

# Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Shepway District Council

Electoral review

January 2014

### **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2014

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Summary  | 1  |
| 1 Introduction   | 3  |
| 2 Analysis and final recommendations                           | 5  |
| Submissions received   | 7  |
| Electorate figures   | 7  |
| Council size   | 7  |
| Electoral fairness   | 8  |
| General analysis   | 8  |
| Electoral arrangements   | 9  |
| West Shepway   | 10 |
| Central Shepway  | 10 |
| North-east Shepway   | 11 |
| Folkestone   | 12 |
| Conclusions  | 14 |
| Parish electoral arrangements                                  | 14 |
| 3 What happens next?   | 17 |
| 4 Mapping  | 19 |
| <br>   |    |
| Appendices   |    |
| A Table A1: Final recommendations for Shepway District Council | 20 |
| B Glossary and abbreviations                                   | 22 |



# Summary

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

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in September 2012. This review is being conducted as follows:

| <b>Stage starts</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|---------------------|---|
| 23 October 2012     | Consultation on council size  |
| 29 January 2013     | Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE                 |
| 8 April 2013        | LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations                 |
| 18 June 2013        | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them             |
| 10 September 2013   | Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations |

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 30 members comprising one single-member, seven two-member and five three-member wards. During the consultation period on a warding pattern for Shepway, we received 37 submissions. We received a district-wide submission from Shepway District Council. Folkestone and Hythe Labour Party and Shepway Liberal Democrats each commented on the District Council's proposals and made proposals of their own. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

Our draft recommendations for Shepway sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

During the consultation on the draft recommendations for Shepway, we received 34 submissions. These included submissions from Shepway District Council, Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party, four district councillors, five parish and town councils and a group of town councillors, one local organisation and 21 members of the public.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

Shepway District Council has forecast an increase in electorate of approximately 7% across the district by 2019.

Following publication of our draft recommendations, we did not receive any comments on the electorate figures. Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content that the Council's projected figures are the best available at the present time. These figures form the basis of the final recommendations.

### General analysis

We have considered all submissions received during the consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we have made four changes to ward names in the district. However, we have made no changes to the ward boundaries proposed in our draft recommendations.

Our final recommendations for Shepway are that the Council should have 30 members representing one single-member, seven two-member and five three-member wards. None of the wards will have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. Having taken into account the evidence we have received during consultation, we believe that our final recommendations will ensure good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and providing for effective and convenient local government.

### What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Shepway District Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Shepway District Council in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**Our final recommendations can also be viewed at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

# 1 Introduction

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

2 We wrote to Shepway District Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during the consultation on warding patterns informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Shepway District Council*, which were published on 18 June 2013. Consultation on our draft recommendations took place until 9 September 2013.

## What is an electoral review?

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

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Shepway?

5 We decided to conduct this review following a request from Shepway District Council and because, based on December 2011 electorate figures, 36% of wards in Shepway had a variance of greater than 10% from the average for the district. Additionally, one ward (Folkestone Harvey Central) has 41% more electors per councillor than the average for the district. The electoral inequality in this ward is not forecast to improve significantly before 2019.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Shepway District Council.

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

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

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

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

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

13 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Shepway District Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

## Submissions received

14 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Shepway District Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 34 submissions during the consultation on the draft recommendations, including district-wide schemes from the Council and Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party. We also received submissions from five parish and town councils and a group of town councillors, four district councillors, one local organisation and 21 local residents.

15 All of the submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).

## Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, Shepway District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2019, projecting an increase in the electorate of just over 7% over the period from 2012–19. The Council made an amendment to its figures after consultation on warding patterns had ended, to reflect the fact that a housing development in Stanford parish was no longer expected to proceed.

17 The Council provided details of all of the proposed housing developments expected to take place across the forecast period, and a year-by-year breakdown of how each development will progress. The most significant development in the district is at Shorncliffe Barracks, on land sold by the Ministry of Defence to a property developer.

18 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures, as amended, are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

19 Shepway District Council currently has 46 councillors elected from 22 wards, comprising four single-member, 12 two-member and six three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council had considered reducing the council size to 30 members. The Council's formal proposal to us, however, argued in favour of a council size of 38. We considered that, based on the evidence received from the Council, that a council size of 30 was most appropriate.

20 During the consultation on council size we received 28 submissions. In general, respondents favoured a reduction from 46, with many of those supporting a reduction favouring a council size of 30.

21 We considered that the Council's initial submission had sufficient regard to the governance and management structure which would exist under a council size of 30, and to the scrutiny of the Council, work on outside bodies, members' representational role and the Council's other statutory functions. We therefore decided to invite submissions on warding patterns based on a council size of 30.

22 During our consultation on warding patterns we received seven submissions commenting on council size. On the basis of evidence received we were content that a council size of 30 members would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors' representational role. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Shepway District Council were based on a council size of 30.

23 During consultation on the draft recommendations we received one submission on council size. This submission supported our proposal to reduce the council size from 46 to 30. We have based our final recommendations on a council size of 30.

## Electoral fairness

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

25 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (82,514 in 2012 and 88,795 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 30 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,750 in 2012 and 2,960 by 2019.

26 Under our final recommendations, all of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Shepway.

## General analysis

27 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 34 submissions.

28 In Folkestone we received a submission from Shepway District Council which proposed new warding arrangements for the central and western areas of Folkestone, and for Sandgate village. The Council also proposed an amendment to our proposed boundary between Folkestone East and Folkestone Harbour. Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party disagreed with the

Council's proposals, arguing that the boundaries proposed did not accurately reflect local communities. Folkestone Town Council supported the District Council's proposals.

29 We received submissions from the Coastal Community Group and New Romney Town Council, as well as some local residents, which favoured the creation of a coastal ward running from New Romney to Dungeness.

30 In relation to Hythe we received some submissions relating to the name of our proposed Hythe Rural ward. Also in this area, we received a submission arguing that Lympe parish should be included in our proposed North Downs West ward.

31 In addition to its comments concerning Folkestone, the submission from Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party also argued that Dymchurch ought to be represented by a single-member ward, with another single-member ward covering the rural area to the north and west of Dymchurch.

32 In the North Downs area we received submissions suggesting amendments to our proposed wards. Elham Parish Council proposed that Elham parish should be included in the North Downs West ward. An alternative pattern was also received from Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party, which proposed that Newington parish should be included in the North Downs West ward. This proposal was also put forward by a local resident.

33 Our final recommendations do not propose any changes to the boundaries as detailed under our draft proposals. However, as a result of evidence received, we have decided to change four ward names.

34 Our final recommendations would result in five three-member wards, seven two-member wards and one single-member ward. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Shepway.

## Electoral arrangements

35 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Shepway. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- West Shepway (page 10)
- Central Shepway (pages 10–11)
- North-east Shepway (pages 11–12)
- Folkestone (pages 12–14)

36 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 20–21 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## West Shepway

37 In this part of the district we proposed two-member wards for Walland & Denge Marsh and New Romney as part of our draft recommendations. These wards were projected to each have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

38 During our earlier consultation on warding arrangements, we had received a proposal from the Coastal Community Group proposing a single-member Coastal ward. We did not adopt this ward as part of our draft recommendations due to the high level of electoral inequality that would have resulted.

39 During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received submissions from the Coastal Community Group and New Romney Town Council as well as some local residents covering this part of the district. The Coastal Community Group proposed an alternative warding pattern for this area. The Group proposed a three-member Coastal ward which covered New Romney Town and the coastal area adjacent to New Romney Town along to Dungeness Point. This ward would have 7% fewer electors than the district average by 2018.

40 The Group provided good community identity evidence to support its proposed ward, which was also supported by New Romney Town Council and a number of local residents. However, if this proposal were to be adopted then the remainder of our proposed Walland & Denge Marsh ward would have 37% more electors than the district average by 2019. This in itself would trigger one of our intervention criteria to conduct another review.

41 We considered that the proposed coastal ward had merit and investigated whether there were any other arrangements for this area that would allow for the inclusion of this ward while also providing good electoral equality in adjoining wards. However, we were unable to establish any alternative warding patterns which would meet our statutory criteria and not require completely re-drawing the warding pattern for most of the district, for which there was a measure of support. Therefore, we are confirming as final our Walland & Denge Marsh and New Romney wards. These two-member wards would each have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

## Central Shepway

42 Our draft recommendations for Central Shepway were two-member wards for Romney Marsh and Hythe Rural, and a three-member Hythe ward. These wards would have 6% more, 7% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

43 As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a Hythe ward which included Saltwood parish. This was different from the Council's original proposal, which had included the parish in its proposed Hythe Rural ward.

However, as a result of evidence provided by Saltwood Parish Council, we included the parish in our proposed Hythe ward. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Parish Council stated it was 'pleased' with our proposals.

44 We received a submission from Councillor Newlands (Lympne & Stanford ) stating that Lympne parish, which as part of our draft recommendations we had included in our Hythe Rural ward, should be included in a ward with Stanford parish due to the community links between these parishes. However, including Lympne and Stanford in the same ward would cause unacceptably large electoral imbalances in this part of the district. We have therefore decided not to include this modification as part of our final recommendations.

45 We received some submissions relating to the proposed ward name of Hythe Rural. Shepway District Council favoured changing the name to 'Hythe West and Lympne' to 'give a more accurate indication of the area it covers'. Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party proposed the ward name 'Palmarsh & Lympne' to reflect the 'two main communities in the area'. A local resident also proposed this ward name. Conversely, a group of councillors on Hythe Town Council wanted to retain the proposed Hythe Rural ward. We do not consider that we have received compelling evidence to change the proposed ward name and have decided to confirm our proposed Hythe Rural ward as final.

46 To the south of Hythe, we received a submission from Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party which reiterated its support for two single-member wards in place of our proposed two-member Romney Marsh ward. It proposed a single-member Dymchurch ward, and a single-member ward covering the remaining parishes. We did not receive any other submissions supporting this arrangement. We consider that the alternative warding pattern proposed would unnecessarily split the St Mary's Bay community. Therefore, we confirm our proposed Romney Marsh ward as final.

47 Our final recommendations for this area are for a three-member Hythe ward and two-member Hythe Rural and Romney Marsh wards with 7% more, 7% fewer and 6% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

### North-east Shepway

48 Our draft recommendations for north-east Shepway were a two-member North Downs West ward and a three-member North Downs East ward. These wards would have 10% fewer and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

49 We received several submissions regarding this area during the consultation. These included submissions from local residents, Elham Parish Council and Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party.

50 Elham Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be included in our North Downs West ward with the parishes of Stelling Minnis and Lyminge. The Parish Council indicated it shared community links with these parishes and feared that Elham would be ‘swamped’ by being in a ward with Hawkinge parish. We investigated the proposal to include Elham with Stelling Minnis and Lyminge in our North Downs West ward and found that it would result in our North Downs West and North Downs East wards having variances higher than we would normally propose. North Downs East would have 12% fewer electors, and North Downs West would have 12% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. We consider that evidence has not been received to support these levels of electoral imbalance.

51 Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party, as well as a local resident, argued that Newington parish should be included in North Downs West ward, rather than in North Downs East as proposed in our draft recommendations. Two local residents argued that Newington shares more links with Folkestone than with the rural area to the north, with Newington residents using services in the proposed Cheriton & Morehall ward. We did not consider that the evidence provided was strong enough to propose a change to our draft recommendations in this part of the district. Furthermore, we consider that the M20, while not a boundary, provides a clear barrier between urban Folkestone and its rural hinterland.

52 In our draft recommendations report we sought representations on whether our proposed three-member North Downs East ward could be divided into smaller wards – i.e. single-member and two-member wards. We received only one submission on this point. Shepway District Council considered that a single-member ward in this part of the district would cover too large a rural area for one member to be able to adequately represent.

53 We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendations for north-east Shepway. These are for a two-member North Downs West ward and a three-member North Downs East ward. These wards would have 10% fewer and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

## Folkestone

54 Our draft recommendations for Folkestone were a single-member Folkestone Park ward, two-member Folkestone Harbour and Sandgate wards and three-member Cheriton & Morehall, Folkestone Central and Folkestone East wards. These wards were projected to have 6% more, 2% fewer, 6% fewer, 2% fewer, 4% fewer and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

55 The majority of submissions we received during the consultation on our draft recommendations were regarding Folkestone. Submissions mainly focused on the Sandgate area and on the proposed ward names in the town.

56 Shepway District Council proposed a different pattern of wards for the central and western part of Folkestone. It proposed a single-member Sandgate ward, and two-member wards named Folkestone Harvey and Folkestone Central. The Council provided limited community identity evidence to support its alternative warding pattern. Its proposed boundary between Sandgate and Folkestone Harvey wards was similar to that proposed by Councillors Love and Bunting during the consultation on warding arrangements. The Council's proposals were supported by Folkestone Town Council, which asserted that 'the north part of Sandgate associates itself more with Folkestone than Sandgate village'.

57 Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party strongly opposed the Council's proposed new boundary arrangements in this part of Folkestone. The Party argued that the Council's proposed single-member Sandgate ward would 'create disharmony within the parish'. Four local residents also objected to the Council's boundary between its proposed Sandgate and Folkestone Harvey wards. We are not persuaded that the Council has provided compelling evidence to amend our draft recommendations here.

58 The Council also proposed amending the boundary between our proposed Folkestone East and Folkestone Harbour wards. A triangular area which includes Dallas Brett Crescent and Keyes Place was included in our proposed Folkestone Harbour ward as part of our draft recommendations. The Council, reiterating its earlier submission, argued that this area has similar housing to that in our proposed Folkestone East ward and that the area should be included in this ward. Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party disagreed with this and reiterated its earlier support for this area to be included in our Folkestone Harbour ward.

59 We consider that the A260 provides a strong, easily identifiable boundary between the wards, and we do not believe that the case has been made to amend the boundaries in this area.

60 We received a number of submissions from local residents arguing that some of our proposed ward names for Folkestone did not accurately reflect the local area. Respondents argued that Folkestone Park was not a name that would be familiar locally and suggested including the name 'Broadmead' as it would be recognisable to local people. We have decided to include the ward name of Broadmead as part of our final recommendations.

61 We are also amending our ward names for Sandgate, Folkestone East and Cheriton & Morehall. Evidence from local residents indicated that there were more locally recognisable or appropriate ward names. Under our final recommendations the ward of Sandgate will be named Sandgate & West Folkestone, Folkestone East will be named East Folkestone and Cheriton & Morehall will be named Cheriton.

62 To summarise, we confirm as final the boundaries for all of the wards in Folkestone. Our final recommendations are a single-member Broadmead ward, two-member Folkestone Harbour and Sandgate & West Folkestone

wards, and three-member Cheriton, East Folkestone and Folkestone Central wards. These wards are projected to have 6% more, 2% fewer, 6% fewer, 2% fewer, 2% more and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

## Conclusions

63 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2019 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

|  | Final recommendations |       |
|--|-----------------------|-------|
|  | 2012                  | 2019  |
| Number of councillors  | 30                    | 30    |
| Number of electoral wards                                      | 13                    | 13    |
| Average number of electors per councillor                      | 2,750                 | 2,960 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average | 2                     | 0     |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average | 1                     | 0     |

### **Final recommendation**

Shepway District Council should comprise 30 councillors serving 13 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

66 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Folkestone parish.

**Final recommendation**

Folkestone Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, the same as at present, representing seven wards: Broadmead (returning two members), Central (returning four members), Cheriton (returning four members), East Folkestone (returning four members), Harbour (returning two members), Harvey West (returning one member) and North-East Folkestone (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.



### 3 What happens next?

67 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Shepway District Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Shepway District Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

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



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Shepway

69 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Shepway District Council:

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

**You can also view our final recommendations for Shepway District Council on our interactive maps at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Shepway District Council**

|    | <b>Ward name</b>   | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (2012)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2019)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|----|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1  | Broadmead          | 1                            | 2,994                    | 2,994                                    | 9%                             | 3,149                    | 3,149                                    | 6%                             |
| 2  | Cheriton           | 3                            | 8,455                    | 2,818                                    | 2%                             | 8,690                    | 2,897                                    | -2%                            |
| 3  | East Folkestone    | 3                            | 8,383                    | 2,794                                    | 2%                             | 9,026                    | 3,009                                    | 2%                             |
| 4  | Folkestone Central | 3                            | 8,137                    | 2,712                                    | -1%                            | 8,496                    | 2,832                                    | -4%                            |
| 5  | Folkestone Harbour | 2                            | 5,373                    | 2,687                                    | -2%                            | 5,786                    | 2,893                                    | -2%                            |
| 6  | Hythe              | 3                            | 9,076                    | 3,025                                    | 10%                            | 9,518                    | 3,173                                    | 7%                             |
| 7  | Hythe Rural        | 2                            | 4,746                    | 2,373                                    | -14%                           | 5,526                    | 2,763                                    | -7%                            |
| 8  | New Romney         | 2                            | 5,680                    | 2,840                                    | 3%                             | 6,151                    | 3,076                                    | 4%                             |
| 9  | North Downs East   | 3                            | 8,491                    | 2,830                                    | 3%                             | 9,114                    | 3,038                                    | 3%                             |
| 10 | North Downs West   | 2                            | 5,074                    | 2,537                                    | -8%                            | 5,334                    | 2,667                                    | -10%                           |

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Shepway District Council**

|    | <b>Ward name</b>           | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (2012)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2019)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 11 | Romney Marsh               | 2                            | 6,010                    | 3,005                                    | 9%                             | 6,282                    | 3,141                                    | 6%                             |
| 12 | Sandgate & West Folkestone | 2                            | 4,175                    | 2,088                                    | -24%                           | 5,555                    | 2,778                                    | -6%                            |
| 13 | Walland & Denge Marsh      | 2                            | 5,920                    | 2,960                                    | 8%                             | 6,168                    | 3,084                                    | 4%                             |
|    | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>30</b>                    | <b>82,514</b>            | <b>–</b>                                 | <b>–</b>                       | <b>88,795</b>            | <b>–</b>                                 | <b>–</b>                       |
|    | <b>Averages</b>            | <b>–</b>                     | <b>–</b>                 | <b>2,750</b>                             | <b>–</b>                       | <b>–</b>                 | <b>2,960</b>                             | <b>–</b>                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Shepway District Council.

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

## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

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

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

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

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