

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.196

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 196

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton GCB KBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Professor Michael Chisholm

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Sir Andrew Wheatley CBE

To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISTRICT
OF BRACKNELL IN THE COUNTY OF BERKSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the District of Bracknell in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 12 August 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Bracknell District Council, copies of which were circulated to the Berkshire County Council, Parish Councils in the district, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Bracknell District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council have opted for whole council elections.

5. The Council presented their draft scheme of representation on 3 December 1974 as a dual submission. In the first part the Council proposed to divide the area into 18 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 34 members. The scheme took account only of the minimal increase in population up to the time of the 1976 elections. The second scheme, which it was intended should come into effect by 1979, allowed for the establishment of 20 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to give a total council of 40 members.

6. We noted that because of the rapid growth expected in the electorate of the Bracknell New Town the Council's first scheme had been prepared on the basis that it would apply only to the 1976 elections and that it was the Council's intention to carry out a further review before the 1979 elections.

7. We advised the Council that this procedure would not be consistent with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 which oblige us to have regard to changes expected in the size and distribution of the electorate within five years.

8. We also noted ~~and~~ pointed out to the District Council that the proposed Great Hollands ward would be subject to a meagre standard of representation. It had sufficient electors to justify the allocation of 4 members instead of the 3 proposed by the Council. This raised the question of dividing the ward into two or more new wards, for our guidelines, as set out in our Report No 6, do not permit district wards returning more than 3 members save in the most exceptional circumstances.

9. The Council, however, pressed for consideration of the dual submission, or alternatively for the eventual issue by the Secretary of State of an Order in two parts. They also asked for the Great Hollands ward of the parish of Bracknell to be considered as a special case, and to be allowed to return four

members in either scheme. The short-term scheme would then provide for a District Council of 35 members, instead of 34 as originally proposed.

10. We considered the two draft schemes together with copies of the correspondence received by the Council during the preparation of the schemes and after their publication, as well as a number of letters we received direct.

11. We noted that most of the parish councils had agreed with the District Council's provisional proposals, or had offered no comment. Bracknell Town Council and a local political party had suggested identical district ward boundary changes within Bracknell New Town, and these had been incorporated in the District Council's schemes. A local residents association had suggested an increase from four to six in the total representation of the proposed three district wards in the parish of Sandhurst. We noted that this increase was incorporated in the Council's 40-member long-term scheme.

12. We considered that the Council's 35-member scheme produced an unsatisfactory standard of representation. This was partly because the Council had not provided for this arrangement lasting until 1979. We also noted the proposed four member ward. For these reasons and bearing in mind the question of procedure referred to in paragraph 7 above, we considered that this scheme did not comply with our rules and guidelines, and we decided to reject it.

13. We then considered the Council's 40-member scheme and noted that by 1979 it would ensure a tolerably even standard of representation, having regard to the special difficulties in devising suitable long term arrangements for new and expanding towns.

14. We considered the Council's submission that the proposed Great Hollands ward should return 4 members - (see paragraph 9 above). We could find no sufficient grounds for departing from our guidelines in this case. We considered the effect on electoral representation of dividing the ward into two district wards, using

the Great Hollands Road as the boundary between them. We decided that this arrangement should be included in our draft proposals, and that the Council should be advised that, if this proposal were confirmed, the Council would be asked to review the electoral arrangements of the parish of Bracknell accordingly.

15. We noted that the scheme provided for two single-member wards, Crown Wood and Birch Hill, whose electorates were too small to make them immediately viable as electoral wards. They were expected to be viable by 1979, because of development in those areas which are, respectively, parts of the Harmanswater and Hanworth areas of Bracknell New Town. We considered that the only arrangement we could propose at present was the inclusion of the proposed Crown Wood and Birch Hill Wards in their parent areas. We therefore decided that the Crown Wood area should be included in the proposed Harmanswater ward: that the Birch Hill area should be included in the proposed Hanworth ward : and that each of these wards should return three councillors.

16. We studied a number of ways in which the 40-member draft scheme might be modified so as to improve the standard of representation. In most instances we concluded that no change should be made. We noted, however, that the proposed Binfield ward, if it returned only one member, would still be under-represented in 1979. As there seemed to be no way in which this parish could be grouped with neighbouring wards to correct this imbalance, we decided to propose the allocation of an additional member.

17. We then considered the comments which had been received, where these made suggestions which the Council had not incorporated in their draft scheme. We considered that the Council's rejection of these comments was justified, and we decided to propose no further change in the draft scheme.

18. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 above, we decided that the District Council's 40-member draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act

and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

19. On 20 June 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals and the accompanying maps which illustrated the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 15 August 1975.

20. In response to our draft proposals Bracknell District Council reiterated their earlier submissions. They objected to the proposal to divide their proposed Great Hollands ward into two separate wards and reaffirmed the submission previously made for the creation of a single 4 member ward. The Council expressed concern that a number of the proposed wards would be over-represented in 1976 and that the elector/councillor ratios in the wards which we had proposed in Bracknell New Town would be higher than those in the rest of the district.

21. Two branches of a local political party wrote to us separately, also objecting to the proposal to divide the proposed Great Hollands ward and commenting that there would be considerable under-representation for the inhabitants of Bracknell New Town as opposed to the surrounding villages.

22. A local political party wrote to us in support of our proposed division of the Council's proposed Great Hollands ward.

23. The local Member of Parliament wrote to us in support of our draft proposals.

24. Berkshire County Council wrote that our draft proposals appeared satisfactory. However, a later letter intimated that a proposed reduction in County seats could pose problems in certain districts and the County Council might raise this issue at the informal meeting.

25. Bracknell Town Council submitted an alternative scheme providing for 18 wards to return a total council of 35 members.

26. In view of these comments, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr Bernard Marder was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

27. After the announcement of the local meeting we received further letters from Bracknell District Council, Sandhurst Town Council and a community association. The District Council supported, with modifications, Bracknell Town Council's alternative scheme. Sandhurst Town Council supported our allocation of two councillors to the proposed College Town ward. The community association likewise supported our allocation of three councillors to the proposed Hanworth ward. We sent copies of these letters to the Assistant Commissioner.

28. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at Bracknell on 26 September 1975. A copy (without enclosures) of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

29. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should remain unaltered except in the proposed Oulsmoor ward where, because of revised population estimates, he recommended that the number of councillors should be reduced from two to one.

30. We noted that, before we could formulate our final proposals, it would be necessary to invite the District Council to make an order under Section 50(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to create parish wards in the Town of Bracknell which matched the district wards recommended by us. This would include the division of their proposed Great Hollands ward into two wards as described in paragraph 14 above. The District Council continued to be reluctant to divide the ward in this way and this in turn led to a counter-request from numerous

electors for a parish electoral review to ensure that the parish of Bracknell should be re-warded as we had proposed.

31. The matter was resolved after the District Council elections in May 1976. The new District Council, in agreement with Bracknell Town Council, carried out the necessary parish reviews and established parish wards compatible with the district wards which we proposed. We were thus enabled to formulate our final proposals.

32. In the light of all the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to the modification proposed by the Assistant Commissioner and referred to in paragraph 29 above, and we formulated our final proposals accordingly.

33. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this Report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 defines the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are illustrated on the attached maps.

34. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and copies of the maps are being sent to Bracknell District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)
10 March 1977

Gray's Inn Chambers,
Gray's Inn,
London WC1R 5JA.

6 October 1975

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE,
Chairman,
Local Government Boundary Commission
for England.

Dear Sir Edmund,

Review of Electoral Arrangements
Bracknell District.

1. I have to report that following my appointment by the Home Secretary as Assistant Commissioner for the purpose of assisting the Commission's review of electoral arrangements for the Bracknell District, I presided at a local meeting held in the District Offices, Easthampstead House, Bracknell, on Friday 26 September 1975 to hear representations.

2. The meeting opened at 10 a.m. and was closed at approximately 1p.m. I enclose an attendance list showing that 21 persons attended. After the meeting I inspected in some detail the Great Hollands area of Bracknell New Town, to which area much of the discussion was directed.

I also made a more general inspection of the District, visiting in addition to other parts of the New Town, the areas of Warfield, Winkfield, Ascot, Crowthorne and Sandhurst. There follows a report of the issues emerging in the course of the review, of the representations made at the meeting, and of my conclusions and recommendations.

3. The District

Bracknell District is effectively the old Easthampstead Rural District, its boundaries apparently unchanged on reorganisation. Bracknell New Town lies at the centre, with a large and growing population; well over half the current population of the District is in the New Town, which is also the dominant centre for employment, local administration, shopping and entertainment. The rest of the District is predominantly rural in character, sparsely populated with large tracts of countryside dotted with pleasant villages; but there are smaller urban centres at Ascot, Crowthorne and Sandhurst.

4. Background.

In my instructions from the Commission it was made clear that a major problem arises in attempting to devise electoral arrangements which will remain satisfactory over the term of review for areas where rapid changes of population will take place. Bracknell District is a case in point; the population in the rural areas of the District is likely to remain relatively stable over the next five years, whilst the population of the New Town will increase substantially over the same period. The problem cannot be solved by more frequent review, since apart from the administrative difficulties

involved, the Commission regards itself bound by the Act (Schedule II) to look to the whole 5 year period ahead to 1979. In those circumstances it is well-nigh impossible to ensure that any scheme proposed will be wholly satisfactory throughout the period of review, and the task of review is therefore to devise the best possible arrangements having regard to the statutory rules which must be observed, and the practice guidelines which the Commission have adopted. I should add at this point that this particular problem, which is basic to the Bracknell review, was recognised and accepted by those present at the local meeting.

5. Progress of the Review.

The history of the review since August 1974, when the Commission invited the District Council to prepare and submit draft proposals, is fully set out in my instructions, and I need not repeat it here. It is sufficient to say that in the course of consultation and correspondence, the following issues appeared to remain unresolved and likely to give rise to controversy:-

- (a) the balance of representation generally between Bracknell New Town and the more rural parts of the District;
- (b) whether the estimates of projected population growth in the District were likely to be accurate and realistic over the Review period;
- (c) more specifically, what representation was appropriate for Great Hollands Ward in the New Town, and whether that ward should be divided into two wards;

(d) the appropriate level of representation in the areas of Ascot and Sandhurst.

The Commission's draft proposals issued in June 1975 endeavoured to meet these and other problems, but subsequent representations indicated that differences of view remained on all these issues, and the Commission accordingly decided in August to call a local meeting. At about the same time, Bracknell Town Council (a ~~parish~~ council under the Act) submitted an objection to the Commission's draft proposals, their objection including alternative proposals. Hence, by the time the meeting was convened, there were in circulation two schemes alternative to that embodied in the Commission's draft proposals, and a number of variations on all three had been mooted.

6. Summary position at the time of the meeting.

It should be borne in mind that the District Council, as constituted under interim arrangements for the 1973 elections, has a membership of 31 councillors elected for 16 wards. Representation is reasonably spread on the basis of the electorate of that time, but of course no account is taken of projected changes of population up to 1979. (see Table 1).

The scheme described as the District Council's "Long-term (1979) proposals" - see Table 3 - would produce a Council of 40 members in 18 wards. This would include 4 members representing an undivided Great Hollands Ward.

The Commission's draft proposals (Table 4) would produce a 41 member Council in 19 wards. Great Hollands would be divided into ^{2 x} ~~the~~ 2-member wards, and the scheme differs in representation elsewhere from the proposals of the District Council.

Finally, the scheme put forward on behalf of Bracknell Town Council (Table 5) would produce a 35-member Council in 18 wards. A single Great Hollands Ward would return 3 councillors, whilst representation elsewhere is somewhat reduced when compared with the Commission's draft proposals.

7. Representations at the Meeting.

(i) After opening the meeting and outlining the issues which appeared to arise, I heard the views of the District Council, represented by Cllr. Lindop, leader of the majority (Labour) group, which at present has overall control. Cllr. Lindop acknowledged the difficulty of devising arrangements which would remain adequate for the period ahead. The Council would have preferred a two-stage review but now accepted the Commission's view that this could not be arranged. The District Council had been persuaded by the Commission's proposals, but have now had further thoughts as to the appropriate size of Council, and wished to support the proposals put forward by Bracknell Town Council (Table 5), subject to the minor revision indicated in the minutes attached to the

District Council's letter to the Commission dated 19 September 1975. This would produce a 35-member Council in 18 wards (as in the Bracknell Town Council scheme) but the Ascot members would be increased from 2 to 3 and the Sandhurst members reduced from 2 to 1.

(ii) In view of the effect of these proposals on the size of the Council, I sought information as to whether a 35 member council would cause manning difficulties, but Cllr. Lindop's view was clear that it would not. The present Council ran satisfactorily with 31 members, and if there were any difficulty to be foreseen, it was more likely to result from a lack of candidates to fill the seats.

(iii) Mr. Furley represented Bracknell Labour Party. He is a County Councillor for the Great Hollands/Wildridings area of the New Town. Mr. Furley confined his remarks to the question of Great Hollands ward, reiterating the objections set out fully in an enclosure to the letter dated 21 August 1975 from Mr. McCormack, Secretary of Bracknell District Labour Party. These views can be summarised as three propositions, viz. (a) Great Hollands Ward is entitled to 4 members; (b) Great Hollands should not be split into two wards; and (c) the reasons for not splitting the ward constitute exceptional circumstances, justifying a departure from the Commission's normal practice of limiting ward representation to a maximum of 3. The concept of the Great Hollands area as a single unit with a single centre and a single Community Association with an active community spirit,

was strongly argued by Mr. Furley. In answer to my questions, he did not think division into two wards would create practical difficulties in voting, though the political parties would need to form separate ward organisations.

(iv) Cllr. Mrs. Benwell is leader of the minority Conservative group on the District Council. She expressed general agreement with the proposals now put forward by the Council, i. e. the modified Bracknell Town Council scheme, but wished to take issue in regard to two points. Firstly, with regard to Great Hollands, representation there should be 4 councillors, and the Conservatives supported division into 2 x 2 member wards, with Gt. Hollands Road forming a convenient and logical boundary. Mrs. Benwell made the point that there was no difficulty in councillors from adjoining wards co-operating on issues of common interest - they did that anyway.

(v) Secondly Mrs. Benwell proposed that Hanworth should be divided now into 2 x 2 member wards. These proposals would produce a Council of 37 members. She agreed that the Commission's proposals produced a larger Council than was necessary, and that the Council would function efficiently with a smaller number. Mrs. Benwell also accepted the District Council's proposed adjustments at Ascot (3) and Sandhurst (1).

(vi) Mr. Smith spoke for the Hanworth Community Association, which has about 300 members and is governed by an executive part-elected by the members and part nominated by official bodies. He drew attention to the special need for full and careful representation of new housing areas in the early period of growth, in support of a generous representation for the Hanworth Ward in particular, where substantial growth was anticipated in the review period.

(vii) In relation to the predictions of growth, I sought the help of the District Secretary, Mr. Casson. It appears that the predictions for the New Town are based on figures supplied by Bracknell Development Corporation for their current approved building programme. These figures were originally supplied early in 1975, but the latest information is that the Corporation's programme is going ahead as scheduled. Outside the designated area of the New Town however, the projected 1979 populations at Owlsmoor and Sandhurst had been revised downward, and the Council had taken account of this revision in putting forward an adjusted version of the Bracknell Town Council scheme.

(viii) Mr. Steele is a resident of Sandhurst, who urged that at least one of the three Sandhurst wards should have an extra councillor, that is a minimum of 4 councillors for Sandhurst as a whole. (I note that none of the proposals canvassed would produce less than this number.)

(ix) Mrs. Banks represented Winkfield Parish Council. The parish includes the wards of Ascot, Cranbourne and St. Mary's. It is an extensive rural area with consequent difficulties of communication, and it is the unanimous view of the Parish Council that any reduction from the present number of 5 councillors would have serious consequences.

(x) Mrs. Bayle spoke on behalf of Bracknell Town Council. They made no specific objection to the adjustments which the District Council proposed to their (the Town Council's) scheme at Ascot and Sandhurst. However, Mrs. Bayle urged support for the Labour Party's case against splitting the Great Hollands ward. In her view there should be a reasonable balance within wards of Council and private housing, and splitting the ward would upset this balance and be socially divisive.

(xi) Mr. Mattick lives in Wildridings and is vice-chairman of the Conservative Association. In his view the present electorate in Great Hollands ward was too large and unwieldy, and a division would be healthy politically. He saw no reason for a community association to be confined to a single ward. These views were supported by Mr. Matthews, the Conservative party agent, and by Mr. Mosses, who saw no difficulty in using a polling station in an adjoining ward. This happened already in the Priestwood/Garth area.

(xii) Finally, Mr. Over on behalf of Berks. County Council, explained their position, and indicated that on the basis of exercises they had carried out, the County Council saw no problems in regard to representation from the District which would require them to make objections or comments to the Commission at this stage. Arrangements for County Council elections were unlikely to be reviewed for some time, and it was not possible to predict what might happen when that time came, but for the present no difficulties were seen in grouping the District wards for the purpose of County Council elections.

8. Conclusions.

In the light of the discussion at the meeting which I have summarised, and my inspection of the area, I have reached the following conclusions:-

- (i) There is broad acceptance of, and no indication of dissent from, the view of the Commission, that the current review must look to the whole of the period to 1979; and that over that period of rapid but uneven growth, no arrangements are likely to be ideally satisfactory all the time;
- (ii) there is general agreement locally that a Council with less than the 41 members proposed by the Commission would be adequate and efficient; preference is shown for a smaller Council as proposed by the Bracknell Town Council scheme. On the other hand, I do not think the 41-member Council proposed by the Commission would prove unwieldy or unworkable;

- (iii) the scheme put forward by the Town Council (Table 5) would require adjustment in any event to take account of under-representation at Ascot and the reduced 1979 population estimate at Sandhurst. The adjustments proposed for this purpose by the District Council appear to be reasonable and to command acceptance;
- (iv) however, the Town Council's scheme leaves unresolved the problem of representation of two of the wards in the New Town, namely Great Hollands and Hanworth. These two wards are not alike, in that the former is almost fully developed whilst the latter will grow very considerably (1145 to 5600) over the review period; but by 1979 their electorates will be the same size, and their character as urban wards of a thriving new town will be similar. Great Hollands is now seriously under-represented, but both would suffer considerable under-representation by 1979 if the Town Council's proposals were accepted in their present form;
- (v) Great Hollands presents a most difficult problem, to which I can see no ideal solution. The fact is that Great Hollands is at present grossly under-represented (3 councillors with an entitlement of over 4) and would still be under-represented beyond acceptable limits in 1979 unless the number of councillors is increased. Furthermore, the District

Council is itself concerned at the general under-representation of the New Town by comparison with the rural areas of the District. Thus the case for increasing the number of councillors in the ward to 4 is in my view overwhelming. In the ordinary course, this increase could readily be achieved by dividing Great Hollands into 2 x 2 member wards as proposed by the Commission, using the only obvious and convenient boundary of Great Hollands Road. That division does not produce a perfect balance of numbers between North and South, but I believe the difference is acceptable for the sake of a clear boundary.

As against this, the case for retaining an undivided ward is one of substance and not in my opinion motivated by considerations of party advantage. I accept that this is a single community, clearly defined by the Ringmead "circle", with a single communal and shopping centre and a lively community life and spirit. These advantages should not lightly be discarded in the atmosphere of a new and growing town. However, whilst I give full weight to the representations made by advocates of a united ward, I am not persuaded that these social advantages would be lost or even diminished by dividing the area into 2 wards for electoral purposes.

I heard no evidence which satisfies me that any practical disadvantages would result from a division, and I see no reason why councillors should not cooperate on issues of common interest with those of an adjoining ward. For these reasons I conclude that no exceptional circumstances can be found to justify departure from the well-established practice of the Commission with regard to the number of councillors per ward. I appreciate that a decision on this matter may rest on steps to be taken by the District Council for alteration of parish wards. My view of this Council is that they have so far taken the greatest care in the search for a fair and adequate system of representation, and if my recommendations were adopted by the Commission, I see no reason to doubt that the Council would take the necessary steps in the same spirit;

- (vi) As I have indicated, the problem in Hanworth is different; here there will be major growth over the review period, so that whilst the present electorate is small, the 1979 electorate should equal that of Great Hollands. There is no ideal solution here either. If the area has 4 councillors, they will represent too few voters for much of the review period; if there are only two councillors, the ward will be seriously under-represented by 1979, especially by comparison with the adjoining Great

Hollands area. I conclude that the Commission's proposals are the best that can be devised in the circumstances; obviously adjustment will almost certainly be required at the next review.

- (vii) The revised population estimates for Owlsmoor (1975-973; 1979-1400) leads me to conclude that the Commission's proposals should be modified by reducing representation here to one member. Entitlement will thus be acceptable for the current electorate, and almost exactly right in 1979;
- (viii) In view of a reduced 1979 estimate of population for Sandhurst, there is a case for reducing the representation here as well, particularly as there is some degree of over-representation in the adjoining wards of College Town and Little Sandhurst. The difficulty here is that Sandhurst ward's current electorate would be seriously under-represented by 1 councillor. On balance therefore, I conclude that the Commission's proposals are reasonably adequate for the time being, but would recommend a more comprehensive review of parish boundaries in this area at a later stage;


- (ix) I heard no evidence to suggest differences of opinion over the details of proposed ward boundaries, and conclude that (apart from the question of dividing Great Hollands) the details of boundaries as indicated in the Commission's proposals command general support;
- (x) I heard no evidence of disagreement over the proposed names of wards. The point raised in para. 21 of my instructions regarding "Old Bracknell" ward appears to have sunk without trace.

9. Recommendation.

I hope I have made clear in the body of this report the peculiar difficulties of achieving adequate and fair representation in the circumstances obtaining in the Bracknell District. No solution is ideal and none can be recommended with absolute confidence. There is considerable merit in the proposals of Bracknell Town Council as modified and adopted by the District Council, but on balance I consider that the Commission's draft proposals produce a somewhat better result overall. I therefore recommend that the Commission's draft proposals as set out in the Commission's letter of 20 June 1975 and accompanying memorandum should be adopted, subject only to the modification that the number of councillors for Owlsmoor ward be reduced from two to one.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,


 (BERNARD MARDER)
 Assistant Commissioner.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND
REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS : BRACKNELL DISTRICT

Copy of Attendance List at Local Meeting
held on 26 September 1975

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
J. Kirk	Great Hollands
H. Kirk	Great Hollands
B.J.Smith	Hanworth Community Association
M.W.Branch	LGBC Secretariat (observer)
R.N.Mosses	Priestwood/Garth Conservatives
John Mattick	Old Bracknell, covering Great Hollands & Wildridings Conservative Association
Pauline Steel	Sandhurst Conservatives
M. Leutrie	Priestwood/Garth Conservatives
M.L.Townsend (Mrs)	Priestwood/Garth Conservative Ass..
Cllr Mrs. Benwell	Leader, Conservative Group, Bracknell District
Cllr. Margaret Banks	Winkfield Parish Council, Ascot
R.H.Matthews	Agent, Wokingham Conservative Association
Cllr. A.D.Steel	Sandhurst Conservatives
D.K.Over	Berkshire County Council
H.J.F.Gould	Berkshire County Council
D.J.Bayle	Great Hollands
P.A.Bayle	Bracknell Town Council
Alan Furley	Bracknell Labour Party
W.J.Lindop	Bracknell District Council
D.C.Casson	Bracknell District Council
W.M.Hayward	Bracknell District Council

SCHEDULE 2

DISTRICT OF BRACKNELL : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ASCOT	3
BINFIELD	2
BULLEROOK	3
COLLEGE TOWN	2
CRANBOURNE	1
CROWTHORNE	3
GARTH	2
GREAT HOLLANDS NORTH	2
GREAT HOLLANDS SOUTH	2
HANWORTH	3
HARMANSWATER	3
LITTLE SANDHURST	2
OLD BRACKNELL	3
OWLSMOOR	1
PRIESTWOOD	2
ST MARY'S	1
SANDHURST	2
WARFIELD	1
WILDRIDINGS	2

BRACKNELL DISTRICT : DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

ASCOT WARD

The Firlands, Manor and Priory wards of the parish of Winkfield.

BINFIELD WARD

The parish of Binfield

BULLBROOK WARD

The Bullbrook ward of the parish of Bracknell.

COLLEGE TOWN WARD

The College Town ward of the parish of Sandhurst

CRANBOURNE WARD

The Cranbourne ward of the parish of Winkfield

CROWTHORNE WARD

The parish of Easthampstead and the Crowtherne ward of the parish of Crowtherne

GARTH WARD

The Garth ward of the parish of Bracknell.

GREAT HOLLANDS NORTH WARD

That part of the Great Hollands ward of the parish of Bracknell which lies to the North of Great Hollands Road.

GREAT HOLLANDS SOUTH WARD

That part of the Great Hollands ward of the parish of Bracknell which lies to the south of the Great Hollands Road

HANWORTH WARD

The Hanworth ward of the parish of Bracknell

HARMANSWATER WARD

The Harmanswater ward of the parish of Bracknell

LITTLE SANDHURST WARD

The Little Sandhurst ward of the parish of Sandhurst

OLD BRACKNELL WARD

The Old Bracknell ward of the parish of Bracknell

OWLSMOOR WARD

The Owlsmoor ward of the parish of Crowthorne

FRIESTWOOD WARD

The Priestwood ward of the parish of Bracknell

ST. MARY'S WARD

The St. Mary's ward of the parish of Winkfield

SANDHURST WARD

The Sandhurst ward of the parish of Sandhurst

WARFIELD WARD

The parish of Warfield

WILDRIDINGS WARD

The Wildridings ward of the parish of Bracknell