# Local Government Boundary Commission For England Report No. 354

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Nicholas Morrison KCB

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

AH

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

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE BOROUGH OF HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH IN THE COUNTY OF LEICESTERSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the borough of Hinckley and Bosworth in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 31 December 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to Leicestershire County Council, parish councils and parish meetings in the district, Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.

3. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Borough Council have passed a resolution under section 7(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, requesting a system of elections by thirds.

5. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation on 27 June 1975. The scheme provided for 17 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a council of 33.

6. We considered the Borough Council's draft scheme together with the related comments and 3 alterna tive schemes. One of these schemes, from a local political organisation proposed twenty single-member wards for the urban area of Hinckley. We noted that if these single-member wards were paired, the scheme would then be numerically superior to the Council's draft scheme and to the other alternative schemes submitted. We decided to adopt this scheme, with minor modifications, as our draft proposals for the urban area of Hinckley. We adopted the Borough Council's draft scheme for the rural wards, subject to slight modifications.

7. On 8 September 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that comments should reach us by 3 November 1976.

8. We received a number of comments in response to the draft proposals. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, seven local political organisations, five parish councils, a civic society and a private individual objected to the draft proposals. A local councillor, supported by eleven other councillors, submitted an alternative scheme for the urban wards. The County Council had no objections to the draft proposals in so far as they might affect the future county electoral arrangements and one parish council supported the draft proposals as they affected their ward.

9. In view of these comments we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr W E Lane was appointed an Assistant Commissioner. He was asked to hold a local meeting and to report to us. Copies of the comments were sent to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to be available for public inspection. Notice of the meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

10. The Assistant Commissioner held two meetings, (the first was adjourned to enable further work to be done on an alternative scheme put forward by a local political association) at the Council Offices, Hinckley, on 26 January and 8 December 1978. He inspected certain areas of the district. A copy of his report is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

11. In the light of the discussion at the meetings the Assistant Commissioner recommended that:-

a. for the urban area, excluding Stoke Golding, there should be substituted for the Commission's draft proposals a revised draft scheme, put forward by the Borough Council, subject to the transfer of an area from Trinity ward to De Montfort ward;

b. for the rural area, including Stoke Golding, the Commission should adhere to their draft proposals subject to the renaming of "Ferrers All Saints" ward as "Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston" and of "Gopsall" ward as "Twycross and Shackerstone".

12. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which had been received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the alterations recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted and decided to formulate our final proposals accordingly.

13. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2, 3 and 4 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. A detailed description of the

boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the map, is set out in Schedule 3. Our proposals for the order of retirement of councillors is shown in Schedule 4.

PUBLICATION

14. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and will be available for inspection at the Borough Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without the map) are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed:

NICHOLAS MORRISON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

R R THORNTON

LESLIE GRIMSHAW (Secretary)

24 May 1979

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS :
HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH DISTRICT

REPORT BY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER : W. E. LANE

Meetings open to anyone interested were held at the Council Offices, Argents Mead, Hinckley, on 26 January and 8 December 1978 to enable me to hear local views on the proposed electoral arrangements for the Borough of Hinckley and Bosworth.

Appendices A and B contain lists of the names and addresses of those attending the meetings and the interests they represented. All present were invited to give their views on any aspect they wished. The meetings were conducted informally so that everyone had the opportunity of expressing their views and commenting on the views of others.

In answer to my enquiry there was no request for an inspection and, in view of the information available in writing as well as verbally at the meetings, I did not carry out any specific inspections but looked at Hinckley town, Barwell and Earl Shilton enough to gain a useful general impression.

The Borough Council's draft scheme, submitted on 27 June 1975, provided for 17 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to make a council of 33, one less than the existing council. The Commission considered the comments made on this scheme and on 8 September 1976 announced their draft proposals. In the urban area, to achieve a better equality of representation, they proposed 10 wards made up by pairing the 20 single member wards advocated by the Conservative Party. In the rural area they adopted the Borough Council's draft scheme subject to:

(a) division of the proposed 2-member Bagworth and Newbold Vernon ward to give each parish separate representation as requested by Newbold Vernon Parish Council

(b) allocation of 2 members to the proposed Markfield ward, thereby making a council of 34, on acceptance of an increase in the projected electorate for Markfield Parish from 2704 to 3424

The Borough Council based their draft scheme on the electorate figures for 1975 and as projected for 1980. Because 1980 is now so much more relevant than 1975, I have dealt solely with the figures for 1980, i.e. a total of 67,113 electors after allowing for the Markfield adjustment (see above). Some of the schemes under consideration provide for 33 councillors, others 34. The average electorate per councillor for a council of 33 is 2034 and for a council of 34 is 1974. The "entitlement" of a ward, referred to later in this report, means the number of councillors to which the ward would be entitled on the basis of one councillor for the average electorate quoted above, varying, of course, between a council of 33 and 34.

From figures used in objections to the Commission's draft proposals it came to light that, within correct figures for the urban area as a whole, the allocation of figures to individual proposed wards was wrong, thereby invalidating the numerical basis of the Borough Council's draft scheme and the Commission's draft proposals. After correction, many entitlements in the draft proposals were significantly worsened. Conversely, the draft scheme entitlements for some wards were improved.

The Borough Council responded to this unsatisfactory situation by sending to the Commission on 20 October 1977 a revised draft scheme varying the boundaries, and hence the electorates of the seven urban wards in their original draft scheme. For the rural area they repeated the proposals in their original draft scheme with the adoption of the Commission's proposals for the separation of Bagworth and Newbold Vernon parishes into separate wards and the allocation of an extra member to Markfield ward, making a council of 34.

Borough Councillor M.S. Russell, backed by eleven other Councillors, wrote to the Commission supporting the Borough Council's draft scheme but also proposing an alternative scheme of 2-member wards for the urban area in case the Commission did not accept the Borough Council's revised draft scheme and still preferred 2-member wards.

In the meantime, written representations had been made on the Commission's draft proposals, which contained the wrong figures for the urban wards. These, and the representations made at the meeting, had to be considered in the light of the Borough Council's revised draft scheme based on corrected figures as well as of the Commission's draft proposals.

A major representation at the meeting was by the Liberal Party who submitted their own scheme for the urban area. Since it had only been recently conceived as a total scheme they had been unable to ascertain all the correct figures and had not yet fully considered all the rural area. It seemed to me that in spiteof its hastily prepared last minute appearance it was too important a scheme to be ignored but could not be properly considered and compared with other proposals until it included verified figures. It was therefore arranged that the Borough Secretary would make available the necessary figures for the Liberals to complete the preparation of their scheme which would then be studied by everyone interested and be considered at an adjourned hearing. That adjourned hearing was held on 8 December 1978, having been much delayed by extraneous legal factors.

I thus had before me at the meetings:-

A. The Commission's draft proposals (with wrong figures for urban wards).

B. The Borough Council's revised draft scheme (with corrected figures).

C. Councillor Russell's 2-member urban wards alternative to B.

D. The Liberals' scheme.

E. Written comments received before the first meeting from

Bosworth Conservative Association
Burbage Branch Labour Party
Burbage Ward Liberal Association
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Earl Shilton Branch Labour Party
Earl Shilton Conservative Association
Mr. D.G. Loxley
Hinckley & Bosworth District Labour Party
Castle Ward Conservative Branch
Hinckley Civic Society
Sutton Cheney Parish Council
Twycross Parish Council
Nailstone Parish Council
Osbaston Parish Council
Barlestone Parish Council
Markfield Parish Council

F. Written comments received between the first and second meetings from

Groby Parish Council
Markfield Parish Council
Markfield and Stanton Conservative Branch
Ratby Conservative Association
Sheepy Parish Council

When the Borough Council submitted its original draft scheme it was Labour controlled, but was Conservative controlled, as now, when it commented on the Commission's draft proposals and a year later when it submitted its revised draft scheme based on corrected figures. It was so divided in its reactions to the Commission's draft proposals for the urban area that it resolved to ask for a local meeting "to hear the diverse representations" ..... "as the only way for a satisfactory solution to be achieved". The Borough Council's revised draft scheme narrowed the differences but does not appear to have had unanimous support. The Castle Ward Conservative Branch and the Hinckley Civic Society also called for a local meeting. It was apparent at the first meeting, and increasingly so at the second meeting, that there was a widespread hope that from discussion at the meetings there would emerge an improved scheme likely to be generally regarded as satisfactory. The view was clearly expressed that after so many proposals the time had come for decision.

URBAN AREA

The urban area, where most of the problems lie, can best be reviewed separately from the rural area, looking at each scheme on its merits and in the light of comments on it.

Commission's Draft Proposals

On the corrected figures for individual wards, equality of representation measured by reference to entitlement was worsened in 5 out of 10 2-member wards. In 3 of the 10 it was seriously out of line, the 1980 entitlements compared with an allocation of 2 members to each ward being:-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hollycroft | 3044 electors | 1.54 entitlement |
| Burbage | 5555 electors | 2.81 entitlement |
| Sketchley | 2702 electors | 1.37 entitlement |

Burbage with more than twice as many electors as Sketchley would have only the same number of councillors.

The Bosworth Conservative Association, the Burbage Branch Labour Party, the Burbage Ward Liberal Association and the Hinckley & Bosworth Liberal Association all had specific objections to ward boundaries, mainly on the grounds of disregard of affinity of interests and particularly in relation to Burbage and Barwell/Earl Shilton. They also criticised the inequality of representation. The Borough Council indicated that many councillors, too, deplored the disregard of affinity of interests and some preferred the Borough Council's original draft scheme. That scheme was also preferred by Hinckley & Bosworth District Labour Party and Castle Ward Conservative Branch which both rejected the Commission's draft proposals. The Earl Shilton Branch Labour Party, the Earl Shilton Conservative Association and Mr. D.G. Loxley, a resident of Earl Shilton, all protested vigorously against the destructive effect which the creation of the proposed Sunnyside ward would have on the community of Earl Shilton.

All these objections had been submitted in writing and were supported and amplified by those attending the meeting as members and representatives of the various organisations. Mr. W. Wileman, an independent elector from Earl Shilton, also appeared at the meeting to protest against the creation of Sunnyside ward.

There was no support for the Commission's draft proposals. There were, however, suggestions for specific modifications to certain ward boundaries proposed by the Commission which are dealt with in three groups, Burbage/Sketchley, De Montfort/Hollycroft/Clarendon and Barwell/Sunnyside/Earl Shilton.

Burbage/Shetchley

The Bosworth Conservative Association and the Burbage Branch Labour Party each suggested, almost identically, an alternative boundary between the two wards running north-south instead of east-west as proposed by the Commission and not affecting any other wards. The numerical affect in terms of the 1980 electorate would be:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Commission's Draft Proposals | | Suggested modification | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Electorate | Entitlement | Electorate | Entitlement |
| Burbage | 2 | 5555 | 2.81 | 4754 | 2.41 |
| Sketchley | 2 | 2702 | 1.37 | 3503 | 1.77 |
| | 4 | 8257 | 4.18 | 8257 | 4.18 |

The modifications effect an improvement, but not to a satisfactory level.

De Montfort/Hollycroft/Clarendon

The Bosworth Conservative Association suggested boundary modifications which would considerably improve the entitlement for Hollycroft ward as the 1980 electorate figures show:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Commission's Draft Proposals | | Suggested modification | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Electorate | Entitlement | Electorate | Entitlement |
| De Montfort | 2 | 4047 | 2.05 | 3919 | 1.99 |
| Hollycroft | 2 | 3044 | 1.54 | 3397 | 1.72 |
| Clarendon | 2 | 4005 | 2.03 | 3780 | 1.91 |
| | 6 | 11096 | 5.62 | 11096 | 5.62 |

Barwell/Sunnyside/Earl Shilton

The Bosworth Conservative Association noted that in places the Barwell/Sunnyside boundary follows footpaths which no longer exist. To correct this they suggested modifications which would have the following numerical effects using figures for 1980:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Commission's Draft Proposals | | Suggested modification | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Electorate | Entitlement | Electorate | Entitlement |
| Barwell | 2 | 4519 | 2.29 | 4999 | 2.53 |
| Sunnyside | 2 | 3662 | 1.85 | 3182 | 1.61 |
| | 4 | 8181 | 4.14 | 8181 | 4.14 |

The considerably worsened entitlements are unacceptable, leaving the need for a well defined boundary to be met in some other way.

Among those who objected on the grounds of affinity of interests to the proposed boundaries dividing the community of Earl Shilton, only the Earl Shilton Branch Labour Party specifically suggested an alternative. This was to leave it as it is, which is the equivalent of reverting to the Borough Council's original draft scheme. To do this would involve the transfer of 1974 electors, and with them 1 councillor, from Sunnyside to Earl Shilton. The numerical effect in 1980 figures would be:-

| Ward | Commission's Draft Proposals | | | Suggested alternative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Cllrs | Electorate | Entitlement | No. of Cllrs | Electorate | Entitlement |
| Sunnyside | 2 | 3662 | 1.86 | 1 | 1888 | 0.96 |
| Earl Shilton | 2 | 4382 | 2.22 | 3 | 6156 | 3.12 |
| | 4 | 8044 | 4.08 | 4 | 8044 | 4.08 |

This alternative in itself would be satisfactory but it has to be borne in mind that it could be affected by the alteration of Sunnyside's other boundary with Barwell to produce a well defined Area.

Thus the suggested modifications to the Commission's draft proposals, while effecting improvements in some directions, made it worse in others and failed to achieve acceptable overall levels.

The Commission's draft proposals themselves are therefore seen, after correction of electorate figures for individual urban wards, to be unsatisfactory in various instances in regard to equality of representation, or affinity of interests, or clear definition of boundary, opposed by many objectors (Conservative, Labour, Liberal and independent), supported by no-one, and not suscepticle to adequate improvement by modification despite suggestions. It is necessary therefore to turn to the other basically different schemes.

Borough Council's Revised Draft Scheme

The revised draft scheme is similar to the original draft scheme, providing (in a Council of 34 members) 6 3-member and 1 2-member wards for the urban area, excluding Stoke Golding, which is linked with Higham-on-the-Hill and Sutton Cheney in the Ambien ward. After correction of the figures for individual wards the entitlements in the original draft scheme were noticeably improved in some wards. To that extent it was not open to quote the same objections as had at first appeared to the Commission. In the light of the searching reconsideration which followed the Commission's draft proposals and the correction of electorate figures, the Borough Council sought a solution by improving on their original draft scheme and so produced their revised draft scheme.

The following table compares the two schemes numerically:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Borough Council's Draft Scheme in corrected figures for 1980 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Original | | Revised | |
| | | Electorate | Entitlement | Electorate | Entitlement |
| Barwell | 3 | 5834 | 2.89 | 5734 | 2.90 |
| Burbage | 3 | 7089 | 3.51 | 6488 | 3.29 |
| Castle | 3 | 5397 | 2.67 | 5998 | 3.04 |
| Clarendon | 3 | 6303 | 3.12 | 5991 | 3.03 |
| De Montfort | 3 | 6281 | 3.11 | 5302 | 2.69 |
| Earl Shilton | 3 | 6136 | 3.03 | 6236 | 3.16 |
| Trinity | 2 | 3491 | 1.73 | 4782 | 2.42 |
| | 20 | 40531 | 20.06 | 40531 | 20.53 |

The original draft scheme was for 33 councillors for the whole District giving an average entitlement of 2034, whereas the revised draft scheme was for 34 councillors (1 extra for Markfield parish) with an average entitlement of 1974. This, of course, explains the difference in total entitlement for the urban wards between the two schemes. In the revised scheme the entitlements for Burbage and Castle wards become satisfactory but those for De Montfort and Trinity wards are unsatisfactory.

In the course of its development the Council's scheme appears to have grown in favour, gaining support among Conservatives as well as Labour, though the Liberals have put forward their own scheme. The Borough Council clearly regard their revised draft scheme as having superseded the original. As the two schemes were so similar and there were no suggestions of reverting to the original scheme where there was, in fact, some difference, I have used the revised scheme only for further review and comparison with schemes produced by other people.

The Castle Ward Conservative Branch and the Hinckley & Bosworth District Labour Party both called for a return to the Borough Council's draft scheme. None of the comments on the Commission's draft proposals carried criticisms of the Council's draft scheme, though some favoured it. The Earl Shilton Branch Labour Party, the Earl Shilton Conservative Association and two independent residents were strongly opposed to any division of the Earl Shilton community, the integrity of which is preserved in the Council's 3-member Earl Shilton ward.

There was much discussion at the meetings, largely arising from the Liberal's proposals, on what affinity of interests there was between the part of Castle ward lying south of the railway line and Burbage ward adjoining it to the east, south and west. There were marked differences of opinion and no common view on what new ward boundaries might be desirable. I was left with the impression that most people would probably prefer to make no major change and would be satisfied with the Council's revised scheme. Similarly there was discussion on how many members it was desirable to have to a ward, with marked differences of opinion, but again I was left with the impression that most people would probably prefer 3-member wards, partly perhaps because that would maintain the status quo with which they were satisfied. So on this score, too, the Council's scheme attracted support.

Apart from the Liberals, who advocated their own alternative scheme, there were no objectors to the Council's scheme.

The defective Barwell/Sunnyside boundary, lacking proper definition on the ground, which, as mentioned above, was contained in the Commission's proposals, did not feature in the Council's scheme.

On equality of representation the scheme was satisfactory except for the wards of De Montfort and Trinity as mentioned above.

Thus in general terms and in relation to the statutory criteria of equality of representation as nearly as may be, easy identification of boundaries and affinity of interests, the Borough Council's revised draft scheme appeared satisfactory, with the exception of the level of representation in two neighbouring wards.

Councillor Russell's alternative scheme

Councillor Russell made it clear that he supported the Council's scheme, but he had put in his 10 2-member ward alternative scheme for the urban area in case the Commission "opt for a 2-member ward system as their scheme seems to indicate". I assured him that there was no disposition on the part of the Commission, or myself, to favour 2-member wards as such, nor indeed to hold them in disfavour.

His scheme is, in effect, an amendment to the Commission's draft proposals. In 7 of the wards it follows the general pattern of the Bosworth Conservative Association's suggested amendments to the draft proposals, but with variations which are significant in terms of size of electorates and hence entitlements. In the other 3 wards it provides an entirely fresh tripartite division of the Barwell/Earl Shilton area. In calculating his electorates for the 10 wards Councillor Russell has used the corrected figures for 1980 with an average electorate of 1974 producing entitlements ranging between 1.90 and 2.29. He explained that he had aimed only at equality of representation and not at ward community of interest which he considered to be largely sentimental and irrelevant in this urban area. This was not a point of view generally shared by others who had written in or appeared at the meeting, and it was obvious that there would be serious objections, particularly in the Barwell/Earl Shilton area, to his boundaries which cut through areas of affinity of interests. It did not therefore appear that his scheme could be used to achieve an acceptable improvement of the Commission's draft proposals. In his letter he and his eleven co-signatories had declared their support for the Council's scheme and offered their scheme only as a fall-back alternative, so it seemed to me that there was no point in pursuing it unless on its own merits it was superior to the Council's scheme. This was not so, as it did not suitably improve the Commission's draft proposals, which themselves were inferior to the Council's scheme.

The Liberal's Scheme

This provides in a Council of 33 members 10 wards for the urban area, including Stoke Golding, 3 with 3 members, 5 with 2 members and 2 with 1 member. Using the same corrected figures for 1980 as for the other schemes, the numerical position is:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Electorate | Entitlement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Church | 1 | 1596 | 0.78 |
| Burbage | 3 | 6831 | 3.36 |
| Sketchley | 1 | 1327 | 0.65 |
| Castle | 2 | 3520 | 1.73 |
| Clarendon | 2 | 3518 | 1.73 |
| Trinity | 2 | 4149* | 2.04 |
| De Montfort | 2 | 4920 | 2.42 |
| Hollycroft | 2 | 3719 | 1.83 |
| Barwell | 3 | 5734 | 2.82 |
| Earl Shilton | 3 | 6236 | 3.07 |
| | 21 | 41550* | 20.43 |

*includes 1019 in Stoke Golding

In presenting their scheme, the Liberals explained that they had found it difficult to be certain, particularly in the centre of the urban area, exactly where affinity of interests lay. They had tried to follow affinity where they could, but in some places ward boundaries had inevitably to be arbitrary. In Barwell and Earl Shilton they supported local feeling that the two communities should be individually represented and made each a 3-member ward. Burbage was particularly difficult. While some might consider that the community of the existing Castle ward extended continuously into thepart lying south of the railway line, the Liberals regarded that southern part as more closely linked with Burbage. They preferred the practical boundariesof the railway line and the two main roads running south, thus dividing the whole of the area south of the railway line (i.e. existing Burbage and part Castle) into 3 wards - from west to east, Sketchley, Burbage and Church. They would concede that it might be better to amend their proposed Burbage/Church boundary by transferring an area immediately to the west of Church Street from Burbage ward to Church ward to keep the old village of Burbage together, and at the same time improve the numerical balance, though this would be contrary to their principle of having natural boundaries for recognisable communities. They indicated a possible area south of Foresters Road around the Recreation Ground but did not define a precise area or give figures.

The Borough Council objected that the Liberals scheme involved unacceptable departures from numerical equality of representation and cautioned that postal addresses should not be taken as a reliable indicator of affinity. A Borough Councillor from the urban area objected to the creation of the proposed Holly croft and Clarendon wards. He thought it would be unwise to make a separate ward out of a completely new estate which would be better mixed with older residential areas. Another Borough Councillor said that, whilst admitting that ward boundaries were difficult to draw and easy to criticise, he found the Liberal scheme quite unacceptable in some respects, particularly in regard to inequality of representation.

A resident of Stoke Golding objected to its proposed inclusion in the Liberals' urban Trinity ward. As a growing community on its own, separated from Hinckley by milesof fields, he thought it should be part of Ambien ward with Sutton Cheney and Higham-on-the-Hill, as proposed by the Borough Council. Sutton Cheney Parish Council, on the other hand, thought that Stoke Golding should be excluded from Ambien ward on the grounds that the population of Ambien ward with Stoke Golding would be too great for representation by one Councillor only and that the comparatively urban area of Stoke Golding might dominate the election of candidates for the ward. Two Borough Councillors spoke in favour of the inclusion of Stoke Golding in Ambien ward and against the Liberal scheme, one of them denying that there was any invidious distinction in practice between the different parts of Ambien ward.

Apart from Sutton Cheney Parish Council's objection, which wasmade in relation to the Commission's draft proposals but might be regarded as having some common ground with the Liberals' scheme, no support was given to the Liberals' scheme. Several of those who opposed it specifically supported the Borough Council's revised draft scheme.

It appeared to me that in the urban area as a whole the Liberals' scheme had not achieved any better balance in relation to affinity of interests than the Borough Council's scheme and in some respects might notbe as good. On equality of representation its disparities of entitlement were unsatisfactory in several cases and appreciably worse overall than in the Borough Council's scheme. Nor did they lend themselves to correction, except perhaps in Burbage and Church wards.

The objection by Sutton Cheney Parish Council that Ambien ward has too great a population for 1 member, with the inference thatit should be altered, does not offer a feasible alternative. It is, of course, not size of population but size of electorate that has to be taken into account, and on that score Ambien, as proposed by the Borough Council, is very satisfactory. Stoke Golding could not stand by itself, nor could the Liberals' Trinity ward do without it. The figures are:-

| Ambien ward (1 member) | Electorate | | Entitlement | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sutton Cheney | 405 ) | 1022 | 0.2 ) | 0.5 |
| Higham-on-the-Hill | 617 ) | | 0.3 ) | |
| Stoke Golding | 1019 | | 0.5 | |
| | 2041 | | 1.0 | |
| Trinity ward (2 members) | 4149 | | 2.04 | |
| less Stoke Golding | 1019 | | 0.50 | |
| | 3130 | | 1.54 | |

At the first meeting, before the corrected figures were available for the Liberals' scheme, it was challenged for producing urban weighting. On the corrected figures provided for the second meeting, and excluding Stoke Golding (1019 electors and ½ member) from the Liberals' urban area for comparison with the Borough Council's scheme, the Liberals give the urban area 20.5 members in a Council of 33 on an entitlement of 19.93, an insignificant urban weighting. The Borough Council's scheme gives the same area 20 members in a Council of 34 on an entitlement of 20.53, a similarly insignificant weighting in the opposite direction. It would be difficult to devise a scheme which was satisfactory in all other respects for a relatively small Council and which gave a closer urban/rural balance. The small imbalance invalidates neither scheme and favours neither scheme in the choice between the two.

Towards the end of the second meeting there emerged an appreciation that the Borough Council's revised scheme for the urban area was, all in all, despite certain defects, the best scheme which had been put up. I therefore invited the meeting to consider whether there was any way of remedying those defects, which related to the unsatisfactory entitlements of De Montfort and Trinity wards. These have been mentioned above and are set out again below:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Electorate | Entitlement |
|---|---|---|---|
| De Montfort | 3 | 5302 | 2.69 |
| Trinity | 2 | 4782 | 2.42 |
| | 5 | 10084 | 5.11 |

The outcome was a recognition that the over-entitlement of one and the under-entitlement of the other, which almost balanced each other, could both be remedied by moving their common boundary a little to the west. The York Road/Teign Bank area was indicated as containing an appropriate electorate for transfer from Trinity ward to De Montfort ward. I enquired closely as to whether any local ties would be broken by this change of boundary, and was assured by several people present, including representatives of different political parties who knew the locality, that there would not be.

The exact electorate of the area has since been ascertained as 638. The numerical effect of the transfer would be entirely satisfactory, as may be seen:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | Electorate | Entitlement |
|---|---|---|---|
| De Montfort (enlarged) | 3 | 5940 | 3.01 |
| Trinity (reduced) | 2 | 4144 | 2.10 |
| | 5 | 10084 | 5.11 |

This alteration to the boundary and the area involved are described in Appendix C.

RURAL AREA

In their revised draft scheme the Borough Council adopted the Commission's draft proposals for the rural area, except for the name of Ferrers All Saints ward, and so, subject to that exception, were fully in support of the Commission's draft proposals. They did not suggest any variation or alternative for consideration. Councillor Russell's alternative urban scheme did not concern the rural area. The only other alternative scheme to consider was the Liberal's. Ambien ward, with its two rural parishes and a detached part of the Hinckley urban area, has already been discussed earlier in my report.

The Commission's draft proposals provided for 3 2-member wards (1 combining 2 parishes) and 8 1-member wards (1 combining 2 parishes and 3 combining 3). The Liberals' scheme provided for 2 3-member wards (1 combining 2 parishes and 1 combining 3), 1 2-member ward (combining 3 parishes) and 4 1-member wards (1 combining 2 parishes and 3 combining 3).

Apart from the naming of wards, no-one other than the Liberals objected to the Commission's draft proposals. The Liberals' scheme was strongly opposed by the Borough Council on the grounds that it divided parishes which had been together for various purposes for some years, seemed to make some changes for the sake of change, and produced some large groupings of parishes which might result in all members coming from the major village in the group to the disadvantage of the smaller villages. Others who spoke at the meeting as individuals supported the Borough Council's criticisms, one adding that the grouping of villages was arbitary, another that some of the wards were extended to unmanageable proportions for the councillors servicing them. Groby Parish Council wrote objecting to being linked with Ratby or any other parish and this view was endorsed from Ratby's point of view by Ratby Conservative Association. Markfield Parish Council and Markfield & Stanton Conservative Branch each wrote very emphatically making similar objections to those quoted above and forthrightly questioning the capacity and experience of the Liberals to deal with problems of rural warding. Sheepy Parish Council wrote to say that Sheepy and Witherley Parishes both strongly opposed any change, such as was suggested by the Liberals, to the Sheepy and Witherley ward. No-one supported the Liberals' scheme.

It appeared to me that the Commission's draft proposals preserved established links between parishes whereas the Liberals' scheme severed some of them. Moreover, the Liberals' scheme, by putting all 19 parishes into combined wards, militated against the much valued individual parish representation which was better preserved in the Commission's draft proposals with 6 1-parish wards.

As for equality of representation, the Commission's draft proposals contain two unsatisfactory entitlements:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | 1980 Electorate | Entitlement | (per member) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Desford & Peckleton | 2 | 3275 | 1.66 | (0.83) |
| Gopsall | 1 | 1096 | 0.56 | (0.56) |

The other entitlements range from 0.71 to 1.27 for 1-member wards and from 1.73 to 2.25 for the 2-member wards.

The Liberals' scheme also contains two unsatisfactory entitlements:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | 1980 Electorate | Entitlement | (per member) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Markfield, Bagworth & Desford | 3 | 7318 | 3.598 | (1.20) |
| Groby & Ratby | 3 | 6906 | 3.395 | (1.13) |

The other entitlements are 1.735 for the 2-member ward and between 0.962 and 1.035 for the 1-member wards.

Calculated as entitlements per member in each of the four wards set out above, they look satisfactory except for Gopsall. This calculation cannot, however, be allowed to mask the fact that no entitlement is acceptable if it is nearer to the next whole number of members above or below the number of members actually allocated, as is Markfield, Bagworth & Desford. But it cannot be remedied by increasing the number of members, since a 4-member ward does not comply with the Commission's published guidelines. A partial improvement might be to divide the ward into two, as follows:-

| Ward | No. of Cllrs | 1980 Electorate | Entitlement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Markfield & Bagworth | 2 | 4832 | 2.37 |
| Desford | 1 | 2486 | 1.22 |
| | 3 | 7318 | 3.59 |

but the entitlement of the 2-member ward would be less than satisfactory.

There would still remain the difficulty over Stoke Golding. If the best scheme for the uran area, i.e. the Borough Council's revised draft scheme, is to be used, Stoke Golding would be linked with the rural area and this would not fit in with the Liberals' scheme for the rural area which excludes Stoke Golding. Because the arithmetic of each scheme depends on its own treatment of Stoke Golding, it does not seem possible to reconcile the two schemes.

The Commission's draft proposals for the rural area can, however, be used alongside the Borough Council's revised draft scheme for the urban area as they both treat Stoke Golding in the same way.

Thus on grounds of affinity, more individual representation of individual parishes, local support and compatibility with the best scheme for the urban area, the Commission's draft proposals are to be preferred, in my view, to the Liberals' scheme. On equality of representation, the Liberals' scheme has an unacceptaole defect in Markfield, Bagworth & Desford ward which, as already discussed, cannot be remedied. The Commission's draft proposals have a defect, albeit less serious, in Gopsall ward. There is no room for manoeuvre to devise a remedy without repercussions which would produce a domino effect throughout the District. This would, in effect, mean trying to design a whole alternative new scheme and none such has been suggested or seems possible. Therefore it seems to me that in the particular circumstances of this rural area this obviously generous representation must be accepted as inevitable.

Ward Names

"Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston" is the name of the existing ward comprised of those three villages. The Commission in their draft proposals renamed the ward "Ferrers All Saints", as had the Borough Council in their original draft scheme. All three Parish Councils objected and asked for the existing name to be kept. The Borough Council accepted their views and reverted to the existing name in their revised draft scheme. The objections to the name "Ferrers All Saints" were that it would be geographically unidentifiable to people living outside the area, it would cause the parishes to lose their individual identities, and it was inappropriate, Ferrers being a family name no longer associated with the locality and All Saints being the church of Nailstone, the smallest of the three villages. Although it is the aim of the Commission to avoid unwieldy composite names, they have already included the tripartite name of Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth in their draft proposals, and it would seem to me only reasonable to do so in this case, too, to meet unanimous local wishes.

The parishes of Twycross and Shackerstone are combined by the Commission in a single ward, as now. The Commission have adopted the ward name of "Gopsall", as in the Borough Council's draft scheme. Twycross Parish Council asked for it to be renamed "Twycross" after their village, the bigger of the two, though they would have no objection to the addition of "Shackerstone" to the name. They explained that "Gopsall" was no longer appropriate, being the name of the former Hall, now demolished, and Park, now divided into two farms. The Borough Council did not object to the suggested change, which seems to me entirely reasonable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that:-

1. For the urban area excluding Stoke Golding there should be substituted for the Commission's draft proposals the Borough Council's revised draft scheme sent to the Commission on 20 October 1977, subject to the transfer from Trinity ward to De Montfort ward of an area in the York Road/Teign Bank locality as described earlier and more particularly defined in Appendix C.

2. For the rural area including Stoke Golding the Commission should adhere to their own draft proposals subject to the renaming of "Ferrers All Saints" ward as "Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston" and of "Gopsall" ward as "Twycross and Shackerstone".

APPENDIX A

THE BOROUGH COUNCIL OF HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH

LOCAL MEETING - REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

26th JANUARY 1978 - ATTENDANCE LIST

| Signature | Name of body represented |
|---|---|
| L.J. Hamlet | Twycross Parish Council |
| T.W. Lucas | Barwell |
| M.Smith (Mrs) | Hinckley Civic Society; Hon. Sec., P.G.F. Lancaster, 'Rosewood', Sketchley Lane, Burbage, Leics. |
| J. Baker, 13 Station Road | Hinckley Borough Council (Castle Ward) |
| W. B. Blackwell, 28 Trinity Vicarage Rd, Hinckley. | Hinckley Borough Council (Clarendon Ward) |
| F.N. Warmleighton | Earl Shilton. 216 Hinckley Road. |
| D.G. Loxley | 54 Stoneycroft Road, Earl Shilton. |
| H. Woodley | Hinckley & Bosworth B.C. 10 Roseway, Stoke Golding. |
| Jean Massey | Hinckley & Bosworth B.C. 7 Laburnum Drive, Earl Shilton. |
| E.J.A. Cotton | Earl Shilton - 'Barracca', Earl Shilton. |
| C. Marvin | Earl Shilton - 12 High Street. |
| Alfred Cobley | 174 Hinckley Road, Earl Shilton. |
| S. Fell | Hinckley - 53 Duport Road. |
| D. Fell | Hinckley - 53 Duport Road |
| B. Palmer,3 Derby Rd., Hinckley. | Hinckley & Bosworth Liberal Association. |
| David W Inman, 8 Seaton Close, Burbage. | Burbage Liberal Association. |
| T.E. Brown, 57, Leicester Road, Hinckley. | Bosworth Constituency (Liberal). |
| J. Ward | Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield. |
| P.A. Jacques | North West Leics. D.C. |
| D. Brackenbury | North West Leics. D.C. |
| M.S. Russell | Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Councillor (Barwell) |
| Frances Hitchcock | Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Cl.(Barlestone) |

| Signature | Name of body represented |
|---|---|
| W. Wileman | 40, Stoneycroft Road, Earl Shilton. |
| G.S. Morrell | Hinckley & Bosworth Council. |
| J. Royce | Hinckley & Bosworth Council. |
| A.C. Davenport | 22, Trafford Road, Hinckley. |
| Colin Pemberton | Leicester Mercury. |

APPENDIX B

THE BOROUGH COUNCIL OF HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH

LOCAL MEETING - REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

8th DECEMBER 1978 - ATTENDANCE LIST

| Signature | Address | Name of body represented |
|---|---|---|
| M. S. Russell | 130 Kirkby Road,Barwell | Councillor |
| J.N. Brand | 21 Hazel Way, Barwell | Councillor |
| A. Blackwell | 28 Trinity Vicarage Rd., Hinckley | Councillor |
| D Parker | 3 Derby Road,Hinckley | H & B Liberal Association |
| John S White | Council Offices,Coalville | Observer only |
| G S Morrell | Copton Ash Farmhouse, Twycross. | H & B Councillor |
| J W Lord | 37 Station Road, Stoke Golding. | |
| D W Inman | 58 Azalea Drive,Burbage | Burbage & Hinckley Liberal Association |

Description of the amended section recommended by the Assistant Commissioner in the boundary between the De Montfort and Trinity wards as proposed in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's revised draft scheme sent to the Commission on 20 October 1977.

---

From the point where the boundary between De Montfort and Trinity wards strikes Middlefield Lane and turns south along Middlefield Lane, thence across Middlefield Lane and along the roadway running south-westwards to the boundary of Richmond Park thence along the north-east and south-east boundaries of Richmond Park to Richmond Road thence south-eastwards along Richmond Road to Tudor Road, thence north-eastwards along Tudor Road to Teign Bank Road thence south-eastwards along Teign Bank Road to its junction with Factory Road.

---

The amended boundary thus described and shown in red on the attached MAP A to be in substitution for that section of the proposed boundary which runs between the commencing and terminating points of the amended section of boundary.

---

The area involved and its electorate is set out on the back of the attached MAP A.

SCHEDULE 2

BOROUGH OF HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH :

NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

| NAME OF WARD | NO OF COUNCILLORS |
|---|---|
| Ambien | 1 |
| Bagworth | 1 |
| Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston | 1 |
| Barwell | 3 |
| Burbage | 3 |
| Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth | 1 |
| Castle | 3 |
| Clarendon | 3 |
| De Montfort | 3 |
| Desford and Peckleton | 2 |
| Earl Shilton | 3 |
| Groby | 2 |
| Markfield | 2 |
| Newbold Verdon | 1 |
| Ratby | 1 |
| Sheepy and Witherley | 1 |
| Trinity | 2 |
| Twycross and Shackerstone | 1 |

The proposed ward boundaries are shown on a map which can be inspected at the Council's offices. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards as defined on the map is attached at Schedule 3.

BOROUGH OF HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

BURBAGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of the Borough meets the Ashby de la Zouch Canal, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said canal to the Nuneaton-Leicester railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to Rugby Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of the property known as Sketchley Hill House, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary to and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of said property to the access road that leads to Hill Farm, thence northeastwards along said access road to the footpath that leads to Lucas Road, thence northwestwards along said footpath to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 46 Lucas Road, thence northeastwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 48-70 Lucas Road, to the rear boundary of No 48 Featherston Drive, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and southeastwards and eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 50-126 Featherston Drive, crossing Boyslade Road to and continuing northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 128-136 Featherston Drive, the rear boundaries of Nos 99-91 Forresters Road to the western boundary of No 89 Forresters Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 4-8 Forresters Close to the southern boundary of No 8 Forresters Close, thence northeastwards along said boundary, the southern end of Forresters Close and the southern boundary of No 7 Forresters Close to the rear boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along said rear boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 5 and 3 Forresters Close and the eastern boundary of No 81 Forresters Drive to the rear boundary of No 79 Forresters Drive, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 77-35 Forresters Drive to the road known as Sunnyhill South, thence northwards along said road to Forresters Road, thence eastwards and northeastwards along said road to Hinckley Road, thence

northwards along said road to Sapcote Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point due south of the fence being an extension of the rear boundaries of the properties known as En-Fin, Stepping Stones and Farthings, thence northwards to said fence, thence northwestwards along said fence and the aforementioned rear boundaries of said properties to the northernmost point of the property known as Farthings, thence northeastwards in a straight line to the southwestern corner of parcel No 1763 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm SP 4493 (A) Publication of 1964, thence northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of said parcel to and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said parcel and in prolongation thereof to the southeastern boundary of parcel No 1775, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said parcel to and southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of said parcel to the southwestern boundary of parcel No 0092, thence northwestwards along said field boundary to the Nuneaton-Leicester railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said borough boundary to and northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

CLARENDON WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Burbage Ward meets the southwestern boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said Borough boundary to the eastern boundary of Higham on the Hill CP, thence northeastwards along said CP boundary to the footpath that leads from Ashby de la Zouch Canal to north of the properties Nos 163-157 Outlands Drive, thence eastwards and southeastwards along said footpath to a point in prolongation northwards of Clifton Way, thence southwards along said prolongation to and continuing southwards and southeastwards along said way to Roston Drive, thence eastwards along said drive to Oatlands Drive, thence northeastwards and northwards along said drive to Lismore Drive, thence northeastwards along said drive to the road known as Hollycroft,

thence southeastwards along said road to and southwards along Lower Bond Street, thence southwards along the road known as The Borough and southwestwards along Regent Street, and southwestwards and southeastwards along Rugby Road to the northern boundary of Burbage Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to and southeastwards and southwestwards along the western boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

CASTLE WARD

Commencing at the point on the eastern boundary of Clarendon Ward where it meets the road known as Stockwell Head, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said road to the road known as New Buildings, thence northeastwards along said road to Leicester Road, thence eastwards along said road to Spa Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to London Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the Nuneaton-Leicester Railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Burbage Ward, thence southwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to and northwestwards and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of Clarendon Ward to the point of commencement.

TRINITY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Clarendon Ward meets the eastern boundary of Higham on the Hill CP, thence generally northwards along said CP boundary to the track leading to Wykin Lane, at NG Reference SP 4008195976, thence northeastwards along said track to said lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the path between Wykin Lane and Stoke Road at NG Reference SP 4068695830, thence northeastwards along said path, crossing Stoke Road, and continuing generally northeastwards along Rogue's Lane to the unnamed stream forming the eastern boundary of Rogue's Lane Nurseries, thence southeastwards along said stream to the southeastern boundary of Parcel No 3863 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm SP 4295 (A), Publication of 1965, thence southwestwards along said southeastern boundary, crossing Middlefield Lane in a straight line, to and southwestwards along

the southeastern boundary of Parcel No 2249 to the southwestern boundary of Parcel No 3130, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Richmond Park, thence southwestwards along said boundary to Richmond Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Tudor Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Teign Bank Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Factory Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the northern boundary of Clarendon Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

DE MONTFORT WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Castle Ward meets the northern boundary of Calrendon Ward, thence northwestwards along the northern boundary of Clarendon Ward to the eastern boundary of Trinity Ward, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to Rogue's Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of Parcel No 1540, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm SP 4396 (A1), publication of January 1978, thence northeastwards to and along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of Parcel No 3236 to the southwestern boundary of the Allotment Gardens, thence southwestwards along said southwestern boundary to the southernmost point of said gardens, thence southeastwards in a straight line from said point to the northwestern corner of the enclosure situated to the north of the Electricity Sub Station, thence southeastwards along the western boundary of said enclosure and continuing southeastwards along the western boundary of Parcel No 5422 to the western boundary of the Allotment Gardens, thence southwestwards along said western boundary to and southwards and eastwards along the western and southern boundaries of the Pond to and eastwards and northwards along southern and eastern boundaries of the Allotment Gardens to the southern boundary of Parcel No 6322, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the western boundary of Parcel No 7220, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said western boundary and the southern boundary of said parcel, and continuing eastwards along the southern boundary of

Parcel No 7717, the rear boundaries of No's 13-5 Powers Road, the southern boundary of No 24 St Mary's Avenue, the southern end of St Mary's Avenue, the southern boundary of No 51 St Mary's Avenue and in prolongation thereof to the footpath leading from the west of No 6 Waterfall Way to Barwell Lane (Grass Road), thence southwards along said footpath to Barwell Lane, thence eastwards along said lane to the track leading to Leicester Road, thence southeastwards along said track to Leicester Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the unnamed road leading to the property known as Lynden Lea, thence southeastwards along said road to the unnamed stream forming the northwestern boundary of Burbage Common (Golf Course), thence northeastwards along said stream to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of Burbage Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to and southwestwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along the northern boundary of Castle Ward to the point of commencement.

BARWELL WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of De Montfort Ward meets the unnamed stream north of Rogue's Lane Nurseries, thence northwestwards along said stream to the southern boundary of Sutton Cheney CP, thence eastwards along said CP boundary and eastwards, northeastwards and eastwards along the southern boundary of Peckleton CP to the unnamed stream flowing from the rear of No 53 Moore Road to the parish boundary, thence southwards, southwestwards and southwards along said stream to the footpath leading to Heath Lane and running adjacent to the southern boundary of Parcel No 2264, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm SP 4597 (B1) publication of 1978, thence northeastwards along said footpath to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property known as The Notheys, thence southwards to and along said eastern boundary to and continuing southwards along the eastern boundary of St Newlands Primary School, crossing Moore Road to the rear boundary of No 73 Belle Vue Road, thence southwards along said rear boundary and southwards and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 71-3

Belle Vue Road and southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of No 228 Hinckley Road to Hinckley Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point being the prolongation northwestwards of Elmesthorpe Lane, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and said lane to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of Parcel No 6666, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm SP 4596 (A) publication of 1972, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of De Montfort Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

EARL SHILTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Barwell Ward meets the southern boundary of Peckleton CP, thence eastwards along said CP boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards, southeastwards and generally southwestwards along said Borough boundary to the eastern boundary of Barwell Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

AMBIEN WARD

The parishes of Higham on the Hill

Sutton Cheney

and that area bounded by a line commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Sutton Cheney CP meets the western boundary of Barwell Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the northwestern boundary of Trinity Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Higham on the Hill CP, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said CP boundary to the southern boundary of Sutton Cheney CP, thence eastwards along said CP boundary to the point of commencement.

BAGWORTH WARD

The parish of Bagworth

BARLESTONE, NAILSTONE AND OSBASTON WARD

The parishes of Barlestone
Nailstone
Osbaston

CADEBY, CARLTON AND MARKET BOSWORTH WARD

The parishes of Cadeby
Carlton
Market Bosworth

DESFORD AND PECKLETON WARD

The parishes of Desford
Peckleton

GROBY WARD

The parish of Groby

MARKFIELD WARD

The parish of Markfield

NEWBOLD VERDON WARD

The parish of Newbold Verdon

RATBY WARD

The parish of Ratby

SHEEPY AND WITHERLEY WARD

The parishes of Sheepy
Witherley

TWYCROSS AND SHACKERSTONE WARD

The parishes of Twycross
Shackerstone

SCHEDULE 4

BOROUGH OF HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH

Elections by thirds

Order of retirement and Parish Elections

PE = Parish Elections

| NAME OF WARD | NO.OF COUNCILLORS REPRESENTING WARD | ORDER OF RETIREMENT | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1ST YEAR | 2ND YEAR | 3RD YEAR |
| Ambien | 1 | - | - | 1 PE |
| Bagworth | 1 | - | - | 1 PE |
| Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston | 1 | - | 1 PE | - |
| Barwell | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Burbage | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth | 1 | 1 PE | - | - |
| Castle | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Clarendon | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| De Montfort | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Desford and Peckleton | 2 | - | 1 | 1 PE |
| Earl Shilton | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Groby | 2 | 1 | - | 1 PE |
| Markfield | 2 | - | 1 | 1 PE |
| Newbold Verdon | 1 | 1 PE | - | - |
| Ratby | 1 | - | 1 PE | - |
| Sheepy and Witherley | 1 | - | 1 PE | - |
| Trinity | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Twycross and Shackerstone | 1 | 1 PE | - | - |
| | 34 | 11 | 12 | 11 |