

Draft Recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Broxtowe in Nottinghamshire

*December 1999*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke (Deputy Chairman)  
Kru Desai  
Peter Brokenshire  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Broxtowe in Nottinghamshire.

© Crown Copyright 1999

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government 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 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>27</i>
APPENDICES	
A Broxtowe Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>29</i>
B The Statutory Provisions	<i>31</i>

Two large maps illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Broxtowe are inserted inside the back cover of the report



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Broxtowe on 18 May 1999.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Broxtowe:

- **in 14 of the 21 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 14 wards and by more than 20 per cent in six wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 79-80) are that:

- **Broxtowe Borough Council should have 44 councillors, five fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 21 wards, as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In all but one of the proposed 21 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **Electoral equality is expected to improve further with no wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Eastwood and Stapleford;**
- **new warding arrangements for the parishes of Nuthall and Greasley.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for 10 weeks from 14 December 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 21 February 2000:

**Review Manager  
Broxtowe Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 0171 404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1	Attenborough	1	Attenborough ward (part); Chilwell East ward (part)
2	Awsorth	1	Awsorth & Cossall ward (part - Awsorth parish)
3	Beeston Central	2	Beeston Central ward (part); Beeston North East ward (part)
4	Beeston North	2	Beeston North East ward (part)
5	Beeston Rylands	2	Beeston Rylands ward; Beeston Central ward (part)
6	Beeston West	2	Beeston Central ward (part); Beeston North East (part); Beeston North West ward (part); Chilwell East ward (part)
7	Bramcote	3	Beeston North West ward (part); Bramcote ward (part); Stapleford East ward (part)
8	Brinsley	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (Brinsley parish)
9	Chilwell East	2	Attenborough ward (part); Bramcote ward (part); Chilwell East ward (part)
10	Chilwell West	3	Attenborough ward (part); Chilwell West ward
11	Cossall & Kimberley	3	Awsorth & Cossall ward (part - Cossall parish); Kimberley ward (Kimberley parish)
12	Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale)	2	Eastwood East ward (part - part Eastwood parish); Eastwood North ward (part - part Eastwood parish); Greasley ward (part - part Greasley parish)
13	Eastwood South	3	Eastwood South ward (Eastwood parish); Eastwood East ward (part - part Eastwood parish); Eastwood North ward (part - part Eastwood parish)
14	Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe)	3	Greasley ward (part - part Greasley parish)
15	Nuthall East & Strelley	2	Nuthall ward (part - part Nuthall parish); Strelley & Trowell ward (part - Strelley parish)
16	Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall)	2	Greasley ward (part - part Greasley parish); Nuthall ward (part - part Nuthall parish)
17	Stapleford North	2	Stapleford North ward (part - part Stapleford parish)
18	Stapleford South East	2	Stapleford East ward (part - part Stapleford parish); Stapleford North ward (part - part Stapleford parish); Stapleford West ward (part - part Stapleford parish)
19	Stapleford South West	2	Stapleford West ward (part - part Stapleford parish)

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
20	Toton & Chilwell Meadows	3	Toton ward; Attenborough ward (part); Bramcote ward (part)
21	Trowell	1	Strelley & Trowell ward (part - Trowell parish)

*Notes: 1 Beeston Town, Chilwell and part of Stapleford are the unparished parts of the borough and comprise the nine existing wards indicated above.*

*2 Map 2 and the large maps at the back of this report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Broxtowe

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Attenborough	1	1,932	1,932	-1	1,926	1,926	-3
2 Awsworth	1	1,777	1,777	-9	1,930	1,930	-3
3 Beeston Central	2	4,043	2,022	4	4,028	2,014	1
4 Beeston North	2	4,154	2,077	7	4,118	2,060	3
5 Beeston Rylands	2	4,112	2,056	6	4,178	2,089	5
6 Beeston West	2	4,098	2,049	5	4,059	2,030	2
7 Bramcote	3	6,235	2,078	7	6,236	2,079	4
8 Brinsley	1	1,998	1,998	3	2,000	2,000	0
9 Chilwell East	2	4,018	2,009	3	4,109	2,054	3
10 Chilwell West	3	6,326	2,109	8	6,266	2,089	5
11 Cossall & Kimberley	3	5,434	1,811	-7	5,512	1,837	-8
12 Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale)	2	3,905	1,953	0	4,048	2,024	1
13 Eastwood South	3	5,954	1,985	2	5,858	1,953	-2
14 Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe)	3	5,036	1,679	-14	5,500	1,833	-8
15 Nuthall East & Strelley	2	3,583	1,792	-8	3,651	1,826	-8
16 Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall)	2	3,534	1,767	-9	4,094	2,047	3
17 Stapleford North	2	3,959	1,980	2	4,165	2,083	4
18 Stapleford South East	2	3,845	1,923	-1	4,043	2,022	1

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
19 Stapleford South West	2	4,138	2,069	6	4,186	2,093	5
20 Toton & Chilwell Meadows	3	5,567	1,856	-5	5,769	1,923	-4
21 Trowell	1	2,014	2,014	3	2,080	2,080	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>85,662</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>87,756</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,947</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,994</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Notes: 1 *The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

2 *The total electorate for 1999 varies from that shown in Figure 4 by 28 electors which would have a negligible impact on electoral variances.*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Broxtowe in Nottinghamshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the eight districts in Nottinghamshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Broxtowe. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1975 (Report No. 73). The electoral arrangements of Nottinghamshire County Council were last reviewed in May 1980 (Report No. 383). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix B).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the borough.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (second edition published in March 1998). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the borough as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 Third, we are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that borough but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a borough’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Description</b>
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the borough and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the borough council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Nottinghamshire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

12 Stage One began on 18 May 1999, when we wrote to Broxtowe Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Nottinghamshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the borough, the members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough and the Members of the European Parliament for the East Midlands Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the

local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 20 September 1999.

13 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

14 Stage Three began on 14 December 1999 and will end on 21 February 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Broxtowe extends across the southwest corner of Nottinghamshire, and is bordered to the south by the River Trent, the districts of Amber Valley and Erewash in Derbyshire to the west, the district of Ashfield to the north and the City of Nottingham to the east. The borough has a population of approximately 112,000 within an area of 8,055 hectares. Broxtowe has four main centres of population in the towns of Beeston and Stapleford in the south and Eastwood and Kimberley in the north.

17 The borough contains 10 parishes located in the northern part of the borough. Beeston town, Chilwell and part of Stapleford in the south of the borough are unparished. Broxtowe town comprises approximately one fifth of the borough's total electorate.

18 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

19 The electorate of the borough is 85,690 (February 1999). The Council presently has 49 members who are elected from 21 wards. Ten wards are each represented by three councillors, eight are each represented by two councillors and three are single-member wards. The Council is elected together every four years.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Broxtowe, with around 14 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increase has been in Greasley ward with approximately 2,600 more electors than 20 years ago.

21 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,749 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,791 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 14 of the 21 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average and, five wards by more than 20 per cent and four wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Greasley ward where the councillor represents 58 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Broxtowe*

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Attenborough	2	4,483	2,242	28	4,653	2,327	30
2 Awsworth & Cossall	2	2,288	1,144	-35	2,506	1,253	-30
3 Beeston Central	3	5,340	1,780	2	5,310	1,770	-1
4 Beeston North-East	3	4,618	1,539	-12	4,580	1,527	-15
5 Beeston North-West	2	2,866	1,433	-18	2,868	1,434	-20
6 Beeston Rylands	2	3,376	1,688	-3	3,360	1,680	-6
7 Bramcote	3	4,553	1,518	-13	4,630	1,543	-14
8 Brinsley	1	1,999	1,999	14	2,000	2,000	12
9 Chilwell East	3	4,744	1,581	-10	4,780	1,593	-11
10 Chilwell West	3	4,447	1,482	-15	4,424	1,475	-18
11 Eastwood East	2	3,420	1,710	-2	3,408	1,704	-5
12 Eastwood North	1	1,854	1,854	6	1,854	1,854	4
13 Eastwood South	2	3,450	1,725	-1	3,450	1,725	-4
14 Greasley	3	8,313	2,771	58	9,336	3,112	74
15 Kimberley	3	4,924	1,641	-6	4,936	1,645	-8
16 Nuthall	2	4,943	2,472	41	5,026	2,513	40
17 Stapleford East	3	4,533	1,511	-14	4,554	1,518	-15
18 Stapleford North	3	4,512	1,504	-14	4,958	1,653	-8
19 Stapleford West	3	4,248	1,416	-19	4,230	1,410	-21
20 Strelley & Trowell	1	2,091	2,091	20	2,157	2,157	20
21 Toton	2	4,688	2,344	34	4,736	2,368	32
<b>Totals</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>85,690</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>87,756</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,749</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,791</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Awsworth & Cossall ward were relatively over-represented by 35 per cent, while electors in Greasley ward were significantly under-represented by 58 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Broxtowe Borough Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received nine representations during Stage One, including a borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

#### **Broxtowe Borough Council**

24 The Borough Council proposed a council of 44 members, five less than at present, serving 21 wards, the same as at present. The Council proposed retaining a mix of one-, two- and three-member wards which would involve warding the parishes of Nuthall and Greasley and re-warding the parishes of Eastwood and Stapleford. The Borough Council undertook a comprehensive local consultation exercise with local groups, parish and town councils and political parties before submitting its proposals. The Council's proposals also received "unanimous cross-party support" from members on the Borough Council.

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

25 We received representations from three parish councils. Nuthall and Trowell parish councils both supported the Borough Council's proposals as they related to their areas. Brinsley Parish Council stated that it was "satisfied with the current electoral arrangements for both parish and district councils".

#### **Other Representations**

26 We received a further five representations from four local residents and a petition from residents in the Bramcote area. The petition, signed by 89 residents of Turnberry Close and Kingsbridge Way, along with a separate submission from a local resident opposed the Borough Council's proposals to include these two roads in its proposed Chilwell East ward, and preferred remaining in Bramcote ward for community identity reasons. Another resident considered that the whole of Bramcote should be "recognized and represented as an entity, which is in line with local opinion". Two residents of the current Stapleford East ward supported the Borough Council's proposals for Bramcote ward but also suggested modifying the existing Stapleford parish boundary thereby including properties along Valmont Road and Baulk Lane in Bramcote.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

27 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Broxtowe is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

28 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

29 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

30 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

31 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 2.5 per cent from 85,690 to 87,756 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects much of the growth to be in Greasley ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Awsworth & Cossall ward. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

32 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

33 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

34 Broxtowe Borough Council presently has 49 members. The Borough Council proposed a council of 44 members, a reduction of five. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 44 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

35 There appears to be a large degree of consensus behind elements of the Council's proposals, and we note the extensive consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties. This scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements. We have therefore concluded that we should base our recommendations on the Borough Council's scheme. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Borough Council's proposals in Beeston, affecting three wards, in order to achieve a better balance of electoral equality in the town.

36 We noted that a number of respondents considered that the existing parish boundaries in the borough no longer reflect the settlement pattern in some areas as new development now straddles these boundaries. As part of this review, the Commission is unable to make recommendations for changes to external parish boundaries. However, the Borough Council can initiate a parish review under the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 and in its Stage One submission indicated its intention to do so upon completion of this PER. The Borough Council's proposals for the parished area of the borough utilised these existing parish boundaries in forming new borough ward boundaries.

37 We also note that in some areas, the Borough Council's proposed parish ward boundaries or proposed borough ward boundaries in the unparished area did not follow recognisable ground features. In these instances, and where we have adopted the Borough Council's proposals, we have modified a number of boundaries to better follow ground features in consultation with both the Borough Council and Ordnance Survey. Unless otherwise stated, no electors have been affected where such boundaries have been modified.

38 For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

### **The Parished Area**

- Brinsley, Eastwood East, Eastwood North, Eastwood South and Greasley wards;
- Awsworth & Cossall and Kimberley wards;
- Nuthall and Strelley & Trowell wards;
- Stapleford East, Stapleford North and Stapleford West wards.

## **The Unparished Area**

- Bramcote ward;
- Beeston Central, Beeston North-East, Beeston North-West and Beeston Rylands wards;
- Chilwell East and Chilwell West wards;
- Attenborough and Toton wards.

39 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps inserted at the back of this report.

## **The Parished Area**

40 The north of the borough forms the parished area with 10 parishes - the three towns of Eastwood, Kimberley and Stapleford, the seven parishes of Awsworth, Cossall, Greasley, Nuthall, Brinsley, Trowell and Strelley. It contains approximately 53 per cent of the borough's electorate.

### **Brinsley, Eastwood East, Eastwood North and Eastwood South and Greasley wards**

41 These five wards are located in the north of the borough. The average number of electors per councillor in each of the two-member Eastwood East, one-member Eastwood North and two-member Eastwood South wards is less than 10 per cent from the borough average both under existing and forecast electorate figures. The three wards together comprise the whole of the parish of Eastwood, which is currently warded for electoral purposes. The electoral variance in Brinsley ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is 14 per cent (12 per cent in 2004). The current three-member Greasley ward, comprising solely the parish of the same name, has the worst electoral equality in the borough with each of the three councillors representing 58 per cent more electors than the borough average (74 per cent in 2004).

42 In its submission, the Borough Council proposed no change to the existing single-member ward of Brinsley. Additionally, Brinsley Parish Council stated that it was "satisfied with the current electoral arrangements". Under a council size of 44, the proposal for no change would result in an electoral variance in Brinsley ward of 3 per cent (equal to the average in 2004). We received no further comments on the existing Brinsley ward and given the good level of electoral equality are proposing no change to its current arrangements as part of our draft recommendations.

43 The parish of Eastwood is warded for electoral purposes and currently comprises three separate borough wards. Greasley parish currently forms a three-member borough ward and suffers the greatest electoral inequality in the borough. In its submission, the Borough Council proposed a new Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale) ward comprising parts of the existing Eastwood North and Eastwood East wards, together with the north western corner of Greasley parish. The new ward's southern boundary in Eastwood parish would follow the rear of properties on the estate off Derby Road, go across Mansfield Road, then following the rear of properties along Princes Street, Grange View and Garden Road before turning southwards at the rear of Walker Street to Nottingham Road where it would continue to the parish boundary. The Borough Council's proposed southern boundary would continue from the junction of Abbey Road and Mill

Road eastwards across open land to the rear of Beauvale and Moorgreen before following the dismantled railway line west to the M1 motorway and borough boundary. New parish wards of Eastwood and Greasley parishes would be created as a consequence, which are discussed in detail later in this chapter. Under these proposals, Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale) ward would have an electoral variance equal to the borough average (1 per cent above in 2004).

44 The Borough Council proposed a new Eastwood South ward to the south of its proposed Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale) ward, comprising parts of Eastwood East and Eastwood South wards and a small area of Eastwood North ward. The Borough Council proposed a modified Greasley ward, to be called Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) which would comprise the Newthorpe and Giltbrook areas of the parish and would return three councillors. Under these proposals, the average number of electors per councillor in Eastwood South ward would be 2 per cent above the borough average and in Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) ward 14 per cent below the average (2 per cent below and 8 per cent below respectively in 2004). The Watnall area of Greasley parish would form part of an adjacent ward detailed later.

45 We received no further representations on this area, although the Borough Council did note a representation it had received during its own consultation exercise from Greasley Parish Council. The Parish Council agreed that the parish of Greasley would require warding as part of the review in order to achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality; however, it wished this warding to provide for wards that solely contained areas of Greasley parish.

46 We have carefully considered the Borough Council's proposals for Eastwood and Greasley parishes. We have noted Greasley Parish Council's wish to retain the external parish boundaries as borough ward boundaries but given the large electoral imbalances under the current arrangements and the reduced council size proposed, significant change is inevitable in this area. Moreover, we have concluded that the dispersed settlement pattern within Greasley and the need to have regard to achieving good electoral equality in all areas of the borough warrant the warding of Greasley parish and changes to the warding of Eastwood parish. We judge the Borough Council's proposals achieve good electoral equality and reflect closely the settlement pattern in the area. We are therefore adopting the Borough Council's proposed Eastwood North and Greasley (Beauvale), Eastwood South and Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) wards, together with a number of minor boundary amendments, affecting no electors, in order to more closely match ground features. The detailed ward boundaries for these wards are shown on the large maps at the back of this report.

### **Awsorth & Cossall and Kimberley wards**

47 These two wards are located on the western side of the borough with Awsorth & Cossall ward returning two councillors and Kimberley ward returning three councillors. Awsorth & Cossall ward (comprising the parishes of Awsorth and Cossall) currently has an electoral variance of 35 per cent (30 per cent in 2004) and Kimberley ward, comprising the parish of the same name, has a variance of 6 per cent (8 per cent in 2004).

48 The Borough Council proposed that Awsorth parish should form a new single-member Awsorth ward with an electoral variance of 9 per cent (3 per cent in 2004). The Council also proposed that Cossall and Kimberley parishes should form a three-member ward with an electoral

variance of 7 per cent (8 per cent in 2004). The Council stated that in response to its consultation process, Cossall Parish Council had objected to its proposal because it would no longer form part of a ward with Awsworth parish. The Borough Council noted the parish's concern that it shared little community identity with Kimberley parish but considered that retaining Cossall with Awsworth parishes in a single-member ward would adversely impact upon electoral equality in the area. The Borough Council noted it had also considered proposing both the parishes of Awsworth and Cossall form part of a three-member ward along with the Babbington area of Kimberley parish. However, this would have resulted in significant electoral variances in the area, and it did not therefore put this forward in its submission.

49 We received no further representations in respect of these two wards and having carefully considered the Borough Council's proposals, we have concluded that they achieve good electoral equality and an appropriate balance between the statutory criteria. Furthermore, having examined alternatives, we do not consider a more suitable alternative warding pattern is available in the area which would not impact upon electoral equality and the achievement of the statutory criteria in the borough as a whole. We are therefore adopting the Borough Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on the large maps in the back of the report.

#### **Nuthall and Strelley & Trowell wards**

50 Strelley & Trowell and Nuthall wards span the centre of the borough and are currently represented by a single councillor and two councillors respectively. Nuthall ward is currently under-represented with 41 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average and Strelley & Trowell ward is also under-represented with 20 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (40 per cent and 20 per cent more in 2004).

51 The Borough Council proposed creating a new two-member Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) ward which would comprise a south-eastern part of Greasley parish around the Watnall settlement and part of Nuthall parish, broadly west of the M1 motorway and north of the Kimberley/Eastwood bypass. The remaining part of Nuthall parish, together with all of Strelley parish, would form a new two-member Nuthall East & Strelley ward. The Borough Council noted that the majority of electors in Strelley lived in Strelley village which is "closer to Nuthall than to Trowell". Under the Borough Council's proposals, the average number of electors in Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) ward would be 9 per cent below the borough average and in Nuthall East & Strelley ward 8 per cent below (3 per cent below and unchanged respectively in 2004).

52 The Borough Council proposed a new single-member Trowell ward consisting solely of the parish of Trowell, which it considered would reflect community identity while also fitting its proposed ward pattern in the surrounding area. The ward would have an electoral variance of 3 per cent (4 per cent in 2004). We received a representation from Trowell Parish Council supporting the Borough Council's proposals stating that they wished to "maintain the rural identity and proud community spirit of our village" which they considered "would be achieved by becoming a solely single-member ward".

53 We have carefully considered the proposals for the two wards in this area. We judge that the proposal to ward Nuthall parish, utilising the M1 motorway, would provide a clear boundary and

the proposed Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) ward would achieve a high degree of electoral equality and reflect the local settlement pattern. We also consider that Nuthall East & Strelley and Trowell wards would achieve good electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We are therefore wholly adopting the Borough Council's proposals for these three wards in our draft recommendations. The proposed ward boundaries are illustrated on the large maps at the back of the report.

### **Stapleford East, Stapleford North and Stapleford West wards**

54 These three three-member wards are located in the south-west of the borough and together comprise the whole of Stapleford parish, which for electoral purposes is currently warded. Stapleford East ward also contains part of the adjoining unparished area of Bramcote. The current electoral variances are 14 per cent in Stapleford East, 14 per cent in Stapleford North and 19 per cent in Stapleford West (15 per cent, 8 per cent and 21 per cent respectively in 2004).

55 The Borough Council proposed re-warding the parish of Stapleford to create three revised wards. A modified two-member Stapleford North ward would comprise most of the existing Stapleford North ward except for properties along the south of Hickings Lane. These properties, along with that part of Stapleford parish within Stapleford East ward and properties on the east side of Toton Lane (currently part of Stapleford West ward) would form part of a new Stapleford South-East ward. The unparished area of the existing Stapleford East ward would form part of a modified Bramcote ward (detailed later). A modified two-member Stapleford South-West ward would comprise most of the present Stapleford West ward apart from properties to the east of Toton Lane.

56 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the electoral variance in Stapleford North, Stapleford South-East and Stapleford South-West wards would be 2 per cent, 1 per cent and 6 per cent (4 per cent, 1 per cent and 5 per cent respectively in 2004).

57 We received no further comments directly on the proposed warding pattern in Stapleford. In its submission, the Borough Council noted that in response to its own local consultation exercise, Stapleford Town Council had supported the proposals for Stapleford, although they suggested that the boundary between the proposed Stapleford South-East and Stapleford South-West wards should follow the centre of Toton Lane. However, the Borough Council considered that its proposals would better reflect local ties between both sides of Toton Lane.

58 In considering the Borough Council's proposed three wards for Stapleford, we judge that they would achieve reasonable electoral equality and utilise clear ward boundaries and therefore include them as part of our draft recommendations. The proposed ward boundaries are illustrated on the large maps at the back of the report. We would, however, welcome further evidence during Stage Three on the appropriate location of the boundary along Toton Lane between Stapleford South-East and Stapleford South-West wards.

## **The Unparished Area**

59 The unparished area of the borough comprises the areas of the former Beeston and Stapleford UDC, less the Stapleford area that became a parish following the Borough Council's last parish review in 1986. The area includes the settlements of Beeston and Chilwell and has an electorate of nearly 40,500 or nearly half the borough's total electorate.

### **Bramcote ward**

60 The three-member Bramcote ward is located to the east of Stapleford parish. Under the existing arrangements, the average number of electors per councillor in the ward is 13 per cent below the borough average (14 per cent below in 2004).

61 The Borough Council proposed a modified Bramcote ward, comprising most of the existing ward with the exception of properties on Kingsbridge Way and Turnberry Close. The ward would also include the unparished part of the current Stapleford East ward and an area of the current Beeston North West ward, broadly around the Cemetery. Under this proposal, the electoral variance in Bramcote ward would be 7 per cent (4 per cent in 2004).

62 We also received a petition signed by 89 electors from Kingsbridge Way and Turnberry Close opposing the Borough Council's proposal that these two roads, currently within Bramcote ward, should form part of a modified Chilwell East ward on community identity grounds. Furthermore, one local resident objected to the Borough Council's proposal, stating that it "seems counter productive to move an area whose residents have a clear focus on Bramcote village into a ward to which they have no allegiance or reason to focus upon".

63 Three local residents of Bramcote made submissions supporting the Borough Council's proposal to include the unparished area of the current Stapleford East ward in the modified Bramcote ward, which they considered would better reflect local community links. One of these residents, while supporting the Borough Council's proposals, suggested that parts of Valmont Road, Marshall Drive and Baulk Lane, currently in Stapleford parish, should be included in the unparished Bramcote area. However, we are unable to modify external parish boundaries, but, as noted earlier, the Borough Council intends to undertake a parish review following the completion of this PER.

64 We have considered the proposals for this area and note that should electors within Kingsbridge Way and Turnberry Close form part of the Borough Council's proposed Bramcote ward, the electoral variance in the ward would worsen from 6 per cent to 9 per cent (4 per cent to 7 per cent in 2004). There would also be a consequential impact on the Borough Council's proposed adjoining ward of Chilwell East (detailed later) where the electoral equality would improve from 3 per cent, both now and in 2004 to equal to the borough average (2 per cent in 2004). We consider that the Borough Council's proposal for Bramcote ward provides the best balance between the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria and are therefore adopting it as part of our draft recommendations. The proposed ward boundaries are shown on the large maps at the back of the report.

### **Beeston Central, Beeston North-East, Beeston North-West and Beeston Rylands wards**

65 These four wards cover the town of Beeston, located in the far south-east of the borough. Beeston Central and Beeston North-East wards each return three councillors and have electoral variances of 2 per cent and 12 per cent respectively (1 per cent and 15 per cent in 2004). Beeston North-West and Beeston Rylands wards each return two councillors and have electoral variances of 18 per cent and 3 per cent respectively (20 per cent and 6 per cent in 2004).

66 The Borough Council proposed four revised wards for the Beeston area, each returning two councillors. A new Beeston North ward would comprise the existing Beeston North-East ward apart from the Salthouse Lane/Cloisters area which, together with part of the existing Beeston Central ward broadly east of Dovecote Lane, would form a modified Beeston Central ward. Under these proposals, Beeston North and Beeston Central wards would have electoral variances of 13 and 4 per cent respectively (9 and 1 per cent in 2004).

67 Under the Borough Council's proposals, a new Beeston West ward would comprise part of the existing Beeston Central ward, west of Dovecote Lane, along with most of the existing Beeston North-West ward south of Old Drive and Bramcote Drive. An area of the existing Chilwell East ward, broadly west of Park Road and east of properties to the rear of Grove Avenue, would also form part of the Council's proposed Beeston West ward. The Borough Council's revised Beeston Rylands ward would comprise all of the existing Beeston Rylands ward together with an area of the existing Beeston Central ward south of Queens Road, west of Dovecote Lane, north of the railway line and to the east of Marina Avenue. Under the borough Council's proposal, Beeston West and Beeston Rylands wards have electoral variances of 11 per cent and 6 per cent respectively (both 7 per cent in 2004).

68 We have carefully considered the Borough Council's proposals for Beeston town and note the improvement to electoral equality. We are, however, of the opinion that the Borough Council's proposals for Beeston North, Beeston West and Beeston Rylands wards could be improved in order to achieve a better balance of electoral equality across the town. We propose transferring an area of the proposed Beeston North ward around the town centre (south of Abbey Road and west of Muriel Road and Derby Road) to a modified Beeston West ward. We also propose transferring an area broadly south of West End/Middle Street, east of Dovecote Lane and west of Station Road into a modified Beeston Rylands ward. We judge these modifications would further improve the balance of electoral equality across the town while having regard to the statutory criteria. We are recommending adopting the Borough Council's proposals for Beeston Central ward unaltered as they would achieve a good degree of electoral equality and utilise clearly identifiable ward boundaries. Under our proposals the electoral variance in Beeston North ward would be 7 per cent, in Beeston West ward it would be 5 per cent and in Beeston Rylands ward it would be 6 per cent (3 per cent, 2 per cent and 5 per cent respectively in 2004). The proposed ward boundaries are shown on the large maps at the back of the report.

### **Chilwell East and Chilwell West wards**

69 The two wards of Chilwell East and Chilwell West each return three councillors and are located in the south of the borough. The average number of electors per councillor in Chilwell

East ward is 10 per cent below the borough average and in Chilwell West ward 15 per cent below (11 per cent and 18 per cent below in 2004).

70 The Borough Council proposed a new two-member Chilwell East ward comprising that part of the existing ward broadly west of Grove Avenue, north of Queens Road/Bye Pass Road, east of Chilwell Lane/Bramcote Lane and Attenborough Lane and south of open land to the north of Kingsbridge Way and Cliffe Grove Avenue. The remaining parts of the existing Chilwell East ward would be included in a modified Attenborough ward (detailed later), and a modified Beeston West ward (detailed above).

71 The boundaries of the existing three-member Chilwell West ward would also be modified under the Borough Council's proposals. The northern, eastern and western boundaries would remain broadly unaltered, although an area of the existing Attenborough ward, north of Carter Road/Chetwynd Road and High Road, would form part of the modified Chilwell West ward, together with the Haddon Crescent and Burgh Hall Close areas.

72 Under the Borough Council's proposed Chilwell East and Chilwell West wards, the electoral variances would be 3 per cent and 8 per cent respectively (3 per cent and 5 per cent in 2004). As noted above, we received a submission and a petition from residents of Kingsbridge Way and Turnberry Close who opposed their inclusion in the proposed Chilwell East ward for community identity reasons. However, as discussed earlier, we concluded that in order to achieve a good level of electoral equality, our draft recommendations should include these two roads within the proposed Chilwell East ward.

73 We received no further direct comments on the Chilwell area of the borough and judge that the Borough Council's proposals for the area would achieve good electoral equality, reflect the statutory criteria and utilise clear ward boundaries where possible. We are therefore adopting the Council's proposals for Chilwell East and Chilwell West in their entirety, subject to a number of minor boundary modifications not affecting any electors, to ensure that they follow recognisable ground features. The proposed ward boundaries are illustrated on the large maps at the back of the report.

### **Attenborough and Toton wards**

74 The two two-member wards of Attenborough and Toton are located in the far south-west of the borough. Under existing arrangements, Attenborough ward is under-represented by 28 per cent and Toton ward by 34 per cent (30 per cent and 32 per cent respectively in 2004).

75 The Borough Council proposed a new three-member Toton & Chilwell Meadows ward which would comprise the whole of the existing Toton ward along with part of the existing Attenborough ward including the former Ministry of Defence Ordnance Depot. The Council noted that recent extensive redevelopment in the area of the Ordnance Depot has changed the profile of the area considerably.

76 The Borough Council also proposed modifying the existing two-member Attenborough ward to form a new single-member ward. An area of the existing ward north of the Queens Road/Bye Pass Road and Nottingham Road would form parts of the modified Chilwell East, Chilwell West

and Toton & Chilwell Meadows wards, with the River Erewash and borough boundary forming the southern and western ward boundaries. The eastern boundary would follow a line between the allotment gardens and the Nottingham Rugby Football Club ground. Under the Borough Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Toton & Chilwell Meadows ward would be 5 per cent below the borough average and in Attenborough ward, 1 per cent below (4 and 3 per cent below respectively in 2004).

77 We received no further representations regarding these two wards and we are satisfied that the Borough Council's proposed Toton & Chilwell Meadows and Attenborough wards would achieve a good level of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We are therefore adopting them as part of our draft recommendations. The proposed ward boundaries are shown on the large maps at the back of the report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

78 Only the Borough Council commented on the electoral cycle during Stage One, preferring to retain the current arrangements whereby the council is elected together every four years. We therefore propose no change to the current electoral cycle of whole-council elections for the Borough Council.

## **Conclusions**

79 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- (a) there should be a reduction in council size from 49 to 44;
- (b) there should be 21 wards, the same as at present;
- (c) the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified;
- (d) elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

80 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, but propose departing from them in the following area:

- (a) in Beeston, we are transferring the area broadly south of Abbey Road and west of Muriel Road/Derby Street from the Council's proposed Beeston North ward into a modified Beeston West ward, affecting 245 electors;
- (b) also in Beeston, we propose transferring the area north of Queens Road and broadly south of West End/Middle Street and east of Dovecote Lane from the Council's proposed Beeston North ward into their proposed Beeston West ward, affecting 450 electors.

81 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

*Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	49	44	49	44
Number of wards	21	21	21	21
Average number of electors per councillor	1,749	1,947	1,791	1,994
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	14	1	14	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	6	0

82 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Broxtowe Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 14 to one. By 2004 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Broxtowe Borough Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 21 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole Council.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

83 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Greasley, Eastwood, Nuthall and Stapleford to reflect the proposed borough wards.

84 The parish of Eastwood is currently served by 15 councillors representing three wards: Eastwood East, Eastwood North and Eastwood South, each returning five councillors.

85 The Borough Council proposed re-warding the parish of Eastwood to reflect its reconfigured borough wards. Under these proposals, each of the two proposed borough wards containing parts of Eastwood parish would also form parish wards, with Eastwood North parish ward (containing that part of Eastwood parish within the proposed borough ward of Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale)) returning four councillors and Eastwood South parish ward (coterminous with the proposed borough ward of Eastwood South) returning 11 councillors.

86 Having adopted the Borough Council’s proposed borough wards for Eastwood, we are proposing the same two wards for Eastwood parish. The detailed boundaries are illustrated on the large maps inside the back cover of this report.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Eastwood Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: North (returning four councillors) and South (11 councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as named on Map 2 and on the large maps at the rear of the report.

87 The parish of Greasley is currently served by 15 councillors and is unwarded. The Borough Council proposed warding the parish to reflect its proposed borough ward boundaries between Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale) and Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) and between this latter ward and the proposed ward of Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall). Under the Borough Council’s proposals, one parish ward, to be called Greasley Beauvale would cover that part of Greasley parish with the proposed Eastwood North & Greasley (Beauvale) ward, returning two councillors. A second parish ward, Greasley Giltbrook & Newthorpe would return nine councillors and cover that part of the parish contained within the proposed Greasley (Giltbrook & Newthorpe) ward. A third parish ward, Greasley Watnall, would return four councillors and cover that part of the parish contained within the proposed Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) ward.

88 Having adopted the Borough Council’s proposed borough wards in the Greasley area, we are recommending the adoption of the Borough Council’s proposed consequential warding of Greasley parish. This would involve three parish wards for the parish of Greasley as shown on the large map at the back of the report.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Greasley Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Watnall (returning four councillors), Giltbrook & Newthorpe (nine councillors) and Beauvale (two councillors). The boundary between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large maps at the rear of the reports.

89 The parish of Nuthall is currently served by 13 councillors and is unwarded. The Borough Council proposed warding the parish to reflect its proposed borough wards in the area. It proposed a ward, Nuthall West, which would contain that part of Nuthall parish within Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) borough ward and would return four councillors, and a second parish ward containing that part of Nuthall parish within Nuthall East & Strelley ward, which would return 11 councillors. Nuthall Parish Council in its submission stated it had “no objections” to the Borough Council’s proposals as they affected the parish.

90 We are adopting the Borough Council’s proposals for Nuthall West & Greasley (Watnall) and Nuthall East & Strelley borough wards and we are therefore recommending the adoption of the Borough Council’s proposed parish ward boundaries in the area.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Nuthall Parish Council should comprise 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Nuthall East (returning nine councillors) and Nuthall West (returning four councillors).

91 The parish of Stapleford is currently served by 18 parish councillors from three wards: Stapleford East (returning four councillors), Stapleford North (seven councillors) and Stapleford West (seven councillors). Each parish ward is coterminous with the existing borough ward of the same name. The Borough Council proposed re-warding the parish in order to reflect its proposed borough wards in the area. It proposed three new wards of Stapleford North (returning six councillors), Stapleford South-West (six councillors) and Stapleford South-East (six councillors), each coterminous with its proposed borough wards in the area. As we are adopting the Borough Council’s proposed borough warding pattern in Stapleford, we are also adopting their proposed parish warding.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Stapleford Town Council should comprise 18 town councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Stapleford North, Stapleford South-West and Stapleford South-East, each returning six town councillors.

92 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the borough.

**Draft Recommendation**  
For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the Borough Council.

**We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Broxtowe and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

*Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Broxtowe*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

93 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Broxtowe. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 21 February 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

94 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Broxtowe Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

95 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### Broxtowe Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Borough Council only in three wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

*Figure A1: Broxtowe Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
Beeston North	Beeston North East (part)
Beeston Rylands	Beeston Central ward (part); Beeston Rylands ward
Beeston West	Beeston Central ward (part); Beeston North West ward (part); Chilwell East ward (part)

*Figure A2: Broxtowe Borough Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Beeston North	2	4,399	2,199	13	4,362	2,181	9
Beeston Rylands	2	3,644	1,822	-7	3,714	1,857	-7
Beeston West	2	4,321	2,160	-1	4,279	2,139	7

*Source: Electorate figures are based on Broxtowe Borough Council's submission.*

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



## APPENDIX B

### The Statutory Provisions

#### Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear<sup>1</sup>. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

#### **Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements**

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

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

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.