

Porter, Johanna

From: CllrR Parker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 27 March 2015 15:55
To: Reviews@
Cc: Porter, Johanna; CllrJ Hough; Bowden, Tim
Subject: Labour Group Submission
Attachments: LGboundary commission 27.3.2015.pdf; Profiling using LGBCE CoL calcs.xlsx

Importance: High

Good Afternoon,

On behalf of the Labour Group at Lincolnshire County Council – please see attached submission document and relevent paperwork.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email.

Kind regards

Councillor Robert Parker
Deputy Labour Group Leader

----- Note: We are a Microsoft Office site. Our base version is 2010. Please make sure that files you send can be read in this format. Any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of this e-mail is strictly prohibited save unless expressly authorised by the sender. The information contained in this message is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the addressee or the person responsible for delivering this to the addressee, you may not copy, distribute or take action in reliance on it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender(s) immediately by telephone. Please also destroy and delete as soon as possible the message from your computer.

At the meeting on 3rd March between Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) a number of issues were discussed to which responses were required by Friday 27 March.

Those matters, which were referred to in the email dated 24 February 2015 from LCC's Nigel West, on behalf of the Boundary Commission, were,

- Further clarification /justification on the electoral figures
- Understanding the councillors current and future roles in committees
- The relationship between councillors and parish councils
- The role of the councillor in the future workings of the council
- Review of the commissioning model and what it means for Lincolnshire

For simplicity, this response from the Labour Group on Lincolnshire Council has been divided into three sections in order to tackle the points raised.

1. LGBC/LCC projections on the 2021 electorate

Since the meeting on 3 March discussions between LCC and the LGBC have led to new figures being 'agreed' on the projected number of voters in 2021 that increases the number from 565,427 in the earlier figures to 580,447. Having looked at the methodology used we can see the reasoning applied and accept the new projected figure for 2021.

Working on the revised figure of 580,447 for 2021 and using calculations made by LCC we note that the 'best fit' meaning the lowest range between the maximum and minimum number of electors for councillors in the seven district areas is at 77 councillors where the difference is 383. The 'worst' fits are at 71, 73 and 75 seats. The calculations are set out in the attached appendix.

2. Current role of the councillor on Lincolnshire County Council

We have a different view about the role and workload of the councillor to that put forward by LCC in their submission of 29th January 2015, which we set out below.

At paragraph 18 it refers to “a small number of sub- committees and working groups which meet from time to time....plus various panels such as the Fostering and Adoption Panel.” The suggestion is that these are few and far between, are unimportant and take up little time. The reverse is true.

Sub Groups.

One of the most important sub groups is the Lincolnshire Safeguarding Boards Scrutiny Sub Group, with seven councillors which looks at the performance of the Lincolnshire Children's Safeguarding Board and the Adults Safeguarding Board. The individual councillors who sit on the Sub Group also attend meetings of the two boards and their committees on a rotation basis to ensure they fully understand the workings of the board and the safeguarding agenda. The role also involves attending local safeguarding events such as conferences to ensure the wider Lincolnshire community are as up to date as possible on the safeguarding agenda.

Task and Finish Groups and working groups.

These are an important part of the improvement agenda of the council. At any one time as many as three or four of these may be taking place. One recent example was the Frontline Social Workers and Safeguarding Scrutiny Review. Six councillors and a parent governor representative took part. The review took place over eight months and involved a large amount of work. A summary of what the councillors did in order to produce the report is shown below in an extract from the final report.

'The review was carried out between November 2013 and May 2014. As part of the review, the Task and Finish Group met 11 times during which it reviewed local safeguarding practices, procedures and policies, benchmarking Lincolnshire against other local authorities, and performance information relating to safeguarding. The Task and Finish Group also spoke to a range of frontline workers, such as Social Workers, Family Support Workers and Targeted Youth Workers, and also to Team Managers from the different localities. The Task and Finish Group visited the Customer Service Centre to observe the handling of queries and referrals relating to children's social care as they came in. Individually, the Members of the Task and Finish Group also attended meetings of Child Protection Conferences and Support Panel meetings, and some were given the opportunity to shadow a Social Worker as they conducted home visits. The Task and Finish Group has also spoken to the University of Lincoln regarding the social care degrees that are offered and also to the Lincolnshire Safeguarding Children Board to find out what they are doing around multi-agency working and training. Some Members of the Task and Finish Group also attended a Signs of Safety training session, and met with Judge Swindells, the Family Court Judge in Lincolnshire, to find out her views on whether safeguarding was robust enough in Lincolnshire'.

Panels

The Corporate Parenting Panel, with seven councillors takes the lead on the Councils crucial role as a corporate parent. It meets at least four times a year, sometimes more often. It plays a crucial role in improving the lives of looked after children, the numbers of which have been rising and total over 600 at any one time. In addition there are seven visiting members, some of whom are not on the

corporate parenting panel, who pay quarterly visits to our children's homes, on each visit they have to prepare a report. Every county councillor also has responsibilities as a corporate parent.

There are four Fostering and Adoption Panels. Each panel meets every three weeks. There is a county councillor on each panel. The meetings are all day and up to six cases are considered. Preparation time is considerable. Each case file needs to be read which on average takes about two to two and a half hours and overall preparation time can be as much as twenty hours per meeting. As one of our panel members put it "I have to set aside the whole week before a panel meeting in order to properly prepare." In addition there are twice yearly all day training days, a need to keep abreast of current legislation, and members must have a full understanding of the National Guidance.

Appeals Panels. As part of an employee's right to appeal against dismissal and disciplinary proceedings they have a right to appeal to a panel of three councillors. These appeal hearings necessarily happen as and when required. However they can last all day, and members have to be trained. Currently there is a pool of thirteen councillors from which a panel can be selected.

All of these panels, working groups, task and finish groups and sub groups require a considerable commitment from a limited group of councillors and if these numbers are reduced it will make it more difficult to fulfil these essential functions.

Relationships with external organisations

At paragraph 19 the council submission report refers to partnerships with external organisations and gives a list of outside bodies. There is then a formal list of these attached. These are only the tip of the iceberg for individual councillors. And as the Council looks to work with more outside organisations in the future the work councillors do with other organisations will become even more important. Councillors sit on or attend many other meetings of organisations in the local community.

These include being school governors, working with residents associations, neighbourhood forums, and community groups, policing forums and more. And as the Council withdraws from providing services like youth clubs having to fill in roles that were previously provided by paid county Council staff. This can mean an individual councillor can have up to 10 or more additional outside organisations they are directly involved in.

Examples of what some individual Labour councillors are involved in are now shown:

“Robert Parker (County Councillor for Lincoln West)

Deputy Leader of the Labour Group which involves weekly meetings or telephone discussions with the Group Leader and standing in when necessary for the Group Leader at other meetings for example, Leaders' meetings

Shadow Executive Member for Finance which involves extensive work at the time of the Annual Budget round in putting together the Labour Group's alternative budget. During the year there are monthly briefing meetings with the Director of Finance

Member of Value for Money Scrutiny Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee both of which meet 9 times a year for a half day each

Member of the recently formed Scrutiny Review Group which has been set up to review the role and performance of scrutiny work with the help of outside consultants. This new work is somewhat similar to another review I was involved in last year when we looked at the council's constitution. We met monthly for 2 hours for the best part of a year.

Outside Bodies: I am one of the County Council's representatives on the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee which meets 10 times a year for half a day each time. I am also a council representative on the Friends of Usher Gallery Board which meets quarterly for 2 hourly meetings.

I am a Local Authority appointed governor at a local infant school. I am Vice Chair of the governing body and Chair of the Resources Committee. There are 6 meetings a year both of the full governors and the Resources Committee (2 hours). I also go in to the school about twice a month for informal discussions

Divisional work as a County Councillor

Meetings

- Bottom of the Hill Group –small businesses group (6 weekly)
- Bailgate Guild – small businesses group (6 weekly)
- Carholme Community Forum – local groups forum (6 weekly)
- Lincoln City Centre Policing Forum (quarterly)
- Lincolnshire County Labour Party – to report on County Council activity (quarterly)
- Lincoln Labour Party – to report on County Council activity (monthly)
- Carholme Labour Party to report on local County Council activity (monthly)

Surgeries are held twice a month on a Saturday morning at a local church hall. Monthly I distribute leaflets advising of the details of the surgeries.

Constituent case work is dealt with by telephone, email and face to face discussions at people's homes or at County Office and averages a day a week.

Communicating with constituents. Every quarter, I write, design and distribute a division wide leaflet to residents advising about County Council matters (budget changes, library closures etc). I share this responsibility with City of Lincoln councillors.

East Midlands Councils (EMC) I am Leader of the Labour Group at EMC and one of the Vice Chairs. EMC is a representative body of all local authorities in the East Midlands and works to develop the work of member councils and to influence MPS and government. This work takes up about 2-3 half days a month for which I receive an allowance.”

“Nev Jackson (County Councillor for Lincoln Park)

Committees

- Audit Committee
- Pensions Committee
- Economic Scrutiny Committee
- Appeals Committee - as and when required

- Training for Audit Committee roughly twice yearly. Pensions Committee hold special meetings of Investment Strategy working group also ad hoc meetings are held on LGPS changes and changes to West Yorkshire providing administration from April.

Outside Bodies

- Local Authority Pension Forum. Meeting four times annually in London odd special meeting also act as mentor Road Safety Partnership meeting quarterly
- School governors two schools meeting termly plus one sub Cttee for each termly
- Two neighbourhood boards meeting bi monthly
- City Football club initiative arising from Kick It Out anti-racism project.

Above meetings about ninety minutes to two hours duration

- Two police forums quarterly plus odd special meeting with residents re drugs in ward resulting in a number of successful police drug raids recently
- Monthly surgery one hour, plus hand delivery leaflets which gives details of city council services and our PCSOs about two to three hours each month

In addition though not directly council I sit on three charitable boards which meet bi-monthly. I was asked to participate in these boards because they were aware I am a councillor.”

Shadow Executive and the Opposition.

No mention is made in the Council's submission of the important role of the opposition. In addition to its role in holding the council and the executive to account it also provides an alternative administration through the shadow executive. This is recognised in the Council's constitution and shadow executive members receive a special responsibility allowance albeit a small one. Currently there are 8 members of the Shadow Executive. In addition to developing policy shadow executive members meet with relevant officers on a regular basis, receive special briefings about their responsibilities, and attend scrutiny and committee meetings relating to their portfolio. For example the Shadow Executive member for NHS Liaison, Public Health and Community Engagement in addition to her two committees also attends the Health Scrutiny Committee and the Health and Well Being Board. The Shadow Executive meets regularly about eight times a year.

As part of our work as an opposition, Councillors are very involved with supporting community groups who want to challenge or change council decisions or develop a new policy for the council.

A recent example is the Save Lincolnshire Libraries Campaign. Opposition members have been involved in and supported this campaign since June 2013 when the plan was announced to close 30 out of 45 council libraries. The work on this has been considerable. Amongst many other things a judicial review was successful in the high court which found the council consultation was flawed and it had failed to properly consider an expression of interest by a charity under the Localism Act. This kind of work is not recognised in the council submission and would become increasingly difficult if numbers of Councillors are reduced.

We also wish to show the extensive time consuming nature of council work as a front-line councillor on Lincolnshire County Council. Below is a table which sets out details of the length in pages of recent papers going to a variety of council committees.

Type of Meeting	Date of Meeting	Length of Report
Community and Public Safety Scrutiny Committee	14 January 2015	302 pages
Value for Money Scrutiny Committee	23 February 2015	141 pages
Adult Scrutiny Committee	25 February 2015 1 April 2015	428 pages 187 pages
Flood and Drainage Management Committee	27 February 2015	93 pages
Economic Scrutiny Committee	24 February 2015	97 pages
Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee	6 March 2015	226 pages
Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee	9 March 2015	74 pages
Health Scrutiny Committee for	11 March 2015	106 pages

Lincolnshire		
Planning Committee	16 March 2015	148 pages
Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board	24 March 2015	378 pages
Audit Committee	30 March 2015	408 pages of which 211 pages are only available on-line
Executive	8 April 2015	109 pages

The work of most councillors is on Scrutiny Committees which are responsible for policy development, monitoring the outcome of policy and providing a sounding board for the Executive. To do that job effectively means devoting sufficient member time to that task which is why in the light of the information in this paragraph we can see no justification for the number of members to be reduced below the existing number

The relationship between councillors and parish and town councils

Clearly parish councils are important but for many councillors in more urban areas there are Town Councils as well. So for example in East and West Lindsey there are town councils in places like Alford, Gainsborough, Louth, Mablethorpe and Sutton on Sea, Market Rasen, Skegness and Spilsby in addition to the large numbers of parish councils.

Town councils tend to be more active and meet more often than parish councils. The relationship between county councillors and parish councils varies but in addition to attending some if not all of the meetings, Town councillors and Town clerks will turn to the County Councillor when they need help to solve a problem.

As an example, a recent case in Louth resolved around a disagreement between the Town and the County Councils over the running of a community room in Louth Library. To get this sorted various emails were exchanged, a meeting took place at the county council with a relevant officer and then a final meeting took place between the Louth county councillors, the chairman of the local charity, a town councillor and a library officer. Following the meeting agreement was reached on a way forward. This took perhaps in total 8 hours to resolve. This is an example of just one of many issues that county councillors deal with.

Relationships between councillors and other organisations in the City of Lincoln

The city of Lincoln is quite different to other parts of Lincolnshire. It is a sub-regional centre with a population of over 90,000 people which makes it twice the size of any other settlement. It is the home to the University of Lincoln and Bishop Grosseteste University College which together have 15,000 students receiving full or part-time education. That means that there are different and often more challenging demands on County Councillors who represent divisions in the city. Anti-social

behaviour, noise nuisance, tenancy and other social issues are all familiar matters which councillors have to deal with and which take time to try to resolve. So too does liaising with a large number of voluntary groups such as the Student Union, business groups, tenants and residents associations to deal with the often small scale but important problems that cause friction in urban areas. Urban life also brings increasing problems of trying to fit more cars into an historic city than there are parking spaces available and which takes up a disproportionate amount of councillor time.

No mention was made in the submission by LCC of these sorts of demands on councillors in Lincoln and indeed other urban areas like Boston and Grantham which we think the LGBC needs to recognise.

The internet and social media

At the recent meeting with representatives of the boundary commission the question was raised as to how the use of the internet and social media had affected the work of councillors now and what might happen in the future. There is also the suggestion in paragraph 45 of the Council's submission that the use of electronic communication could mean that 71 councillors could handle the work of 77 particularly in relation to Parish Councils. No evidence is given for this assumption, which we believe is a false one.

Our experience is that the use of email in particular has meant an increase in the amount of contact with both officers and the public. People feel more able to contact you at any time, and to copy you into everything they are dealing with. Not only do you have to deal with the normal council responsibilities but large numbers of emails as well. On Monday 23rd March Councillor Hough received 21 emails on his ipad and another 21 the following day. On his home computer he receives up to 50 a day. It is an ever increasing part of the workload and there is no evidence that it will decrease in the future.

While it has helped to speed up the process of getting replies and action it has also increased the demands on councillors and as more people use it this is likely to increase rather than diminish the work load of individual councillors.

3 Role of the councillor on Lincolnshire County Council in future

Looking forward the role of the councillor seems likely to increase rather than diminish. With fewer staff and more and more services to be commissioned and the resulting contracts to be monitored there seems little likelihood that there will be any lessening in the role of the councillor. One of the recommendations of the recent audit report on libraries was that there should be more scrutiny in future including additional meetings.

At paragraph 35 of the Council's submission it states that although reducing the number of councillors would increase the workload under the existing arrangements "other changes within the council are likely to have an effect on the workload, including our move towards a commissioning- based approach to service provision. As this change will bring about staff reductions, councillors feel that there should be a corresponding reduction in their numbers, especially as reducing the council's size to 71 members would not significantly increase the members' average workload."

No evidence is produced to support these assertions that

a) a commissioning- based approach to service provision will reduce the work for councillors and

b) that by reducing the staff fewer councillors would be required.

We believe that both assumptions are incorrect

The expanded commissioning role

In paragraph 21 of the county council's submission, they suggest that the county council by becoming a commissioning council could have slightly fewer committees. No evidence is given for this. Also by implication, becoming a commissioning council will lead to fewer responsibilities for councillors. Our view remains that the opposite could be argued.

Councillors need to be involved at all stages of the commissioning process from specification to monitoring. As commissioning develops, the scrutiny work of councillors will be an important and - increasingly time consuming - part of our work.

As Chairman of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee for the last two years, having been involved for the last ten years, Councillor John Hough has seen the increasing need for more work to be done on existing and future commissioning contracts. The committee has recently had to set up a working group to review the school improvement service provided by CfBT, an outside contractor, and are currently having to look in much more detail at changes to other outsourced services such as the service provided by Action for Children which provides short breaks for severely disabled children. "The need for effective scrutiny and monitoring of outside contracts is greater now than it has ever been," he said,

Another example is the domiciliary care service. Previously mainly provided by our own staff currently we have 74 different companies providing it. This is to be reorganised, a lengthy report went to the Adult Scrutiny Committee which had major reservations about what is being proposed. To properly scrutinise changes in such a major service and then monitor performance of companies and subcontractors will require more work by councillors than in the past.

Fewer staff.

Taking the issue of fewer staff meaning fewer councillors would be required, our experience is the opposite. As staff numbers have reduced we are finding that councillors have to take on more of the work as there are fewer full time staff.

This applies both on the work associated with committees, panels and task and finish groups and in the work in the community.

Because there are fewer staff, members of the public see county councillors as their first port of call rather than asking for help when there are problems with officers.

As the County Council stops providing services councillors are expected to step in and fill the gap left by service reductions. For example Councillor Hough has taken on the role of treasurer of Louth 13+ the charity that is now responsible for the former youth club premises in Louth. If it was still being run by the county council, officers would have been responsible for the running of the club and its finances.

Effective Scrutiny / Decision Making

One of the most important roles councillors will play in the future is that of ensuring that there is effective scrutiny of the delivery of council services, of forthcoming decisions and of new policy initiatives. Done well this should lead to better outcomes and decisions.

A recent example where this didn't happen was the Libraries Project. An internal audit report was commissioned to look at what could be learned from the Judicial Review where the Court ruled that the Council's decision making process was flawed due to:

- Flaws in the consultation process
- Not considering a proposal by Greenwich Leisure Limited as an expression of interest under Section 81 of the Localism Act

The report then made a number of recommendations about what happened and what would improve the decision making process in the future. Some extracts from the report are shown below.

“4.27 A phased approach would have been good practice for such a significant change as that proposed by the Library Service – an options appraisal around what a comprehensive and efficient library service might look like, followed by an option appraisal on how the service should be delivered. The deferred decision making timetable, which was a consequence of the political drivers and the financial timescales, resulted in the 'what' and the 'how' around the library services being formally considered at the same time. We believe a phased approach and consultation (as originally planned by officers via the 'Big Library Conversation')³ may have improved scrutiny, decision making and the overall outcome.

4.32 We found the papers presented to both pre-decision Scrutiny and the Executive extremely lengthy, for example: Sheffield Hallam University's consultation outcome report, 205 pages (tabled – 15 minutes prior to the meeting) Library Needs Assessment (July 2013), 44 pages plus 7 appendices Libraries Decision Report (December 2013), 84 pages plus 11 appendices.

4.33 Members generally have five working days to reflect on the papers in advance of these meetings – in our opinion Councillors would benefit from more time to consider the bigger issues. We acknowledge that it is important to demonstrate that appropriate due diligence has taken place in any new proposal but we believe that the focus and key messages can sometimes get lost in such lengthy reports.

4.34 We found little effective scrutiny contribution to the Library Needs Assessment, preferred delivery model and Executive decision making. Earlier scrutiny meetings had acted more as a sounding board for library service concepts. Scrutiny over the option appraisal would have: increased the level of transparency and openness provided an understanding behind the rationale for the preferred model resulted in a smoother and more effective pre-decision scrutiny

4.35 We believe it would have been better had the Scrutiny Committee been engaged at an earlier stage to fully understand the legalities, business and service delivery issues associated with the library review. It would have also allowed officers to respond to scrutiny feedback within their proposal and carry out more work, if considered necessary

Project Plans

5.4 Project plans should allow sufficient time to introduce at least one additional pre-decision report into the Scrutiny process to enable earlier engagement and improved contribution to strategy, policy and decision making.”

This report has highlighted the need for councillors to spend more time, not less, on scrutinising major projects.

We have highlighted a number of examples and projects where more work needs to be done by councillors not less. However in addition to these there are some other very big issues which councillors need to look very closely at in the future.

These include the whole issue of Adult Social Care. The current service is unsustainable in the future with money that is proposed going forward. As the issue of trying to integrate Adult Social Care and the NHS goes on, the work required from councillors as well as officers will be immense.

Another large issue is that of schools attainment. As the education structure has changed in Lincolnshire with more and more academies, standards have slipped behind the rest of the country. This will be a major challenge going forward for councillors both directly through council committees, working groups and task and finish groups but also as governors in individual schools

Conclusion

We acknowledge that the boundary review is timely in order to remove disparities in the size of electorate which have been created between different divisions. We have tried to show by evidence and argument that councillors have a very full current workload, and a likely increasing one, in addition to their own work and family commitments. They make a huge contribution to the work of the council and to the ultimate wellbeing of the community. Reducing the number of councillors from the current 77 would in our view put at risk the future good governance of Lincolnshire County Council.

Importantly, 77 seats is the number based on the LGBC/LCC projections for 2021 at which there is the least difference in the number of voters for each councillor by district area and where the 'best fit' occurs. That is an important issue which no doubt will be taken into account.

For all the reasons stated in this submission, we feel that the most appropriate outcome is for the number of county council seats to remain at 77.

2014 electorate figures with projections

County divisions	2014 electorate figures				2015 forecast electorate figures				2021 forecast electorate figures						
	Electorate	Variance in district		Variance in county		Electorate	Variance in district		Variance in county		Electorate	Variance in district		Variance in county	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Boston Coastal	5,867	-1,099	-15.77%	-1,359	-18.11%	5,916	-1,032	-14.85%	-1,336	-18.43%	6,052	-1,236	-16.96%	-1,486	-19.71%
Boston East	6,573	-393	-5.64%	-653	-9.04%	6,578	-370	-5.33%	-675	-9.30%	6,901	-387	-5.31%	-637	-8.45%
Boston Fishtoft	7,738	772	11.09%	512	7.09%	7,634	686	9.87%	381	5.26%	7,936	648	8.89%	398	5.28%
Boston North West	6,988	23	0.33%	-238	-3.29%	7,050	102	1.47%	-202	-2.79%	7,519	231	3.17%	-19	-0.25%
Boston Rural	9,252	2,286	32.82%	2,026	28.03%	9,169	2,220	31.96%	1,916	26.42%	9,241	1,952	26.79%	1,702	22.58%
Boston South	6,339	-627	-9.00%	-887	-12.27%	6,272	-676	-9.73%	-980	-13.52%	6,728	-560	-7.68%	-810	-10.74%
Boston West	6,002	-964	-13.83%	-1,224	-16.94%	6,018	-930	-13.39%	-1,235	-17.02%	6,640	-648	-8.90%	-899	-11.92%
Boston Borough total	48,759					48,637					51,018				
Boston Borough average	6,966					6,948					7,288				
Alford & Sutton	7,419	310	4.36%	193	2.67%	7,322	401	5.79%	70	0.96%	7,749	642	9.04%	210	2.79%
Horncastle & Tetford	8,397	1,288	18.12%	1,171	16.20%	8,062	1,140	16.47%	809	11.16%	8,216	1,110	15.62%	678	9.00%
Ingoldmells Rural	7,651	542	7.33%	425	5.88%	7,622	700	10.12%	369	5.09%	7,894	788	11.09%	356	4.72%
Louth Marsh	6,804	-305	-4.29%	-422	-5.84%	6,702	-220	-3.17%	-551	-7.59%	7,068	-38	-0.54%	-470	-6.23%
Louth North	5,619	-1,490	-20.96%	-1,607	-22.24%	5,538	-1,384	-20.00%	-1,715	-23.65%	5,576	-1,531	-21.54%	-1,963	-26.04%
Louth Rural North	6,576	-533	-7.50%	-650	-8.99%	6,500	-422	-6.10%	-753	-10.38%	6,542	-564	-7.94%	-996	-13.21%
Louth South	7,378	269	3.78%	152	2.10%	7,271	349	5.04%	18	0.25%	7,237	131	1.84%	-301	-3.99%
Louth Wolds	6,331	-778	-10.94%	-895	-12.39%	6,238	-684	-9.88%	-1,015	-13.99%	6,264	-843	-11.86%	-1,274	-16.90%
Mablethorpe	6,468	-641	-9.02%	-758	-10.49%	6,377	-545	-7.87%	-876	-12.07%	6,759	-348	-4.89%	-779	-10.34%
Skegness North	7,376	267	3.76%	150	2.08%	6,972	50	0.73%	-281	-3.87%	7,602	496	6.98%	64	0.85%
Skegness South	6,540	-569	-8.00%	-686	-9.49%	5,916	-1,006	-14.53%	-1,337	-18.43%	5,959	-1,147	-16.15%	-1,579	-20.95%
Spilsby Fen	7,581	472	6.44%	355	4.91%	7,381	460	6.64%	129	1.77%	7,450	343	4.83%	-88	-1.17%
Tattershall Castle	7,969	860	12.10%	743	10.28%	7,619	697	10.07%	366	5.05%	7,806	699	9.84%	267	3.55%
Wainfleet & Burgh	7,008	-101	-1.42%	-218	-3.02%	6,861	-61	-0.88%	-392	-5.41%	6,887	-219	-3.09%	-651	-8.64%
Woodhall Spa & Wragby	7,517	408	5.74%	291	4.03%	7,446	524	7.57%	193	2.66%	7,588	481	6.77%	49	0.65%
East Lindsey total	106,634					103,826					106,598				
East Lindsey average	7,109					6,922					7,107				
Lincoln Birchwood	6,246	-146	-2.28%	-980	-13.56%	6,295	-304	-4.60%	-958	-13.20%	6,295	-471	-6.96%	-1,243	-16.49%
Lincoln Boutham	6,355	-38	-0.59%	-871	-12.06%	6,934	335	5.08%	-319	-4.39%	7,562	796	11.77%	23	0.31%
Lincoln Bracebridge	6,124	-268	-4.19%	-1,102	-15.24%	6,149	-450	-6.81%	-1,104	-15.22%	6,211	-555	-8.20%	-1,327	-17.61%
Lincoln East	5,999	-393	-6.15%	-1,227	-16.98%	5,947	-651	-9.87%	-1,305	-18.00%	5,991	-775	-11.45%	-1,547	-20.53%
Lincoln Glebe	6,784	392	6.12%	-442	-6.12%	6,619	21	0.31%	-633	-8.73%	6,994	228	3.38%	-544	-7.22%
Lincoln Hartsholme	6,641	248	3.89%	-585	-8.10%	6,771	172	2.61%	-482	-6.65%	7,018	252	3.73%	-520	-6.90%
Lincoln Moorland	5,634	-758	-11.86%	-1,592	-22.03%	5,738	-860	-13.03%	-1,514	-20.88%	5,775	-991	-14.65%	-1,763	-23.39%
Lincoln North	7,824	1,432	22.40%	598	8.27%	7,872	1,273	19.30%	619	8.54%	7,926	1,160	17.15%	388	5.15%
Lincoln Park	5,231	-1,162	-18.17%	-1,995	-27.61%	5,312	-1,287	-19.50%	-1,941	-26.76%	5,371	-1,395	-20.62%	-2,168	-28.75%
Lincoln West	7,084	692	10.82%	-142	-1.96%	8,349	1,750	26.52%	1,096	15.11%	8,514	1,749	25.85%	976	12.95%
Lincoln total	63,921					65,986					67,657				
Lincoln average	6,392					6,599					6,766				
Bassingham Rural	9,308	1,547	19.93%	2,082	28.81%	9,084	1,258	16.07%	1,832	25.26%	9,267	1,078	13.17%	1,728	22.93%
Billinghay & Metheringham	6,832	-929	-11.98%	-394	-5.45%	6,936	-891	-11.38%	-317	-4.36%	7,102	-1,086	-13.26%	-436	-5.78%
Bracebridge Heath & Waddington	8,835	1,074	13.83%	1,609	22.27%	8,895	1,068	13.65%	1,642	22.64%	9,548	1,359	16.60%	2,009	26.65%
Branston & Navenby	7,930	169	2.18%	704	9.74%	8,082	256	3.27%	830	11.44%	8,157	-32	-0.39%	619	8.20%
Heighington & Washingborough	5,527	-2,234	-28.79%	-1,699	-23.51%	5,567	-2,259	-28.87%	-1,685	-23.24%	5,614	-2,574	-31.44%	-1,924	-25.52%
Hykeham Forum	5,611	-2,151	-27.71%	-1,615	-22.35%	5,585	-2,242	-28.64%	-1,667	-22.99%	5,609	-2,579	-31.50%	-1,929	-25.59%
Ruskington & Cranwell	8,544	783	10.09%	1,318	18.24%	8,542	715	9.13%	1,289	17.77%	8,524	336	4.10%	986	13.08%
Skellingthorpe & Hykeham South	9,010	1,249	16.09%	1,784	24.69%	9,268	1,441	18.41%	2,015	27.78%	11,004	2,815	34.38%	3,466	45.97%
Sleaford	7,699	-63	-0.81%	473	6.54%	7,885	59	0.75%	633	8.73%	8,387	198	2.42%	849	11.26%
Sleaford Rural South	8,636	875	11.27%	1,410	19.52%	8,494	668	8.53%	1,242	17.12%	8,468	280	3.42%	930	12.34%
Sleaford West & Leasingham	7,442	-319	-4.11%	216	2.99%	7,755	-72	-0.92%	502	6.93%	8,391	203	2.48%	853	11.32%
North Kesteven total	85,374					86,095					90,072				
North Kesteven average	7,761					7,827					8,188				
Crowland & Whaplode	6,989	-756	-9.76%	-237	-3.29%	6,847	-1,035	-13.13%	-405	-5.59%	6,991	-1,306	-15.74%	-547	-7.26%
Donington Rural	6,765	-979	-12.65%	-461	-6.38%	6,956	-926	-11.75%	-297	-4.09%	7,233	-1,065	-12.83%	-306	-4.05%
Holbeach	7,368	-377	-4.86%	142	1.96%	7,479	-403	-5.11%	226	3.12%	7,612	-685	-8.26%	74	0.98%
Holbeach Rural	7,378	-367	-4.73%	152	2.10%	7,551	-331	-4.19%	299	4.12%	7,635	-663	-7.99%	96	1.28%
Spalding East & Moulton	9,089	1,344	17.36%	1,863	25.78%	9,237	1,355	17.19%	1,984	27.36%	9,741	1,444	17.40%	2,203	29.23%
Spalding Elloe	7,753	9	0.11%	527	7.29%	8,051	169	2.15%	798	11.01%	8,539	242	2.91%	1,001	13.28%
Spalding South	8,036	292	3.76%	810	11.21%	7,975	93	1.18%	723	9.96%	8,381	83	1.01%	843	11.18%
Spalding West	8,550	806	10.40%	1,324	18.33%	8,786	904	11.46%	1,533	21.14%	10,340	2,042	24.61%	2,802	37.17%
Sutton Elloe	7,773	29	0.37%	547	7.57%	8,055	173	2.20%	803	11.07%	8,205	-93	-1.12%	667	8.84%
South Holland total	69,700					70,938					74,677				
South Holland average	7,744					7,882					8,297				
Bourne Abbey	9,367	2,159	29.96%	2,141	29.63%	9,519	2,272	31.34%	2,267	31.25%	10,037	2,456	32.40%	2,498	33.14%
Bourne Castle	6,937	-271	-3.76%	-289	-4.00%	7,134	-114	-1.57%	-119	-1.64%	8,466	885	11.67%	928	12.31%
Colsterworth Rural	5,741	-1,467	-20.35%	-1,485	-20.55%	5,727	-1,520	-20.97%	-1,525	-21.03%	5,718	-1,863	-24.57%	-1,820	-24.14%
Deeping St. James	5,800	-1,408	-19.53%	-1,426	-19.73%	5,846	-1,401	-19.33%	-1,406	-19.39%	5,799	-1,781	-23.50%	-1,739	-23.07%
Folkingham Rural	7,840	632	8.77%	614	8.50%	7,734	486	6.71%	481	6.63%	7,732	151	1.99%	193	2.57%
Grantham Barrowby	6,691	-517	-7.17%	-535	-7.40%	6,652	-595	-8.22%	-601	-8.28%	6,699	-882	-11.63%	-839	-11.13%
Grantham East	8,405	1,197	16.61%	1,179	16.32%	8,463	1,215	16.77%	1,210	16.69%	8,468	887	11.70%	930	12.33%
Grantham North	7,125	-82	-1.14%	-100	-1.39%	7,203	-45	-0.62%	-50	-0.69%	7,235	-346	-4.57%	-304	-4.03%
Grantham North West	7,081	-127	-1.76%	-145	-2.01%	7,296	48	0.67%	43	0.60%	9,746	2,165	28.56%	2,207	29.28%
Grantham South	8,416	1,208	16.76%	1,190	16.47%	8,420	1,172	16.18%	1,167	16.10%	9,103	1,522	20.08%	1,565	20.76%
Hough	7,226	518	7.19%	500	6.92%	7,402	155	2.13%	150	2.06%	7,254	-3			