

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
Brinsley, Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale), Eastwood South, Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) and Nuthall West and Greasley (Watnall)	10
Awsorth, Cossall & Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell	12
Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West	13
Attenborough, Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands, Beeston West, Bramcote, Chilwell East, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows	13
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	19
4 Mapping	21
Appendices	
A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Broxtowe Borough Council	22
B Glossary and abbreviations	24

Summary

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

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

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
3 September 2013	Consultation on council size
11 December 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
20 February 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
29 April 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
22 July 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

During the preliminary period of the review, the Commission received a submission from Broxtowe Borough Council proposing to retain the existing council size of 44. The Commission received six submissions during its initial consultation on council size. During consultation on warding arrangements, we received 12 submissions including a borough-wide scheme from Broxtowe Borough Council. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

Broxtowe Borough Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 4% over this period. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

Broxtowe Borough Council currently has a council size of 44. The Council originally proposed retaining its current council size. The Council outlined how 44 members

would provide for effective governance and decision-making and ensure members could undertake the representational role.

During consultation, we received six submissions relating to council size. Three supported a council size of 44 and the other two supported a reduction in council size. Having considered the evidence received we have therefore adopted a council size of 44 as part of our draft recommendations.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during consultation on warding arrangements, we have developed proposals based on a combination of the submissions received. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on those of Broxtowe Borough Council. However, we have proposed amendments in parts of Beeston, Cossall and Trowell. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the borough.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Broxtowe Borough Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **21 July 2014**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

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

Review Officer
Broxtowe Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

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

1 Introduction

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

2 We wrote to Broxtowe Borough Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals first on council size and then on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Broxtowe in autumn 2014.

What is an electoral review?

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

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Broxtowe?

6 Based on December 2012 electorate data, the ward of Eastwood North & Greasley has 36% fewer electors than the borough average.

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

¹ Schedule 2 to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 21 July 2014. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in winter 2014. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 19 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

14 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between borough wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single borough ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

15 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Broxtowe Borough Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Broxtowe Borough Council (the Council) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. During the preliminary period the Council put forward proposals for the retention of the existing 44-member council. We received a further six submissions during consultation on council size. During the consultation on ward boundaries we received 12 submissions, including a borough-wide submission from the Council. All representations received can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

17 As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2019. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). The Council initially submitted two sets of figures dependent on whether the Field Farm development was completed during the forecast period. We asked the Council to clarify when it expected this to be completed. In addition, we noted that development had been called in by the Secretary of State. Our conversations with the Planning Inspectorate suggested that the decision on this would not be made before spring 2014. Indeed, we note that this date has now been pushed back until August 2014. Therefore, we do not consider that the Field Farm development is likely to be completed and occupied within the forecast period.

18 The Council's forecast figures (without the Field Farm development) predicted an increase in electorate of 4.1 %, slightly lower than the Office for National Statistics forecasts for population. We are satisfied that these figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

19 The Council currently has 44 members elected from 21 borough wards, comprising four single-member, 11 two-member and six three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed the retention of the existing council size of 44 members.

20 The Council outlined its governance and management structure, citing that it operates a Leader and Cabinet model. The cabinet has eight members, five of which are portfolio holders for: Housing; Economy and Regeneration; Resources; Environment; Arts, Culture and Leisure. However, most decisions are taken by the executive as portfolio holders do not have any delegated decision-making powers. The Mayor is usually only appointed to one committee because of the number of civic engagements they undertake during their year of office. This effectively reduces the number of members to be allocated to committees to 43.

21 The Council outlined that its planning decisions are largely delegated to the Head of Planning. We understand that the Council's Development Control Committee considers only about 5% of cases (around 38 cases per year). The Council also outlined that it operated two committees which oversee the licensing functions of the Council.

22 In its submission the Council also outlined how it undertook scrutiny. The Council's scrutiny role is member-led, with topics for review and the direction and outcomes being set by councillors. The scrutiny function is co-ordinated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which also monitors service delivery and budgets, deals with call-ins and decides which topics should be the subject of a scrutiny review. There are also three Examination and Inquiry Groups which carry out the scrutiny reviews.

23 The Council stated that a reduction in council size would have an impact on its ability to deliver an effective scrutiny programme through either not reviewing so many topics or not undertaking such thorough reviews.

24 The Council outlined members' representational role, arguing that a recent survey showed that members spend at least four to six hours a week on case work. In addition, members spend on average four hours a week communicating directly with residents about ward issues through face-to-face contact, e-mails and telephone calls.

25 The Council expressed a concern that a reduction in the number of councillors would impact on their ability carry out these tasks which it considers to be an extremely important part of their role.

26 We noted the evidence and argument and considered that the Council had demonstrated how a council of 44 members would continue to ensure effective governance and decision-making arrangements in Broxtowe. On this basis we decided to carry out a consultation on a council size based on 44 members.

27 We received six submissions during consultation on council size. Three expressed general support for the existing council size of 44 members. Of the three submissions opposing the existing council size, two made general comments about the need for a reduction, while the second argued that a reduction could be realised if members were deployed more effectively.

28 We noted that there was limited support and objections to the retention of the existing council size of 44 members. We therefore decided to consult on warding patterns based on a council size of 44. During consultation on warding patterns we received one comment in relation to council size. On the basis of evidence received, we decided to base our draft recommendations on a council size of 44.

Electoral fairness

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

30 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (84,591 in 2013 and 88,072 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 44 under our draft recommendations.

Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 1,923 in 2013 and 2,002 by 2019.

31 Under our draft recommendations, all of our proposed wards will have electoral variances 10% or less from the average for the borough by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Broxtowe.

General analysis

32 During consultation on warding arrangements we received 12 submissions, including a borough-wide scheme from the Council. The Council's proposals secured good levels of electoral equality with no ward having a variance of greater than 8% from the borough average by 2019. However, we note that in a number of areas the Council proposed wards that have no or very limited direct road access between different areas within the proposed wards.

33 The Council's proposed Kimberley & Cossall ward appeared to have no direct road links between Cossall parish and Kimberley parish, with the only road link being along an unmetalled road or through Awsworth parish. Indeed, a number of respondents highlighted the lack of direct transport links between Cossall and Kimberley. We do not consider that this provides a ward with effective and convenient local government or reflects community links. We therefore examined options to address this. We propose a three-member Kimberley ward comprising Kimberley parish and the areas of Greasley and Nuthall parishes that the Council proposed transferring to its Kimberley & Cossall ward. This ward would have 7% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019.

34 To the south and west of this, we proposed combining Awsworth and Cossall parishes with the Council's Trowell ward, to create a two-member Trowell & Awsworth ward with 10% more electors than the borough average by 2019. We acknowledge that this would combine Trowell parish with parishes to the north, but we note that there are good road links between these areas.

35 The Council's Nuthall East & Strelley ward combined Strelley parish with part of Nuthall parish. Our investigations indicated that this ward would not have complete internal road links between the two parishes. We have explored alternatives, but are of the view that Strelley parish has a particular geography with no direct road links into any other part of Broxtowe borough. It is therefore not possible to include the parish in any ward with direct road links. On balance, we consider that the Council's proposed ward provides the best warding pattern and are retaining this ward as part of the draft recommendations.

36 We also noted that the Council's proposed Attenborough ward contained an area of housing around Charlton Grove that is some distance by road from the remainder of the properties in the ward. We considered that this area has better links into Beeston West ward. We therefore explored alternative warding patterns. Transferring this area out of Attenborough would worsen electoral equality to 15% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019. We did not consider there to be evidence to support this electoral variance. However, we did consider that there are reasonable road links between the Council's Attenborough and Chilwell East wards, via Meadow Lane and Attenborough Lane. We therefore propose combining the Council's proposed Attenborough and Chilwell East wards to create a three-member

Attenborough & Chilwell East ward which would have 1% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019.

37 We also noted that the Ashfield Liberal Democrats put forward a number of amendments to the Council's proposals in the Eastwood area. These amendments were designed to address the defacement of the boundary between Eastwood and Greasley parishes, which results in an irregular boundary that in part cuts through properties or part way through streets. We have given consideration to these proposals and acknowledge that the existing parish boundary is not sensible. However, these proposals would require the creation of a number of parish wards with fewer than 100 electors. The Commission is of the view that parish wards of this size are not in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore will not recommend them.

38 For this reason, we are not adopting the Ashfield Liberal Democrats' amendments to the boundaries in the Eastwood area. These issues would be best addressed by a Community Governance Review during which the Council can take soundings from local people as to the best boundary between Eastwood and Greasley parishes.

39 A local resident argued that all wards should be represented by a single member. We have given consideration to these comments, but note that the Council did not request a single-member ward review and therefore the Commission is not required to make provision for a uniform pattern of single-member wards for the borough.

40 Finally, in a number of areas alternative ward names were suggested. We have sought to ensure consistent ward names that best reflect the local areas covered by the ward.

41 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Electoral arrangements

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

- Brinsley, Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale), Eastwood South, Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) and Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) (pages 10 – 12)
- Awsworth, Cossall & Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell (pages 12 – 13)
- Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West (page 13)
- Attenborough, Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands, Beeston West, Bramcote, Chilwell East, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows (pages 13 – 14)

43 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 22 – 23 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Brinsley, Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale), Eastwood South, Greasley (Giltbrook and Newthorpe) and Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall)

44 The existing wards of Brinsley, Eastwood North and Greasley (Beauvale), Eastwood South, Greasley (Giltbrook and Newthorpe) and Nuthall West and Greasley (Watnall) lie to the north of the borough, covering Eastwood town and the surrounding rural area. The Council put forward proposals for the single-member Brinsley and Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale wards, the two-member Eastwood Hilltop, Eastwood St Mary's and Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West wards and a three-member Greasley ward. These wards would have 5% fewer, 3% more, 2% more, equal to, 7% fewer and 8% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The Council put forward only limited evidence to support its warding proposals.

45 Ashfield Liberal Democrats put forward almost identical proposals to the Council for the Eastwood wards, with the same levels of electoral equality. However, it put forward amendments to the Council's proposals to improve the 'chaotic' boundaries that result from the parish boundary between Eastwood and Greasley parishes. It stated that this boundary requires a Community Governance review. It also named the Eastwood North & Greasley North ward as Eastwood Hall. Councillor Charlesworth (Eastwood ward) expressed support for the Ashfield Liberal Democrats proposals, but stated that its 'Eastwood Hall' ward should be called D H Lawrence ward.

46 Greasley Parish Council requested that any ward that contains part of the parish should have Greasley within its name, adding that some of its members believe Watnall should be represented by a single member. Councillors R Willimott and B Willimott (Greasley parish) expressed support for the Council's proposals to divide Greasley parish between its Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale, Greasley and Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West wards, stating that these proposals highlighted the 'Greasley connection in each case'. Councillor Owen (Nuthall Division, Nottinghamshire County Council) objected to the ward name Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West, stating that while Watnall is 'an integrated part of the wider Nuthall community [...] no-one living at Watnall gives their address with any reference to Greasley'.

47 We have given careful consideration to the evidence received. We note that the Council's proposals secure good electoral equality, while generally using identifiable boundaries. We note the Ashfield Liberal Democrats proposed a number of amendments to the Council's proposals in these areas in order to provide stronger boundaries around areas where the parish boundary between Eastwood and Greasley parish is effectively defaced. However, as stated in paragraph 37 in the General analysis section, these proposals would result in the creation of unviable parish wards which the Commission will not normally recommend. Therefore, we are not recommending the amendments put forward by the Ashfield Liberal Democrats.

48 We consider that the Council's proposed Greasley and Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West wards provide good electoral equality while using generally identifiable boundaries. In addition, we note that these wards reflect the comments of Councillors R Willimott and B Willimott that the parish should be divided to reflect the adjoining areas that different parts of the parish have links to. However, we also note that the proposals require the creation of a parish ward of 25 electors between its proposed Greasley and Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West wards as its proposed boundary did not reflect the electoral division in the area. As stated above, the Commission does not consider that small parish wards provide for effective and convenient local government. We are therefore transferring this area from the proposed Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West ward to Greasley ward with the boundary following the existing electoral division boundary. This would worsen electoral equality in Greasley Watnall & Nuthall from 7% fewer electors than the borough average in 2019 to 8% fewer. Electoral equality in Greasley ward would remain 8%.

49 In the Eastwood area, we considered that the Council's proposals generally follow clear boundaries, whilst also securing good electoral equality. We note that it proposed transferring two areas of Greasley parish, around Coach Drive and Brunel Avenue to its Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale ward. This area contains sufficient electors to create a viable parish ward. In addition, our tour of the area confirmed that these areas have good links into Eastwood and into the Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale ward.

50 However, we did have some concerns about the Council's proposed boundary between its Eastwood Hilltop and Eastwood St Mary's wards around Manor Road and Priory road. Following our tour of the area, we consider that this area should be in the Eastwood Hilltop ward. We consider this boundary is more easily identifiable. Transferring these areas would worsen electoral equality in Eastwood Hilltop and Eastwood St Mary's wards from 2% more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor in the borough by 2019, to 5% more and 3% fewer, respectively.

51 We are adopting the Council's Brinsley ward without amendment as part of our draft recommendations. This ward comprises the whole of Brinsley parish and ensures good electoral equality.

52 Finally in this area, we note that there were a number of comments about the proposed ward names. We note that a number of options were put forward in relation to the Council's Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale ward, but that there was no agreement on what this ward should be called. We also note Councillor Owen's objection to the Council's Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West ward.

53 We generally seek to use simple ward names, while also trying to reflect the local area. In addition, if using geographical references, such as 'Eastwood North', we generally like to ensure related wards have geographical references. In the case of the Eastwood area, this is not the case and neither Eastwood Hilltop or Eastwood St Mary's have geographical references. In addition, we note Councillor Owen's comments that some parts of Greasley parish are generally referred to by other names, such as the Watnall area. While we note that this does not reflect the preference of Greasley parish, we consider that the most sensible ward name for this area would be Eastwood Hall, for the Council's proposed Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale ward. While we acknowledge Councillor Charlesworth's preference that it

be called DH Lawrence ward, to reflect the famous resident of Eastwood Hall, we are concerned this does not reflect a specific geographic area. We also propose renaming Greasley Watnall & Nuthall West ward as Watnall & Nuthall West. We acknowledge that these amendments remove the Greasley name from two wards containing parts of the parish, but note that we are retaining a Greasley ward which comprises a large area of this parish.

54 Our single-member Brinsley and Eastwood Hall wards, two-member Eastwood Hilltop, Eastwood St Mary's and Watnall & Nuthall West wards and three-member Greasley ward would have 5% fewer, 3% more, 5% more, 3% fewer, 8% fewer and 8% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

Awsworth, Cossall & Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell

55 The existing wards of Awsworth, Cossall & Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell are in the centre of the borough. The Council proposed the single-member Awsworth and Trowell wards, a two-member Nuthall East & Strelley ward and a three-member Kimberley & Cossall ward. These wards would have 6% more, 1% more, 1% fewer and 3% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The Council put forward only limited argument in support of its proposals.

56 The North West Broxtowe Labour Party proposed amendments to the existing Kimberley ward that appeared broadly similar to the Council's proposals. It did not provide any supporting evidence for this amendment. Councillor Rigby (Trowell ward) and Cossall Parish Council objected to transferring part of Cossall parish to the Council's proposed Awsworth ward arguing that it would take a large number of electors from the parish, which would challenge the viability of the remainder of the parish. Councillor Pike (Cossall Parish Council) also objected to these proposals for this reason, but indicated that by including part of Cossall in a ward with Kimberley parish, residents would have to travel via the Awsworth ward as Cossall and Kimberley have no direct road links. Finally in this area, Trowell Parish Council requested that a small area of Trowell Park Drive, currently in Stapleford parish, be transferred to Trowell.

57 We have given careful consideration to the evidence received. We note that the Council's proposals secured good electoral equality, however, we did have concerns about the boundaries of a number of the proposed wards. We note that its proposed Kimberley ward would include small areas of Greasley and Nuthall parishes (330 and 143 electors by 2019, respectively). While small, these areas would form viable parish wards of Greasley and Nuthall parishes. In addition, on our tour of the borough we observed that this area has good road links into Kimberley and we are therefore content that this boundary reflects local communities.

58 However, we do have concerns about the Council's proposal to link Kimberley in a ward with part of Cossall parish. We note the comments of Cossall Parish Council about the impact on the parish. We have a particular concern that the Council's proposals would require residents in Cossall to travel via Awsworth. Our tour of the area indicated that the direct links between Cossall and Kimberley would be along a very narrow, unmetalled road. It was not clear on our visit to the area if this road was for private access only. We are not of the opinion that this provides effective and convenient local government for the residents of Cossall, or indeed

reflects local communities. Our visit did confirm that Cossall has good road links into Awwsworth.

59 We have therefore explored alternative warding patterns for this part of the borough. The geography and size of the constituent parishes make this challenging. However, we consider that a ward combining Awwsworth, Cossall and Trowell parishes provides the best balance between our statutory criteria. We note that, while the distance between Cossall and Trowell is quite far, there is a direct road link between these two communities. In addition, our proposed ward would have 10% more electors than the borough average by 2019. Our modified Kimberley ward, would be based on the Council's proposed Kimberley & Cossall ward less a part of Cossall parish. This ward would have 7% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019.

60 In the remainder of this area, we note that Strelley parish, included in the Council's Nuthall East & Strelley ward has no direct links into Nuthall. However, we also note that Strelley has no direct road links to anywhere else in the borough of Broxtowe. Therefore, we have concluded there are no viable alternative warding patterns in this area other than that put forward by the Council. We are therefore adopting its proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

61 In this part of the borough, our draft recommendations are for the two-member Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell & Awwsworth wards, and a three-member Kimberley ward. These wards would have 1% fewer, 10% more and 7% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West

62 The existing wards of Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West, lie within the parish of Stapleford, which is to the north of Beeston. The Council proposed minor modifications to the existing wards to improve electoral equality. Its two-member Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West wards would have 7% fewer, 1% fewer and 2% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The Council put forward only limited evidence in support of its proposals.

63 We received no other comments on the proposals for these wards. We note that the Council's proposals secure reasonable electoral equality, while also using clear boundaries. We are therefore adopting these wards as part of our draft recommendations.

64 Our Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West wards would have 7% fewer, 1% fewer and 2% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

Attenborough, Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands, Beeston West, Bramcote, Chilwell East, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows

65 The existing wards of Attenborough, Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands, Beeston West, Bramcote, Chilwell East, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell

form the southern area of Broxtowe borough. The Council put forward proposals for a single-member Attenborough ward, the two-member Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands, Beeston West and Chilwell East wards, and the three-member Bramcote, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows wards with 2% fewer, 1% more, 2% more, 7% fewer, 3% fewer, 6% more, 1% more, 2% fewer and 6% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

66 The Council put forward only limited evidence in support of its proposals. We received no other comments on the proposals for this area.

67 We have given careful consideration to the evidence received. We note that the Council's proposals reflect minor changes to the existing wards. Its proposed wards secure good levels of electoral equality while generally following clear and identifiable boundaries. However, we did have concerns about the boundary of the Council's proposed Attenborough ward and the inclusion of a small area of housing centred on Charlton Grove in this ward. This also includes a few houses in its Beeston Rylands ward. Our tour of the area confirmed this area has good access across Queens Road West to Beeston West.

68 However, transferring this area to Beeston West ward would worsen electoral equality in Attenborough ward to 15% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019. It would also change electoral equality in Beeston West ward from 3% fewer to 3% more electors. We do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to justify an Attenborough ward with 15% fewer electors than the borough average. We have therefore examined alternative proposals. Our investigations indicated that it would be possible to combine a revised Attenborough ward with the Council's proposed Chilwell East ward. The resulting three-member ward would have 1% fewer electors than the borough average by 2019. During our visit to the area we observed the road links of this ward which are along Attenborough Lane and Meadow Lane. Therefore, as part of our draft recommendations, we are adopting a three-member Attenborough & Chilwell East ward and have made revisions to Beeston West ward. This also requires a very small amendment to Beeston Rylands, but this does not affect electoral equality.

69 We also had some concerns about the boundary of the Council's proposed Chilwell West ward and the finger to the south around Haddon Crescent. However, during our tour of the area we observed that the ward had good road links to the north and into Chilwell West ward via Attenborough Lane. We are therefore adopting this ward as part of our draft recommendations.

70 In the remainder of the area, we are adopting the Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. These wards secure good electoral equality and have clear and identifiable boundaries.

71 Our two-member Beeston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Rylands and Beeston West wards and three-member Attenborough & Chilwell East, Bramcote, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows wards will have 1% more, 2% more, 7% fewer, 3% more, 1% fewer, 1% more, 2% fewer and 6% more electors than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

Conclusions

72 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	44	44
Number of electoral wards	20	20
Average number of electors per councillor	1,923	2,002
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	0	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation

Broxtowe Borough Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

75 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Eastwood, Greasley, Nuthall and Stapleford.

76 Eastwood Town Council is currently represented by 15 parish councillors representing two parish wards. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Eastwood parish.

77 As stated in paragraph 53, if a ward or parish ward has a geographical element to its name, such as Eastwood North, we generally seek to ensure that related wards or parish wards also contain a geographical element. As described above we are renaming the Council's Eastwood North & Greasley Beauvale ward as Eastwood Hall and therefore also propose renaming its Eastwood North parish ward as Eastwood Hall.

Draft recommendations

Eastwood Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Eastwood Hall (returning four members); Eastwood Hilltop (returning five members); and Eastwood St Mary's (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

78 Greasley Parish Council is currently represented by 15 parish councillors representing three parish wards. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Greasley parish.

Draft recommendations

Greasley Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Greasley (returning nine members); Greasley Larkfields (returning one members); Greasley Watnall (returning three members); and Greasley Beauvale (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

79 Nuthall Parish Council is currently represented by 13 parish councillors representing two parish wards. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Nuthall parish.

Draft recommendations

Nuthall Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Nuthall East (returning nine members); Nuthall Larkfields (returning one members); and Nuthall West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

80 Stapleford Town Council is currently represented by 18 parish councillors representing three parish wards. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Stapleford parish.

Draft recommendations

Stapleford Town Council should return 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Stapleford North (returning six members); Stapleford South East (returning six members); and Stapleford South West (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

81 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Broxtowe Borough Council contained in 21 July 2014. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

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

83 Express your views by writing directly to:

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

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

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

85 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

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

87 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Broxtowe Borough Council in 2015.

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

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for Broxtowe

89 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Broxtowe Borough Council:

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

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Broxtowe Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Attenborough & Chilwell East	3	5,733	1,911	-1%	5,959	1,986	-1%
2	Beeston Central	2	3,794	1,897	-1%	4,036	2,018	1%
3	Beeston North	2	3,983	1,992	4%	4,064	2,032	2%
4	Beeston Rylands	2	3,652	1,826	-5%	3,719	1,860	-7%
5	Beeston West	2	4,067	2,034	6%	4,140	2,070	3%
6	Bramcote	3	5,966	1,989	3%	6,071	2,024	1%
7	Brinsley	1	1,870	1,870	-3%	1,892	1,892	-5%
8	Chilwell West	3	5,815	1,938	1%	5,910	1,970	-2%
9	Eastwood Hall	1	2,020	2,020	5%	2,052	2,052	3%
10	Eastwood Hilltop	2	4,003	2,002	4%	4,191	2,096	5%
11	Eastwood St Mary's	2	3,510	1,755	-9%	3,879	1,939	-3%
12	Greasley	3	5,418	1,806	-6%	6,486	2,162	8%
13	Kimberley	3	5,241	1,747	-9%	5,565	1,855	-7%

Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Broxtowe Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
14	Nuthall East & Strelley	2	3,935	1,968	2%	3,960	1,980	-1%
15	Stapleford North	2	3,658	1,829	-5%	3,713	1,856	-7%
16	Stapleford South East	2	3,783	1,892	-2%	3,945	1,973	-1%
17	Stapleford South West	2	4,025	2,013	5%	4,067	2,034	2%
18	Toton & Chilwell Meadows	3	6,291	2,097	9%	6,342	2,114	6%
19	Trowell & Awsworth	2	4,203	2,102	9%	4,390	2,195	10%
20	Watnall & Nuthall West	2	3,624	1,812	-6%	3,691	1,845	-8%
	Totals	44	84,591	-	-	88,072	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,923	-	-	2,002	-

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

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

Appendix B

Glossary and abbreviations

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

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

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

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