoneleigh parish) be made coterminous with the district ward of the same name. We also propose that revised St John's and Park Hill parish wards be made coterminous with the district wards of the same names. We are not proposing any changes be made to the number of town councillors elected from each ward but we would very much welcome views on this point from all interested parties during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation
The boundary between the three Kenilworth town council wards of Abbey, St John's and Park Hill should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on Maps A2 and A3.

We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

Draft Recommendation
For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the District Council.

We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Warwick and welcome comments from the District Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2:
The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Warwick
5. NEXT STEPS

We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Warwick. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 19 July 1999. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the District Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Warwick Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphins Court
10/11 Great Barnstaple
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@gcc.gov.uk

In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.
APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Warwick: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Warwick area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 and A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Kenilworth.

Map A3 illustrates the proposal to include the Burton Green parish ward of Stoneleigh parish within the revised Abbey ward.

The large map inserted at the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa and Whitnash.
APPENDIX B

Warwick District
Council's Proposed
Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ substantively from those put forward by the District Council only in three wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure B1:
Warwick District Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Constituent areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>Abbey ward (part); St John's ward (part);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill</td>
<td>Abbey ward (part); St John's ward (part); Stoneleigh ward (part – the parish ward of Burton Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's</td>
<td>St John's ward (part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Warwick District Council also proposed boundary changes between the wards of Bishop's Tachbrook, Warwick Saal and Whitnash, and between the wards Abbey and Stoneleigh. We are not including these proposals as part of our draft recommendations.
Figure B2: Warwick District Council’s Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abbey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bishop’s Tachbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Budbrooke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clarendon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Crown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cubbington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lapworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Leek Wootton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Manor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Milverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,669</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Park Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Radford Semle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St John’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Stoneleigh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Warwick North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,681</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Warwick South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,899</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>6,003</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Warwick West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Whitnash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,688</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>6,975</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Willes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,890</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95,471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Warwick District Council’s submission.
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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: The Commission’s Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken no later than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission’s predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBCC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.1 Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission’s review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

(a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
(b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBCC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority’s area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

- Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government elections of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

(a) the ratio of the number of local government elections to the number of councillors to be
eleced shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;

(3) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;

(4) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (2) above, regard should be had to:

(a) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

(a) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(b) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

(a) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(b) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(c) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.