

Draft Recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Gedling in Nottinghamshire

*December 1999*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke (Deputy Chairman)  
Kru Desai  
Peter Brokenshire  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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 councils in the district.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Gedling in Nottinghamshire.

© Crown Copyright 1999

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

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government 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 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>33</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Gedling: Detailed Mapping	<i>35</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from – Gedling Borough Council – Gedling Liberal Democrats	<i>39</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>45</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Arnold and Carlton towns is inserted inside the back cover of the report



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Gedling on 18 May 1999.

- **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 Gedling:

- **in 11 of the 24 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and four wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 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 11 wards and by more than 20 per cent in five wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 120–121) are that:

- **Gedling Borough Council should have 50 councillors, seven fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards, instead of 24 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 22 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of two, and two 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 borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 20 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all 22 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements for the parishes of Bestwood St Albans and Calverton.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for ten weeks from 14 December 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 21 February 2000:

**Review Manager  
Gedling Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1:  
The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Bestwood Village	1	Bestwood Park ward (part – Bestwood Village parish ward, as proposed); St Marys ward (part)	Map 2 and A2
2	Bonington (in Arnold)	3	Bestwood Park ward (part – Top Valley parish ward, as proposed); Bonington ward (part); Oxclose ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Large map and A2
3	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	2	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward; Netherfield ward (part)	Map 2
4	Calverton	3	Calverton ward; St Marys ward (part)	Map 2 and A3
5	Carlton (in Carlton)	3	Carlton ward (part); Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part); Conway ward (part)	Large map
6	Carlton Hill (in Carlton)	3	Carlton ward (part); Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part)	Large map
7	Daybrook (in Arnold)	2	Bonington ward (part); Oxclose ward (part)	Large map
8	Gedling (in Carlton)	3	Conway ward (part); Gedling ward (part); Porchester ward (part)	Large map
9	Killisick (in Arnold)	1	Killisick ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Large map
10	Kingswell (in Arnold)	2	Kingswell ward (part); Woodthorpe ward (part)	Large map
11	Lambley	1	Lambley ward; Gedling ward (part); Porchester ward (part)	Map 2
12	Mapperley Plains (in Arnold)	3	Mapperley Plains ward; Killisick ward (part)	Large map
13	Netherfield & Colwick (in Carlton)	3	Netherfield ward (part)	Large map
14	Newstead	1	Newstead ward; St Marys ward (part)	Map 2
15	Phoenix (in Carlton)	2	Gedling ward (part); Phoenix ward (part); Priory ward (part)	Large map
16	Porchester (in Carlton)	3	Porchester ward (part); St James ward (part)	Large map
17	Ravenshead	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Ravenshead parish)	Map 2
18	St James (in Carlton)	2	Phoenix ward (part); Priory ward (part); St James ward (part)	Large map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
19	St Marys (in Arnold)	3	Killisick ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Large map
20	Valley (in Carlton)	2	Carlton ward (part); Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part); Conway ward (part); Gedling ward (part)	Large map
21	Woodborough	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Woodborough parish)	Map 2
22	Woodthorpe (in Arnold)	3	Kingswell ward (part); Woodthorpe ward (part)	Large map

*Notes: 1 The towns of Arnold and Carlton – except Colwick parish – are unparished.*

*2 Map 2, Appendix A and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Gedling

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Bestwood Village	1	1,260	1,260	-28	1,883	1,883	3
2	Bonington	3	5,314	1,771	1	5,463	1,821	0
3	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	2	3,052	1,526	-13	3,363	1,682	-8
4	Calverton	3	5,411	1,804	3	5,911	1,970	8
5	Carlton	3	5,245	1,748	-1	5,337	1,779	-3
6	Carlton Hill	3	5,223	1,741	-1	5,258	1,753	-4
7	Daybrook	2	3,785	1,893	8	3,808	1,904	4
8	Gedling	3	5,193	1,731	-2	5,259	1,753	-4
9	Killisick	1	1,885	1,885	7	1,896	1,896	4
10	Kingswell	2	3,741	1,871	6	3,773	1,887	3
11	Lambley	1	1,712	1,712	-3	1,778	1,778	-3
12	Mapperley Plains	3	5,661	1,887	7	5,746	1,915	5
13	Netherfield & Colwick	3	5,145	1,715	-3	5,412	1,804	-1
14	Newstead	1	1,638	1,638	-7	1,858	1,858	2
15	Phoenix	2	3,660	1,830	4	3,679	1,840	1
16	Porchester	3	5,414	1,805	3	5,459	1,820	0
17	Ravenshead	3	4,812	1,604	-9	5,022	1,674	-8
18	St James	2	3,683	1,842	5	3,716	1,858	2
19	St Marys	3	5,273	1,758	0	5,527	1,842	1
20	Valley	2	3,513	1,757	0	3,722	1,861	2
21	Woodborough	1	1,621	1,621	-8	1,690	1,690	-7
22	Woodthorpe	3	5,735	1,912	9	5,771	1,924	5
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>87,976</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>91,331</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,760</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,827</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Gedling Borough 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.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Gedling in Nottinghamshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the eight districts in Nottinghamshire 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.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Gedling. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1975 (Report No. 71). The electoral arrangements of Nottinghamshire County Council were last reviewed in May 1980 (Report No. 383). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie 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).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough 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 borough.

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 In our Guidance, we state that 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 configuration 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.

7 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.

8 Third, we are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district 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 we 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.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

10 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, ie in year one half of the district council would be elected, in year two half of 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.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Nottinghamshire 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.

12 Stage One began on 18 May 1999, when we wrote to Gedling Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Nottinghamshire Local Councils Association, parish councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, Members of the European Parliament for the East Midlands Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press,

issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. At the request of the Borough Council, the closing date for receipt of representations was extended by two weeks, to 17 September 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 14 December 1999 and will end on 21 February 2000. 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.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them 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.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 Gedling lies immediately to the north-east of the city of Nottingham, and contains a mixture of suburban and rural communities, covering some 12,003 hectares. It is bordered by Sherwood Forest to the north, while the River Trent forms its southern boundary. It is primarily residential. The two major towns in the borough, Arnold and Carlton, comprise 33 per cent and 35 per cent respectively of the borough's total electorate. There are 11 parishes in the borough, all of which are situated in rural areas, except for the urban parish of Colwick.

17 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 borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

18 The electorate of the borough is 87,977 (February 1999). The Council presently has 57 members who are elected from 24 wards, seven of which are relatively rural, the remainder being predominantly suburban. 13 of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and four are single-member wards. Whole council elections take place every four years.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Gedling borough, with around 16 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increase has been in Bestwood Park ward, with approximately 2,700 more electors than 20 years ago.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,543 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,602 by the year 2004, if the present number of councillors is maintained. Due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 11 of the 24 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, four wards by more than 20 per cent and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst electoral imbalance is in Bestwood Park ward where the councillor represents 136 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Gedling*

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Bestwood Park	1	3,635	3,635	136	4,370	4,370	173
2	Bonington	3	3,925	1,308	-15	3,968	1,323	-17
3	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	2	3,052	1,526	-1	3,363	1,682	5
4	Calverton	3	5,361	1,787	16	5,861	1,954	22
5	Carlton	3	4,677	1,559	1	4,771	1,590	-1
6	Carlton Hill	3	4,794	1,598	4	4,830	1,610	0
7	Cavendish	2	2,732	1,366	-11	2,891	1,446	-10
8	Conway	2	2,967	1,484	-4	3,057	1,529	-5
9	Gedling	3	4,428	1,476	-4	4,451	1,484	-7
10	Killisick	2	3,351	1,676	9	3,370	1,685	5
11	Kingswell	3	4,568	1,523	-1	4,587	1,529	-5
12	Lambley	1	1,043	1,043	-32	1,076	1,076	-33
13	Mapperley Plains	3	4,500	1,500	-3	4,579	1,526	-5
14	Netherfield	3	5,145	1,715	11	5,412	1,804	13
15	Newstead	1	1,582	1,582	2	1,802	1,802	12
16	Oxclose	2	2,663	1,332	-14	2,680	1,340	-16
17	Phoenix	2	2,321	1,161	-25	2,334	1,167	-27
18	Porchester	3	4,322	1,441	-7	4,380	1,460	-9
19	Priory	2	2,255	1,128	-27	2,272	1,136	-29
20	Ravenshead	3	4,812	1,604	4	5,022	1,674	4
21	St James	3	4,105	1,368	-11	4,144	1,381	-14

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
22 St Marys	3	5,210	1,737	13	5,462	1,821	14
23 Woodborough	1	1,621	1,621	5	1,690	1,690	5
24 Woodthorpe	3	4,908	1,636	6	4,957	1,652	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>87,977</b>	–	–	<b>91,329</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,543</b>	–	–	<b>1,602</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Gedling Borough Council

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Lambley ward were relatively over-represented by 32 per cent, while electors in Bestwood Park ward were relatively under-represented by 136 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

21 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 Gedling Borough Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received nine representations during Stage One, including borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council and Gedling Liberal Democrats, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

#### **Gedling Borough Council**

23 The Borough Council proposed a council of 50 members, seven fewer than at present, serving 22 wards, compared to the existing 24. It proposed 11 three-member wards, six two-member wards, and five single-member wards. Overall, change was proposed to all but five of the existing wards. It supported maintaining elections of the whole Council every four years.

24 Under the Borough Council's proposals there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by more than 10 per cent in only two wards. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average by 2004. The Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

#### **Gedling Liberal Democrats**

25 Gedling Liberal Democrats (the Liberal Democrats) proposed a council size of 51 members, six fewer than at present, serving 24 wards, as at present. It proposed seven three-member wards, 12 two-member wards and four single-member wards. Overall, there would be change to all but three of the existing wards. The Liberal Democrats put forward two alternative warding arrangements in Arnold and Carlton.

26 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by more than 10 per cent in only three wards. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

#### **Gedling Borough Labour Group**

27 Gedling Borough Labour Group (the Labour Group) supported the Liberal Democrats' scheme. It supported a council size of 56 to 58 members, comprising predominantly two-member wards. It also proposed alternative warding arrangements for Arnold in order to divide the town into three two-member and four three-member wards. It expressed opposition to the Borough

Council's proposals. There were discrepancies between the electoral data supplied by the Labour Group and the Borough Council; therefore, we have not given consideration to these figures.

### **Members of Parliament**

28 Vernon Coaker MP expressed opposition to single-member wards and, in particular, objected to the Borough Council's proposed single-member ward for Killisick. He also expressed concern regarding the Borough Council's proposed Daybrook, Carlton Hill, Phoenix and Valley wards.

### **Parish Councils**

29 We received representations from two parish councils. Calverton Parish Council proposed boundary modifications to its parish wards. Woodborough Parish Council supported retaining the existing arrangements in Woodborough parish.

### **Other Representations**

30 We received a further three representations. Bestwood St Albans Labour Party supported retaining the boundaries of the existing Bestwood Park ward, with the addition of an extra councillor for the area. A borough councillor expressed concern about the Borough Council's proposals for Bonington, Daybrook and Killisick wards. A local resident expressed concern regarding the existing Bestwood Park ward, and proposed dividing the ward.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

31 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Gedling 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 to reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

32 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.

33 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.

34 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable; however, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes 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**

35 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4 per cent from 87,977 to 91,329 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Bestwood Park ward. The Council has 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.

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

## **Council Size**

37 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

38 Gedling Borough Council is presently served by 57 members. At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed a reduction in council size to 50, arguing that a smaller council size of 50 members would provide "reasonable representation", especially given the "compact area" of the borough. It also argued that a warding pattern based on 50 members would secure the best possible coterminosity between the boundaries of district wards and parishes.

39 The Liberal Democrats proposed a reduction in council size to 51 members. They argued that 51 members would secure the best possible coterminosity between the boundaries of district wards and parishes. The Labour Group supported a council size of between 56 and 58 members, arguing that this would enable councillors to be "in regular contact with their community on a personal level".

40 We note that there is some agreement to reduce the number of councillors on the Borough Council, and we concur with this view. Having carefully considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the Borough Council's proposal for a council size of 50 members would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Under the proposed council size of 50 members, the rural wards would all vary by 8 per cent or less by 2004, while the urban wards would all vary by 5 per cent or less.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

41 After careful consideration of the evidence received at Stage One we consider that the Borough Council's proposals would represent the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and we are content to endorse these proposals substantially. In particular, we consider that the Borough Council would provide the optimum warding arrangements within the existing Bestwood Park ward and that, as a consequence, we are restricted as to the extent to which we are able to reflect the Liberal Democrats' proposals elsewhere. Similarly, we consider that the Borough Council's proposals would provide a better reflection of the interests and identities of communities in the town of Carlton. Nevertheless, we note that there is a degree of consensus throughout the borough between the two schemes, and we have been able to reflect elements of the Liberal Democrats' proposals in our draft recommendations.

42 We propose departing from the Borough Council's scheme in relation to the proposed wards of Bestwood Village, Bonington, Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Gedling, Killisick, Lambley, Netherfield & Colwick, Newstead, and St Marys wards, in the interests of better reflecting the interests and identities of communities. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

## **The urban areas**

- (a) Killisick, Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards (in Arnold);
- (b) Bonington, Kingswell, Oxclose and Woodthorpe wards (in Arnold);
- (c) Gedling, Phoenix, Porchester, Priory and St James wards (in Carlton);
- (d) Carlton, Carlton Hill, Cavendish, Conway wards and Netherfield wards (in Carlton).

## **The rural areas**

- (e) Bestwood Park, Newstead and Ravenshead wards;
- (f) Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough wards.

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

## **The urban areas**

### **Killisick, Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards (in Arnold)**

44 The existing wards of Killisick, Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards cover the northern area of Arnold town. Killisick ward is represented by two councillors, while Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards are each represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements of a 57-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the borough average by 9 per cent, 3 per cent and 13 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve marginally in Killisick ward, but is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years in Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards.

45 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by three wards, with the proposed Killisick ward being represented by a single councillor, and the proposed Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards each being represented by three councillors. It proposed that the whole of Worrall Avenue and the area bounded by Bonington Drive, Brookfield Road, Hallams Lane and Arnot Hill Road should be transferred from Killisick ward to the proposed St Marys ward. It proposed transferring that part of the existing Killisick ward, bounded by the northern edge of the new development on Killisick Lane and by Killisick and Coppice roads to Mapperley Plains ward. It also proposed transferring that the part of St Marys ward bounded by Church Street, Cross Street and Mellors Road to the proposed Bonington ward.

46 Under the Borough Council's proposals for a 50-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in Bonington, Killisick and Mapperley Plains wards varying from the borough average by 1 per cent, 4 per cent and 7 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 1 per cent and 5 per cent in Killisick and Mapperley Plains wards, while equalling the borough average in Bonington ward.

47 The Liberal Democrats proposed that this area should be divided between three wards, with the proposed Killisick and Plains wards each being represented by two members, and the proposed St Marys ward being represented by three members. The Liberal Democrats argued that the existing boundary between Killisick and St Marys wards should be retained on the grounds that it delineates communities in this area. However, they proposed modifying the existing boundary in order to include both sides of Birchfield Road in Killisick ward. They also proposed transferring the area to the north of Coppice Road from the existing Mapperley Plains ward to the proposed Killisick ward, with the remainder of Mapperley Plains ward forming a new Plains ward.

48 The Liberal Democrats also proposed that St Marys ward should be divided in order to better reflect the interests and identities of the constituent communities in this ward. They proposed that the part of St Marys ward to the north of Woodborough and Lime lanes should be transferred to Calverton ward, while that part of the ward to the north-west of the Leapool roundabout and Ollerton Road should be transferred to Newstead ward, and the area to the south-west of the roundabout and Mansfield Road should be transferred to the proposed Bestwood ward. They also proposed that the part of Bonington ward bounded by Mansfield Road and Cross Street should be included in St Marys ward, and that Cross Street and Coppice Road should form the southern boundary of the ward. They also suggested an alternative scheme for St Marys ward to include that part of Bonington ward bounded by Mansfield Road, Cross Street and Galway Road which would not have a significant effect on the level of electoral equality in the area.

49 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 51-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in Killisick, Plains and St Marys wards varying from the borough average by 5 per cent, 3 per cent and 1 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the average by 2 per cent, 5 per cent and 2 per cent respectively by 2004.

50 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be represented by three wards with the proposed Killisick ward being represented by two councillors and the proposed Mapperley Plains and St Marys wards each being represented by three councillors. It supported the Liberal Democrats' proposal to include the whole of Birchfield Road in Killisick ward. It also proposed that that part of St Marys ward, comprising Catriona Crescent and Homefield Avenue, should be included in Killisick ward. It argued that the "natural boundary" of Gedling Road and Rolleston Drive should form the southern boundary of Killisick and Mapperley Plains wards, and that the proposed Mapperley Plains ward should include the eastern part of Killisick ward bounded by Killisick Lane, Spinningdale Close and Harwood Close, ensuring that the whole of the Middlebeck/Howbeck estate would be included in one ward. It also proposed that St Marys ward should include that part of Kingswell ward bounded by Arnot Hill Road, Hallams Lane and High Street.

51 Vernon Coaker MP and a borough councillor both expressed opposition to the Borough Council's proposal to make Killisick a single-member ward. They argued that this would fail to encourage local participation in politics, and that one councillor would not adequately represent the area.

52 Having given careful consideration to the representations received at Stage One, we note that the proposed warding arrangements in this area are influenced by the proposed ward boundaries in the existing Bestwood Park ward. However, we note that there is broad agreement over some warding arrangements in this area, and we have been able to reflect this. On balance, we have decided to endorse the Borough Council's proposals substantially in this area which we consider would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. While we note that the Liberal Democrats' proposal to establish a larger Killisick ward and a more compact Plains ward has merit, we consider that the Borough Council's proposed warding arrangements for the existing Bestwood Park ward, in particular, would offer a better warding arrangement than that put forward by the Liberal Democrats. Our decision to endorse the Borough Council's proposals for Bestwood Park, as already indicated, restricts the extent to which we are able to reflect the Liberal Democrats' proposals elsewhere in Arnold. Also, while we have carefully considered the Labour Group's proposed boundaries between Killisick and St Marys wards and Killisick and Mapperley Plains wards, we have not been persuaded that these proposals would better reflect the identities and interests of communities in this area.

53 However, we are proposing to depart from the Borough Council's scheme in two areas. First, we note that Birchfield Road would be split between two wards under the Borough Council's proposals, and we have not been persuaded that this would satisfactorily reflect the identities and interests of communities in this area. We therefore propose retaining the whole of Birchfield Road in Killisick ward, as put forward by the Liberal Democrats and the Labour Group. Second, we propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' proposal to divide the rural part of the existing St Marys ward between the wards of Bestwood Village, Calverton and Newstead in order to better reflect the identities and interests of the constituent communities in this area. We note that the existing ward comprises urban and rural areas with little common identity, and we consider that those parts of St Marys ward to the north of Lime Lane and to the east of Mansfield Road should be combined with adjoining wards.

54 Under our draft recommendations for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in Killisick and Mapperley Plains wards would each vary by 7 per cent from the borough average, while St Marys ward would be equal to the borough average. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve generally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the average by 4 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent by 2004.

#### **Bonington, Kingswell, Oxclose and Woodthorpe wards (in Arnold)**

55 The existing wards of Bonington, Kingswell, Oxclose and Woodthorpe wards cover the southern area of Arnold town. Bonington, Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards are each represented by three councillors, while Oxclose ward is represented by two councillors. Under current arrangements of a council size of 57, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the borough average by 15 per cent, 1 per cent, 14 per cent and 6 per cent, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, except for Woodthorpe ward, which is expected to improve marginally by 2004.

56 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by four wards, with the proposed Bonington and Woodthorpe wards each being represented by three

councillors and the proposed Daybrook and Kingswell wards each being represented by two councillors. It proposed that Bonington ward should comprise the Top Valley area of Bestwood Park ward, following the polling district boundary, that part of Bonington ward to the north of Acton Road and that part of St Marys ward bounded by Church Street, Cross Street and Mellors Road. It also proposed including in Bonington ward that part of the existing Oxclose ward to the west of Mansfield Road, north of the junction with Acton Road, up to, but not including Danes Close and Haworth Gardens. It argued that residents of this area share transport links with Bonington rather than Daybrook.

57 It argued that Daybrook ward should comprise the remainder of Bonington and Oxclose wards. It proposed that Kingswell ward should comprise the existing Kingswell ward less that part to the south of Arno Vale Road but excluding the school. It also proposed including that part of Woodthorpe ward to the north of Thackerays Lane. It proposed that Woodthorpe ward should comprise the remainder of Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards, arguing that the boundary of Thackerays Lane and Arno Vale Road represents the “best and most identifiable boundary for the community of Woodthorpe”.

58 Under the Borough Council’s 50-member council scheme, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average in Bonington, Daybrook, Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards by 1 per cent, 8 per cent, 6 per cent and 9 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent from the average in Daybrook, Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards, and being to equal the borough average in Bonington ward.

59 The Liberal Democrats proposed that this area should be represented by five wards, with the proposed Bonington, Daybrook, Kingswell and Warren Hill wards each being represented by two councillors and the proposed Woodthorpe ward being represented by three councillors. They proposed that Bonington ward should comprise those parts of Bonington, Killisick, Kingswell and St Marys wards in the centre of Arnold, using the main roads of Coppice Road, Cross Street, Gedling Road, Hallams Lane, St Albans Road and Sandfield Road as “very strong” boundaries. As an alternative, they proposed including the area bounded by Galway Road, Mansfield Road and Cross Street in Bonington ward, which would have a marginal effect on electoral equality. They proposed that Daybrook ward should comprise the existing Oxclose ward, less the chapel and cemetery, that part of Bonington ward to the south of St Albans Road and that part of Kingswell ward to the west of Arno Hill Road. They proposed that the remainder of Kingswell ward should form a new ward of the same name, less that part of the existing ward to the south of Sandfield Road and Greendale ward, which should be transferred to Woodthorpe ward. As an alternative, they proposed including that area of the existing Killisick ward bounded by Gedling Road and Worrall Avenue in Kingswell ward, which would have a marginal effect on electoral equality.

60 They additionally proposed that the Top Valley area of Bestwood Park ward should be linked with part of the existing Bonington ward, to be named Warren Hill ward on the grounds that this area has more in common with Arnold than with Bestwood village. They proposed that the boundary should be drawn along the polling district boundary, and should be extended to include

the Violet Hill and New Farm area. They also proposed that Warren Hill ward should include that part of Bonington ward to the east of Mansfield Road, and the cemetery and chapel from the north of the existing Oxclose ward and, as previously indicated, that Woodthorpe ward should comprise the existing Woodthorpe ward and that part of Kingswell ward, as detailed above.

61 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 51-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in Bonington, Daybrook, Kingswell, Warren Hill and Woodthorpe wards varying from the borough average by 11 per cent, 1 per cent, 2 per cent, 10 per cent and 4 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years to vary by 7 per cent, 2 per cent, 5 per cent, 2 per cent and 1 per cent respectively by 2004.

62 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area, with some boundary modifications. It proposed that Bonington ward should comprise the existing Bonington ward less that part to the west of Mansfield Road to the north of Salcombe Drive. It proposed that Bonington ward should also include the cemetery from the existing Oxclose ward, with the remainder of the existing Oxclose ward and the Top Valley area of Bestwood Park ward forming a revised Oxclose ward. It supported the Liberal Democrats' proposal for Kingswell ward which, it argued, utilised the "natural boundaries" of Gedling Road, Nottingham Road, Plains Road and Somersby Road, and expressed the view that it would "make no sense" to exclude the area to the east of Arno Vale Road from Kingswell ward.

63 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats' proposals for Woodthorpe ward, and argued that the area to the north of Thackerays Lane and Arno Vale Road should be included in the proposed Woodthorpe ward, and that residents of Aylesham Avenue "consider themselves to be part of Woodthorpe".

64 Vernon Coaker MP opposed the Borough Council's proposals for Daybrook ward, arguing that the boundaries do not appear "rational".

65 A borough councillor expressed concern about the Borough Council's proposed Bonington ward, arguing that there is no link between Top Valley and Bonington. She also argued that residents from Acton Road and Furlong Avenue should be included in the same ward as they share interests which would be best represented under a single councillor. Similarly, she argued that the residents of West Street and High Street Avenue should be represented in the same ward.

66 A local resident stated that the area of Warren Hill has transport links with Nottingham City rather than Gedling, and drew particular attention to the lack of communication links and the distance between the Warren Hill area and Bestwood village. She proposed that Bestwood village and Warren Hill should be represented by different borough councillors and that the Top Valley area has more in common with Oxclose ward than anywhere else.

67 On the evidence received at Stage One, we note that both the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats have addressed the poor level of electoral equality in the existing Bestwood Park ward by dividing the existing ward and combining Top Valley with the adjacent area of Arnold. We note that the Top Valley part of Bestwood has greater links with areas outside

the borough but, given that Top Valley merits one and a half councillors under a council size of 50, combining it with adjoining areas is unavoidable in the interests of electoral equality. We do not consider that the proposal of the Labour Group, a borough councillor and a local resident, to include the Top Valley area in Oxclose ward, would create a reasonable ward, given that these areas barely share a boundary. Also, we have not been persuaded that the Liberal Democrats' and Labour Group's proposals would satisfactorily reflect the interests and identities of communities in this area. On balance, we consider that the Borough Council's proposals for Bonington ward would provide the better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. As a consequence of endorsing the Borough Council's scheme for Bonington ward the extent to which we are able to reflect proposals other than those of the Borough Council elsewhere in Arnold is restricted. Nevertheless, we note that the Borough Council has proposed clear boundaries and good electoral equality throughout this area of Arnold, and we are content to endorse its proposals for these wards.

68 Under our draft recommendation for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bonington, Daybrook, Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards would vary by 1 per cent, 8 per cent, 6 per cent and 9 per cent from the borough average, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years to equal the borough average in Bonington ward, and to vary by 4 per cent, 3 per cent 5 per cent from the borough average in Daybrook, Kingswell and Woodthorpe wards by 2004.

#### **Gedling, Phoenix, Porchester, Priory and St James wards (in Carlton)**

69 The existing wards of Gedling, Phoenix, Porchester, Priory and St James cover the north of Carlton town. Gedling, Porchester and St James wards are each represented by three councillors, while Phoenix and Priory wards are each represented by two councillors. Under current arrangements, of a 57-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the five wards varies from the borough average by 4 per cent, 25 per cent, 7 per cent, 27 per cent and 11 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years.

70 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by four wards, with the proposed Gedling and Porchester wards each being represented by three councillors, and the proposed Phoenix and St James wards each being represented by two councillors. The Borough Council proposed that the ridge line should form the boundary between Arnold and Carlton, arguing that this is the "principal feature" of the area. It proposed that Arnold Lane, Gedling Road and Main Road should form the southern boundary of Gedling ward and that the main Nottingham to Lincoln railway line should form the eastern boundary of Gedling ward, thereby including that part of the existing Conway ward to the north of Manor Road and Station Road in Gedling ward it proposed retaining the existing northern boundaries of Gedling ward.

71 It proposed that Phoenix ward should comprise the majority of the existing Priory ward less that area to the west of Hartington Avenue, Westdale Lane East and Perlethorpe Avenue. It proposed that the new Phoenix ward should also include that part of the existing Phoenix ward to the east of Gedling School, Wollaton Avenue, Perlethorpe Avenue, Perlethorpe Drive and Thoresby Avenue. It proposed that Main Road and Gedling Road should form the eastern boundary of the ward, with Arnold Lane forming the northern boundary.

72 The Borough Council also proposed combining that part of the existing Porchester ward to the north of Arnold Lane with Lambley ward on the grounds that the Spring Lane area shares communication links and community interests with Lambley, with the western part of the existing St James ward, bounded by Digby Avenue, Holyoake Road, Westdale Lane West and the edge of the golf course and college grounds being included in Porchester ward, and the remainder of the existing Phoenix, Priory and St James wards forming a revised St James ward.

73 Under the Borough Council's proposals for a 50-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 2 per cent, 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, to equal the borough average in Porchester ward, and to vary by 4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent from the borough average in Gedling, Phoenix and St James wards respectively by 2004.

74 The Liberal Democrats proposed that this area should be represented by three wards, with the proposed All Hallows ward being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Phoenix and Porchester wards being represented by three councillors each. They proposed that Woodborough Road, Mapperley Plains and Plains Road should be retained as the boundary between Arnold and Carlton given that Arnold and Carlton have very different identities. They proposed that All Hallows ward should comprise the existing Gedling ward, with minor boundary modifications. They proposed that All Hallows ward should include both sides of Doveridge Avenue and Doveridge Road, from the existing Conway ward, while excluding the part of the existing Gedling ward to the east of Burton Road. They argued that Burton Road is "a good, logical boundary" and that this modification would dispense with the "current anomaly" whereby Doveridge Avenue and Doveridge Road are excluded from the Gedling area. They proposed that houses on Redland Grove and Redland Avenue should be excluded from All Hallows ward, and that the remaining boundary should be drawn along Main Road and Arnold Lane. They proposed that the northern boundary of All Hallows ward should be drawn from Arnold Lane, to the east of Chase Farm to the spoil heap, east along the top of the ridge to Lambley Lane, and north along Lambley Lane to Spring Lane. They proposed that the boundary should then follow the existing boundary along the track to Gedling Wood, that it should cut across the wood to the north of Gedling Wood Farm to traverse the fields and join Whitworth Drive between the boundaries of Gedling House and the poultry farm, which would ensure that any possible new development on the old Gedling colliery site would be contained in the suburban ward of All Hallows. Also, as an alternative, they proposed that the northern part of Lambley Lane should be excluded from All Hallows ward, together with the northern corner of the proposed ward, and that Redland Avenue and Park Avenue should be transferred into All Hallows ward from the existing Conway ward. This alternative would have a marginal effect on electoral equality.

75 The Liberal Democrats proposed that Phoenix ward should comprise the existing Phoenix ward and that part of Gedling ward to the south of Arnold Lane and east of Main Road. They proposed that Phoenix ward should also include that part of Priory ward to the north of Westdale Lane East, and that part of St James ward to the north of Westdale Lane and to the east of the golf course and college grounds, Digby Avenue and Holyoake Road. They proposed that Porchester ward should comprise the existing Porchester ward less that part to the north of Arnold Lane, which should be transferred to Lambley ward, and the remainder of St James ward.

76 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 51-member council there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in All Hallows, Phoenix and Porchester wards varying from the borough average by 3 per cent, 1 per cent, and 5 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 2 per cent from the average in both Phoenix and Porchester wards, while being equal to the average in All Hallows ward.

77 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats' proposals for Carlton and, in particular, expressed support for the proposed division of central Carlton into three two-member wards.

78 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we consider that both the Borough Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area have merit, and would provide a significant improvement in electoral equality. There is also broad similarity in respect of a number of proposed boundaries including Mapperley Plains, Arnold Lane, Westdale Lane and the main Nottingham to Lincoln railway line, and we consider that these are clear, strong and coherent boundaries.

79 On balance, we consider that the Borough Council's proposal for Gedling ward would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In particular, we note that the existing Conway ward, which is elongated and contains a number of disconnected areas, would be abolished. However, in the northern part of this ward, we consider that the Liberal Democrats' proposal has greater merit, as it involves much of the rural area of Gedling ward being included within Lambley ward, and the old colliery site being retained in All Hallows ward. This would ensure that a possible area of future development would be included in a single suburban ward. The Liberal Democrats' proposal would also abolish the existing boundary between Gedling and Porchester wards, which is not based on an identifiable ground feature. However, given that a suitable alternative boundary was not put forward, we propose modifying the Liberal Democrats' proposals in order to utilise the identifiable boundary of the field edge and the disused railway line. However, we propose retaining the name of Gedling for this ward as we have not been persuaded that All Hallows is a more appropriate name. We welcome further evidence on the most appropriate ward name at Stage Three.

80 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals for Phoenix and St James wards would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In particular, we note that the Liberal Democrats' proposals for Phoenix ward would create an extended ward which would include areas with little connection with each other, while the Borough Council proposed a more compact ward.

81 We have decided to endorse the Borough Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals for Porchester ward. In particular, we note that their proposal to follow Arnold Lane and to include part of the existing St James ward would provide a clearly identifiable area with good electoral equality. Also, as previously indicated, we propose that the Gedling colliery site should be transferred to the modified Gedling ward, while Chase Farm and the Spring Lane area, which shares transport links with Lambley ward, should be combined with Lambley ward.

82 Under our draft recommendation for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Gedling, Phoenix, Porchester and St James wards would vary by 2 per cent, 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent from the borough average, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years to equal the borough average in Porchester ward, and to vary by 4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent from the borough average in Gedling, Phoenix and St James wards by 2004.

### **Carlton, Carlton Hill, Cavendish, Conway and Netherfield wards (in Carlton)**

83 The existing wards of Carlton, Carlton Hill, Cavendish, Conway and Netherfield cover the south of Carlton town. Netherfield ward contains the urban parish of Colwick. Carlton, Carlton Hill and Netherfield wards are each represented by three councillors, while Cavendish and Conway wards are each represented by two councillors. Under current arrangements of a 57-member council, the number of electors per councillor in each of the wards varies from the borough average by 1 per cent, 4 per cent, 11 per cent, 4 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years.

84 The Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by four wards with the proposed Carlton, Carlton Hill and Netherfield & Colwick wards each being represented by three councillors, and the proposed Valley ward being represented by two councillors. It proposed that Carlton ward should comprise the majority of Carlton ward less that part to the north of Carlton Hill, Garden Avenue, and Foxhill Road East. It also proposed including those parts of the existing Carlton Hill and Cavendish wards to the south of Carlton Hill and the part of Conway ward bounded by Burton Road, Foxhill Road East, Manor Road and Station Road.

85 The Borough Council proposed that Carlton Hill ward should comprise the majority of the existing Carlton Hill ward less that part to the south of Carlton Hill, and to the north-east of Foxhill Road Central, Prospect Road and Ernest Road. It also proposed including those parts of Carlton and Cavendish wards between Foxhill Road and Carlton Hill, up to the school boundary, in the proposed Carlton Hill ward. It proposed that Netherfield & Colwick ward should retain the boundaries of the existing Netherfield ward.

86 The Borough Council proposed that Valley ward should comprise the majority of the existing Cavendish ward less that part to the west of Ernest Road and to the south of Foxhill Road. It also proposed that Valley ward should include that part of Carlton Hill ward to the east of Ernest Road and to the north of Foxhill Road and Prospect Road. It argued that the part of the existing Carlton ward to the north of Foxhill Road should also be included in the proposed Valley ward together with that part of Conway ward to the north of Foxhill Road and Burton Road. It argued that the ward should also include parts of Redland Avenue and Redland Grove from Gedling ward.

87 Under the Borough Council's proposals for a 50-member council the number of electors per councillor in Carlton, Carlton Hill and Netherfield & Colwick would vary from the borough average by 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent respectively, and would be equal to the borough average in Valley ward. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, to vary by 3 per cent, 4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent respectively from the borough average by 2004.

88 The Liberal Democrats proposed that this area should be represented by six wards with the proposed Carlton Forum, Carlton Hill, Old Carlton, Southcliffe and Southview wards each being represented by two councillors and the proposed Netherfield & Colwick ward being represented by three councillors.

89 The Liberal Democrats argued that Foxhill Road is “the natural boundary” in this area, and proposed that Carlton Forum ward should include that part of Cavendish ward to the north of Foxhill Road and that part of the existing Carlton Hill ward to the north-west of Foxhill Road and Burton Avenue, including the whole of Cherrywood Gardens. As an alternative, they suggested that this boundary could be drawn along Highfield Drive, Third Avenue, Standhill Avenue and Addison Road, arguing that either of these boundaries would be satisfactory as regards community identity in the area. This alternative would have a marginal effect on electoral equality.

90 They proposed that Carlton Hill ward should comprise the remainder of Carlton Hill ward less that part to the south-east of Dale Road, Shorwell Road and the recreation ground. They proposed that it should also include those parts of Carlton and Cavendish wards between Foxhill Road and Carlton Hill up to the western boundary of the school. They proposed that Shorewell Road should be excluded from this ward because it does not have transport links with the area.

91 The Liberal Democrats also proposed that Netherfield & Colwick ward should comprise the existing Netherfield ward less the area to the north of Stoke Lane, which it proposed should be transferred to Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward in order to ensure that all of the New Cottages are contained in Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward. They also proposed that a boundary between Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph and Netherfield & Colwick wards should be drawn along the Ouse Dyke and across the field boundaries to the river, to include the lagoons area in Netherfield & Colwick ward, from where the lagoons can be accessed.

92 They also proposed that Old Carlton ward should include the majority of Conway ward less Doveridge Avenue and Doveridge Road, to be transferred to All Hallows ward, and that part bounded by Burton Road and Cavendish Road which should be transferred to the proposed Southview ward. They proposed that Old Carlton ward should also include that part of the existing Carlton ward bounded by Beck Street, Cavendish Road, Carlton Hill, Chesterfield Street, Midland Crescent and Midland Road. They also proposed that Mount Pleasant should be included in Old Carlton ward because it is “clearly Old Carlton”. They proposed that Southcliffe ward should comprise the existing Carlton ward less Mount Pleasant, Midland Crescent and Midland Road, and the area to the north of Carlton Hill, with the remainder of Carlton Hill and Cavendish wards. They proposed that Southview ward should comprise the remainder of Carlton, Conway, Priory and St James wards.

93 The Liberal Democrats also suggested an alternative scheme for Carlton under which two three-member wards would be created in the centre of Carlton in place of the proposed Carlton Forum, Carlton Hill and Southview wards, using the boundaries of Foxhill Road and Valley Road. However, they indicated that this would involve splitting the community in the Valley Road area and would “create a very difficult ward”.

94 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 51-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in Carlton Forum, Carlton Hill, Netherfield & Colwick, Southcliffe and Southview wards varying from the borough average by 4 per cent, 8 per cent, 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 1 per cent, and 3 per cent from the borough average in Carlton Forum, Carlton Hill, Netherfield & Colwick and Southcliffe wards respectively, and being equal to the borough average in Southview ward. No electoral data was submitted for their alternative option for the centre of Carlton.

95 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats' proposals for these wards.

96 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we consider that both the Borough Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals have merit. Both schemes provide an improved level of electoral equality, and utilise strong boundaries based on major roads in the area. We also note that there is broad agreement in relation to proposed ward boundaries. However, on balance, we consider that the Borough Council's proposals for this area would offer the better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In particular, we have reservations regarding the Liberal Democrats' proposed Old Carlton and Southview wards, both of which would appear to comprise areas with little common identity and limited communication links. Additionally, we have considered the Liberal Democrats' alternative warding arrangements for two three-member wards in this area, but we share their view that this would create a "difficult" ward.

97 As a consequence of substantially endorsing the Borough Council's proposals in this area, we are limited to the extent to which we are able to reflect the Liberal Democrats' proposals where they depart from the Borough Council's. However, we are proposing to modify the Borough Council's proposals for Netherfield & Colwick ward in order to resolve an anomaly in the present Netherfield boundary. While we concur with the Borough Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals that Netherfield & Colwick ward should retain the existing boundaries of Netherfield ward, we are proposing to modify the ward boundary with Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph in order that the whole of Stoke Lane should be contained within Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward.

98 We have also considered the proposal to transfer the lagoons area of Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward to the proposed Netherfield & Colwick ward. While this would appear to be a sensible proposition, we are unable to transfer part of a parish without first creating a parish ward and, given the fact that this area is uninhabited, we are unable to create a parish ward in this area. Nevertheless, this is an issue which may be addressed by the Borough Council as part of any future parishing review.

99 Under our draft recommendations for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Carlton, Carlton Hill and Netherfield & Colwick wards would vary by 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent, from the borough average respectively, while being equal to the borough average in Valley ward. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years to vary by 3 per cent, 4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

## **The rural areas**

### **Bestwood Park, Newstead and Ravenshead wards**

100 The existing wards of Bestwood Park, Newstead and Ravenshead cover the north-west of the rural area of Gedling borough. Bestwood Park ward comprises the parish of Bestwood St Albans; Newstead ward comprises the parishes of Linby, Newstead and Papplewick; and Ravenshead ward comprises the parish of Ravenshead. Bestwood Park and Newstead wards are each represented by a single councillor, while Ravenshead ward is represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Bestwood Park ward varies from the borough average by 136 per cent, due to recent development, and varies by 2 per cent and 4 per cent from the average in Newstead and Ravenshead wards. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively stable in Ravenshead ward over the next five years, but is projected to deteriorate in Newstead and Bestwood Park wards over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 12 per cent and 173 per cent respectively.

101 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by three wards with the proposed Bestwood Village and Newstead wards each being represented by one councillor, and Ravenshead ward being represented by three councillors. It proposed that Bestwood Park ward should be divided between two new wards, Bestwood Village and Bonington, and proposed Bestwood Village ward, comprising the majority of the existing Bestwood Park ward, less polling district 2, should be linked with parts of the existing Bonington, Oxclose and St Marys wards to form a new Bonington ward, as previously indicated. It also proposed that Newstead and Ravenshead wards should retain their existing ward boundaries. While it acknowledged that this would result in Ravenshead ward having a relatively high level of electoral imbalance, it argued that retaining existing boundaries would ensure that the “parish communities [remain] intact”.

102 Under the Borough Council’s proposals for a 50-member council the number of electors per councillor in Bestwood Village, Newstead and Ravenshead wards would vary from the borough average by 31 per cent, 10 per cent and 9 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 8 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

103 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the area should be represented by three wards, with Bestwood and Newstead wards each being represented by a single councillor and Ravenshead ward being represented by three councillors. They proposed dividing Bestwood Park ward into two wards, arguing that there are no direct transport links between Bestwood village and the Top Valley area. They proposed that the Top Valley area should be combined with the adjacent part of Arnold to form a Warren Hill ward, as previously indicated, and that the remainder of the existing Bestwood Park ward should be combined with that part of the existing St Marys ward to the south of the Leapool roundabout and to the west of Mansfield Road to form a Bestwood ward. They proposed that Newstead ward should include the whole of the existing Newstead ward plus that part of the existing St Marys ward to the north-west of the Leapool roundabout and Ollerton Road. They proposed that Ravenshead ward should retain its existing boundaries.

104 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposal for a 51-member council the number of electors per councillor in Bestwood, Newstead and Ravenshead wards would vary from the borough average by 27 per cent, 5 per cent and 7 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 8 per cent, 4 per cent and 7 per cent from the borough average respectively by 2004.

105 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area with the exception that they proposed linking the Top Valley area with the existing Oxclose ward. Bestwood St Albans Labour Party supported the proposal to increase the borough council representation of the Bestwood area, but argued that the parish boundaries should remain intact.

106 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we note that significant boundary modifications in this area are unavoidable given the high level of electoral imbalance in the existing Bestwood Park ward. As previously indicated, we propose adopting the Borough Council's proposal to divide the existing Bestwood Park ward between two new wards, with the Top Valley area being combined with part of Arnold, and the rural area forming a new Bestwood Village ward. However, we are also proposing combining part of the existing St Marys ward with the proposed Bestwood Village and Newstead wards in the interests of better reflecting the interests and identities of the St Marys area. While there is merit in retaining the existing boundaries of Newstead ward, as already indicated, we have been persuaded that there is compelling evidence supporting the inclusion of part of St Marys ward in a revised Newstead ward. We note that both the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats have proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Ravenshead ward, and we concur with this view which, in our judgement, would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area.

107 Under our draft recommendations for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bestwood Village, Newstead and Ravenshead wards would vary by 28 per cent, 7 per cent and 9 per cent from the borough average, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve significantly over the next five years to vary by 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 8 per cent from the borough average.

### **Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley, and Woodborough wards**

108 The existing wards of Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough cover the eastern, rural area of Gedling borough. Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward comprises the parishes on Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph while Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough wards comprise the parishes of Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough respectively. Calverton ward is represented by three councillors, Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward is represented by two councillors and Lambley and Woodborough wards are each represented by a single councillor. Under current arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley, and Woodborough wards varies by 1 per cent, 16 per cent, 32 per cent, and 5 per cent, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years.

109 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that this area should be represented by four wards with the proposed Calverton ward being represented by three councillors, the proposed Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Lambley and Woodborough wards each being represented by one councillor. It supported retaining the existing boundaries of Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton and Woodborough wards. However, in the interests of electoral equality, it proposed that Lambley ward should include that part of the existing Porchester ward to the north of Arnold Lane, as previously indicated.

110 Under the Borough Council's proposals for a 50-member council the number of electors per councillor in Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley, and Woodborough wards would vary from the borough average by 13 per cent, 2 per cent, 3 per cent, and 8 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 8 per cent, 7 per cent, 3 per cent, and 7 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

111 The Liberal Democrats proposed that this area should be represented by four wards, with the proposed Calverton ward being represented by three councillors, the proposed Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Lambley and Woodborough wards each being represented by one councillor. As previously indicated, they proposed that the western boundary of Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward should be modified to include the northern corner of Netherfield ward and to exclude the lagoons area. They also proposed that the boundary between Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward and the existing Gedling ward should be modified to cut across the fields to the west of Gedling Wood and to the east of Gedling Wood Farm.

112 The Liberal Democrats proposed that Calverton ward should comprise the existing Calverton ward plus that part of St Marys ward to the north-east of Lime Lane and Ollerton Road, as detailed above. They proposed transferring rural areas of the existing Porchester and Gedling wards to the proposed Lambley ward, as previously indicated, and argued that this proposed boundary would have the merit of excluding the old Gedling colliery site from Lambley ward, which may be developed in coming years and would be "distinctly suburban" in character. They also proposed that Woodborough ward should retain its existing boundaries.

113 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 51-member council the number of electors per councillor in Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley, and Woodborough wards would vary from the borough average by 12 per cent, 5 per cent, 1 per cent, and 6 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 6 per cent, 10 per cent, 1 per cent, and 6 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

114 The Labour Group supported the Liberal Democrats proposals for this area.

115 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we note that the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats have proposed minimal change in this area, and we concur with this view. We propose retaining the existing warding arrangements for Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward, subject to a minor boundary modification with the new ward of

Netherfield & Colwick, as previously indicated. While we have considered the Liberal Democrats' proposal to modify the boundary between Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward and Gedling ward, we note that the proposed new ward boundary would not be tied to firm ground detail nor would it offer improvements to electoral equality, and we have therefore not been persuaded to endorse this proposal. As already indicated, we are proposing to largely retain the existing boundaries of Calverton ward, as proposed by the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats, subject to including part of St Marys ward, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats.

116 We note that there is broad similarity between the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats in relation to proposed changes to the existing Lambley ward, with both proposing to include the northern part of Porchester ward in a revised Lambley ward. However, as already indicated, the Liberal Democrats additionally proposed including the spoil heaps, which are currently contained within Gedling ward, in Lambley ward. On balance, we have been persuaded to adopt the Liberal Democrats' proposal to include the northern parts of Gedling and Porchester wards in Lambley ward, except for the Gedling colliery site, which would remain in Gedling ward. We consider that this proposal has merit as it would ensure that any future development on the colliery site would be contained within the suburban ward of Gedling, while the uninhabited part of the ward would be transferred to the rural ward of Lambley. We also propose retaining the existing warding arrangements for Woodborough ward, as proposed by the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats.

117 Under our draft recommendations for a 50-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph, Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough wards would vary by 13 per cent, 3 per cent, 3 per cent and 8 per cent, from the borough average, respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively stable over the next five years, varying by 8 per cent, 8 per cent, 3 per cent and 7 per cent from the borough average respectively by 2004.

## **Electoral Cycle**

118 At Stage One, the Borough Council supported maintaining whole-council elections every four years. We received no other representations regarding the Borough Council's electoral cycle.

119 Given the Borough Council's support and the lack of opposition to the current electoral cycle, we are content to recommend that the present system of whole-council elections every four years should be retained.

## **Conclusions**

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

- (a) there should be a reduction in council size from 57 to 50;
- (b) there should be 22 wards, two fewer than at present;

(c) the boundaries of 22 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of two wards;

(d) elections should continue to be held every four years for the whole council.

121 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

(a) the boundary between the proposed Bestwood Village and Bonington wards should be modified to be coterminous with the proposed parish ward, as proposed by Bestwood St Albans Parish Council;

(b) the northern part of St Marys ward should be divided between the wards of Bestwood Village, Calverton and Newstead, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats;

(c) the northern parts of the existing Gedling and Porchester wards should be combined in Lambley ward, while the whole Gedling Colliery site should be included in Gedling ward;

(d) the whole of Birchfield Road should be included in Killisick ward as proposed by the Liberal Democrats and the Labour Group;

(e) that part of Netherfield ward to the north of Stoke Lane should be included in Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward.

122 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

*Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	57	50	57	50
Number of wards	24	22	24	22
Average number of electors per councillor	1,543	1,760	1,602	1,827
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	11	2	11	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	4	1	5	0

123 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Gedling Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 11 to two. By 2004 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough.

**Draft Recommendation**

Gedling Borough Council should comprise 50 councillors serving 22 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held every four years for the whole Council.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

124 The Borough Council received a submission from Bestwood St Alban’s Parish Council proposing that the parish should be divided into two wards, Village and Top Valley. The former would comprise the Village and Surprise View areas, and the latter the Top Valley development. It proposed that the boundary should be drawn along the existing polling district boundary with modifications, in order to include Bestwood Country Park, Big Wood and Warrenhill Plantation within the proposed Village ward. The Parish Council argued that the Country Park is part of Bestwood Village’s heritage and should be warded with it. This proposal has been supported by the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats. The Parish Council proposed that there should be no change to the existing parish council size, and that Village ward should be represented by four councillors and Top Valley ward by five councillors. Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided that the proposed new warding arrangements would provide better representation and we are content to endorse this proposal and to modify the proposed borough ward boundary accordingly.

**Draft Recommendation**

Bestwood St Albans Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two new wards, with the proposed Village ward returning four councillors and the proposed Top Valley ward returning five councillors. The parish ward boundaries are illustrated on Map A2 in Appendix A.

125 Calverton Parish Council proposed that its parish wards should be modified in order to achieve greater electoral equality. It suggested that the area between the school grounds and Flatts Lane should be transferred from polling district 3 to district 1, and that the part of district 2, to the south-west of Bonner Hill, Bonner Lane, Crookdole Lane and Park Road East, should be transferred to district 3. The Borough Council did not comment on these proposals. Having considered the Parish Council’s proposal, we consider that the proposed ward boundary modifications would offer improved electoral equality within the parish, and we are content to accept the Parish Council’s proposal.

**Draft Recommendation**

Calverton Parish Council should comprise three wards, as at present, the boundaries of which should be modified as illustrated on Map A3 in Appendix A.

126 We have not received any submissions regarding the electoral cycle of parish councils in the borough. We are not, therefore, proposing any change to their electoral cycle.

**Draft Recommendation**

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

**127 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Gedling and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish 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 Gedling*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

128 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Gedling. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 21 February 2000. 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 Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

129 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Gedling Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

130 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 Gedling: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Gedling 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 Bestwood St Albans parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed warding of Calverton parish.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Arnold and Carlton.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Gedling: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Bestwood St Albans Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed Warding of Calverton Parish*

## APPENDIX B

### Gedling Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Borough Council in a number of wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

*Figure B1: Gedling Borough Council's Proposals: Constituent Areas*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
Bestwood Village	Bestwood Park ward (part)
Bonington	Bestwood Park ward (part); Bonington ward (part); Oxclose ward (part); St Marys ward (part)
Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph)
Calverton	<i>Unchanged</i> (Calverton parish)
Gedling	Conway ward (part); Gedling ward (part)
Killisick	Killisick ward (part)
Lambley	Lambley ward; Porchester ward (part)
Netherfield & Colwick	Netherfield ward
Newstead	<i>Unchanged</i> (Newstead parish)
St Marys	Killisick ward (part); St Marys ward (part)

Figure B2: Gedling Borough Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1 Bestwood Village	1	1,214	1,214	-31	1,837	1,837	1
2 Bonington	3	5,328	1,776	1	5,477	1,826	0
3 Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	2	3,052	1,526	-13	3,363	1,682	-8
4 Calverton	3	5,361	1,787	2	5,861	1,954	7
8 Gedling	3	5,193	1,731	-2	5,259	1,753	-4
9 Killisick	1	1,833	1,833	4	1,844	1,844	1
11 Lambley	1	1,713	1,713	-3	1,776	1,776	-3
13 Netherfield & Colwick	3	5,145	1,715	-3	5,412	1,804	-1
14 Newstead	1	1,582	1,582	-10	1,802	1,802	-1
19 St Marys	3	5,463	1,821	3	5,717	1,906	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>87,977</b>	–	–	<b>91,329</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,760</b>	–	–	<b>1,827</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on Gedling Borough 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.

## Gedling Liberal Democrats' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3: Gedling Liberal Democrats' Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
All Hallows (in Carlton)	Conway ward (part); Gedling ward (part); Porchester ward (part)
Bestwood	Bestwood Park ward (part); St Marys ward (part)
Bonington (in Arnold)	Bonington ward (part); Killisick ward (part); Kingswell ward (part); St Marys ward (part)
Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph ward; Netherfield ward (part)
Calverton	Calverton ward; St Marys ward (part)
Carlton Forum (in Carlton)	Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part)
Carlton Hill (in Carlton)	Carlton ward (part); Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part)
Daybrook (in Arnold)	Bonington ward (part); Kingswell ward (part); Oxclose ward (part)
Killisick (in Arnold)	Killisick ward (part); Mapperley Plains ward (part); St Marys ward (part)
Kingswell (in Arnold)	Kingswell ward (part)
Lambley	Lambley ward; Gedling ward (part); Porchester ward (part)
Netherfield & Colwick (in Carlton)	Netherfield ward (part)
Newstead	Newstead ward; St Marys ward (part)
Old Carlton (in Carlton)	Carlton ward (part); Conway ward (part); Gedling ward (part)
Phoenix (in Carlton)	Phoenix ward; Gedling ward (part); Priory ward (part); St James ward (part)
Plains (in Arnold)	Mapperley Plains ward (part)
Porchester (in Carlton)	Porchester ward (part); St James ward (part)
Ravenshead	<i>Unchanged</i> (Ravenshead parish)
St Marys (in Arnold)	Killisick ward (part); St Marys ward (part)

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
Southcliffe (in Carlton)	Carlton ward (part); Carlton Hill ward (part); Cavendish ward (part)
Southview (in Carlton)	Carlton ward (part); Conway ward (part); Priory ward (part); St James ward (part)
Warren Hill	Bestwood Park ward (part); Bonington ward (part)
Woodborough	<i>Unchanged</i> (Woodborough parish)
Woodthorpe (in Arnold)	Woodthorpe ward; Kingswell ward (part)

Figure B4: Gedling Liberal Democrats' Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	All Hallows	2	3,562	1,781	3	3,585	1,793	0
2	Bestwood	1	1,260	1,260	-27	1,643	1,643	-8
3	Bonington	2	3,831	1,916	11	3,850	1,925	7
4	Burton Joyce & Stoke Bardolph	2	3,052	1,526	-12	3,363	1,682	-6
5	Calverton	3	5,411	1,804	5	5,911	1,970	10
6	Carlton Forum	2	3,587	1,794	4	3,754	1,877	5
7	Carlton Hill	2	3,726	1,863	8	3,756	1,878	5
8	Daybrook	2	3,491	1,746	1	3,512	1,756	-2
9	Killisick	2	3,611	1,806	5	3,643	1,822	2
10	Kingswell	2	3,396	1,698	-2	3,411	1,706	-5
11	Lambley	1	1,712	1,712	-1	1,778	1,778	-1
12	Netherfield & Colwick	3	5,145	1,715	-1	5,412	1,804	1
13	Newstead	1	1,638	1,638	-5	1,858	1,858	4
14	Old Carlton	2	3,431	1,716	-1	3,507	1,754	-2
15	Phoenix	3	5,222	1,741	1	5,260	1,753	-2
16	Plains	2	3,343	1,672	-3	3,403	1,702	-5
17	Porchester	3	5,443	1,814	5	5,485	1,828	2
18	Ravenshead	3	4,812	1,604	-7	5,022	1,674	-7
19	St Marys	3	5,216	1,739	1	5,476	1,825	2
20	Southcliffe	2	3,405	1,703	-1	3,483	1,742	-3
21	Southview	2	3,552	1,776	3	3,598	1,799	0
22	Warren Hill	2	3,121	1,561	-10	3,493	1,747	-2

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
23 Woodborough	1	1,621	1,621	-6	1,690	1,690	-6
24 Woodthorpe	3	5,385	1,795	4	5,436	1,812	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>87,973</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>91,329</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,725</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,791</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Gedling Borough 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 reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), 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<sup>1</sup>. 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 LGBC, 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;

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

- 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 electors 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 electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) 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 (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) 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:

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

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

6 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:

- (h) 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;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) 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.