

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No.133

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 133

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MID-BEDFORDSHIRE IN THE COUNTY OF BEDFORDSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of Mid-Bedfordshire in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 13 May 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Mid-Bedfordshire District Council, copies of which were circulated to the Bedfordshire County Council, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings in the district and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and to the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Mid-Bedfordshire District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The District Council have not exercised an option in accordance with section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972. The provisions of section 7(6) of the Act, which provide for a system of whole council elections, will therefore apply.

5. On 30 October 1974, Mid-Bedfordshire District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 28 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 54 members.

6. We considered the draft scheme together with the comments which we had received and those of the representations which had been made to the District Council which they had been unable to accept and embody in their proposals.

7. Among the comments was an alternative scheme which had been submitted by a local political party for the division of the district into 42 wards returning a total of 56 councillors. We found that the standard of equality of representation offered by this alternative scheme was generally inferior to that offered by the draft scheme and, accordingly, we decided to reject it.

8. The remaining comments dealt with particular aspects of the Council's proposals and included suggestions that the town of Biggleswade should be a single district ward returning 6 members, that the town of Shefford should be warded with the parishes to the west rather than with the parish of Clifton to the east, that the parish of Steppingley should be included in the proposed Flitwick West ward, and that the proposed 2-member ward comprising the parishes of Harlington and Westoning should be divided into two wards with one district councillor representing each of the parishes. There was also an objection to the inclusion of the parish of Wrestlingworth in the proposed Wensley ward and comments on the names which the District Council had suggested for some of the wards.

9. Having studied these comments we concluded that we could respond to the suggestion that the parish of Steppingley should be included in the proposed Flitwick West ward and that the Harlington and Westoning ward should be divided

into two wards and we resolved to modify the draft scheme accordingly. We agreed also that the name of the proposed Haynes ward should be changed to "Haynes and Houghton Conquest". On the information before us we felt unable to accept the other suggested modifications and we resolved to reject them.

10. We considered whether the draft scheme should be further modified to secure improved equality of representation. We resolved to change some of the proposed ward boundaries but concluded, in the case of the proposed Flitwick West ward, that the ward should be allocated 2 councillors instead of 3 as the District Council had proposed. We made this change because we thought that the District Council's forecast of the electorate of the ward in five years' time was optimistic.

11. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 9 and 10 above, we decided that the District Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements of the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines, and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

12. On 22 January 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, for other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 14 March 1975.

13. Mid-Bedfordshire District Council accepted our draft proposals but suggested that the names of two of the proposed wards should be changed.

14. The local political party, which had written to us previously, reiterated their earlier proposals for Ampthill, Flitwick, Biggleswade and Sandy. In addition

they made proposals for the division of our proposed Marston and Potton wards, for a regrouping of the proposed wards in the vicinity of Shefford and for the revision of the boundary between our proposed Sandy All Saints and Sandy St Swithuns wards. Biggleswade Town Council restated their previous views that the town should continue as one district ward returning 6 councillors. If this was not possible, they asked that the names of the two proposed wards should be changed. Shefford Town Council re-affirmed their original proposals and the Member of Parliament representing their constituency expressed sympathy with their case. Stotfold Town Council reiterated an earlier comment which they had made suggesting that the proposed Stotfold ward should be renamed "Astwick & Stotfold".

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

16. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at the Council Chamber, Ampthill on 8 October 1975. A copy (without enclosures) of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

17. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be varied as follows:-

a. that the proposed Biggleswade North and South wards should be renamed "Biggleswade Ivel" and "Biggleswade Stratton" respectively.

b. that the parishes of Shefford, Clifton, Henlow and Langford be regrouped as follows:-

i. a Shefford ward, returning 2 councillors, comprising the parish of Shefford;

ii. a Clifton and Henlow ward, returning 3 councillors, comprising the parishes of Clifton and Henlow;

iii. a Langford ward, returning 1 councillor, comprising the parish of Langford.

He also recommended a revised description of ward boundaries in Sandy.

18. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the modifications recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted and that we should formulate our final proposals accordingly. However, we noted that before we could do so it would be necessary, in view of the provisions of paragraph 3(2)(b) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, to ask the District Council to finalise their orders under section 50(4) of the Act to establish parish wards in Flitwick, Sandy and Biggleswade which would be compatible with the district wards which we intended to recommend. In inviting the District Council to make the orders we drew their attention to the Assistant Commissioner's recommendations as to the names of the two proposed wards in Biggleswade and to his comments about the precise definition of the boundary between the proposed Sandy All Saints and Sandy St Swithuns wards. In due course the District Council sent us copies of the orders which they had made and we then formulated our final proposals.

19. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and defines their areas. Schedule 3 shows the number of councillors to be returned by each ward. The boundaries of the new wards are illustrated on the map.

#### PUBLICATION

20. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Mid-Bedfordshire District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices.

Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH (SECRETARY)

// December 1975

To the Chairman and Members of the Local Government Commission for England.

Review of Electoral arrangements for the District of Mid Bedfordshire.

---

The Commission's draft proposals for the District of Mid Bedfordshire are set out in appendix A.

A number of comments on these proposals had been received and a local meeting was held at the Council Chamber, 12 Dunstable Street, Ampthill on Wednesday the 8th October to hear local views on the proposed arrangements for the Ampthill, Aspley, Biggleswade North, Biggleswade South, Campton and Meppershall, Clifton and Shefford, Cranfield, Flitwick East, Flitwick West, Henlow and Langfold, Marston, Potton, Sandy All Saints, Sandy St. Swithuns and Stotfold Wards. As will appear later a discussion also took place in relation to the arrangements in the Shellington and Stondon ward.

I took the opportunity, whilst I was in the area, to visit all these wards with the exception of the two at Sandy as the parties concerned with the dispute about the boundary there were unable to put forward the proposals included in this report until after the close of the local meeting.

The persons who were present at the meeting are shown in the list Appendix B.

Cranfield Ward: Parish of Hulcote and Salford.

The Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party had suggested that this parish should be transferred from the Cranfield Ward to the Aspley Ward but they withdrew this suggestion at the meeting. After the close of the meeting a letter was received from the Aspley Guise Parish Council objecting to this proposal but, in view of the withdrawal by the Labour Party, the Commission's draft proposals will stand.

Stotfold Ward.

The representative of the Stotfold Town Council drew my attention to the repeated requests which had been made by his council both to the District Council and to the Commission for the name of the ward to be "Astwick and Stotfold" thus preserving the name of the village of Astwick. He drew attention to the fact that a number of the wards in the district comprised the names of two communities included in the ward.

The electorate in the parish of Astwick on the 1974 register was 22 and the estimate for 1979 is 29. In all the cases where the names of two parishes are included in the proposed ward name the electorate of each is substantially greater than this figure and, even in the smallest - Upper Stondon with a 1979 electorate of 70 - it must be borne in mind that there is also an area bearing the name of Lower Stondon having a much larger electorate.

Also there are a few other instances of two parishes being combined with a ward named after one only and in these cases too each of the parishes has a greater electorate than has Astwick and they could be said to have an equal or greater claim for the inclusion of their name in the ward name.

Although I am sympathetic to the desire of the Stotfold Town Council to preserve the name of the village, I do not consider that its size warrants it.

I accordingly recommend that the Commission's draft proposals be adhered to.

### Shillington and Stondon Ward.

The Secretary of the Stondon Ratepayers Association asked that the parish electoral arrangements at Stondon should be considered. The electorate in Lower Stondon was stated to exceed 1,200 and this did not appear to be in dispute. It was contended that, if Lower Stondon could comprise a parish, it with Upper Stondon would have an electorate equal to that of Shillington and Higham Gobion. Each would then be able to return one member. It was appreciated that I could not make any recommendation on this matter in view of the requirement in paragraph 3 (2) of the 11th Schedule to the Local Government Act 1972 that every parish should lie wholly within a single ward of the district and, in any event, it appears unlikely that the District Council would favour two single member wards.

### Marston Ward.

A representative of the Marston Moretaine Parish Council had been in attendance at the meeting but was unable to be present when this matter was discussed but his point of view was expressed by a representative of the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party. It was said that the Marston Moretaine electorate formed too great a part of the whole. On the 1979 figures it was 2,070 out of a total of 3,398 and it would be fairer for the remaining 1,328 to be represented by their own member with two members representing Marston Moretaine. This proposal would mean an additional member on the district council. The average number of electors to each member on the 1979 electorate on the Commission's draft proposals is 1,438 on a council of 53 members and this would, of course, be slightly less on a council of 54 members. Each of two members for Marston Moretaine, with an electorate of 1,035, would therefore be substantially below the average. The total electorate of the ward proposed by the Commission does not justify three members and, as was pointed out at the meeting, if there is to be an additional member of the district council there are other wards where that additional representation would be more appropriate.

I do not consider that the reasons advanced justify an additional member and I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals should stand.

### Biggleswade.

In this case, as also in Ampthill, Flitwick, Potton and Sandy, the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party urged that there should be single member wards.

I think it might be helpful if I make some general comments on the issue of single member wards in urban areas as opposed to multi member wards there.

The Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party had gone to considerable trouble to marshal their arguments in favour of their proposals and put them before me forcefully and cogently and it was apparant that they felt very strongly about the matter. It is not necessary for me to set their arguments out in any detail as it did not seem to me that you would be concerned with whether these arguments convinced me but whether the suggestions commended themselves to those others in the area who would have to operate the new arrangements. It was clear that they did not. The District Council had considered the proposal on more than one occasion and had rejected it. The Town and Parish Councils in the areas affected were opposed to it and expressed their opposition equally forcefully. It was also clear that the adoption of single member wards would involve further detailed work in re-warding, agreeing new boundaries and ascertaining that the electorates were such as to comply with the provisions of Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972.

In the absence of any general acceptance of the principle this would be bound to cause considerable delay and, if there was one subject upon which there was unanimity, it was that the question of these wards should be settled as quickly as possible.

For all these reasons I do not feel able to recommend the acceptance of the principle of single member wards in these urban areas and, having set out the position here, I shall not repeat it on each occasion where the point arises.

The representative of the Biggleswade Town Council indicated that his Council were overwhelmingly opposed to single member wards and were also opposed to the proposed division of the town into two - three member wards. They wished for it to be one - six member district ward. The former Urban District Council consisted of twelve councillors who were elected every third year by the whole electorate. This system was well understood by the electors who, it was said, frequently voted only for a limited number of the candidates. It was also stressed that the statement in paragraph 31 of your report No.6 that "we consider that only in the most exceptional circumstances should it be necessary for the number of councillors for a ward to be other than one, two or three" was not a statutory requirement but an expression of your opinion. It was not contended that Biggleswade was an exceptional case but I was asked not to disregard the opinion of the Town Council. A letter from one of the existing members of the Town Council stressing the advantages of the one - six member ward. He said that he was not completely opposed to the Commission's draft proposals but would prefer the present system. If there were to be two wards he would prefer them to be called "North" and "South".

Although it is true that there is no statutory prohibition of a ward with more than three members, the members of the Town Council must remember that you have a duty under the Local Government Act to review the electoral arrangements for the new districts and it would have been more helpful to me if they had been able to refer to any exceptional circumstances affecting their area. In the absence of any such circumstances I do not feel that I can recommend you to accede to their request however strongly it may be held particularly as I am faced with an equally strong view to recommend the division of the area into six wards.

There was unanimous approval of those present at the meeting that, if there were to be only two wards the ward described in the draft proposals as "Biggleswade North" could be re-named "Biggleswade Ivel" and that the ward described as "Biggleswade South" should be re-named "Biggleswade Stratton".

I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals be confirmed but that the Biggleswade North and Biggleswade South wards be re-named Biggleswade Ivel and Biggleswade Stratton respectively.

#### Potton Ward.

The draft proposals provide for two members to represent this ward and the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party indicated that they advocated two single member wards, one comprising the parish of Everton and part of the parish of Potton and the other the remainder of the parish of Potton each having approximately equal electorates. There was said to be a natural boundary between these two wards but the proposal would, apparently, split the built up area of Potton.

The proposal would contravene the provisions in the 11th Schedule to the Act requiring parishes to be wholly within a ward and the District Council, who pointed out that the Potton Town Council had not objected, were not proposing to vary the parish boundaries. As had been explained earlier they did not favour the principle of single member wards.

After the conclusion of the meeting I received a letter from the Potton Town Council indicating that at a meeting on the 6th October it had been unanimously resolved "that the Potton Town Council strongly oppose the creation of two single member wards in Potton and consider that the original proposals should be continued".

The proposed ward is by no means the largest in the district council's area and its size did not therefore seem to me to warrant its division. The case made for two single member wards was, in my view, nothing like strong enough to justify a suggestion that the parish boundaries should be re-drawn in such a way as to divide the Potton community and I therefore recommend that the draft proposals of the Commission should stand.

### Amphill Ward.

Here again the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party desired that, instead of one ward with three members, there should be three single member wards. They said that the area divided naturally into three wards with approximately equal electorates. The North with 1,367, the South with 1,551 and the East with 1,467 electors in 1979.

The District Council were opposed to single member wards in this case also.

A representative of the Amphill Town Council stressed that they did not wish for the Town to be divided. They considered that any boundaries would be artificial and they did not want to separate the older parts of the town from the newer. He claimed that the ratepayers and the electors did not object to the Commission's draft proposals.

Two members of the Mid-Beds Conservative Association, one of whom was also a County Councillor for Amphill, supported the views expressed on behalf of the town council.

There is clearly no general consensus of opinion in support of single member wards sufficient to justify me in proposing any change in the draft proposals and I therefore recommend that they should not be varied.

### Sandy.

The District Council, accepting that the number of members for each should not exceed three, had suggested one ward with 2 members and one with three and the Commission had included this in their draft proposals. The District Council did not favour five single member wards as previously stated but the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party did desire that arrangement.

In this case also they stated that the area would naturally divide into five wards.

The Sandy Town Council had no comments to make on the draft proposals save to indicate their choice of names and these had been adopted.

The representative of the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party indicated that the boundary between the two proposed wards was not clear particularly at its southern end and it was agreed that a discussion should take place on the site with a representative of the District Council. As a consequence the following description of the All Saints ward has been agreed "All that part of the Parish of Sandy lying to the West of a line drawn south from the boundary with the parish of Tempsford along the centre of Tempsford Road and St. Neots Road, then west along the centre of Bedford Road, south along the centre of Kings Road and Swansholme Gardens to a point on the footpath on the east side of No.62 Swansholme Gardens and continuing along the centre of the footpath east of No.7 Park Court and then along the rear boundaries of Nos. 8 and 9 Park Court to the River Ivel and continuing south along the centre of the river to the boundary with the parish of Biggleswade."

The description of the St. Swithuns ward will be the same subject to the substitution of the word 'East' for 'West' in the first line.

I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals be approved and that the revised description set out above be adopted.

### Flitwick.

The Commission's draft proposals provide for two wards each with two members this being a variation on the District Council's original proposal which provided for one ward with two members and one with three.

The Mid Bedfordshire Labour Party said that they considered that the projected electorate for 1979 was much too low and that the numbers in the area by that date would fully justify five members and again they desired five single member wards. They claimed that, as substantial areas had recently been developed and further areas were already the subject of detailed planning permissions and were now being developed in Flitwick West, the electorate in that ward in 1979 would be

approximately 2,647 justifying three members.

Information from the Planning Departments of the County and the District indicate that 96 dwellings have been completed and 337 have detailed planning permission and work on the sites has commenced. In addition an area of 148 acres has not yet received detailed planning permission but this area would accommodate approximately 1,485 dwellings.

On the basis of two electors per dwelling, the dwellings already completed and with detailed planning permission would add 860 to the figure of 990 for Flitwick West in the Numerical Analysis of the Commission's draft proposals: to this must be added the very small increase (11) for the parish of Steppingley making 1,867 in total. With an average electorate to each councillor of 1,438 this figure of 1,867 can rise by a further 1,000 before it reaches the average for two members and this latitude should more than provide for further dwellings completed up to 1979.

I do not therefore consider that the case has been made out for five members and for similar reasons to those already stated and especially as it would be necessary to re-draw the ward boundaries to provide for four wards instead of five I do not consider that the area should be divided into single member wards and I therefore recommend that the draft proposals be approved.

Clifton and Shefford Ward.

Henlow and Langford Ward.

Campton and Meppershall Ward.

Representatives of the Clifton Parish Council, the Shefford Town Council, the Campton Parish Council, the Meppershall Parish Council and the Mid Bedfordshire Constituency Labour Party addressed me on the manner in which these parishes should be combined.

The Shefford Town Council did not favour the proposal for them to be combined with Clifton with three members. They felt so strongly about it at one time that they suggested that consideration might be given to reducing the representation to two to enable each to have their own member. They claimed that there was no history of co-operation between the two communities, that there was a "green belt" between the two areas even though it was comparatively narrow and that the two communities each had a different outlook.

Clifton were not so opposed and supported the draft proposals.

Campton did not want to be combined with Shefford and Meppershall supported the draft proposals.

The Labour Party supported the view of the Shefford Town Council. They estimated that the electorate in Shefford in 1979 would be 2,919.

During the discussion a proposal emerged that Shefford and Langford should each stand on their own, that Clifton should be combined with Henlow and that the draft proposals for combining Chicksands Campton and Meppershall should remain undisturbed. The figures would be as follows:

	1974	Electrates 1979	av. electors per member 1979
Shefford - 3 members	1959	2686*	895
Clifton & Henlow - 3 members	3831	3889	1296
Langford - 1 member	1682	1857	1857

\* This figure is calculated as 72.4% of the County Planners latest estimate of the population in 1979.

With three members Shefford would be over represented. With two the average would be 1,343 which is very near to the general average of 1,411.

This solution has the disadvantage of not having been considered by Langford and Henlow but it meets the objections of Shefford, Campton, Meppershall and the Labour Party.

I therefore recommend that the parish of Shefford should comprise the Shefford ward with two members, that the parishes of Clifton and Henlow should comprise the Clifton and Henlow ward with three members and that the parish of Langford should comprise the Langford ward with one member.

Sd. J. C. NELSON.

27.11.75.

## DISTRICT OF MID-BEDFORDSHIRE : DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

## BLUNHAM WARD

The parishes of Blunham, Mogerhanger and Tempsford.

## SANDY ALL SAINTS WARD

The All Saints Ward of the Parish of Sandy

## SANDY ST SWITHUNS WARD

The St Swithuns Ward of the Parish of Sandy

## POTTON WARD

The parishes of Everton and Potton

## NORTHILL WARD

The parish of Northill

## BIGGLESWADE IVEL WARD

The Ivel Ward of the Parish of Biggleswade

## BIGGLESWADE STRATTON WARD

The Stratton Ward of the Parish of Biggleswade

## WENSLEY WARD

The parishes of Cockayne Hatley, Sutton, Wrestlingworth, Eyeworth, Dunton and Edworth

## OLD WARDEN AND SOUTHILL WARD

The parishes of Old Warden and Southill

## CRANFIELD WARD

The parishes of Cranfield and Hulcote and Salford

## MARSTON WARD

The parishes of Marston Moretaine, Lidlington, Millbrook and Ridgmont.

## AMPTHILL WARD

The parish of Ampthill

MAULDEN WARD

The parish of Maulden

HAYNES AND HOUGHTON CONQUEST WARD

The parishes of Houghton Conquest and Haynes

CLOPHILL WARD

The parish of Clophill

CAMPTON AND MEPPERSHALL WARD

The parishes of Chicksands, Campton and Meppershall

CLIFTON AND HENLOW WARD

The parishes of Clifton and Henlow

LANGFORD WARD

The parish of Langford

ARLESEY WARD

The parish of Arlesey

STOTFOLD WARD

The parishes of Astwick and Stotfold

ASPLEY WARD

The parishes of Aspley Heath, Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley

WOBURN WARD

The parishes of Woburn, Eversholt, Potsgrove, Milton Bryan, Tingrith and Battlesden

FLITWICK WEST WARD

The parish of Steppingley and the Flitwick West Ward of the parish of Flitwick

FLITWICK EAST WARD

The Flitwick East Ward of the parish of Flitwick

HARLINGTON WARD

The parish of Harlington

WESTONING WARD

The parish of Westoning

FLITTON AND PULLOXHILL WARD

The parishes of Flitton and Pulloxhill

WREST WARD

The parishes of Gravenhurst and Silsoe

SHILLINGTON AND STONDON WARD

The parishes of Higham Gobion, Shillington and Upper Stondon

SHEFFORD WARD

The parish of Shefford

## DISTRICT OF MID-BEDFORDSHIRE : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO OF COUNCILLORS</u>
AMPTHILL	3
ARLESBY	2
ASPLEY	2
BIGGLESWADE IVEL	3
BIGGLESWADE STRATTON	3
BLUNHAM	1
CAMPTON AND MEPPERSHALL	1
CLIFTON AND HENLOW	3
CLOPHILL	1
CRANFIELD	3
FLITTON AND PULLOXHILL	1
FLITWICK EAST	2
FLITWICK WEST	2
HARLINGTON	1
HAYNES AND HOUGHTON CONQUEST	1
LANGFORD	1
MARSTON	2
MAULDEN	1
NORTHILL	1
OLD WARDEN AND SOUTHILL	1
POTTON	2
SANDY ALL SAINTS	2
SANDY ST SWITHUNS	3
SHEFFORD	2
SHILLINGTON AND STONDON	2
STOTFOLD	3
WENSLEY	1
WESTONING	1
WOBURN	1
WRPST	1

