

# Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council

Electoral review

July 2014

### **Translations and other formats**

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

Tel: 020 7664 8534

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

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

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2014

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Rural area	9
North Peterborough	10
Central Peterborough	11
South Peterborough	13
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	21
4 Mapping	23
Appendices	
A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Peterborough City Council	21
B Glossary and abbreviations	23



# Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Peterborough City Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in August 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
24 September 2013	Consultation on council size
14 January 2014	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
2 April 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 July 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
7 October 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Submissions received

We received 32 submissions during our consultation on council size, and 24 submissions during our consultation on warding arrangements.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and draft recommendations

### Electorate figures

Peterborough City Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 11% over this period. This represents a high level of growth, predominantly in the south of the city. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

### Council size

Peterborough City Council currently has a council size of 57. The Council originally proposed a council size of 60. In support of this increase, the Council highlighted the high workload of its cabinet members and backbench members, which is expected to become greater in coming years.

In its warding pattern submission for the authority, the Council proposed a further increase to 61. We were not persuaded that such an increase was necessary, and in any case given that the Council elects by thirds, the Commission has a presumption in favour of three-member wards, and therefore towards council sizes which are divisible by three.

During consultation, we did not receive persuasive evidence in support of any other council size for Peterborough. We have therefore adopted a council size of 60 as part of our draft recommendations.

## General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during consultation on warding arrangements, we have developed proposals based on a combination of the submissions received. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on the scheme developed by the Council. We have proposed amendments to the scheme, notably in the rural area to the west of the city, and in the south-east of the city in order to provide draft recommendations which better reflect our statutory criteria. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the district.

## What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council contained in the report. **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 these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **6 October 2014**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

**Review Officer**  
**Peterborough Review**  
**The Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**Layden House**  
**76–86 Turnmill Street**  
**London EC1M 5LG**  
[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our draft recommendations for Peterborough City Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Peterborough City Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to Peterborough City Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during the consultation on warding patterns informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council*.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council in early 2015.

## What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Peterborough?

6 We decided to conduct this review because based on December 2012 electorate data, 33% of the city's wards currently have a variance of more than 10%. Of these, one ward – Orton with Hampton – has an electoral variance of 34%.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your ward name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change as a result of our recommendations.

---

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

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 6 October 2014. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in early 2015. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 17 and more information can be found on our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

9 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed ward boundaries, ward names and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Peterborough is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (‘the 2009 Act’),<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

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

13 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

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

15 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Peterborough City Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any

---

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

evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

## Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Peterborough City Council ('the Council') and met with members, parish council representatives and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

17 During consultation on warding patterns we received 24 submissions which included a city-wide scheme from the Council. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

18 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period approximately five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 11% over this period.

19 We are satisfied the Council's forecasts provide realistic projection of growth in Peterborough and have used these as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

20 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to us to increase the council size to 60 members. During this preliminary period we also received a submission from Thorney Parish Council which favoured reducing the number of councillors from 57. We received 32 submissions during our council size consultation. These were from six city councillors, 21 residents, three parish councils, the local association of parish councils, and an MEP. The Council did not submit further comments in this round of public consultation.

21 Five of the six city councillors supported a council size of 60 while one did not – Councillor Swift (North ward) favoured a reduction to 38 members.

22 Thorney Parish Council reiterated its submission in favour of reducing Peterborough's council size, while two other parishes made submissions, but referred only to potential warding arrangements, not to the overall council size.

23 We received 21 submissions from local residents. Two supported a council size of 60, while 19 favoured reducing the council size from its present membership of 57. Seven local residents specified a figure to reduce to, while the other 12 favoured a reduction without specifying a particular number.

24 We carefully considered the representations received during consultation. We considered that the Council's original submission proposing a council of 60 had been supported by adequate evidence to justify increasing the existing council size. We were satisfied that the Council demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under the proposed council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been provided to justify a reduction in council size. Those respondents who proposed a reduction did not, in our view, adequately justify their preferred number in the context of the size and geographical nature of the City. We therefore consulted on electoral arrangements for the city based on a council size of 60 members.

25 During the consultation on warding patterns, the Council proposed increasing the council size by a further one councillor, to 61 members. This was to incorporate a single-member Barnack ward within its proposals. As Peterborough elects by thirds, the presumption in legislation is that all the wards should be represented by three councillors. As a consequence, the council size should be a figure which can be divisible by three. Accordingly, we are not minded to increase the council size to 61.

## Electoral fairness

26 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The city average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (134,535 in 2013 and 150,040 by 2020) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 60 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 2,242 in 2013 and 2,501 by 2020.

28 Under the draft recommendations, none of our proposed 20 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2020.

## General analysis

29 We received 24 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns for Peterborough. The Council submitted an authority-wide proposal. We also

received submissions from seven parish councils and the Barnack Ward group of parish councils. We also received submissions from three city councillors, the Liberal Democrat Group on the council, Peterborough Liberal Democrats, Brookfield & Dukesmead Residents' Association and nine local residents.

30 The Council's proposal was for 21 wards – one single-member ward and 20 three-member wards. The single-member ward (Barnack) was identical to the existing Barnack ward. The Council used some of the existing boundaries as part of its proposed wards, and railway lines and main roads as boundaries in several areas.

31 The Liberal Democrat Group on the Council proposed a different pattern of wards in the north of the urban area. However, the rest of the submissions received referred to specific areas, both in the urban area and in the rural area.

32 Several parish councils opposed the introduction of three-member wards across the authority. To the west of the city, Barnack Parish Council and Ufford Parish Council favoured retaining the single-member Barnack ward. To the east of the city, the parish councils of Eye, Thorney and Peakirk all stated that they did not wish to be part of a three-member ward.

33 Four local residents made comments regarding the Hampton area, while the remaining submissions from local residents covered various different areas of the city.

34 Our draft recommendations are largely based on the Council's proposed ward boundaries – however, given that the Council proposed a 61-member scheme and our draft recommendations are for a pattern based on a 60-member council, there are some differences. Most notably, the differences are in the western rural area, and in Stanground. We have used, without modification, some wards that the Council proposed; however we have also proposed different wards from the Council in several areas of the city.

35 Our draft recommendations are for 20 three-member wards. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral imbalance of greater than 10% from the average for Peterborough by 2020. A summary of our proposed electoral arrangement is set out in Table A1 (on pages 21–22) and the map accompanying this report.

## Electoral arrangements

36 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of Peterborough. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Rural area (pages 9–10)
- North Peterborough (pages 10–11)
- Central Peterborough (pages 11–13)

- South Peterborough (pages 13–14)

37 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 21–22 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Rural area

38 The rural area of the authority is to the east, west and north of the urban area. The largest settlements in the rural area are Thorney, Eye and Glinton.

39 To the west and north of the city, the Council proposed a single-member Barnack ward and a three-member Glinton, Northborough & Wittering ward. The single-member Barnack ward is identical to the existing Barnack ward. Barnack Parish Council, the Barnack Ward Group of Parishes, Ufford Parish Council and Councillor Over (Barnack) all favoured a single-member Barnack ward.

40 The Council used community identity evidence in support of its proposal for a single-member Barnack ward, and we recognise that there is strong evidence of close community links in this area. The Council also gave numerical reasons in arguing for an additional councillor for the authority. We are not persuaded by the Council's reasoning, and as discussed below, it is possible to have a viable uniform pattern of three-member wards across the authority.

41 As an exception to the presumption of providing for a uniform pattern of three-member wards, we considered the possibility of dividing the combined area of the Council's proposed Barnack and Glinton, Northborough & Wittering wards in to a single-member and a two-member ward respectively. However, the two-member ward would have 52% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. Accordingly, we are recommending a three-member Barnack ward, and a three-member West ward.

42 Our proposed Barnack ward comprises the parishes of Bainton, Barnack, Deeping Gate, Etton, Glinton, Helpston, Maxey, Northborough, St Martin's Without, Southorpe, Ufford, Upton, Wittering and Wothorpe. This three-member ward would have 9% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

43 To the south of Barnack ward, we are recommending a three-member West ward which contains a mixture of urban and rural areas. In order to provide for a uniform pattern of three-member wards which have good electoral equality, it is necessary to have this mixture of urban and rural communities. Given the spread of population in the parishes on the other side of the city, we consider that the area to the west of the city is the most suitable location to propose such a three-member ward.

44 We also received a submission from a local resident that expressed concern about residents in Longthorpe being in a large ward, as the community is 'distinctive and cohesive'. Given the presumption to have three-

member wards in an authority which elects by thirds, geographically large wards are very likely to be the result. Therefore, small communities like Longthorpe will form part of larger wards, with various different communities within them.

45 Our proposed West ward runs from Thornhaugh parish to the western edge of the city, taking in parts of Bretton and Longthorpe. We consider that although this is a large ward, the A47 represents a strong communication link across its area, linking the various communities. This ward would have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

46 In the rural area to the east of Peterborough, the Council proposed a largely rural ward comprising the parishes of Borough Fen, Eye, Newborough, Peakirk and Thorney.

47 We received a submission from Peakirk Parish Council which argued against having a three-member ward in the rural area. Thorney Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be part of a single-member ward for the village, and that it has different issues and concerns from the neighbouring Eye parish. Eye Parish Council favoured being in a two-member ward which covered the parish – the parish is currently split between two city wards.

48 A single-member Thorney ward and a two-member Eye & Newborough ward would have 19% fewer and 13% more electors per councillor respectively than the city average by 2020. Given the high electoral variances that would result, we have decided not to depart from the uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area.

49 Our proposed three-member Eye, Thorney & Newborough ward is projected to have 2% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

## North Peterborough

50 The northern area of Peterborough city runs from Werrington in the north, to the A47 Soke Parkway, which forms the boundary between some of the wards proposed by the Council.

51 The Council proposed the three-member wards of Bretton, Gunthorpe, Paston & Walton and Werrington. We also received a submission from the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council. The wards proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group were similar in places to the Council's, but differed mainly in the Gunthorpe and Paston areas.

52 We consider that the Liberal Democrat Group's proposed wards use strong boundaries in some areas, but in others appear to divide communities and do not always follow easily identifiable boundaries. The Group's proposed Walton ward covers both sides of the Soke Parkway which, in our view, is a very strong boundary. We consider that overall the Council's proposed wards

provide for strong boundaries, and good electoral equality. We are proposing to adopt the Council's proposed Gunthorpe ward.

53 We have decided to modify the Council's proposed Paston & Walton and Werrington wards. Brookfield & Dukesmead Residents' Association argued that Dukesmead Mobile Home Park has closer community links to the proposed Werrington ward. We agree with the Residents' Association's view, and note that the mobile home park's main road access is to the north, towards Werrington.

54 We have amended the Council's proposed Bretton ward in two areas. Firstly, we have included Marholm parish in this ward, to improve electoral equality in both our proposed Barnack and Bretton wards. Although Marholm is just outside the main urban area of Peterborough, we consider that its proximity to other areas in the ward and the clear access provided by Walton Road, means that it fits most conveniently in Bretton ward. Secondly, we have amended the Council's proposed boundary between this ward and its proposed West ward. Our change moves an area of properties off Bretton Way into West ward in order to improve electoral equality.

55 Our draft recommendations for the northern area of the city provide for the three-member wards for Bretton, Gunthorpe, Paston & Walton and Werrington. These wards are projected to have 9% fewer, 7% more, 3% more and 10% more electors per councillor respectively than the city average by 2020.

## Central Peterborough

56 The central area of Peterborough covers the area south of the Soke Parkway, and north of the River Nene.

57 The Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed different wards in this area of the city. A local resident commented that Bluebell Avenue and Welland Close should be in Dogsthorpe ward but provided no evidence to support this.

58 As noted in paragraph 52, the Liberal Democrat Group's proposed Walton ward crosses the Soke Parkway, which we consider to be a strong boundary. We have adopted the Parkway as a boundary in this area and, as a consequence, we are moving away from the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals. We are therefore recommending different wards for Dogsthorpe and for North ward (to the west of Dogsthorpe).

59 On our visit to the area, we considered that the Council's proposed boundaries for Dogsthorpe were clear and identifiable, and the ward provides for good electoral equality. We are therefore adopting the Council's Dogsthorpe ward as part of our draft recommendations. This ward is projected to have 4% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the city average by 2020.

60 To the west of Dogsthorpe is the Council's proposed North ward. This ward uses Soke Parkway as its northern boundary, and the East Coast mainline railway as its western boundary. We have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Council's proposed boundaries here. We are, however, making an amendment to the proposed boundary between North and Park wards. Councillor Swift (North ward) suggested that the boundary run along Lincoln Road and St Pauls Road. We have chosen to adopt this amendment as we consider that it provides a stronger ward boundary than that proposed by the Council. Our proposed North ward is projected to have 8% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

61 The Council and Liberal Democrat Group proposed a similar Ravensthorpe ward. Both submissions used Soke Parkway and the railway as boundaries, and used an existing polling district boundary which follows part of Bradwell Road and Thorpe Road. The Council opted for a slightly different boundary from the Liberal Democrat Group in the south of the ward, incorporating some allotments in to its proposed Ravensthorpe ward. A local resident also expressed support for the Council's proposed ward. We consider that the Council's boundary, which follows the rear of houses on Mayor's Walk, is more clearly identifiable and so we have decided to adopt the Council's proposed Ravensthorpe ward as part of our draft recommendations. This ward is projected to have 4% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

62 The Council proposed a Central ward which used the railway as its western boundary, the River Nene as its southern boundary, and the A1139 as its eastern boundary. Given our proposed West ward (discussed above), we have adopted the Council's Central ward with some modifications to its western and eastern boundaries, in order to provide for good electoral equality in our proposed West and Central wards.

63 Our proposed Central ward straddles the railway in places, and only partially uses it as a boundary. We consider that there are sufficient road links across the railway to warrant this approach. In the east of the ward we are recommending the use of Wellington Street and Star Road as the boundary with our proposed East ward. We consider that our proposed Central ward has clearly identifiable boundaries, and it is projected to have 5% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

64 As discussed above, we have decided to adopt a slightly amended version of the Council's proposed Park ward as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposed Park ward is projected to have 4% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

65 As a consequence of our recommendations for West and Central wards, we are also adopting an East ward which is different from that proposed by the Council. As noted in paragraph 63, we have used Wellington Street and Star Road as the boundary between East and Central wards. Our proposed East ward is projected to have 1% more electors per councillor than the city

average by 2020.

## South Peterborough

66 South of the River Nene, the southern half of Peterborough covers an almost entirely built-up area, with a small rural area south of the Hampton Vale development.

67 In addition to the Council's proposals in this area, we also received responses from six local residents and Orton Waterville Parish Council.

68 Orton Waterville Parish Council argued that the entirety of the parish should be within an Orton Waterville ward, as currently it is split between two city wards which, in its view, causes confusion. The City Council's proposals for this area retain a split of the parish between its proposed Orton Waterville and Orton Longueville wards. If all of Orton Waterville parish was in Orton Waterville ward, this ward would have 18% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. This is an unacceptably high electoral variance and we have therefore decided to base our draft recommendations on the Council's proposed Orton Waterville ward, which is projected to have 7% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

69 Adjacent to Orton Waterville is the Orton Longueville area. We are adopting the Council's proposed Orton Longueville ward, with an amendment to its eastern boundary. In order to provide for better electoral equality in our proposed Hargate & Hempsted ward, which is immediately to the east of Orton Longueville, we have included an area of housing in Hargate & Hempsted ward. This area includes streets off Morpeth Close and Nansicles Road. Our proposed Orton Longueville ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

70 To the north-east of Orton Longueville is our proposed Fletton & Woodston ward. We have made two large amendments to the Council's proposed ward here. In the northern part of the ward, we have included an area of houses north of the River Nene, which the Council had included in its West ward. This area of houses has access to the rest of the ward via Thorpe Road and the A1179.

71 In the south-east of our proposed ward we have amended the Council's proposed boundary between this ward and Fletton & Stanground ward. The Council proposed a Stanground South ward (which is to the east of its proposed Fletton & Stanground ward) which would have 18% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. This is a higher variance than we can accept. We have therefore recommended different electoral arrangements for wards around Stanground South, a consequence of which is a different boundary from that proposed by the Council between Fletton & Woodston and Fletton & Stanground wards.

72 The eastern boundary of our proposed Fletton & Woodston ward follows the A15 London Road north-east and then joins the railway. We consider that

using the road and railway provides this ward with strong boundaries. This ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

73 As mentioned above, we are proposing a different pattern of wards in the Stanground area, as the Council had proposed a ward with an unacceptably high electoral variance. We received a submission from a local resident regarding this area which stated that the A1139 should be used as a boundary between Fletton and Stanground. The Council proposed using this road as part of its boundary, but we have had to depart from this in order to provide for good electoral equality.

74 Our proposed Fletton & Stanground ward is similar to the one put forward by the Council. As mentioned above, we have used the A15 and the railway as a boundary for this ward. We have also proposed a different boundary from that proposed by the Council between this ward and Stanground South ward. Our proposed boundary runs along the A605, in an east-west direction, before turning south to join the boundary proposed by the Council along Whittlesey Road. We received a submission from a local resident arguing that the Old Fletton area should be in a Fletton ward. However, in order to provide for good electoral equality in this area, we have placed some parts of Old Fletton in our Fletton & Stanground ward, and some in our Stanground South ward.

75 We consider that our proposed Stanground South and Fletton & Stanground wards have easily identifiable boundaries, and note that the wards would have 9% fewer and 3% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the city average by 2020.

76 We received four submissions from local residents regarding the Hampton and Hampton Vale areas. All four local residents argued that Hampton should have its own councillor, rather than being in a ward with Orton, and areas on the other side of the A1139, as under the existing arrangements. The Council proposed a Hampton Vale ward, which comprises much of the existing Hampton Vale area, and will contain the properties currently being built in this area.

77 Given the high number of electors currently in this area, and all those forecast to be living in this proposed ward in the coming years, it was not possible to include all electors in the Hampton area to the south of the A1139 in one ward. Our proposed Hampton Vale ward is projected to have 8% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

78 As discussed in paragraph 69 above, we have proposed an amendment to the Council's Hargate & Hempsted ward. This amendment is to provide for better electoral equality in the ward, and our proposed ward would have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

## Conclusions

79 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2020 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2013	2020
Number of councillors	60	60
Number of electoral wards	20	20
Average number of electors per councillor	2,242	2,501
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

### **Draft recommendation**

Peterborough City Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 20 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

82 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Bretton, Hampton Hargate & Vale, Orton Longueville, and Orton Waterville parishes.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Bretton Parish Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bretton North (returning 14 members) and Bretton South (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

84 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Hampton Hargate & Vale parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Hampton Hargate & Vale Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hampton Hargate (returning six members and Hampton Vale (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

85 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Orton Longueville parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Orton Longueville Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: East (returning one member), North-East (returning one member), and Orton Longueville (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

86 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Orton Waterville parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Orton Waterville Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Goldhay (returning one member), and Orton Waterville (returning 12 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

87 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Peterborough City Council contained in this report. We will fully take into account all submissions received by 6 October 2014. Any submissions received after this date may not be taken into account.

88 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Peterborough and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, ward names and parish electoral arrangement. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during our consultation on these draft recommendations. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

89 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer  
Peterborough Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG**

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

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

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

91 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, irrespective of whom they are from.

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

93 After the publication of our final recommendations, the review will be implemented by order subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. When made, the draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Peterborough City Council in 2016.

## Equalities

94 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## 4 Mapping

### Draft recommendations for Peterborough

95 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Peterborough City Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Peterborough City Council.

**You can also view our draft recommendations for Peterborough City Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**



## Appendix A

**Table A1: Draft recommendations for Peterborough City Council**

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barnack	3	7,747	2,582	15%	8,180	2,727	9%
2	Bretton	3	6,546	2,182	-3%	6,864	2,288	-9%
3	Central	3	7,668	2,556	14%	7,876	2,625	5%
4	Dogsthorpe	3	6,681	2,227	-1%	7,180	2,393	-4%
5	East	3	6,891	2,297	2%	7,608	2,536	1%
6	Eye, Thorney & Newborough	3	7,159	2,386	6%	7,680	2,560	2%
7	Fletton & Stanground	3	6,705	2,235	0%	7,245	2,415	-3%
8	Fletton & Woodston	3	7,487	2,496	11%	7,548	2,516	1%
9	Gunthorpe	3	6,215	2,072	-8%	8,012	2,671	7%
10	Hampton Vale	3	3,792	1,264	-44%	6,904	2,301	-8%
11	Hargate & Hempsted	3	3,929	1,310	-42%	6,961	2,320	-7%

**Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Peterborough City Council**

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12 North	3	6,661	2,220	-1%	6,866	2,289	-8%
13 Orton Longueville	3	7,690	2,563	14%	7,723	2,574	3%
14 Orton Waterville	3	7,143	2,381	6%	8,051	2,684	7%
15 Park	3	7,673	2,558	14%	7,827	2,609	4%
16 Paston & Walton	3	7,366	2,455	10%	7,758	2,586	3%
17 Ravensthorpe	3	7,417	2,472	10%	7,776	2,592	4%
18 Stanground South	3	4,895	1,632	-27%	6,795	2,265	-9%
19 Werrington	3	8,069	2,690	20%	8,220	2,740	10%
20 West	3	6,801	2,267	1%	6,966	2,322	-7%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>134,535</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>150,040</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,242</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,501</b>	<b>–</b>

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

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

## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision-making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average

Ward	A specific area of a district or district, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the borough or district council
------	---