

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND



LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
REPORT No. 413

LONDON

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

£3.00 net

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
REPORT No. 413

LONDON

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

© Crown copyright 1981
First published 1981

ISBN 0 11 751558 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Nicholas Morrison, KCB

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank, DL

Mr R R Thornton, CBE, DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

To:—

The Rt Hon William Whitelaw, CH, MC, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

REPORT ON INITIAL REVIEWS OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS IN DISTRICTS AND LONDON BOROUGHS

INTRODUCTION

1. In our Report No 6 dated 22 November 1973 we announced our programme for carrying out the initial reviews of the electoral arrangements for the new districts and counties in England in accordance with section 63 and Schedule 9 of the Local Government Act 1972. That report did not cover the London boroughs, on which the Government had not then announced their intentions, but on 19 June 1974 the Secretary of State requested the Commission to add to their programme reviews of the electoral arrangements of the 32 London boroughs.

2. On 15 January 1976 in our Report No 141 we made an interim report on the progress made with all these reviews up to that date. We have now completed the initial reviews of all metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts and of the London boroughs, and have thought it appropriate at this stage to make a further report recording the outcome. We will report separately in due course on the initial reviews of the electoral arrangements for counties, though we have referred in this report, where appropriate, to the progress so far made on the county reviews.

OUTCOME OF THE REVIEWS

3. We have published 365 individual reports covering the 32 London boroughs, 36 metropolitan districts, and 296 non-metropolitan districts. In the case of one metropolitan district—the City of Manchester—we published two reports, a second review having been carried out by direction of the Home Secretary as a result of a substantial revision of the electoral register that occurred after our first report was published. We have summarised in Appendices A, B and C the provisions of the Orders made by the Home Secretary, following our reports, in respect of the London boroughs, metropolitan districts and non-metropolitan districts respectively in terms of sizes of council, numbers of wards, and numbers of councillors per ward, giving the dates of the relevant reports and Orders. In 35 cases (3 London boroughs, 7 metropolitan districts, and 25 non-metropolitan districts) the Order made modifications to the proposals we had made in our report. Most of these modifications were concerned with minor matters such as names of wards, the order of retirement for councillors, or the final detail of boundary mapping or description. The majority of the modifications to the substance of our proposals affected only one or two wards in the area; none of the remainder involved changes in more than a minority of the wards.

TIMETABLE

4. At the time Report No 6 was published we stated that our aim was to complete the district reviews, both non-metropolitan and metropolitan, so that the new arrangements could apply for the elections taking place in 1978 and 1979; we also hoped that some of the counties would be completed in time for their elections in May 1977. The aim for the London boroughs was to complete all the reviews in time for the 1978 elections; this aim was achieved, though our report on the Borough of Enfield could not be implemented until after the Order was ultimately made on 27 May 1980 following prolonged litigation. The completion of the Commission's reviews of metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts took a good deal longer than was expected at the outset. This was due to several factors, notably the subsequent addition to the programme in June 1974 of the reviews of the London boroughs, which had to be given a high priority, the fact that in some districts the completion of all the agreed procedures was unusually protracted, and in the latter stages the consequences of the litigation initiated by the Borough of Enfield on 3 November 1977.

5. The Commission decided to appeal against the adverse decision of the High Court in the Enfield case as the acceptance of its implications would have cast doubts upon the general approach adopted by the Commission in their reports. For this reason we had no alternative but to suspend in January 1978 all work on the district reviews then outstanding and to reduce the staff of the Commission to a minimal level. Although work was resumed in August 1978 following the decision of the Court of Appeal on 27 July 1978, the staff of the Commission had then to be rebuilt to an appropriate level and the new staff to be trained. An element of uncertainty about the legal position remained until the Borough's appeal to the House of Lords was finally concluded on 8 November 1979. This process of litigation not only directly delayed the conclusion of a large number of district reviews but had a serious secondary effect on the initial county reviews, which could not, under the provisions of the Act, be started until Orders had been made for all the districts in a county. It had been possible to start only three county reviews before the suspension of work in January 1978, so the process of carrying out county reviews did not effectively get under way until the early part of 1979, and even then the majority could not be started because all the necessary district Orders had not been made.

6. Despite these delays, which were almost entirely beyond the Commission's control, the last of our initial reports on the London boroughs, metropolitan districts and non-metropolitan districts were submitted to the Home Secretary on 15 September 1977, 13 December 1979* and 10 July 1980 respectively. We also made every possible effort to complete the maximum number of county reviews in time for the Home Secretary, if he thought fit, to make the necessary Orders in time for the county council elections in May 1981. As a result 23 reports on non-metropolitan counties, ie, more than half, had been submitted by the end of 1980. None of the reviews of the six metropolitan counties could be completed; in only one case had the necessary

*This excludes the second report on the City of Manchester which was published on 31 July 1980.

district Orders been made in sufficient time to make completion by the end of 1980 even a possibility.

7. Following the conclusion of the Enfield case, we have of course been guided in all our subsequent work by the comments contained in the judgments given by the House of Lords and the Court of Appeal in our application of the Local Government Act 1972 to the cases coming before us. It is however appropriate to record that after the judgment given by the House of Lords on 8 November 1979, we were able to inform the Home Secretary that we did not consider that there was any inconsistency between the House of Lords' judgment and what we had done in practice hitherto.

SIZE OF COUNCILS

8. In our Report No 6 (paragraph 30) we stated that we proposed to use the following ranges for the size of district councils, which were the same as those used, save in exceptional circumstances, for the 1973 elections by the Home Office after consultation with local authority associations:—

Metropolitan District Councils	50–80
Non-metropolitan District Councils	30–60

It will be seen from Appendices B and C to this Report that six metropolitan district councils, all of which included major cities, were able to establish exceptional cases for councils larger than the top of the range; the City of Birmingham with a council of 117 was the only one exceeding 100. Among non-metropolitan district councils only the City of Bristol, for which we exceptionally proposed a 68 member council, exceeded the maximum of the range. On the other hand in 15 districts we recommended councils of less than 30 members, the smallest being Rutland with 20.

9. Following consultations with the London Boroughs Association and the three main political parties, the Commission decided that a range of council sizes of 50–70 councillors should apply throughout Greater London. In the event, as will be seen from Appendix A, all councils fell within this range, with the exception of Barking where a council of 48 was considered appropriate.

NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS PER WARD

(a) METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

10. We are required under section 6(2)(b) of the Act to divide metropolitan districts into wards, each returning a number of councillors divisible by three. In Report No 6 we expressed the view that only in the most exceptional cases should six member wards be necessary. In fact in only one case (in Gateshead) did we recommend a six member ward, but we expressed the hope that the Borough would be willing to make a parish warding order enabling two 3-member wards acceptable to us to be established. In the event the council did this in time for the appropriate modification to be included in the Order made by the Home Secretary. The result is that all metropolitan districts consist entirely of 3-member wards.

11. While we appreciate the advantage of 3-member wards in that they may enable a local government election to take place every year, we have found that the provision in the Act which restricted us to 3-member wards (or a multiple thereof) in metropolitan districts obliged us on occasion to propose arrangements which were in other respects less satisfactory than we would have wished. Because the primary criterion was that, under paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 of the Act, the electorate of each ward in a district had in effect to be as nearly as may be of the same size, we were deprived of the element of flexibility sometimes needed to meet the other requirements of Schedule 11—particularly paragraph 3(3)(b) relating to local ties. (Paragraph 3 of Schedule 11 is reproduced at Appendix D.) Being unable to adjust the number of councillors to match the local communities more closely, we had to place communities in what was sometimes an unsatisfactory pattern of approximately equal sized wards, except on rare occasions where overriding factors relating to the interests of effective and convenient local government could be shown to apply. This alone would suggest that, in any amending legislation that may be contemplated in the future, consideration should be given to allowing the Commission the same degree of flexibility in metropolitan districts as regards the number of councillors per ward as they already possess in London boroughs and non-metropolitan districts.

12. The case for amending legislation does not, however, rest solely on these grounds. More importantly, if no such amendment is made the Commission will be faced with very considerable and time-consuming difficulties when conducting their statutory reviews of metropolitan county and district boundaries between 1984 and 1989. Unless a proposed boundary change is of a minor nature or happens to involve an electorate approximately equal to that of one or more wards of the metropolitan district affected it will be necessary in every case to carry out a completely fresh review of the electoral arrangements for the whole of that district and create a new pattern of wards which will satisfy the statutory criteria. This will greatly add to the length and complexity of these reviews. If one or two member wards were permitted, a comparatively limited adjustment of electoral arrangements to accommodate a boundary change should often be possible.

(b) NON-METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

13. In paragraph 31 of Report No 6 we expressed the view that only in exceptional circumstances should it be necessary for the number of councillors for a ward to be other than one, two or three. As Appendix C shows, there were only five cases throughout the country, involving three districts, where we found it necessary to propose wards with more than three members; four of these were five-member wards and one was a four-member ward. In 38 districts a uniform pattern under which all wards had three members was found appropriate, no doubt influenced, as we recognised in Report No 6 it would be, by the convenience of this arrangement where a council opts for election by thirds. In only five districts a uniform two-member ward pattern proved appropriate. In the vast majority a pattern consisting of a mixture of one, two and three-member wards was found to be best suited to meet the often conflicting requirements of electoral equality and preservation of local ties.

14. The five exceptional cases in which we recommended that wards be represented by more than three members generally arose from the unwillingness of the district council concerned to ward the parish concerned. Paragraphs 3(2)(b) and (c) of Schedule 11 of the Act* provide for every parish ward, or every parish where it is not divided into parish wards, to lie wholly within a single ward of the district, but the Commission have no power to determine whether, and if so how, a parish should be warded; the responsibility for making parish warding orders rests with district councils. In practice the great majority of councils were willing to make the necessary parish warding orders to match the Commission's proposed district wards, though the process of making the agreed order often proved protracted and on a number of occasions considerably delayed the submission of the Commission's report on the district concerned. In the very small minority of cases where the district council considered there were strong reasons for not making a parish warding order requested by the Commission we decided on balance that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to accept the district council's view, even though this resulted in a larger ward than we would otherwise have wished.

15. We consider that we should in future endeavour to avoid the difficulties and delays we have experienced in carrying out electoral reviews as a result of the responsibility of district councils for making parish warding orders and the way in which paragraphs 3(2)(b) and (c) of Schedule 11 of the Act are drafted. We take the view that the Commission are in the last resort empowered by the Act to divide a parish ward or an unwarded parish for district warding purposes if satisfied that it is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. This is based not only on the overriding provisions of section 47(1) of the Act, but also on the grounds that compliance with Schedule 11 is conditioned by the phrase "so far as is reasonably practicable" in section 78(2) of the Act. If a district council refuses to make a parish warding order this could mean in a particular case that it was not "reasonably practicable" for the Commission to comply with the relevant paragraphs of Schedule 11. If this were not so, the Commission might be obliged to make proposals for wards which they considered inappropriate in order to conform to the parish warding arrangements or the non-warding of a parish determined by a district council, and which were contrary to other provisions of the Act regarding effective and convenient local government or electoral equality. We would nevertheless hope that in any amending legislation the intentions of the Act might be clearly defined in this respect.

(c) LONDON BOROUGHS

16. When initiating our reviews of London boroughs we stated that we had concluded that the number of councillors per ward should not exceed three unless there were very exceptional circumstances. As indicated in Appendix A no larger wards were required and in the majority of boroughs a mixture of two and three member wards was found to be appropriate, although some use was made of one-member wards in five boroughs, thus

*see Appendix D

again illustrating the desirability of allowing the Commission flexibility in determining the number of councillors per ward.

FORECASTS OF ELECTORATE

17. Under the provisions of paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 11 of the Act the Commission are bound so far as is reasonably practicable to have regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of a district or London borough likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration. A similar provision applies to counties in paragraph 1(2). This has made it necessary for the Commission to obtain from councils, when they submit their draft schemes, forecasts of likely electorates five years ahead and these forecasts, which cannot by their nature be precise, have on occasion been challenged by other parties and in a few cases have been the subject of very considerable controversy. Councils have adopted different methods of making their calculations and the degree of sophistication they have attempted to apply has varied. There is, however, no universally accepted method that the Commission could have laid down as standard practice, though we have taken the view that aggregate forecasts of electorates built up from detailed examination of existing and likely developments in individual limited areas are more likely to be reliable than attempts to sub-divide aggregate population forecasts into electoral figures for individual wards or districts. But whatever method is adopted the margin for error is bound to be significant; apart from any inherent weaknesses in methodology, policy changes may well invalidate the most meticulously worked out forecast.

18. Under these circumstances we have seen no alternative to basing our calculations on the assumption that the forecasts made by councils with their local knowledge must in general be regarded as the most reliable indication available, though we have noticed what seemed to us a consistent tendency to overestimate. Where convincing evidence has been produced by other parties to cast doubt on council forecasts or where we ourselves have detected what seemed to us inherent improbabilities or inconsistencies in them, we have not hesitated to ask the council concerned for further comments and explanations. In some instances this has led to councils revising their forecasts; in others the issue has been pursued further at local meetings. We have then made such allowance as we thought fit for any remaining legitimate doubts in arriving at our final recommendations, recognising the unavoidable uncertainties inherent in any forecast and that, where more recent evidence of actual electorates is available since a review started, the implications of this may well be relevant. But in taking account of evidence relating to the current electorate we have been very conscious of the fact that under our statutory duty we must have regard, so far as is reasonably practicable, to likely electorate changes within five years.

19. The problems we have experienced in applying the provisions of the Act in respect of forecast electorates are inherent in the way in which the Act was framed by Parliament and we fully realise the advantages of attempting to look forward up to five years ahead in devising electoral arrangements, despite the lack of an indisputable numerical basis from which we could work. It must, however, be recognised that anything approaching a perfect degree of

electoral equality at the end of five years is unlikely to be attainable, particularly where rapid population changes are occurring or are planned, eg, in new or expanding towns and in inner city areas. This may mean more frequent electoral reviews in such cases than would otherwise be desirable.

PROCEDURE

20. In carrying out district electoral reviews we have throughout followed the procedures described in our Report No 6 which were designed to comply with section 60 of the Act; similar procedures were followed in the London boroughs. In general these procedures have worked satisfactorily, though it has been necessary from time to time to issue further guidance to councils on some of their more detailed applications without departing from their general principles. The timetable included as an Appendix to Report No 6 has proved a useful guide, though it has in a good many cases turned out to be over-optimistic. We noted in that report that our estimate of 56 weeks for the review of each district would only be possible if the local authorities concerned were able to adhere strictly to the timetable at every stage. Although it has remained true, as stated in our interim Report No 141, that generally the Commission have enjoyed widespread cooperation from local authorities, it has not always proved practicable for various reasons for them, or indeed for the Commission, to adhere to the illustrative timetable in Report No 6.

21. In paragraph 23 of Report No 6 we thought it likely that there would be comparatively few cases in which we could proceed to formulate final proposals without arranging for an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting. In practice, local meetings were held in about two thirds of all districts, including over 80% in London boroughs and metropolitan districts. We would like to take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation of the excellent work done by Assistant Commissioners; we were greatly assisted by the comprehensive and constructive reports submitted. In view of the exceptional circumstances attending the Home Secretary's direction to carry out a further review of the electoral arrangements for the City of Manchester, the Commission thought it appropriate that three Commissioners should themselves conduct the second local meeting relating to that district.

22. A procedural point that has been drawn to our attention, and which has caused some inconvenience to local authorities, is the absence of any provision in the Act for the Commission to propose minor amendments to the existing electoral arrangements, such as a change in the name of a district ward or an erroneous boundary definition. We are obliged under section 50(3) of the Act to initiate a full scale review of the electoral arrangements for a principal area as a whole before any substantive change (as defined in section 47(1)(i) of the Act), however small, can be made. We would suggest that in any amending legislation some provision might be made for partial reviews to be undertaken in suitable cases.

THE COMMISSION'S FUTURE WORK ON ELECTORAL REVIEWS

23. It remains for us to complete all the remaining initial county electoral reviews in good time for the next county council elections in 1985; in one case (Wiltshire) we have reported that it may be necessary to conduct a second

review during this period. Although a few requests have been received for the Commission to undertake a second review of a district or London borough because of changes in circumstances that have occurred since the initial review, we have so far declined to undertake any such reviews; we thought this inappropriate until all the initial district reviews and as many county reviews as could be undertaken in time for the May 1981 elections had been completed. In view of the undesirability of frequent changes in electoral arrangements and the considerable demands of other work we have in hand, including the remaining county electoral reviews and ad hoc principal area boundary reviews and parish reviews, we remain reluctant to undertake second reviews. We recognise however that there may be very exceptional cases where this would be appropriate because of major changes in the size or distribution of the electorate since the initial review. Any such reviews ought to be undertaken before the Commission embark upon the comprehensive review of the areas and boundaries of all counties, metropolitan districts, London boroughs and the Greater London boundary between 1984 and 1989, in accordance with section 48(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

24. In concluding this report we would like to record our appreciation of the high level of co-operation and help we have received from the local authorities concerned and their staffs. We would wish also specially to mention the indispensable and wholehearted support and assistance given by the staff of Ordnance Survey. We have been greatly assisted by all those organisations and individuals who have commented on our draft proposals and often made most valuable and constructive suggestions. Above all we owe a great debt to the consistent hard work and dedication of the Commission's own Secretariat.

Signed

LS

NICHOLAS MORRISON (Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

R R THORNTON

LESLIE GRIMSHAW (Secretary)

14 May 1981

LONDON BOROUGHS

No. of Report	Borough	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
185	Barking	48	19	11	7	1	13.1.76	6.8.77
192	Newham	60	24	12	12		3.2.76	26.9.77
193	Hounslow	60	21	18	3		20.1.77	24.7.77
194	Sutton	56	25	8	15	2	3.2.77	24.7.77
203	Lewisham	67	26	15	11		24.3.77	6.8.77
205	Southwark	64	25	14	11		10.3.77	6.8.77
207	Kensington & Chelsea	54	21	12	9		10.3.77	6.11.77
209	Ealing	70	24	22	2		24.3.77	15.8.77
210	Hammersmith	50	23	4	19		10.3.77	21.9.77
211	Croydon	70	27	16	11		28.4.77	21.9.77
212	Richmond-upon-Thames	52	19	14	5		28.4.77	21.9.77
213	Redbridge	63	21	21			28.4.77	12.9.77
214	Havering	63	25	13	12		5.5.77	9.9.77
216	Kingston-upon-Thames	50	20	10	10		5.5.77	23.9.77
217	Hillingdon	69	29	11	18		12.5.77	14.10.77
219	Islington	52	20	12	8		19.5.77	21.9.77
223	Hackney	60	23	14	9		5.5.77	28.10.77
225	Westminster	60	23	14	9		16.6.77	15.1.78
226	Brent	66	31	4	27		16.6.77	31.10.77
230	Camden	59	26	7	19		30.6.77	14.11.77
234	Greenwich	62	36		26	10	7.7.77	28.10.77
235	Waltham Forest	57	20	17	3		30.6.77	28.10.77
241	Bexley	62	23	18	3	2	7.7.77	28.10.77
244	Tower Hamlets	50	19	12	7		14.7.77	19.1.78
247	Merton	57	20	17	3		4.8.77	7.11.77
248	Barnet	60	20	20			28.7.77	6.11.77
249	Wandsworth	61	22	17	5		4.8.77	30.11.77
254	Haringey	59	23	13	10		21.7.77	8.12.77
255	Enfield	66	33		33		30.6.77	27.5.80
256	Harrow	63	21	21			15.9.77	24.1.78
257	Lambeth	64	22	20	2		1.9.77	8.12.77
258	Bromley	60	26	9	16	1	15.9.77	21.12.77

METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
181	Sandwell	72	24	24			25.11.76	22.4.78
220	Tameside	57	19	19			28.4.77	24.10.79
229	Oldham	60	20	20			16.6.77	9.11.78
237	Sefton	69	23	23			19.5.77	14.12.78
246	Solihull	51	17	17			28.7.77	26.10.78
252	Manchester (See Report No. 393)							
264	Barnsley	66	22	22			22.9.77	26.10.78
277	Bury	48	16	16			1.12.77	27.11.78
284	Doncaster	63	21	21			17.11.77	8.8.79
289	Bolton	60	20	20			19.1.78	17.10.79
300	Trafford	63	21	21			21.9.78	8.8.79
306	Rotherham	66	22	22			21.9.78	17.10.79
308	Calderdale	54	18	18			21.9.78	17.10.79
310	Walsall	60	20	20			19.10.78	14.11.79
316	Coventry	54	18	18			23.11.78	17.10.79
317	Stockport	63	21	21			26.10.78	17.10.79
319	Liverpool	99	33	33			23.11.78	29.10.79
322	Rochdale	60	20	20			23.11.78	19.10.79
324	Wigan	72	24	24			7.12.78	23.11.79
328	Wirral	66	22	22			7.12.78	23.11.79
329	St. Helens	54	18	18			1.2.79	24.10.79
336	Dudley	72	24	24			23.11.78	24.3.80
337	Bradford	90	30	30			1.3.79	6.12.79
340	Wolverhampton	60	20	20			26.4.79	23.1.80
344	Kirklees	72	24	24			15.3.79	1.10.80
345	Sheffield	87	29	29			1.3.79	6.12.79
346	Leeds	99	33	33			15.3.79	6.12.79
347	Salford	60	20	20			7.6.79	16.1.80
349	Wakefield	63	21	21			20.9.79	18.3.80
350	North Tyneside	60	20	20			5.7.79	5.3.80
351	Birmingham	117	39	39			7.6.79	23.4.80
355	South Tyneside	60	20	20			5.7.79	20.3.80
357	Newcastle-upon-Tyne	78	26	26			14.6.79	22.7.80
358	Gateshead	66	22	22			5.7.79	24.7.80
359	Sunderland	75	25	25			21.6.79	30.5.80
378	Knowsley	66	22	22			13.12.79	11.9.80
393	Manchester	99	33	33			31.7.80	25.2.81

NON-METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
10	Broxbourne	42	14	14			10.10.74	1.11.75
11	Watford	36	12	12			10.10.74	1.11.75
13	Tamworth	27	9	9			12.12.74	1.11.75
14	Southend-on-Sea	39	13	13			9.1.75	18.10.75
15	Castle Morpeth	34	21		13	8	12.12.74	14.10.75
16	Tendring	60	32	7	14	11	6.3.75	14.10.75
17	Bath	48	16	16			6.2.75	1.11.75
18	Dartford	45	22	6	11	5	20.3.75	17.10.75
19	Runnymede	42	14	14			23.1.75	1.11.75
20	Pendle	51	19	16		3	30.1.75	18.10.75
21	Uttlesford	42	31	1	9	21	10.4.75	14.10.75
22	Preston	57	19	19			6.3.75	1.11.75
23	Tandridge	42	21	5	11	5	12.2.75	1.11.75
24	Rushcliffe	54	28	10	6	12	6.3.75	14.10.75
25	Rochford	40	23	3	11	9	13.3.75	24.11.75
26	Salisbury	58	36	6	10	20	20.3.75	1.11.75
27	Holderness	31	20	2	7	11	20.3.75	14.10.75
28	South Ribble	54	22	13	6	3	20.2.75	14.10.75
29	Basingstoke	59	34	6	13	15	15.5.75	2.12.75
30	Elmbridge	60	22	16	6		26.6.75	14.12.75
31	Eastbourne	30	10	10			12.6.75	18.10.75
33	Corby	27	12	6	3	3	19.6.75	3.12.75
34	Guildford	45	21	9	6	6	3.7.75	5.12.75
35	Yeovil	60	42	3	12	27	3.7.75	14.12.75
36	North Wolds	43	24	8	3	13	10.7.75	5.12.75
37	Thamesdown	46	18	14		4	10.7.75	24.11.75
38	Congleton	45	18	11	5	2	17.7.75	5.12.75
39	Fylde	49	22	10	7	5	17.7.75	24.11.75
40	Surrey Heath	36	16	5	10	1	17.7.75	24.11.75
41	Colchester	60	28	16		12	3.7.75	12.12.75
42	Hartlepool	47	17	15		2	31.7.75	5.12.75
43	Langbaugh	60	26	10	14	2	31.7.75	24.11.75
44	Brentwood	39	18	10	1	7	24.7.75	5.12.75
45	Epsom & Ewell	39	13	13			31.7.75	13.12.75
46	Spelthorne	40	16	10	4	2	31.7.75	23.6.76
47	Shrewsbury & Atcham	48	22	13		9	31.7.75	5.12.75
48	Wansdyke	47	30	5	7	18	31.7.75	24.11.75
49	Chelmsford	60	30	10	10	10	31.7.75	24.11.75
50	Mole Valley	41	23	3	12	8	24.7.75	5.12.75
51	Northavon	57	37	3	14	20	24.7.75	14.12.75
52	City of Lancaster	60	29	9	13	7	24.7.75	21.3.77
53	Blackpool	44	22		22		31.7.75	24.11.75

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
54	Luton	48	16	16			31.7.75	24.11.75
55	Chorley	47	22	7	11	4	31.7.75	5.12.75
56	Fenland	40	25	5	5	15	24.7.75	5.12.75
57	South Bedfordshire	53	25	12	4	9	15.5.75	4.12.75
58	Aylesbury Vale	58	38	4	12	22	17.7.75	5.12.75
59	Fareham	42	14	14			24.7.75	24.11.75
60	Harlow	42	16	10	6		19.6.75	5.12.75
61	Ashford	49	45		4	41	10.7.75	24.11.75
62	Chiltern	50	30	3	14	13	31.7.75	2.12.75
63	South Cambridgeshire	55	42	2	9	31	12.2.75	2.12.75
64	City of Cambridge	42	14	14			31.7.75	14.12.75
65	Boothferry	35	22	2	9	11	1.5.75	13.12.75
66	Three Rivers	47	20	7	13		1.5.75	18.12.75
67	Hyndburn	47	17	14	2	1	10.4.75	17.9.76
68	Welwyn Hatfield	43	15	13	2		3.7.75	18.1.76
69	Eastleigh	44	17	10	7		19.6.75	18.12.75
70	Test Valley	44	23	6	9	8	26.6.75	5.12.75
71	Gedling	55	23	12	8	3	19.6.75	5.12.75
72	Berwick-upon-Tweed	28	16	2	8	6	10.4.75	5.12.75
73	Broxtowe	49	21	10	8	3	8.5.75	18.12.75
74	South Shropshire	40	28	3	6	19	31.7.75	21.1.76
75	East Northamptonshire	36	20	7	2	11	17.7.75	21.5.76
76	Kettering	45	22	4	15	3	31.7.75	24.5.76
77	Tynedale	47	32	3	9	20	23.1.75	9.2.76
78	Wansbeck	46	16	14	2		16.1.75	5.12.75
79	Tunbridge Wells	48	24	9	6	9	18.9.75	27.1.76
80	City of Nottingham	55	27	1	26		18.9.75	27.1.76
81	Ashfield	33	15	5	8	2	18.9.75	9.2.76
82	Ribble Valley	38	23	5	5	13	18.9.75	4.2.76
83	Kingswood	47	22	9	7	6	18.9.75	5.12.75
84	Oswestry	29	15	5	4	6	25.9.75	18.12.75
85	Woodspring	59	35	9	6	20	2.10.75	23.3.77
86	City of Peterborough	48	22	12	2	8	2.10.75	3.3.76
87	Middlesbrough	53	25	3	22		25.9.75	15.7.76
88	Wyre	56	27	9	11	7	18.9.75	16.5.76
89	Maldon	30	20	2	6	12	18.9.75	21.5.76
90	Alnwick	29	17	3	6	8	18.9.75	16.5.76
91	Blyth Valley	47	17	13	4		19.9.75	16.5.76
92	Burnley	54	22	16		6	18.9.75	13.2.76
93	Kennet	40	31	1	7	23	24.7.75	26.2.76
94	Woking	35	16	6	7	3	9.10.75	25.2.76
95	Ellesmere Port	41	18	7	9	2	9.10.75	12.2.76
96	Gillingham	42	14	14			2.10.75	28.11.76
97	Stockton-on-Tees	55	30		25	5	9.10.75	30.6.76
98	Barrow-in-Furness	38	13	12	1		16.10.75	17.9.76

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
99	Vale Royal	60	36	6	12	18	16.10.75	25.2.76
100	Cannock Chase	42	15	13	1	1	25.9.75	9.2.76
101	Maidstone	55	28	11	5	12	16.10.75	22.10.76
102	West Lancashire	55	26	9	11	6	16.10.75	18.2.76
103	Rushmoor	45	15	15			9.10.75	17.9.76
105	City of Southampton	45	15	15			23.10.75	13.12.76
106	City of Winchester	54	31	8	7	16	9.10.75	25.2.76
107	Mansfield	46	18	10	8		30.10.75	16.5.76
108	West Somerset	32	19	4	5	10	23.10.75	21.5.76
109	Scunthorpe	40	16	8	8		23.10.75	10.10.76
110	Rossendale	36	13	10	3		23.10.75	26.2.76
111	Taunton Deane	49	29	8	4	17	30.10.75	16.5.76
112	Eden	37	28	2	5	21	6.11.75	16.5.76
113	Daventry	35	26	2	5	19	30.10.75	10.10.76
114	Staffordshire Moorlands	56	28	11	6	11	6.11.75	6.2.76
115	Halton	47	17	15		2	30.10.75	25.2.76
116	Havant	42	14	14			6.11.75	7.3.76
117	Dacorum	58	28	9	12	7	22.10.75	30.7.76
118	Medway	50	20	10	10		13.11.75	17.7.76
119	Beverley	53	24	11	7	6	20.11.75	24.5.76
120	North Shropshire	40	26	1	12	13	20.11.75	12.2.76
121	Hertsmere	39	20	1	17	2	27.11.75	1.3.76
122	Tonbridge & Malling	52	27	6	13	8	27.11.75	29.10.76
123	City of Canterbury	49	25	9	6	10	20.11.75	10.10.76
124	Milton Keynes	46	22	9	6	7	27.11.75	25.2.76
125	Mendip	43	32	2	7	23	27.11.75	16.5.76
126	Newark	56	31	6	13	12	4.12.75	21.5.76
127	Cleethorpes	41	18	8	7	3	4.12.75	2.7.76
128	Glanford	41	23	5	8	10	4.12.75	24.6.76
129	Hart	35	16	6	7	3	11.12.75	1.3.76
130	New Forest	58	33	6	13	14	11.12.75	7.3.76
131	South Northamptonshire	40	32	1	6	25	11.12.75	25.2.76
132	Braintree	60	33	9	9	15	4.12.75	25.5.76
133	Mid Bedfordshire	53	30	7	9	14	11.12.75	21.5.76
134	East Hampshire	42	31	2	7	22	4.12.75	3.7.76
135	Bassetlaw	50	27	10	3	14	27.11.75	8.7.76
136	Darlington	52	25	5	17	3	18.12.75	25.5.76
137	Castle Point	39	14	11	3		30.10.75	27.5.76
138	Lichfield	56	27	9	11	7	18.12.75	25.5.76
139	Stafford	60	30	7	16	7	18.12.75	16.5.76
140	Thurrock	39	15	11	2	2	13.11.75	17.9.76
142	Huntingdon	53	34	4	11	19	8.1.76	10.3.76
143	Blackburn	60	21	19	1	1	11.12.75	17.9.76
144	Reigate & Banstead	49	18	15	1	2	15.1.76	22.10.76
146	Stevenage	39	14	12	1	1	29.1.76	17.9.76

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
147	Epping Forest	59	30	11	7	12	29.1.76	15.8.77
148	Swale	49	25	8	8	9	18.12.75	22.11.76
149	East Hertfordshire	50	30	6	8	16	4.3.76	7.8.76
150	Crewe & Nantwich	57	26	14	3	9	4.3.76	17.3.77
151	North Warwickshire	34	19	2	11	6	25.3.76	17.7.76
152	Sevenoaks	53	33	3	14	16	14.2.76	7.11.76
153	Warrington	60	26	13	8	5	13.5.76	22.8.78
154	Bridgnorth	33	20	3	7	10	10.6.76	10.10.76
155	City of Stoke-on-Trent	60	20	20			10.6.76	31.10.76
156	South Wight	24	16	1	6	9	10.6.76	10.10.76
157	Chester-le-Street	33	17	6	4	7	24.6.76	31.10.76
158	Medina	36	17	4	11	2	24.6.76	10.10.76
159	Malvern Hills	51	33	5	8	20	24.6.76	22.10.76
160	Thanet	54	27	6	15	6	29.4.76	28.9.78
161	Babergh	42	30	1	10	19	8.7.76	21.11.76
162	Derwentside	55	23	13	6	4	15.7.76	5.2.78
163	South Herefordshire	35	32	1	1	30	15.7.76	7.3.77
164	City of Gloucester	33	11	11			1.7.76	21.11.76
165	South Derbyshire	34	19	4	7	8	22.7.76	21.11.76
166	City of York	45	15	15			29.7.76	21.11.76
167	Sedgemoor	49	31	5	8	18	16.9.76	2.3.77
168	City of Hereford	27	9	9			23.9.76	6.3.77
169	Boston	34	17	5	7	5	23.9.76	6.3.77
170	West Oxfordshire	49	33	5	6	22	30.9.76	7.4.77
171	City of Worcester	36	12	12			30.9.76	6.3.77
172	South Norfolk	47	41	1	4	36	9.10.76	11.2.77
173	North Hertfordshire	50	25	11	3	11	9.10.76	10.8.77
174	Craven	34	24	2	6	16	7.10.76	13.5.77
175	West Derbyshire	39	25	6	2	17	14.10.76	6.3.77
176	Wear Valley	40	21	5	9	7	14.10.76	5.10.79
177	Melton	26	17	1	7	9	4.11.76	21.4.77
178	Oadby & Wigston	26	10	6	4		4.11.76	20.4.77
179	Bromsgrove	41	20	7	7	6	4.11.76	24.7.77
180	Nuneaton	45	15	15			11.11.76	21.4.77
182	Scarborough	49	22	10	7	5	25.11.76	21.6.77
183	Crawley	26	11	4	7		11.11.76	5.8.77
184	Chichester	50	33	5	7	21	2.12.76	13.5.77
186	Stratford-on-Avon	55	35	8	4	23	13.1.76	6.8.78
187	West Devon	30	21	3	3	15	20.1.76	13.5.77
188	Purbeck	22	12	3	4	5	7.10.76	21.6.77
189	East Staffordshire	46	25	3	15	7	3.2.77	21.6.77
190	Broadland	49	35	1	12	22	20.1.77	6.8.77
191	Macclesfield	60	34	7	12	15	16.12.76	28.9.78
195	Tiverton	40	28	3	6	19	10.3.77	24.7.77
196	Bracknell	40	19	6	9	4	10.3.77	24.7.77

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
197	South Kesteven	57	34	9	5	20	22.9.77	15.1.78
198	South Hams	44	34	2	6	26	17.3.77	24.7.77
199	Rutland	20	16	1	2	13	9.12.76	14.11.77
200	Newcastle-under-Lyme	56	23	11	11	1	9.12.76	4.12.78
201	Gosport	30	10	10			13.1.77	26.10.78
202	South Staffordshire	50	30	6	8	16	24.3.77	5.12.77
204	City of Norwich	48	16	16			27.1.77	24.7.77
206	High Peak	44	25	4	11	10	10.2.77	16.11.77
208	North Kesteven	39	30		9	21	24.3.77	6.11.77
215	City of Oxford	45	15	15			17.3.77	15.11.77
218	North East Derbyshire	53	26	9	9	8	10.3.77	1.12.78
221	Gravesham	44	19	9	7	3	24.3.77	16.11.77
222	Richmondshire	34	26	2	4	20	26.5.77	14.10.77
224	Erewash	51	24	8	11	5	5.5.77	30.8.78
227	City of Durham	49	24	6	13	5	5.5.77	23.11.78
228	Selby	50	35	2	11	22	5.5.77	15.1.78
231	Basildon	42	14	14			28.4.77	24.1.78
232	Vale of White Horse	51	31	4	12	15	20.1.77	24.1.78
233	City of Derby	44	20	4	16		19.5.77	10.11.78
236	Mid Suffolk	40	34		6	28	26.5.77	15.1.78
238	City of Chester	60	27	11	11	5	7.7.77	24.1.78
239	Penwith	34	16	5	8	3	21.7.77	18.10.78
240	Wyre Forest	42	18	11	2	5	16.6.77	12.10.78
242	Wychavon	49	37	4	4	29	21.7.77	15.1.78
243	Cherwell	52	31	8	5	18	21.7.77	9.10.78
245	Bolsover	37	24	3	7	14	28.7.77	12.10.78
251	Adur	39	14	12	1	1	7.7.77	28.9.78
253	Teignbridge	58	33	4	17	12	28.7.77	15.1.78
259	Hastings	32	16		16		15.9.77	14.3.78
260	Chesterfield	47	20	8	11	1	22.9.77	25.10.78
261	Cotswold	45	33	1	10	22	29.9.77	28.9.78
262	St. Albans	57	20	18	1	1	28.7.77	29.11.78
263	Amber Valley	43	25	2	14	9	28.7.77	10.11.78
265	South Holland	38	23	5	5	13	22.9.77	21.3.78
266	North Norfolk	46	36	3	4	29	29.9.77	28.9.78
267	Allerdale	55	34	6	9	19	22.9.77	21.8.78
268	West Lindsey	37	26	4	3	19	29.9.77	12.7.78
269	City of Carlisle	51	23	12	4	7	5.5.77	3.9.79
270	Copeland	51	26	6	13	7	22.9.77	9.10.78
271	North Cornwall	38	27	4	3	20	17.11.77	7.12.78
272	South Lakeland	52	47		5	42	20.10.77	9.11.78
273	Carrick	45	20	9	7	4	1.12.77	15.9.78
274	Dover	56	31	5	15	11	20.10.77	28.11.78
275	Hove	30	10	10			17.11.77	23.5.78
276	Sedgefield	49	22	9	9	4	3.11.77	5.10.79

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
278	Kerrier	44	22	8	6	8	15.12.77	14.9.78
279	St. Edmundsbury	44	32		12	20	17.11.77	21.8.78
280	Ipswich	48	16	16			15.12.77	28.9.78
281	The Wrekin	46	34		12	22	15.12.77	6.11.78
282	Wokingham	54	24	12	6	6	1.12.77	10.11.78
283	Breckland	53	41	3	6	32	1.12.77	10.11.78
288	Grimsby	45	22	2	19	1	19.1.78	9.11.78
290	Northampton	43	21	1	20		19.1.78	16.11.78
291	Forest Heath	25	15	2	6	7	15.9.77	14.12.78
292	City of Lincoln	33	11	11			19.1.78	30.11.78
293	Hambleton	47	34	2	9	23	15.12.77	11.12.78
294	City of Plymouth	60	20	20			14.9.78	4.12.78
295	Torrige	36	27	4	1	22	21.9.78	30.11.78
296	Bournemouth	57	19	19			20.10.77	11.12.78
297	Weymouth & Portland	35	14	7	7		15.12.77	24.11.78
298	Rugby	48	22	11	4	7	14.9.78	14.12.78
299	Easington	51	26	7	11	8	28.9.78	14.12.78
301	Christchurch	25	10	5	5		28.9.78	13.12.78
302	East Devon	60	35	8	9	18	19.10.78	13.12.78
303	Shepway	56	25	13	5	7	14.9.78	14.12.78
304	Worthing	36	12	12			21.9.78	5.10.79
305	Horsham	43	24	5	9	10	21.9.78	14.12.78
307	Leominster	36	29	2	3	24	19.10.78	13.12.78
309	Waverley	57	28	7	15	6	19.10.78	6.8.79
311	Teesdale	31	19	3	6	10	26.10.78	30.8.79
312	Harrogate	60	33	13	1	19	28.9.78	18.10.79
313	North Wiltshire	52	43		9	34	19.10.78	6.8.79
314	Great Yarmouth	48	21	11	5	5	26.10.78	20.6.79
315	Harborough	37	26	2	7	17	19.10.78	30.8.79
318	City of Kingston-upon-Hull	60	20	20			9.11.78	30.8.79
320	Ryedale	42	28	4	6	18	30.11.78	30.8.79
321	Newbury	45	31	2	10	19	9.11.78	3.9.79
323	West Norfolk	60	40	4	12	24	26.10.78	10.10.79
325	Stroud	56	31	10	5	16	30.11.78	19.11.79
326	Lewes	48	25	7	9	9	14.12.78	30.8.79
327	Wealden	58	33	4	17	12	25.1.79	13.8.79
330	Poole	36	13	10	3		7.12.78	24.10.79
331	Reading	45	15	15			25.1.79	24.10.79
332	Warwick	45	20	11	3	6	22.3.79	18.10.79
333	Wellingborough	34	15	8	3	4	14.12.78	15.12.79
334	Cheltenham	33	11	11			22.3.79	23.11.79
335	City of Leicester	56	28			28	29.3.79	16.11.79
338	City of Portsmouth	39	13	13			22.3.79	19.11.79
339	City of Exeter	36	18		18		26.4.79	16.11.79
341	West Wiltshire	43	28	3	9	16	26.4.79	30.8.79

No. of Report	District	Size of Council	No. of Wards	No. of Councillors per Ward			Date of Report	Date of Order
				×3	×2	×1		
342	North Bedfordshire	53	27	11	4	12	10.5.79	11.12.79
343	Torbay	36	12	12			26.4.79	19.11.79
348	Restormel	44	18	9	8	1	24.5.79	11.12.79
352	East Lindsey	60	48	2	8	38	20.9.79	6.11.79
353	Bristol	68	34		34		26.7.79	4.3.80
354	Hinckley & Bosworth	34	18	6	4	8	24.5.79	1.2.80
356	Redditch	29	11	7	4		26.7.79	19.2.80
360	Forest of Dean	49	28	3†	7	16	26.7.79	15.1.80
361	Brighton	48	16	16			20.9.79	13.2.80
362	Rother	45	26	8	3	15	7.6.79	22.4.80
363	Slough	39	13	13			20.9.79	20.3.80
364	North Devon	44	30	1	12	17	8.11.79	12.2.80
365	Suffolk Coastal	55	42	2	9	31	25.10.79	27.5.80
366	Beaconsfield	41	20	7	7	6	25.10.79	19.3.80
367	Waveney	48	21	11	5	5	11.10.79	9.6.80
368	Tewkesbury	45	31	3	8	20	6.12.79	29.3.80
369	Arun	56	26	7	16	3	6.12.79	7.5.80
371	Wycombe	60	31	11	7	13	25.10.79	18.6.80
372	Charnwood	52	29	5	13	11	13.12.79	3.6.80
373	West Dorset	55	38	5	7	26	31.1.80	3.5.80
374	Mid Sussex	56	30	7	12	11	20.12.79	7.5.80
375	Caradon	41	30	2	7	21	14.2.80	30.5.80
376	Windsor & Maidenhead	58	22	16	4	2	13.12.79	27.5.80
377	North West Leicestershire	40	22	4	10	8	17.1.80	3.6.80
384	Wimborne	36	23	3	7	13	29.5.80	30.7.80
385	South Oxfordshire	56	34	3*	12	18	5.6.80	3.9.80
387	Blaby	39	21	4	10	7	24.4.80	3.9.80
389	East Cambridgeshire	37	18	2**	8	6	12.6.80	3.9.80
392	North Dorset	33	27		6	21	10.7.80	7.10.80

† plus two 5 member wards

* plus one 5 member ward

** plus one 5 member ward and one 4 member ward

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

SCHEDULE 11

RULES TO BE OBSERVED IN CONSIDERING ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

Districts and London boroughs

3.—(1) This paragraph applies to the consideration by the Secretary of State or either of the Commissions of the electoral arrangements for elections of councillors of a district or London borough.

(2) Having regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district or borough likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration—

- (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 of the district or borough;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish or community having a parish or community council (whether separate or common) shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish or community which is not divided into parish or community wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (2) above, in considering the electoral arrangements referred to in sub-paragraph (1) above, regard shall be had to—

- (a) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary.

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

Government Bookshops

49 High Holborn, London WC1V 6HB
13a Castle Street, Edinburgh EH2 3AR
41 The Hayes, Cardiff CF1 1JW
Brazenose Street, Manchester M60 8AS
Southey House, Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ
258 Broad Street, Birmingham B1 2HE
80 Chichester Street, Belfast BT1 4JY

*Government publications are also available
through booksellers*

ISBN 0 11 751558 2