

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	6
Final recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	8
Blaby District	9
Charnwood Borough	11
Harborough District	15
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough	17
Melton Borough	20
North West Leicestershire District	21
Oadby & Wigston Borough	25
Conclusions	27
Parish electoral arrangements	27
3 What happens next?	29
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council	30
B Submissions received	36
C Glossary and abbreviations	38

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Leicestershire?

We have conducted an electoral review of Leicestershire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in the county. Overall, 33% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. Loughborough South division currently has 20% fewer electors than the average for Leicestershire. Leicestershire County Council also recognised this level of electoral imbalance and asked us to address it by conducting a review.

Our proposals for Leicestershire

Leicestershire County Council currently has 55 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that maintaining the council size of 55 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

As Leicestershire County Council is elected at whole-council elections, the Commission may produce a pattern of mixed divisions. Our final recommendations propose that the Council's 55 councillors should represent 51 single-member and two two-member divisions. Five of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Leicestershire by 2021.

We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Leicestershire.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review was conducted following our decision to review Leicestershire County Council's ('the Council's') electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation, firstly on division patterns for the Council and secondly on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

5 This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 April 2015	Council size decision
12 May 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for division patterns to LGBCE
22 July 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
17 November 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
12 January 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
5 April 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

9 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

10 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2015	2021
Electorate of Leicestershire County Council	520,616	549,129
Number of councillors	55	55
Average number of electors per councillor	9,466	9,984

11 Under our final recommendations, five of our proposed 53 divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2021; this is more divisions with variances greater than 10% than we would normally recommend. However, we consider that our recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria and reflect the evidence received. Overall, we consider that we have achieved satisfactory levels of electoral fairness for Leicestershire.

12 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

13 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Leicestershire. Furthermore, they cannot change the boundaries of district council areas or their wards. The recommendations of electoral reviews do not result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Submissions received

14 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

15 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our draft recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling districts and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5.5% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by new housing developments in Blaby, Harborough and North West Leicestershire.

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

Council size

17 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to us to retain the existing council size of 55 members. This was the only proposal made to us in relation to council size.

18 We carefully considered the Council's submission. We consider that its proposal for a council size of 55 members is supported by evidence to justify maintaining the existing council size. We are content that the Council has sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under this council size and ensure effective representation of local residents.

19 We therefore invited proposals on electoral arrangements for Leicestershire based on a council size of 55 members. In response to that consultation, we received no proposals for a different number of councillors. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 55 elected members. We received no comment on council size in response to our consultation on draft recommendations. There being no further evidence on council size for us to consider, we confirm as our final recommendation that Leicestershire County Council should have 55 members.

20 A council size of 55 provides the following allocation between the districts and boroughs in the county – in brackets are the levels of coterminosity we have achieved under the final recommendations:

- Blaby District – eight councillors (83%)
- Charnwood Borough – 14 councillors (71%)
- Harborough District – seven councillors (84%)
- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough – nine councillors (50%)
- Melton Borough – four councillors (88%)
- North West Leicestershire District – eight councillors (89%)
- Oadby & Wigston Borough – five councillors (70%)

Division patterns

21 During consultation on division patterns, we received 63 submissions, including three county-wide proposals. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county or supported the Council's proposal.

22 The Council's proposal provided for an arrangement of one two-member division and 53 single-member divisions for the county. The Council's Labour Group proposed a similar scheme, differing from the Council's proposal in respect of boundaries in the Melton and Coalville areas. The Council's Liberal Democrat Group also supported much of the County Council's proposal, but took a different view in Oadby.

23 We received representations from a number of individual county councillors in support of the Council's scheme, and one on behalf of two councillors in support of the Liberal Democrat group's variation on the Council's scheme.

24 We received further submissions which proposed a pattern of electoral divisions in Harborough and single-member divisions in Oadby divided by the A6.

Draft recommendations

25 Having carefully considered all the proposals received, we were of the view that the Council's proposed patterns of divisions resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. However, we considered that other locally produced proposals for particular parts of the county also had merit. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a combination of proposals but, having visited the county, recommended modifications to those proposals in some areas in order to improve electoral equality and to maintain local ties.

26 Our draft recommendations were for 51 single-member and two two-member divisions. Whilst we acknowledged that our recommended Shepshed division would have a relatively high number of electors for a single-member division when compared with the remainder of the county, we considered that our draft recommendations would generally provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we had received such evidence.

27 We received 127 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. The draft recommendations attracting the largest number of representations were for the south-east part of Charnwood borough and included petitions bearing a total of 157 signatures objecting to our proposals for Syston. We also received a number of responses in relation to our proposals for divisions in Oadby & Wigston borough.

28 We have considered carefully all of the responses to our draft recommendations, and our final recommendations do include some changes. However, whilst some respondents suggested electoral divisions which would cross district council boundaries and others suggested that we disregard electoral equality, we are prevented by law from approaches to making such recommendations.

Final recommendations

Blaby

29 There will be eight county councillors for Blaby. Our draft recommendations were for six single-member divisions and a two-member division. We received objections regarding our divisions for Glenfield and Croft. Having considered the evidence received, we do not consider that persuasive evidence was received to modify our draft recommendation in these areas. We are confirming, as final, our recommendations for Blaby.

Charnwood

30 There will be 14 county councillors for Charnwood. Our draft recommendations were for 14 single-member divisions. Those for south-east Charnwood, and in particular the proposed subdivision of Syston parish, attracted the greatest level of opposition. The impact which our draft recommendations would have on Barkby and Barkby Thorpe, Mountsorrel and Sileby parishes also attracted objections. In other areas of the district, our proposals for Charnwood attracted some support. We have been persuaded by evidence put to us to make changes to our proposed Thurmaston Ridgemere and Syston Ridgeway divisions; consequently, we have also made changes to our Sileby & The Wolds and Syston Fosse divisions which reflect the evidence received.

Harborough

31 There will be seven county councillors for Harborough. Our draft recommendations were for single-member divisions. The District Council supported the draft recommendations. We received objections to the inclusion of East, Thorpe and West Langton parishes in the Market Harborough East division and the inclusion of Tugby & Keythorpe parish in Gartree. Having considered the evidence received, we do not consider that the alternative division patterns proposed would result in a pattern of divisions that provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. Therefore, we are confirming as final our recommendations for Harborough.

Hinckley & Bosworth

32 There will be nine county councillors for Hinckley & Bosworth. Our draft recommendations were for single-member divisions. Whilst most responses about the borough supported the draft recommendations, we did receive objections to the inclusion of part of Burbage parish in a St Marys division, with part of Hinckley town. Alternative division names for Hinckley were proposed. However, we consider it inappropriate to rename our proposed St Marys division Hinckley Central, as it also contains part of Burbage parish. Additionally, respondents commented that Burbage parish has an identity separate to that of Hinckley's town centre. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for Hinckley & Bosworth as final including the division names of De Montfort and Hollycroft.

Melton

33 There will be four county councillors for Melton. Our draft recommendations were for four single-member divisions. We received three submissions that commented on our proposals in this part of the county. Whilst all representations support the boundaries proposed, the Borough Council suggested that our Asfordby division be named Melton Wolds in order to reflect the extent of the division. We have decided to include this alternative division name as part of our final recommendations.

North West Leicestershire

34 There will be eight county councillors for North West Leicestershire. Our draft recommendations were for eight single-member divisions. The draft recommendations for Coalville received broad support, whilst we received both support and opposition to our proposals for Ashby de la Zouch. In light of the evidence received, we have accepted one suggestion regarding Ravenstone with Snibston parish in formulating our final recommendations. Elsewhere across the district, we confirm our recommendations for North West Leicestershire as final.

Oadby & Wigston

35 There will be five county councillors for Oadby & Wigston. Our draft recommendations were for three single-member divisions and one two-member division which included parts of both Oadby and Wigston towns. Our draft recommendations for the borough received substantial opposition which was accompanied by evidence relating to community identities. We are, in the light of that evidence, recommending division boundaries which maintain the distinction between Oadby and Wigston towns as reflected in the pattern of borough ward boundaries.

36 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table 1 (on page 27) and on the large map accompanying this report.

Detailed divisions

37 The tables on pages 9–26 detail our final recommendations for each area of Leicestershire. They detail how the proposed divisions reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Blaby District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Blaby & Glen Parva	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Blaby and Glen Parva.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Braunstone	1	1%	This division comprises all of the parish of Braunstone except that part bounded to the north by Lubbesthorpe Brook and to the east by Lubbesthorpe Way.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Cosby & Countesthorpe	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Cosby, Countesthorpe, Kilby and the southern part of Whetstone parish.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Enderby & Lubbesthorpe	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Enderby and Lubbesthorpe and that part of Braunstone parish bounded to the north by Lubbesthorpe Brook and to the east by Lubbesthorpe Way.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe & Leicester Forests	2	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe, Leicester Forest East, Leicester Forest West and Thurlaston.	The District Council acknowledged our reasoning for the creation of a two-member division. However, we received objections to it, with some respondents preferring to have single-member divisions covering this area. When we formulated our draft recommendations we had

				endeavoured to identify a pattern of single-member divisions which would result in the reflection of community identities and have an acceptable level of electoral equality. We were unable to identify single-member divisions which would achieve the necessary balance of the statutory criteria. We do not consider that alternatives proposed would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. We consider that including all of these parishes together would not break local ties and that it would also have clear boundaries and a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Narborough & Whetstone	1	7%	This division comprises the parish of Narborough together with the northern part of Whetstone parish.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Stoney Stanton & Croft	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Aston Flamville, Croft, Elmesthorpe, Huncote, Potters Marston, Sapcote, Sharnford, Stoney Stanton and Wigston Parva.	We received an objection to the inclusion of Croft parish in this division, citing the relationships that the parish has with Broughton Astley, Cosby and Narborough. We cannot, however, recommend divisions which would cross district boundaries as the respondent proposed. The division as recommended has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

Charnwood Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Birstall	1	9%	This division comprises the parish of Birstall.	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Bradgate	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Anstey, Newtown Linford, Swithland, Thurcaston & Cropston, Ulverscroft and Woodhouse.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Loughborough East	1	-3%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Hastings and Loughborough Lemyngton.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Loughborough North	1	3%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Dishley & Hathern and Loughborough Storer.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Loughborough North West	1	1%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Ashby and Loughborough Garendon.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Loughborough South	1	7%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good

			Southfields and that part of Loughborough Shelthorpe ward lying to the east of, and including, the Shelthorpe Golf Course.	level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Loughborough South West	1	8%	This division comprises the Charnwood Borough Council wards of Loughborough Nanpantan and Loughborough Outwoods, together with that part of Loughborough Shelthorpe ward lying to the west of the golf course.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Quorn & Barrow	1	6%	This division comprises the parishes of Barrow upon Soar and Quorndon together with that part of the parish of Mountsorrel which lies to the west of Bond Lane and the minerals conveyer.	We received an objection to the inclusion of the Mountsorrel North End area in this division. However, not including this area in the Quorn & Barrow division would result in neighbouring divisions having poor levels of electoral equality. We do not consider that the alternative proposal would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria and consider that persuasive evidence of community identity was not received to support the high levels of electoral imbalance. Our recommended division has clear boundaries whilst maintaining a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Rothley & Mountsorrel	1	5%	This division comprises the parish of Rothley together with that part of the parish of Mountsorrel which lies to the east of Bond Lane and the minerals conveyer.	We received an objection to the exclusion of the Mountsorrel North End area from this division. As discussed in the Quorn & Barrow section above we do not consider that persuasive evidence was received to modify our draft recommendations. Our recommended division has clear boundaries whilst maintaining a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

Shepshed	1	14%	This division comprises the parish of Shepshed.	We received one suggestion that Shepshed be combined with part of the neighbouring district council area of North West Leicestershire. We are unable to consider such an option as the legislation with which we must comply states that division boundaries cannot cross the boundaries of district or borough councils. Whilst our proposed division gives a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we consider that the division is clearly separated from Loughborough by the M1 and the open area between the two towns. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Sileby & The Wolds	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Burton on the Wolds, Cotes, Hoton, Prestwold, Seagrave, Sileby, Walton on the Wolds and Wymeswold.	In our draft recommendations, we included part of Sileby parish in a Syston Ridgeway division. We received submissions which argued that the whole of the parish should be included in a single division. As a result of our changes to divisions in other parts of Charnwood, we are able to include the whole of Sileby parish in our Sileby & The Wolds division, creating a division with clear boundaries and a good level of electoral equality.
Syston Fosse	1	-9%	This division comprises the parishes of Cossington, East Goscote, Queniborough, Ratcliffe on the Wreake, Rearsby and Thrussington together with the Central Avenue area of Syston.	We did not receive any objections specifically relating to our draft recommendations for this division. However, as a consequence of modifying our recommendations for the Sileby & The Wolds and Syston Ridgeway divisions, discussed above and below respectively, we have modified our draft recommendation for Syston Fosse. By including the parish of Cossington and by reducing the part of Syston parish in this division, we consider the modifications included as part of our final recommendations provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

Syston Ridgeway	1	-9%	This division comprises the parish of Wanlip, together with the parish of Syston except the Central Avenue area.	Our draft recommendation was for a Syston Ridgeway division which included Cossington parish and part of Sileby parish with the major part of Syston. We excluded eastern and southern parts of Syston from this division. Our proposal for the southern part of Syston attracted more objection than did any other aspect of our draft recommendations and stimulated the submission of further evidence of community identity. We have accepted the arguments made regarding the southern part of Syston and have moved away from our draft recommendations accordingly. Changes in this part of the district have required consequential changes to other divisions in the area. Our modifications for Syston have allowed us to respond to objections in relation to Sileby, but we have also modified our recommendation for Syston Fosse as described above in order to provide for acceptable levels of electoral equality throughout Syston.
Thurmaston Ridgemere	1	-13%	This division comprises the parishes of Barkby, Barkby Thorpe, Beeby, South Croxton and Thurmaston.	Our draft recommendation was for a Thurmaston Ridgemere division which included part of Syston parish. This attracted more objection than did any other aspect of our draft recommendations and stimulated the submission of further evidence of community identity. We have accepted the arguments made regarding the southern part of Syston and moved away from our draft recommendations accordingly. By excluding the southern part of Syston, we would create a division with 13% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county. Whilst this is a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we consider the evidence that community ties in south Syston would be broken to be persuasive to warrant this degree of electoral inequality.

Harborough District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Broughton Astley	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashby Magna, Ashby Parva, Broughton Astley, Dunton Bassett, Frolesworth and Leire.	Apart from a request to adopt a district-wide scheme which would result in excessive levels of electoral inequality, we did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Bruntingthorpe	1	6%	This division comprises the parishes of Arnesby, Bruntingthorpe, Catthorpe, Cotesbach, Fleckney, Gilmorton, Gumley, Husbands Bosworth, Kimcote & Walton, Knaptoft, Laughton, Misterton with Walcote, Mowsley, North Kilworth, Peatling Magna, Peatling Parva, Saddington, Shawell, Shearsby, South Kilworth, Swinford, Theddingworth, Westrill & Starmore and Willoughby Waterleys.	Apart from a request to adopt a district-wide scheme which would result in excessive levels of electoral inequality, we did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Gartree	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Burton Overy, Carlton Curlieu, Cranoe, Gaulby, Glooston, Goadby, Great Glen, Illston on the Hill, Kibworth Beauchamp, Kibworth Harcourt, Kings	Our draft recommendations for a Gartree division included the parish of Tugby & Keythorpe and excluded those of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton. We received opposition to this proposal. Including Tugby & Keythorpe in the Launde division and the East, Thorpe and West Langton parishes in the Gartree division, as proposed by respondents, would result both divisions having a little over

			Norton, Little Stretton, Noseley, Rolleston, Shangton, Slawston, Smeeton Westerby, Stonton Wyville, Tugby & Keythorpe, Tur Langton, Welham and Wistow.	10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county. We consider that evidence has not been received to justify these high degrees of electoral inequality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Launde	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Allexton, Billesdon, Blaston, Bringham, Cold Newton, Drayton, East Norton, Frisby, Great Easton, Hallaton, Horninghold, Houghton on the Hill, Hungarton, Keyham, Launde, Loddington, Lowesby, Marefield, Medbourne, Nevill Holt, Owston & Newbold, Scraftoft, Skeffington, Stockerston, Stoughton, Thurnby & Bushby, Tilton on the Hill & Halstead and Withcote.	We received objections to the inclusion in our draft recommendation of the parish of Tugby & Keythorpe in the neighbouring Gartree division. Our recommended Launde division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. As detailed in our Gartree section above, the alternative proposals would not provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Lutterworth	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bitteswell with Bittesby, Claybrooke Magna, Claybrooke Parva, Lutterworth and Ullesthorpe.	Apart from a request to adopt a district-wide scheme which would result in excessive levels of electoral inequality, we did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Market Harborough East	1	8%	This division comprises the Harborough District Council wards of Market Harborough– Little Bowden and Market	Our draft recommendations for a Market Harborough East division included the parishes of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton in this division. We received objection to this proposal on the grounds that Market

			Harborough–Great Bowden & Arden together with the parishes of East Langton, Thorpe Langton and West Langton.	Harborough East would be an urban division. However, the division does, in addition to the Langtons, include the substantial, rural Great Bowden parish. Our recommended division has clear boundaries and results in good electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Market Harborough West & Foxton	1	9%	This division comprises the Harborough District Council wards of Market Harborough–Logan and Market Harborough–Welland together with the parishes of Foxton and Lubenham.	Apart from a request to adopt a district-wide scheme which would result in excessive levels of electoral inequality, we did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough

Division Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burbage	1	-2%	This division comprises the parish of Burbage except for its Lash Hill parish ward.	We received objections to the exclusion of the Lash Hill parish ward from this division. Respondents were concerned that the effect would be to exclude residents of that area from parish affairs and their right to vote in parish elections. This would not be the case. Inclusion of the Lash Hill parish ward would result in the Burbage division having 33% more electors per councillor than the average for the county, a degree of inequality we are not prepared to recommend. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
De Montfort	1	5%	This division comprises the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council ward of Hinckley De Montfort and that part of the	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a

			Hinckley Trinity ward which lies to the east of Stoke Road and Hollycroft.	good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Earl Shilton	1	4%	This division comprises the parish of Earl Shilton together with the Barwell parish ward of Redhall and that part of the parish ward of St Mary's which lies on Charnwood Road and to the north of Charnwood Road, between Kirby Road and the Earl Shilton parish boundary.	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Groby & Ratby	1	-2%	This division comprises the parishes of Groby and Ratby.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Hollycroft	1	2%	This division comprises that part of the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council ward of Hinckley Clarendon which lies to the north of Coventry Road and to the west of King George's Way and that part of the Hinckley Trinity ward which lies to the west of Stoke Road and Hollycroft.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Mallory	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Barlestone, Newbold Verdon and	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We

			Peckleton together with the Barwell parish ward of Charnwood and that part of the parish ward of St Mary's which lies to the south of Charnwood Road and to the west of Kirby Road.	therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Market Bosworth	1	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Cadeby, Carlton, Higham on the Hill, Market Bosworth, Nailstone, Osbaston, Shackerstone, Sheepy, Stoke Golding, Sutton Cheney, Twycross and Witherley.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Markfield, Desford & Thornton	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bagworth & Thornton, Desford, Markfield and Stanton-under-Bardon.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
St Marys	1	-7%	This division comprises the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council ward of Hinckley Castle and that part of the Hinckley Clarendon ward which lies to the south of Coventry Road and to the east of King George's Way together with the Burbage parish ward of Lash Hill.	We received objections to the inclusion of the Burbage parish ward of Lash Hill in our draft recommendation for a St Marys division. Whilst objectors argued that Lash Hill should be included in the Burbage division, doing so would result in a much higher level of electoral inequality than we are prepared to recommend. Furthermore, inclusion of Lash Hill in the St Marys division will not mean that the Lash Hill area will cease to be part of Burbage parish, as objectors feared. The division we propose has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.

Melton Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Belvoir	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Belvoir, Bottesford, Buckminster, Clawson Hose & Harby, Croxton Kerrial, Eaton, Garthorpe, Redmile, Scalford, Sproxton, Stathern and Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Melton East	1	5%	This division comprises the Melton Borough Council wards of Melton Craven, Melton Newport and Melton Warwick together with that part of Melton Sysonby ward which lies to the east of Scalford Road.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Melton West	1	4%	This division comprises the Melton Borough Council wards of Melton Dorian and Melton Egerton together with that part of Melton Sysonby ward which lies to the west of Scalford Road.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Melton Wolds	1	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Ab Kettleby, Asfordby, Broughton & Old Dalby, Burton & Dalby, Freeby, Frisby on the Wreake,	In our draft recommendations, we proposed the name Asfordby for this division. Whilst we received support for our proposed boundaries for this division, Melton Borough Council suggested that it be named Melton Wolds, in order to reflect the extent of the division as a whole. Having

			Gaddesby, Grimston, Hoby with Rotherby, Kirby Bellars, Knossington & Cold Overton, Somerby, Twyford & Thorpe and Wymondham.	considered the evidence received we have decided to include the division name Melton Wolds in our final recommendations. Our recommended division would have clear boundaries and good electoral equality.
--	--	--	---	--

North West Leicestershire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Ashby de la Zouch	1	3%	This division comprises the parish of Ashby de la Zouch with the exception of the parish ward of Ashby Castle.	<p>Whilst we received some support for our draft recommendations for North West Leicestershire we also received objections to our draft recommendations for the town of Ashby de la Zouch. Some respondents objected to the exclusion of the Ashby Castle area from this division. Ashby Castle is a town ward and district council ward. We did receive alternative proposals in this part of the district.</p> <p>Firstly, a proposal to include the Castle ward in the Ashby de la Zouch division would result in an unacceptable level of electoral inequality with 23% more electors per councillor in Ashby de la Zouch than the average for the county by 2021 and 27% fewer electors in the Valley division. Some respondents considered that this could be addressed by including the Blackfordby area in the Forest & Measham division and/or including part of Loughborough (in Charnwood borough) in the Valley division. The first approach to include Blackfordby in the Forest & Measham division would not provide for acceptable levels of electoral equality. The second approach would not be possible as the legislation with which we must comply states that division</p>

				<p>boundaries cannot cross the boundaries of district or borough councils.</p> <p>We also received another proposal which was to combine our proposed Ashby de la Zouch and Valley divisions to form a two-member division. We do not consider that the evidence received was persuasive to suggest why a two-member division covering this area would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence and alternatives received we consider that the draft recommendations provide for the best balance between the statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our Ashby de la Zouch division as final.</p>
Castle Donington & Kegworth	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Castle Donington, Kegworth and Lockington-Hemington.	This division was proposed and supported locally. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Coalville North	1	3%	This division comprises the North West Leicestershire District Council wards of Coalville East, Coalville West, Hugglescote St Mary's and Snibston South, together with the unparished part of the Snibston North ward and from Ravenstone with Snibston parish, the Limes parish ward.	We received support for our draft recommendations for Coalville. North West Leicestershire District Council suggested, however, that we include in this division, the Limes ward of Ravenstone with Snibston parish. The Council argued that the parish ward has close physical ties to the adjacent part of Coalville and that the parish boundary in this area is obscured by housing development. We consider that the evidence received is persuasive and would result in a division with clear boundaries. We have therefore modified our recommended division as suggested by the District Council.

Coalville South	1	3%	This division comprises the North West Leicestershire District Council wards of Bardon, Greenhill, Ellistown & Battleflat and Hugglescote St John's, together with the unparished part of the Castle Rock ward and the part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the south of Meadow Lane.	We received support for our draft recommendations for Coalville. North West Leicestershire District Council suggested, however, that we include in this division the part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the north of Meadow Lane from the Whitwick electoral division to this division in order to prevent having to create a new polling district. We note, however, that such a change to our draft recommendations would result in a level of electoral inequality which we would not normally recommend and we are not persuaded by the evidence received. We therefore confirm as final our recommendation.
Forest & Measham	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashby Woulds, Measham and Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe.	This division was proposed and supported locally. The only objection we received to our draft recommendation was that this division should include the Blackfordby area of Ashby de la Zouch in order to enable the inclusion of the Ashby Castle town and district ward in the Ashby de la Zouch division. Such a change to our draft recommendations would result in a level of electoral inequality in the Forest & Measham division which we would not normally recommend. The division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Ibstock & Appleby	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of Appleby Magna, Chilcote, Heather, Ibstock, Snarestone, Stretton en le Field and Swepstone and from Ravenstone with Snibston parish, the Ravenstone parish ward.	This division was proposed and supported locally. In response to our consultation, we received a proposal that the whole of Ravenstone with Snibston parish be included in the Valley division. The effect of this would be to leave the Ibstock & Appleby division with a greater level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend. We are not persuaded by the evidence received. North West Leicestershire District Council proposed, however, that we modify our draft recommendation for this division by excluding from it the Ravenstone with Snibston parish ward

				of Limes. As detailed in the Coalville North section above we have decided to modify the division boundaries in this part of the district. Our modified Ibstock & Appleby division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality.
Valley	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Belton, Breedon on the Hill, Coleorton, Isley cum Langley, Long Whatton & Diseworth, Normanton Le Heath, Osgathorpe, Packington, Staunton Harold, Swannington and Worthington, together with the Ashby Castle parish ward.	We received objections to the inclusion of the Ashby Castle parish ward in this division. Simply excluding it from the Valley division would not result in a division with an acceptable level of electoral equality. We also are not persuaded to combine the Ashby de la Zouch and Valley divisions to form a two-member division. The single-member Valley division has clear boundaries and gives a good level of electoral equality. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Whitwick	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Charley and Whitwick together with the borough council ward of Thringstone and that part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the north of Meadow Lane.	We received support for our draft recommendations for Whitwick. North West Leicestershire District Council suggested, however, that we include in the Coalville South division the part of the Broom Leys ward lying to the north of Meadow Lane in order to prevent having to create a new polling district. We note that such a change to our draft recommendations would result in a level of electoral inequality which we would not normally recommend and we are not persuaded by the evidence received to make this modification. We therefore confirm as final our recommendation.

Oadby & Wigston Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
East Wigston	1	-11%	This division comprises that part of the Wigston All Saints borough ward which includes and lies to the south of Central Avenue, together with that part of the Wigston Meadowcourt borough ward which includes and lies to the south of Kelmarsh Avenue and that part including and to the east of Acorn Way.	We are persuaded by the evidence we have received to make final recommendations which reflect Oadby and Wigston as distinct areas and communities. Our final recommendation is for an East Wigston division comprised of the major parts of the Wigston All Saints ward and the Wigston Meadowcourt ward. We are unable to recommend a division which includes the whole of those wards as to do so would result in a degree of electoral inequality in this division than we are prepared to recommend. Whilst the division we propose has a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we are persuaded to do so in this case, having regard to the overall level of electoral equality in Wigston and the nature of the boundaries of this recommended division.
North Wigston	1	-11%	This division comprises the Wigston St Wolstan's borough ward together with that part of the Wigston All Saints borough ward which lies to the north of Central Avenue; that part of the Wigston Meadowcourt borough ward which includes and lies to the north of Kelmarsh Avenue; and the west of Acorn Way and those parts of the Wigston Fields borough ward which lie to the north of Aylestone Lane and Northfield Avenue.	Our final recommendation is for a North Wigston division comprising Wigston St Wolstan's borough ward together with parts of Wigston All Saints, Fields and Meadowcourt wards. Whilst the division has a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we are persuaded to do so in this case, having regard to the overall level of electoral equality in Wigston and the nature of the boundaries of this recommended division.

Oadby	2	-3%	This two-member division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council wards of Oadby Brocks Hill, Oadby Grange, Oadby St Peter's, Oadby Uplands and Oadby Woodlands.	We are persuaded by the evidence we have received to make final recommendations which reflect Oadby and Wigston as distinct areas and communities. We are therefore proposing as our final recommendation that Oadby continue to be represented as a two-member division. This will maintain a good level of electoral equality and provide a division with clear boundaries.
South & West Wigston	1	-11%	This division comprises the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council ward of South Wigston with that part of the Wigston Fields borough ward including and lying to the south Aylestone Lane and Northfield Avenue.	Our final recommendation is for a South & West Wigston division comprising South Wigston borough ward together with parts of Wigston Fields ward. Whilst the division has a higher level of electoral inequality than we would normally recommend, we are persuaded to do so in this case, having regard to the overall level of electoral equality in Wigston and the nature of the boundaries of this recommended division.

Conclusions

38 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	55	55
Number of electoral divisions	53	53
Average number of electors per councillor	9,466	9,984
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	12	5
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

Leicestershire County Council should comprise 55 councillors serving 53 divisions representing 51 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Leicestershire. You can also view our final recommendations for Leicestershire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

41 As a result of our proposed divisions boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Barwell, Braunstone, Mountsorrel and Syston parishes.

42 As result of our proposed divisions boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Barwell parish.

Final recommendation

Barwell Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Charnwood (returning four members), Redhall (returning four members) and St Marys (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

43 As a result of our proposed divisions boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Braunstone parish.

Final recommendation

Braunstone Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Braunstone Millfield (returning three members), Braunstone Ravenhurst & Fosse (returning nine members), Braunstone Thorpe Astley (returning five members) and Braunstone Winstanley (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

44 As a result of our proposed divisions boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Mountsorrel parish.

Final recommendation

Mountsorrel Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Mountsorrel (returning 11 members), Mountsorrel Castle (returning one member) and Mountsorrel North End (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed divisions boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Syston parish.

Final recommendation

Syston Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Syston Merton (returning seven members), Syston New Barkby (returning five members), Syston St Peter's East (returning four members) and Syston St Peter's West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

46 We have now completed our review of Leicestershire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Blaby District								
1	Blaby & Glen Parva	1	9,339	9,339	-1%	9,774	9,774	-2%
2	Braunstone	1	10,142	10,142	7%	10,111	10,111	1%
3	Cosby & Countesthorpe	1	9,496	9,496	0%	10,505	10,505	5%
4	Enderby & Lubbethorpe	1	7,703	7,703	-19%	9,155	9,155	-8%
5	Glenfields, Kirby Muxloe & Leicester Forests	2	17,345	8,673	-8%	18,577	9,289	-7%
6	Narborough & Whetstone	1	10,415	10,415	10%	10,697	10,697	7%
7	Stoney Stanton & Croft	1	9,144	9,144	-3%	10,222	10,222	2%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Charnwood Borough							
8 Birstall	1	10,415	10,415	10%	10,923	10,923	9%
9 Bradgate	1	10,129	10,129	7%	10,678	10,678	7%
10 Loughborough East	1	9,544	9,544	1%	9,732	9,732	-3%
11 Loughborough North	1	10,343	10,343	9%	10,312	10,312	3%
12 Loughborough North West	1	10,485	10,485	11%	10,093	10,093	1%
13 Loughborough South	1	9,967	9,967	5%	10,730	10,730	7%
14 Loughborough South West	1	10,476	10,476	11%	10,782	10,782	8%
15 Quorn & Barrow	1	9,966	9,966	5%	10,618	10,618	6%
16 Rothley & Mountsorrel	1	9,468	9,468	0%	10,469	10,469	5%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
17	Shepshed	1	10,886	10,886	15%	11,372	11,372	14%
18	Sileby & The Wolds	1	9,366	9,366	-1%	10,000	10,000	0%
19	Syston Fosse	1	8,261	8,261	-13%	9,051	9,051	-9%
20	Syston Ridgeway	1	8,860	8,860	-6%	9,103	9,103	-9%
21	Thurmaston Ridgemere	1	8,335	8,335	-12%	8,656	8,656	-13%
Harborough District								
22	Broughton Astley	1	8,734	8,734	-8%	9,786	9,786	-2%
23	Bruntingthorpe	1	10,512	10,512	11%	10,593	10,593	6%
24	Gartree	1	9,874	9,874	4%	10,644	10,644	7%
25	Launde	1	9,892	9,892	5%	10,721	10,721	7%
26	Lutterworth	1	9,079	9,079	-4%	9,999	9,999	0%
27	Market Harborough East	1	10,406	10,406	10%	10,799	10,799	8%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
28	Market Harborough West & Foxton	1	9,933	9,933	5%	10,909	10,909	9%
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough								
29	Burbage	1	9,100	9,100	-4%	9,748	9,748	-2%
30	De Montfort	1	9,782	9,782	3%	10,515	10,515	5%
31	Earl Shilton	1	10,382	10,382	10%	10,416	10,416	4%
32	Groby & Ratby	1	9,561	9,561	1%	9,774	9,774	-2%
33	Hollycroft	1	9,901	9,901	5%	10,179	10,179	2%
34	Mallory	1	10,352	10,352	9%	10,389	10,389	4%
35	Market Bosworth	1	8,947	8,947	-5%	9,282	9,282	-7%
36	Markfield, Desford & Thornton	1	9,444	9,444	0%	10,008	10,008	0%
37	St Marys	1	8,482	8,482	-10%	9,288	9,288	-7%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Melton Borough							
38 Belvoir	1	9,513	9,513	0%	9,587	9,587	-4%
39 Melton East	1	10,353	10,353	9%	10,510	10,510	5%
40 Melton West	1	10,131	10,131	7%	10,384	10,384	4%
41 Melton Wolds	1	9,342	9,342	-1%	9,322	9,322	-7%
North West Leicestershire District							
42 Ashby de la Zouch	1	8,622	8,622	-9%	10,276	10,276	3%
43 Castle Donington & Kegworth	1	8,424	8,424	-11%	9,510	9,510	-5%
44 Coalville North	1	9,201	9,201	-3%	10,320	10,320	3%
45 Coalville South	1	9,394	9,394	-1%	10,271	10,271	3%
46 Forest & Measham	1	8,653	8,653	-9%	9,903	9,903	-1%
47 Ibstock & Appleby	1	8,801	8,801	-7%	9,835	9,835	-1%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Leicestershire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
48 Valley	1	9,086	9,086	-4%	9,340	9,340	-6%
49 Whitwick	1	9,390	9,390	-1%	9,352	9,352	-6%
Oadby & Wigston Borough							
50 East Wigston	1	8,823	8,823	-7%	8,898	8,898	-11%
51 North Wigston	1	8,699	8,699	-8%	8,875	8,875	-11%
52 Oadby	2	19,288	9,644	2%	19,293	9,647	-3%
53 South & West Wigston	1	8,430	8,430	-11%	8,843	8,843	-11%
Totals	55	520,616	-	-	549,129	-	-
Averages	-	-	9,466	-	-	9,984	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Leicestershire County Council.

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/leicestershire/leicestershire-county-council>

Local authority

- Leicestershire County Council

Borough and district councils

- Blaby District Council
- Charnwood Borough Council
- Harborough District Council
- Melton Borough Council
- North West Leicestershire District Council
- Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

Town councils

- Ashby De La Zouch Town Council
- Syston Town Council

Parish councils

- Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Parish Council
- Carlton Parish Council
- Clawson Hose & Harby Parish Council
- East Langton Parish Council
- Glenfield Parish Council
- Hugglescote & Donington le Heath Parish Council
- Market Bosworth Parish Council
- Measham Parish Council
- Osbaston Parish Council
- Queniborough Parish Council
- Ravenstone with Snibton Parish Council
- Shackerstone Parish Council
- Sheepy Parish Council
- Sileby Parish Council
- Stoke Golding Parish Council
- Thorpe Langton Parish Council
- Thurmaston Parish Council
- Tugby & Keythorpe Parish Council
- Whitwick Parish Council

Political parties

- Leicestershire County Council Liberal Democrats Group
- North West Leicestershire Constituency Labour Party

MPs

- Edward Argar MP
- Alberto Costa MP
- The Rt Hon Sir Alan Duncan MP
- The Rt Hon Sir Edward Garnier QC MP

Leicestershire county councillors

- Councillor M. Charlesworth
- Councillor J. Coxon
- Councillor T. Eynon
- Councillor K. Feltham
- Councillor S. Hampson
- Councillor D. Houseman MBE
- Councillor M. Hunt
- Councillor K. Knaggs
- Councillor S Sheahan
- Councillor R. Shepherd

District and borough councillors

- Councillor L. Bentley (Oadby & Wigston Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Bond (Oadby & Wigston Borough Council)
- Councillor L. Breckon (Blaby District Council)
- Councillor R. Denney (Blaby District Council)

Town and parish councillors

- Councillor M.H. & Councillor K Asmal (Syston Town Council)
- Councillor M. Ball (Ashby de la Zouch Town Council)
- Councillor C. Bramley (Worthington Parish Council)
- Councillor D Knaggs (Thurmaston Parish Council)
- Councillor G. Timson (Shepshed Town Council)

Local organisations

- Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
- Wigston Civic Society

Residents

- 72 Local Residents
- We also received a petition signed by 157 residents.

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council