

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Peterborough

Report to the Electoral Commission

July 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by The Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 303

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	13
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	19
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	21
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	23
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	41

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Peterborough is inserted at the back of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No. 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Peterborough.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Peterborough's electoral arrangements on 10 July 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 26 February 2002, after which it undertook an eight-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, The Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations received by the LGCE during consultation on its draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

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

- **in three of the 24 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in five wards and by more than 20 per cent in two wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 107-108) are that:

- **Peterborough City Council should have 57 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 24 wards, the same number as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, and six wards should retain their existing boundaries.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 19 of the proposed 24 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is forecast to improve, with the number of electors per councillor in only one ward, Glington & Wittering, expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Bretton and Eye;**
- **revised warding arrangements for Orton Longueville Parish Council;**
- **revised warding arrangements and an increase in the number of councillors serving Orton Waterville Parish Council.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, to arrive no later than 20 August 2002:

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Barnack	1	the parishes of Bainton, Barnack, Helpston, Southorpe, St Martin's Without, Ufford and Wothorpe	Map 2
2	Bretton North	3	the proposed Bretton North parish ward of Bretton parish	Map 2 and the large map
3	Bretton South	1	the proposed Bretton South parish ward of Bretton parish	Map 2 and the large map
4	Central	3	<i>Unchanged:</i> Central ward	Map 2 and the large map
5	Dogsthorpe	3	Dogsthorpe ward; part of North ward	Map 2 and the large map
6	East	3	East ward; the proposed Finchfield parish ward of Eye parish	Map 2 and the large map
7	Eye & Thorney	2	the parish of Thorney; the proposed Eye parish ward of Eye parish	Map 2
8	Fletton	3	part of Fletton ward; part of South ward	Map 2 and the large map
9	Glington & Wittering	2	the parishes of Ailsworth, Castor, Glington, Marholm, Sutton, Thornhaugh, Upton, Wansford and Wittering	Map 2
10	Newborough	1	<i>Unchanged:</i> the parishes of Borough Fen, Newborough and Peakirk	Map 2
11	North	2	part of North ward	Map 2 and the large map
12	Northborough	1	the parishes of Deeping Gate, Etton, Maxey and Northborough	Map 2
13	Orton Longueville	3	the proposed Longueville parish ward of Orton Longueville parish; the proposed Orton Goldhay East parish ward of Orton Waterville parish	Map 2 and the large map
14	Orton Waterville	3	the proposed parish wards of Orton Goldhay West, Orton Wistow, Orton Village and Orton Brimbles & Southgate of Orton Waterville parish	Map 2 and the large map
15	Orton with Hampton	3	the proposed Botolph parish ward of Orton Longueville parish; part of Fletton ward; part of South ward	Map 2 and the large map
16	Park	3	<i>Unchanged:</i> Park ward	Map 2 and the large map
17	Paston	3	Paston ward; part of Dogsthorpe ward	Map 2 and the large map
18	Ravensthorpe	2	part of Ravensthorpe ward and part of West ward	Map 2 and the large map
19	Stanground Central	3	the parish of Stanground North; part of Fletton ward; part of South ward; part of Stanground ward	Map 2 and the large map
20	Stanground East	1	part of Stanground ward	Map 2 and the large map
21	Walton	2	<i>Unchanged:</i> Walton ward	Map 2 and the large map
22	Werrington North	3	<i>Unchanged:</i> Werrington North ward	Map 2 and the large map

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
23	Werrington South	3	<i>Unchanged: Werrington South ward</i>	Map 2 and the large map
24	West	3	part of Ravensthorpe ward; part of South Bretton ward; part of West ward	Map 2 and the large map

Notes: 1 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

2 We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Table 2: Final Recommendations for Peterborough

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barnack	1	2,010	2,010	5	2,212	2,212	7
2	Bretton North	3	6,375	2,125	11	6,483	2,161	4
3	Bretton South	1	2,074	2,074	8	2,088	2,088	1
4	Central	3	5,453	1,818	-5	5,670	1,890	-9
5	Dogsthorpe	3	5,670	1,890	-1	5,785	1,928	-7
6	East	3	5,815	1,938	1	6,447	2,149	4
7	Eye & Thorney	2	4,017	2,009	5	4,413	2,207	7
8	Fletton	3	5,563	1,854	-3	6,352	2,117	2
9	Glington & Wittering	2	4,000	2,000	4	4,586	2,293	11
10	Newborough	1	1,718	1,718	-10	2,150	2,150	4
11	North	2	3,675	1,838	-4	3,785	1,893	-9
12	Northborough	1	2,057	2,057	7	2,232	2,232	8
13	Orton Longueville	3	6,625	2,208	15	6,674	2,225	7
14	Orton Waterville	3	6,071	2,024	6	6,449	2,150	4
15	Orton with Hampton	3	2,457	819	-57	5,793	1,931	-7
16	Park	3	5,985	1,995	4	6,060	2,020	-2
17	Paston	3	5,410	1,803	-6	5,980	1,993	-4
18	Ravensthorpe	2	4,296	2,148	12	4,345	2,173	5
19	Stanground Central	3	6,312	2,104	10	6,450	2,150	4
20	Stanground East	1	2,057	2,057	7	2,127	2,127	3
21	Walton	2	3,971	1,986	4	4,070	2,035	-2
22	Werrington North	3	5,526	1,842	-4	5,580	1,860	-10
23	Werrington South	3	5,567	1,856	-3	5,670	1,890	-9
24	West	3	6,396	2,132	11	6,569	2,190	6
	Totals	57	109,100	-	-	117,970	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,914	-	-	2,070	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Peterborough City Council.

Note: 1 Discrepancies in draft electorate figures have been resolved following consultation with the City Council.

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

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Peterborough. Peterborough has now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 The last review of the electoral arrangements of Peterborough was a Directed Electoral Review carried out in December 1996 prior to Peterborough becoming a unitary authority. The previous review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1975 (Report No. 86).

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - (c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Peterborough was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish councils in the district.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 The LGCE was not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as Peterborough is concerned, it started from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, the LGCE found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. In particular, it did not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 10 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Peterborough City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Cambridgeshire Police Authority, the Local Government Association, parish councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Eastern region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage

One, was 1 October 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 26 February 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Peterborough*, and ended on 22 April 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The city of Peterborough was initially established as a railway town but has more recently become a major industrial, commercial and shopping centre. It was designated as a New Town in 1968 with development to be concentrated in four new residential townships. The fourth of these is currently under construction to the south of the city (the Hampton development) and is expected to provide over 5,000 houses and 12,000 jobs. Peterborough gained unitary status in 1998. The city has excellent transport links with the main east coast railway line passing through the centre. The River Nene separates the southern area of the city from the northern area and the city is further divided by a network of dual carriageways.

11 The district contains 28 parishes, but much of the city of Peterborough itself is unparished. The city of Peterborough comprises 87 per cent of the district's total electorate.

12 The electorate of the district is 109,100 (February 2001). The Council presently has 57 members who are elected from 24 wards, 18 of which are urban in Peterborough with the remaining six being predominantly rural. Fourteen of the wards are each represented by three councillors, five are each represented by two councillors and five are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

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

14 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,914 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 2,070 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in three of the 24 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Glinton ward where the councillor represents 28 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Peterborough

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barnack	1	1,942	1,942	1	2,120	2,120	2
2	Central	3	5,453	1,818	-5	5,670	1,890	-9
3	Dogsthorpe	3	5,336	1,779	-7	5,450	1,817	-12
4	East	3	5,661	1,887	-1	6,290	2,097	1
5	Eye & Thorney	2	4,171	2,086	9	4,570	2,285	10
6	Fletton	3	5,763	1,921	0	6,790	2,263	9
7	Glington	1	2,452	2,452	28	2,530	2,530	22
8	Newborough	1	1,718	1,718	-10	2,150	2,150	4
9	North	2	4,009	2,005	5	4,120	2,060	0
10	North Bretton	3	5,676	1,892	-1	5,710	1,903	-8
11	Northborough	1	1,947	1,947	2	2,120	2,120	2
12	Orton Longueville	3	6,179	2,060	8	6,230	2,077	0
13	Orton Waterville	3	6,494	2,165	13	6,870	2,290	11
14	Park	3	5,985	1,995	4	6,060	2,020	-2
15	Paston	3	5,410	1,803	-6	5,980	1,993	-4
16	Ravensthorpe	3	5,338	1,779	-7	5,400	1,800	-13
17	South	2	2,925	1,463	-24	6,030	3,015	46
18	South Bretton	2	4,057	2,029	6	4,160	2,080	1
19	Stanground	3	5,967	1,989	4	6,060	2,020	-2
20	Walton	2	3,971	1,986	4	4,070	2,035	-2
21	Werrington North	3	5,526	1,842	-4	5,580	1,860	-10
22	Werrington South	3	5,567	1,856	-3	5,670	1,890	-9
23	West	3	5,827	1,942	1	6,080	2,027	-2
24	Wittering	1	1,726	1,726	-10	2,260	2,260	9
	Totals	57	109,100	-	-	117,970	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,914	-	-	2,070	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Peterborough City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in South ward were relatively over-represented by 24 per cent, while electors in Glington ward were significantly under-represented by 28 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One the LGCE received 37 representations, two of which were district-wide schemes. Peterborough City Council proposed retaining the current council size of 57 with members representing 24 mixed-member wards. The North West Cambridgeshire Constituency Labour Party provided very basic details of a proposed scheme based on a council size of 58 representing 25 mixed-member wards but did not provide any maps, descriptions of wards or argumentation for such a scheme. The LGCE also received a further 35 representations at Stage One with the majority concerning Dogsthorpe ward and the Ortons area. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Peterborough*.

16 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the Council's scheme but moved away from it in certain areas to provide improved electoral equality. The city of Peterborough can be divided into four distinct urban areas; the southern area (the area south of the River Nene), the western area (the area north of the River Nene and west of the railway line), the eastern area (the area north of the River Nene, east of the railway line and south of Soke Parkway) and the northern area (the area east of the railway line and north of Soke Parkway). The LGCE looked at the allocation of councillors between these four areas of Peterborough and found that the western and northern areas were over-represented while the southern area was under-represented. By 2006, under a council size of 57, the area south of the River Nene will be entitled to 16 councillors but under the Council's scheme was only allocated 15 councillors, while the area to the west of the main railway line will be entitled to nine councillors but under the Council's scheme was allocated 10 councillors. The LGCE therefore proposed removing a councillor from this western area and adding it to the southern area to improve electoral equality and allow the utilisation of stronger, more easily identifiable boundaries. It proposed that:

- Peterborough City Council should be served by 57 councillors, the same as at present, representing 25 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 17 of the existing wards should be modified, while seven wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be revised warding arrangements for the parishes of Bretton, Eye, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville.

Draft Recommendation

Peterborough City Council should comprise 57 councillors, serving 25 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in improvements in electoral equality by 2006. The number of electors per councillor in 21 of the 25 wards would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average in 2001, forecast to improve further, with only two wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

18 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 37 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Peterborough City Council.

Peterborough City Council

19 The City Council generally supported the draft recommendations but opposed the creation of single-member wards in the urban area. It therefore put forward amendments to the draft recommendations for the proposed wards of North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton, South, Stanground Central, Stanground East, West and Woodston.

North West Cambridgeshire Labour Party

20 The North West Cambridgeshire Labour Party (hereafter referred to as the Labour Party) generally supported the draft recommendations but supported the Council's amendments to the proposed wards of North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West. It suggested that the proposed Woodston ward be renamed Botolph ward and questioned the Council's projected electorate figures. Its representations were on behalf of the North West Cambridgeshire Constituency Labour Party, the Peterborough Constituency Labour Party and the Peterborough District Labour Party.

Parish Councils

21 Ailsworth, Barnack and Maxey parish councils supported the draft recommendations. Etton Parish Council opposed moving Etton parish from Barnack ward into Northborough ward. Marholm Parish Council stated that it "made no comment" on the draft recommendations.

22 Sutton Parish Council opposed the amalgamation of Glinton and Wittering wards and preferred retaining the existing single-member Wittering ward. Wansford Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations and wished to retain the status quo.

Other Representations

23 A further 28 representations were received in response to the draft recommendations from councillors and residents.

24 Councillor Sandford supported the Council's Stage Three submission with the exception of the proposal to transfer Benland and Barnstock estates to South Bretton ward. Councillors Ash, Miners and Pobgee supported the draft recommendations for the Dogsthorpe area. Councillor Ridgway generally supported the draft recommendations but supported the Council's proposed amendment to Ravensthorpe and West wards. Councillor Rainey supported the Council's proposed amendments to North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards but suggested that the proposed Woodston ward be renamed Botolph.

25 Eleven residents supported the draft recommendations for South, Stanground and Woodston wards. They were also content with the proposals for the wards comprising "the Ortons" but supported the Council's proposed amendments for North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards. Three residents opposed the draft recommendations for Bretton parish and supported the Council's proposals for two two-member wards in this area. Four residents opposed the draft recommendations for the proposed Woodston ward and supported the Council's proposed three-member Orton with Hampton ward instead.

26 A resident supported the draft recommendations, especially for Ravensthorpe and West wards, while another resident supported the Council's proposal to restore Netherton to West ward. A resident supported the draft recommendations for wards south of the River Nene, especially those in the Ortons area. Another resident supported the draft recommendations for South, Stanground and Woodston wards and was content with the proposals for the Ortons. Another resident supported the draft recommendations for the South, Stanground and Woodston area but supported the Council's proposals for North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards.

27 A resident generally supported the draft recommendations but proposed an amendment to the proposed boundary between the wards of North and South Bretton. The same resident also asked us to look again at the proposed single-member Stanground East and Woodston wards. Another resident supported the draft recommendations concerning Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards and pointed out a mapping error regarding the boundary between Orton Brimbles and Orton Village parish wards.

28 A resident proposed an amendment to the proposed boundary between Fletton and Woodston wards to move all of the new development on the site of the old British Sugar Works into a single ward. Finally, another resident considered that the draft recommendation to ward Eye parish and create a Finchfield parish ward was "a step too far".

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

29 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Peterborough is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) – the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

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

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

32 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

33 Since 1975 there has been a 41 per cent increase in the electorate of Peterborough district. At Stage One the City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 8 per cent from 109,100 to 117,970 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in South ward, although a significant amount is also expected in East, Fletton, Paston and Wittering wards. The LGCE recognised that the Council’s submission and its emphasis on the 2001 rather than 2006 figures (particularly with regard to South ward) may have been influenced by the experience of the 1996 review when the growth of 4,000 electors that was predicted in the southern area of the city over the five years to 2001 largely failed to materialise. This expected growth was based on the expectation of the development of a major housing estate in the southern area of the city which did not develop as quickly as was expected. However, the LGCE visited the area and was confident that this large-scale development is now well underway.

34 In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

35 At Stage Three the Labour Party questioned the projected electorate figures provided by the Council regarding the exclusion of “other electors” from the figures. The Council confirmed

that “other electors’ were not included in the Council’s calculations for 2001 and 2006”. It stated that “since – by definition – ‘other electors’ cannot be assigned a physical location within a ward or polling district, it is difficult to conduct the spatial work which is the essence of a boundary review”. Although we would normally expect other electors to be included in a calculation of electorate forecasts, these other electors would normally be distributed evenly over the district and thus the absence of them in Peterborough City Council’s projections does not make the projections any less valid and we remain satisfied that the Council’s electorate forecasts represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

36 As already explained, the LGCE started its review by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although it was willing to carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

37 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the Council’s proposal for retaining the existing council size of 57 members as it considered that this council size provided a reasonable allocation of councillors between the rural and urban areas, had local support and provided for a good allocation of councillors between the separate areas of the city of Peterborough. While alternative council sizes of 42 and 58 were put forward by the Peterborough Civic Society, and Councillor Swift and the Labour Party respectively, the LGCE did not consider that sufficient evidence or argumentation was provided in support of either of these council sizes and therefore retained the existing council size of 57.

38 During Stage Three there were no representations relating to council size and we are therefore content to confirm the LGCE’s draft recommendation to retain the existing council size of 57 members.

Electoral Arrangements

39 The City Council’s proposed scheme was the only complete district-wide scheme that the LGCE received at Stage One. The Council proposed retaining the existing council size of 57 members, serving 24 wards, as at present. The Council’s scheme was largely based on the existing ward structure and included two options (A and B) regarding Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards. The scheme would result in only two wards having a variance of more than 10 per cent by 2006, but these two variances would be extremely high (17 per cent above the district average in Wittering ward and 39 per cent above the district average in South ward).

40 Having carefully considered all the representations received, and in order to secure the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, the LGCE based its draft recommendations on the City Council’s scheme. However, in order to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, it decided to move away from the City Council’s proposals in three areas. Under a 57-member council the western area of Peterborough would be entitled to 9.4 councillors by 2006 (rounded down to 9). The Council’s scheme allocated 10 councillors to this western area and only 15 to the southern area, which is entitled to 16 councillors under a council size of 57. The LGCE therefore looked to redress this misallocation as part of its draft recommendations.

41 The LGCE also built on the Council’s proposals in the western and southern areas to utilise strong, easily identifiable boundaries while taking account of community identity and providing improved electoral equality. In the rural area it proposed a two-member Ginton & Wittering ward as it considered that this provided improved electoral equality while taking account of community identity. It was unable to adopt a number of the Council’s proposals for minor boundary amendments, particularly in the Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville area, since it

did not possess the power to change external parish boundaries. Adopting the Council's proposals would have involved the creation of parish wards containing no or very few electors which it did not consider provided for effective and convenient local government. However, under the 1997 Local Government and Rating Act local authorities have the power to review external parish boundaries and the LGCE suggested that the Council should carry out a parish review following the completion of this review to enable these boundaries to be clarified and tied to firm ground detail.

42 At Stage Three the Council generally supported the draft recommendations but proposed four amendments in the southern and western areas of the city. The Labour Party also generally supported the draft recommendations but proposed four amendments in the southern, eastern and western areas of the city. It also stated that although "you feel it necessary [as we do] to allocate another seat to the area to the south of the river...in the interest of electoral equality, it would seem more appropriate to reduce the number of seats in the Walton, Werrington, Paston area from 11 to 10" rather than to reduce the number of councillors in the western area of the city from 10 to 9 as proposed in the draft recommendations. However, the Labour Party recognised "that we do not have cross party agreement for the reduction of councillors in the Walton, Paston etc area". In light of this and the general support for the draft recommendations we propose confirming the draft recommendations with just four amendments. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) Fletton, Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville, South and Stanground wards;
- b) North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards;
- c) Central, Dogsthorpe, East, North and Park wards;
- d) Paston, Walton, Werrington North and Werrington South wards;
- e) Barnack, Eye & Thorney, Glinton, Newborough, Northborough and Wittering wards.

43 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Fletton, Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville, South and Stanground wards

44 These five wards lie to the south of the River Nene and form the southern part of the city of Peterborough. Fletton ward, Orton Longueville ward (comprising Longueville parish ward of Orton Longueville parish and Orton Goldhay East parish ward of Orton Waterville parish), Orton Waterville ward (comprising Orton Goldhay West, Orton Wistow, Orton Village and Orton Brimbles & Southgate parish wards of Orton Waterville parish) and Stanground ward (including Stanground North parish) are each represented by three councillors while the unparished South ward is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Fletton, Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville and Stanground wards is equal to the district average, 8 per cent, 13 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (9 per cent above, equal to the district average, 11 per cent above and 2 per cent by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in South ward is 24 per cent below the district average (46 per cent above by 2006).

45 At Stage One the City Council proposed a revised warding arrangement in the southern area of Peterborough retaining the same ward names and number of councillors with the exception of South ward which would gain an additional councillor to take account of the enormous electorate growth anticipated in this area. It also proposed two options (A and B) for an amendment to the boundary between Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards.

46 Orton Waterville Parish Council opposed the Council's proposal to transfer part of the Lady Lodge Estate from Orton Waterville to Orton Longueville. It also supported a letter sent by a resident regarding a mistake in the mapping of the parish wards of Orton Waterville Parish Council contained in the 1996 Final Recommendations report on Future Electoral Arrangements for Peterborough.

47 Councillors Sandford, Sharp and Crane supported Option B put forward by the Council for an amendment to the boundary between Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards.

48 The Chairman of Orton Waterville Parish Council supported the submission by Orton Waterville Parish Council and proposed moving the streets of Mandeville, Stagsden, Kinnears Walk, Osprey and Sayers Court from Orton Waterville ward into Orton Longueville ward.

49 A resident opposed Option A put forward by the Council and another resident requested that a mapping error concerning Orton Southgate contained in the Final Recommendations on the Future Electoral Arrangements for Peterborough report of December 1996 be rectified.

50 The LGCE carefully considered all the representations received regarding this area. The Council's scheme allocated 10 councillors to the western area of the city and 15 to the southern area. Under a council size of 57, however, the western area is only entitled to nine councillors while the southern area is entitled to 16 councillors. The LGCE therefore proposed removing a councillor from the western area and adding an extra councillor to the southern area to take account of the growth anticipated in South ward. It appreciated that the growth in this area over the last five years had been slower than anticipated but, having visited the area, it was content that the figures provided by the City Council were the best estimate available at this time.

51 The LGCE decided to recommend an amended two-member South ward using the east coast railway line as its eastern boundary and Fletton Parkway and the existing boundary with Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards as the northern boundary. It was unable to adopt the Council's proposal to move the boundary between Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville and South wards to run along the Fletton Parkway as this would involve the creation of new parish wards in both Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville parishes which would contain no electors. While this proposed ward would provide an extremely high level of electoral inequality in 2001 (84 per cent below the district average) this was forecast to improve to 12 per cent below the district average by 2006. It also considered that this ward would provide a better reflection of community identity than the proposals of the City Council.

52 Given the local opposition to the Council's Option A in the Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville area, the LGCE adopted an amended version of Option B (the proposal put forward by the Chairman of Orton Waterville Parish Council) as it considered that this provided a good level of electoral equality while reflecting community identity. It proposed retaining the existing eastern boundary of Orton Longueville ward but supported the Council's proposal to transfer the area to the south of the River Nene and the west of Nene Parkway from West ward into an amended Orton Longueville ward. The LGCE considered that the Council's proposal to transfer all the electors in the Leighton, Toftland and Wildlake area from Orton Longueville ward into South ward did not provide a good reflection of community identity. It proposed a new single-member Woodston ward with boundaries of Fletton Parkway to the south, the railway line to the east and north-east, Nene Parkway to the west and the River Nene to the north. It proposed an amended three-member Fletton ward which it considered provided a better reflection of community identity. All of the electors currently in South ward in the area bordered by High Street, London Road and the railway line would become part of Fletton ward while all the electors to the east of the railway line and to the south of Fellowes Road and Fletton Avenue would move from Fletton ward into an amended Stanground ward. The LGCE also proposed an amended Stanground ward, to be represented by three members and to be named Stanground Central ward. The western boundary of this proposed ward would run north

along the main railway line, east along Fellowes Road and Fletton Avenue to rejoin the existing boundary running north along Frank Perkins Parkway. It proposed that this ward should retain the existing northern boundary between Stanground and East wards as the adoption of the Council's proposal to move the boundary south to the north bank of the river Nene would involve the warding of Stanground North parish and the creation of a parish ward which would contain no electors. The proposed Stanground Central ward would include all the electors contained in the existing Stanground ward with the exception of a number in the east of the existing ward, where the LGCE proposed a new single-member Stanground East ward. The proposed Stanground East ward would contain all the electors in the polling district STA3 with the exception of those electors in Coneygree Road nos 128–178 and 113–155 and the addition of those in the area bordered by Whittlesey Road, Kingston Drive and Coneygree Road. Given the particular difficulties posed by this area due to the housing development in South ward, the LGCE considered that its proposals offered the best balance between electoral equality and the recognition of community identity.

53 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Fletton, South and Woodston wards would be 3 per cent, 84 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively (3 per cent above, 12 per cent below and 3 per cent above by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in the proposed Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville, Stanground Central and Stanground East wards would be 15 per cent, 6 per cent, 10 per cent and 8 per cent above the district average respectively (8 per cent, 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 1 per cent above by 2006).

54 At Stage Three the Council put forward two amendments to the draft recommendations in this area. It proposed combining the proposed single-member Woodston ward and two-member South ward to create a three-member Orton with Hampton ward incorporating the Hampton housing development. It argued that this proposal "manifestly improves electoral balance numbers" and also "uses the mathematics of the situation to allow greater flexibility in upward growth" as a three-member ward could absorb more electors and still stay within a 10 per cent variance than a two-member ward. The Council stated that "extensive shopping facilities are already in place and libraries, community centres, etc. will soon follow" in the Hampton development while the "northern end of the new ward is - for all intents and purposes - devoid of such facilities; there is no shopping precinct, no library, no community centre". It "therefore anticipates a high level of sharing of community facilities between the different parts of the ward in the future". The Council also stated that it was opposed to single-member wards in urban areas.

55 The Labour Party opposed the City Council's suggestion that Woodston ward be combined with the South ward to form "Orton with Hampton". It supported the draft recommendation for a single-member ward but wished to rename this ward Botolph ward as it considered that "the use of the name Woodston is a totally erroneous description of the ward". It stated that Woodston "refers to an area north of Oundle Road within the proposed Fletton ward" whereas one of the areas contained in the proposed ward is that of Botolph Green. The Labour Party did not "believe that purely in the interest of electoral equality this ward [Woodston] should be combined with the proposed South ward" and considered that "the needs and interests of these two separate and diverse areas are completely different and they are physically separated by the Parkway and the Woodston Industrial Estate". The Labour Party supported the draft recommendations for the Stanground area and considered that the LGCE's proposal "best represents the community interests of Stanground, dividing as it does the new Park Farm Estate from the old and more deprived areas of Stanground". It stated that it had "tried to draw boundaries elsewhere but find[s] that only the boundary chosen by the LGCE respects local ties".

56 Councillor Rainey expressed "support for the suggested ward boundaries for the Ortons" but considered that "the single member ward should be called Botolph rather than Woodston,

which would cause confusion". She stated that "many of the homes in the ward are built around 'Botolph Green' so they already have 'Botolph' as part of their postal address".

57 Eleven residents supported the draft recommendations for South, Stanground and Woodston wards. They were also content with the proposals for the wards comprising "the Ortons". Four residents opposed the draft recommendations for the proposed Woodston ward and supported the Council's proposal for a three-member Orton with Hampton ward instead. One resident of the area stated that "many, many people in this area use the Hampton Shopping Area because it is so convenient, and as the centre develops over the years we will use it more and more". Another resident stated that "if we are not to be included in Orton Longueville, it makes far more sense to take up our City Council's suggestion of a link up with Hampton" as "the convenience of using the Tesco Extra store and the other shops within it is persuading more and more people to go there rather than the city centre". The same resident stated that "I understand that there are to be other facilities like a library in the Hampton Centre and that will make us look in that direction even more". Another resident was "against being included in Woodston ward" and preferred to be included in a ward with Hampton. Another resident opposed the proposed Woodston ward and stated that "if the ward is to be changed then it should be in tandem with Hampton, not Woodston".

58 A resident opposed the draft recommendations for Stanground and Woodston wards. Another resident proposed an amendment to the proposed boundary between Fletton and Woodston wards to move all of the new development on the site of the old British Sugar Works into a single ward. Another resident supported the draft recommendations concerning Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville wards and pointed out a mapping error regarding the boundary between Orton Brimbles and Orton Village parish wards. The same resident would prefer to see elections every second year.

59 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations in the southern area with two amendments. We propose adopting the Council's amendment to create a three-member Orton with Hampton ward by merging the proposed single-member Woodston ward with the proposed two-member South ward as this proposal provides a substantial improvement in electoral equality and evidence has been provided for the existence of community links between these two areas. We would not normally place two such geographically disparate areas in the same ward but we consider that, given the good road links between the two areas, the evidence provided by the Council and by residents that people in the proposed Woodston ward are increasingly looking towards the Hampton development for the provision of services, and the substantial improvement in electoral equality that this proposal provides, this amendment provides an improvement on the draft recommendations. We also consider that as the Hampton development proceeds, the community links between these two areas will grow stronger.

60 The other amendment that we are adopting is a change to the boundary between the proposed parish wards of Orton Brimbles & Southgate and Orton Village which is discussed in more detail in the parishing section at the end of this chapter. This amendment would not affect the district ward boundaries. We are content to endorse the draft recommendations in the rest of the southern area. Although the Council proposed two two-member wards in the Stanground area it did not provide sufficient evidence as to why this would be an improvement on our draft recommendations and, in light of the support from Labour and local residents in this area, we consider that the draft recommendations provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We also considered the proposal of a resident to amend the boundary between the proposed Fletton and Woodston wards to contain all the electors in the new development on the site of the old British Sugar Works in one ward. However, amending the boundary in this area to accomplish this would involve the creation of a parish ward of Orton Longueville parish containing no electors at present and we do not consider that this provides effective and convenient local government. However, the development is proceeding and we recommend that the Council carries out a parish review following this review to amend the

parish boundary of Orton Longueville parish to ensure that all electors in the new development are contained in the same ward.

61 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in our proposed Fletton and Orton with Hampton wards would be 3 per cent and 57 per cent below the district average respectively (2 per cent above and 7 per cent below by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in our proposed Orton Longueville, Orton Waterville, Stanground Central and Stanground East wards would be 15 per cent, 6 per cent, 10 per cent and 7 per cent above the district average respectively (7 per cent, 4 per cent, 4 per cent and 3 per cent above by 2006). The proposed wards are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards

62 These four wards form the western part of the urban area of Peterborough city. North Bretton ward (comprising North Bretton parish ward of Bretton parish), Ravensthorpe ward and West ward are each represented by three councillors while South Bretton ward (comprising South Bretton parish ward of Bretton parish) is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor in South Bretton and West wards is 6 per cent and 1 per cent above the district average respectively (1 per cent above and 2 per cent below the district average by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in North Bretton and Ravensthorpe wards is 1 per cent and 7 per cent below the district average respectively (8 per cent and 13 per cent below the district average by 2006).

63 At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the existing North and South Bretton wards but put forward amendments to Ravensthorpe and West wards to improve electoral equality and to provide stronger and more easily identifiable boundaries. It proposed moving all the electors in the area south of Westfield Road who are currently in Ravensthorpe ward into West ward. It also proposed moving into Ravensthorpe ward from West ward all the electors in the area bordered by Atherstone Avenue to the north, Enfield Gardens to the west and all those living on Portman Close to the south. It also proposed transferring all electors to the south of the River Nene who are currently in West ward into an enlarged South ward, to be represented by three councillors. It proposed that the amended Ravensthorpe ward should be represented by two councillors rather than three as at present, but that the revised West ward should continue to be represented by three councillors.

64 Councillors Sandford and Sharp noted that “proposals in the Council submission regarding the Ravensthorpe ward could potentially alter the delicate political balance on the Council” and stated that they would like to “see other proposals considered which may be less disruptive”. However, it did not fall within the remit of the LGCE to consider the effect that any changes in electoral arrangements may have on the political make-up of an authority as part of a Periodic Electoral Review, and thus the LGCE were unable to take their comments into account while formulating the draft recommendations.

65 The LGCE carefully considered the scheme put forward by the Council in this area, but proposed its own warding arrangement which it considered would provide for stronger, more easily identifiable boundaries while improving electoral equality. The existing South Bretton ward, which the Council proposed retaining, breaches the A47. The LGCE considered that a dual carriageway such as the A47 provides an extremely strong boundary and was therefore keen to use such a feature as a boundary, if at all possible. The LGCE proposed an amended three-member North Bretton ward with all the electors in the Deerleap, Muskham and Sprignall area west of Bretton Way transferring from South Bretton ward into North Bretton ward. An amended South Bretton ward would be represented by one councillor rather than two as at present and would have the boundaries of the A47 to the east and south, the existing boundary to the west and the southern edge of the Sprignall, Deerleap and Muskham estate to the north. The area to the east of the A47 that is currently contained in South Bretton ward

would be split between amended Ravensthorpe and West wards. All those electors east of Breamore Gardens and Vine Walk and all the electors on Ledbury Road and Portman Close east of Tiverton Road would transfer from South Bretton ward to Ravensthorpe ward. The remainder of the electors to the east of the A47 who are currently in South Bretton ward would be included in West ward.

66 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed North Bretton, Ravensthorpe, South Bretton and West wards would be 11 per cent, 14 per cent, 8 per cent and 10 per cent above the district average respectively (3 per cent, 7 per cent, 5 per cent and 5 per cent above by 2006).

67 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council proposed two amendments in this area. It proposed amending the boundary between North and South Bretton wards to move away from the draft recommendations to create two two-member wards rather than a single-member ward and a three-member ward. The Council stated that this proposal “creates a modest improvement in electoral balance numbers”, referred to its “aversion to single-member wards” and considered that its proposal had the support of Bretton parish council. Bretton parish council responded to an initial questionnaire circulated by the City Council and, in response to a question about the number of councillors, stated that “there should always be two so that during holidays or sickness one councillor will always be available”. It also stated that “Tollgate, Middleton, Drayton, Cleatham and Tysedale should be put back into South Bretton ward and the Netherton bits taken out” and that “Bretton should be divided at Sainsbury’s roundabout (Bretton gate) into North and South and should only include residents of Bretton”.

68 The Council also proposed an amendment to the boundary between the proposed Ravensthorpe and West wards and stated that the “effect of this proposal is (i) to shift part of the Netherton Estate from South Bretton to West ward (together with the remaining bulk of the Netherton Estate) instead of shifting it to Ravensthorpe and (ii) to retain the northern portion of West Town in Ravensthorpe rather than shifting it to West ward”. This proposal would not alter the levels of electoral equality in the area. The Council also stated that “in addition to more closely matching community identity in both areas, this proposal would have an important effect on the efficient functioning of local government in that the affected portion of West Town is an area of significant social deprivation which will be eligible for significant ward-specific external funding for regeneration if – but only if – it remains in the Ravensthorpe ward”. The Council also stated that “the area between Westfield Road and Mayor’s Walk contains a substantial proportion of Council-built housing, some of which is now in private hands. It also includes pockets of social deprivation”. The Council went on to say that “in these two respects, this part of the West Town area shares some characteristics of the Westwood and Ravensthorpe Estate areas but contrasts sharply with other areas to the south of Mayor’s Walk. In particular, the western and southern fringes of the existing RAV1 polling district...are now areas of substantial affluence”. The Council also proposed putting the name of the community first in the ward names for Bretton as this procedure is followed elsewhere in the City.

69 Labour supported the Council’s proposals for this area but “repeated its objections to the reduction in the number of councillors in this area from 10 to 9”. It supported the creation of two two-member wards in Bretton “in recognition of the natural boundary at Bretton Centre” and considered that “this return to a more recognisable boundary will be more easily understood by local residents”.

70 Councillor Rainey considered that “the West Town area of Ravensthorpe ward has strong links with the rest of the ward” and stated that “the residents of Ravensthorpe, Westwood Residents Association and West Town Residents Association work together on areas of common interest such as community safety”. She also argued that “West Town residents, in my view, have little in common with the residents of West ward, who are mostly owner-

occupiers of their houses – many very large, and the residents are relatively affluent”. Councillor Rainey considered that a local regeneration project, Urban II, would “increase the joint participation across the ward and strengthen the shared sense of community and identity”. Finally she stated that “if the ward [Ravensthorpe] is to be a two-member ward then the Netherton area should be included in West ward, but the West Town area stay with Westwood and Ravensthorpe” and also supported the Council’s proposals for Bretton.

71 Councillor Sandford considered that both North Bretton and South Bretton should be represented by two councillors but did not consider that the Council’s proposed boundary between the two wards offered the best solution. He stated that “in this instance community identity should outweigh precise electoral equality and that Barnstock and Benland should form part of North Bretton ward, where they have been since the housing was built in the early 1970s”.

72 Councillor Ridgway “welcomed and supported the Commission’s proposal to restore large portions of West Town and Netherton to West ward” and also supported the proposal put forward by the Council for an amendment to the boundaries between the proposed Ravensthorpe and West wards.

73 Nine residents supported the Council’s proposed amendments to the Bretton area and to Ravensthorpe and West wards. Another resident supported the Commission’s draft recommendations, particularly with respect to the Ravensthorpe and West wards. A resident was “delighted to learn that the Peterborough City Council has put forward a proposal to restore our neighbourhood – Netherton – to West ward”. Three residents opposed the draft recommendations for Bretton but “would fully support adjusting the current northern boundary of the South Bretton ward in such a way that both North and South Bretton wards are each represented by two councillors”. Another resident opposed the creation of single-member wards in urban areas and would prefer to “‘balance’ each half of Bretton with a two-seat ward for both North and South Bretton”.

74 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received and have decided, with one amendment, to confirm the draft recommendations for this area. Having considered all the representations we are proposing to adopt the Council’s proposed amendment to the boundary between the proposed wards of Ravensthorpe and West as we consider that this would provide a better reflection of community identity while also providing a stronger and more easily identifiable boundary than under the draft recommendations. Although we are unable to take social deprivation and regeneration issues into account we considered that enough supplementary evidence of community identity was provided for us to adopt this proposed amendment. However, although there was some support for the proposed amendment to the boundary between North Bretton and South Bretton wards put forward by the Council, in this instance we do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to convince us that this option provided an improvement on the draft recommendations. The Council based its argument on a general aversion to single-member wards and we did not consider that the proposed amendment provided a strong and easily identifiable boundary. We considered the possibility, put forward by Councillor Sandford, of retaining Barnstock and Benland estates as part of North Bretton ward but this proposal, while providing a strong boundary, would provide for a high level of electoral inequality which we consider to be unnecessarily high in this area. As proposed by the Council, we are changing the names of the proposed wards in this area so the name of the community comes first but we are confirming the ward boundaries in Bretton as we consider that the warding arrangements for this area under the draft recommendations provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

75 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bretton North, Bretton South, Ravensthorpe and West wards would be 11 per cent, 8 per cent, 12 per cent and 11 per cent above the district average respectively (4 per cent, 1 per cent, 5

76 per cent and 6 per cent above by 2006). The proposed wards are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Central, Dogsthorpe, East, North and Park wards

77 These five wards form the eastern part of the urban area of Peterborough city. Central ward, Dogsthorpe ward, East ward and Park ward are each represented by three councillors while North ward is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor in North and Park wards is 5 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to and 2 per cent below by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in Central, Dogsthorpe and East wards is 5 per cent, 7 per cent and 1 per cent below the district average respectively (9 per cent and 12 per cent below and 1 per cent above by 2006).

78 At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the existing warding arrangements in these five wards with three amendments. The first of these was the proposal to move part of the Bluebell Estate (the area to the east of Lavender Crescent and on Furze Ride) from North ward into Dogsthorpe ward. The second amendment was the proposal to create a new parish ward of Eye Parish to move all the electors in Finchfield and St Michael's Gate from Eye & Thorney ward into East ward. The final amendment was the proposal to move the southern boundary of East ward from its existing position to run along the north bank of the River Nene.

79 Councillors Miners, Pobjee and Ash recommended that if the boundaries of Dogsthorpe ward had to be altered, then a part of Bluebell Estate (Harebell Close, Ferndale Way, Heath Row, Meadow Grove, Ling Garth, Laburnam Grove, Furze Ride and all electors on the north side of Welland Road from the junction of Lavender Crescent up to the Welland Road bridge) should be moved from North ward to Dogsthorpe ward. This was the same amendment as put forward by the City Council.

80 Proforma letters were received from 20 residents of Dogsthorpe ward recommending that their ward boundaries be left as they are now. A resident of Finchfield requested that their road be transferred from Eye & Thorney ward into a Peterborough city ward.

81 Having carefully considered all the representations received, the LGCE proposed adopting the City Council's proposals, with the exception of the amendment to the southern boundary of East ward. It considered that the proposed amendment to Dogsthorpe ward provided for improved electoral equality while also taking account of community identity. It also considered that the proposal to move Finchfield and St Michael's Gate from Eye & Thorney ward into East ward was a good reflection of community identity. However, it was unable to move the southern boundary of East ward to the north bank of the River Nene as this would involve creating a parish ward of Stanground North parish which would contain no electors. As stated earlier, the LGCE did not consider that creating parish wards with no electors provides effective and convenient local government and therefore proposed retaining the existing southern boundary of East ward.

82 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Central, Dogsthorpe and North wards would be 5 per cent, 1 per cent and 4 per cent below the district average respectively (9 per cent, 7 per cent and 9 per cent below by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in the proposed East and Park wards would be 1 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (4 per cent above and 2 per cent below by 2006).

83 At Stage Three the Council supported the draft recommendations in this area. The Labour Party also supported the draft recommendations in this area but put forward an amendment to the boundary between Dogsthorpe and Paston wards to tidy up the boundary so that it followed the A47. This amendment does not affect any electors.

84 Councillors Ash, Miners and Pobjee “fully supported the draft recommendations concerning the enlargement of the Dogsthorpe electoral ward (by including part of the Bluebell Estate)”.

85 A resident considered that the draft recommendation to create a parish ward of Finchfield in East ward “would be a step too far”.

86 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we propose confirming the draft recommendations with one minor amendment that does not affect any electors. This amendment is the proposal put forward by the Labour Party to amend the boundary between Dogsthorpe and Paston wards to tidy up the boundary. The new boundary would run along the A47 rather than along the old Welland Road which we agree is a stronger boundary. We are content to confirm the remainder of our draft recommendations in this area as final as we consider that they provide the best balance between the statutory criteria.

87 Under our final recommendations the electoral variances would remain the same as under the draft recommendations and the proposed wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map in the back of the report.

Paston, Walton, Werrington North and Werrington South wards

88 These four wards are situated in the north of the urban areas of Peterborough city. Paston ward, Werrington North ward and Werrington South ward are each represented by three councillors while Walton ward is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Walton ward is 4 per cent above the district average (2 per cent below by 2006) while the number of electors in Paston, Werrington North and Werrington South wards is 6 per cent, 4 per cent and 3 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent, 10 per cent and 9 per cent below by 2006).

89 At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the existing arrangements in the northern area of Peterborough with one amendment which would affect very few electors. This proposed amendment would involve moving the boundary between Newborough ward and Werrington North ward to run along the Glinton Bypass and would involve the warding of Newborough parish.

90 Councillors Sandford and Sharp proposed retaining the existing Walton ward in its entirety, as put forward by the Council.

91 Having considered the representations received regarding this area the LGCE was content to endorse the proposals put forward by the Council, with one exception. It considered that the existing wards provided a reasonable level of electoral equality which could not be improved without breaching extremely strong boundaries. However, the Council’s proposal to ward Newborough parish would result in the creation of a parish ward which would contain very few electors. The LGCE therefore proposed retaining the existing boundary between Newborough ward and Werrington North ward.

92 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Paston, Werrington North and Werrington South wards would be 6 per cent, 4 per cent and 3 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent, 10 per cent and 9 per cent below by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in our proposed Walton ward would be 4 per cent above the district average (2 per cent below by 2006).

93 At Stage Three the Council and the Labour Party supported the draft recommendations in this area. Councillor Sandford supported the Council’s submission with one qualification

(relating to the Bretton area) and was particularly pleased with the proposal to “retain the current ward boundaries in the northern part of the urban area including my own Walton ward”.

94 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we propose confirming the draft recommendations as final, subject to the small amendment to the proposed boundary between Dogsthorpe and Paston wards detailed in the previous section.

95 Under our final recommendations the electoral variances would remain the same as under the draft recommendations and the proposed wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map in the back of the report.

Barnack, Eye & Thorney, Glinton, Newborough, Northborough and Wittering wards

96 These six wards form the rural part of the district to the east, west and north of the city of Peterborough. Barnack ward (comprising the parishes of Bainton, Barnack, Etton, Helpston, Southorpe, St Martin’s Without and Ufford), Glinton ward (comprising the parishes of Ailsworth, Castor, Glinton and Marholm), Newborough ward (comprising the parishes of Borough Fen, Newborough and Peakirk), Northborough ward (comprising the parishes of Deeping Gate, Maxey and Northborough) and Wittering ward (comprising the parishes of Sutton, Thornhaugh, Upton, Wansford, Wittering and Wothorpe) are each represented by one councillor while Eye & Thorney ward (comprising the parishes of Eye and Thorney) is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Barnack, Eye & Thorney, Glinton and Northborough wards is 1 per cent, 9 per cent, 28 per cent and 2 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent, 10 per cent, 22 per cent and 2 per cent above by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in Newborough and Wittering wards is 10 per cent below the district average in both wards (4 per cent above and 9 per cent above by 2006).

97 At Stage One the City Council proposed a scheme consisting of five single-member wards and one two-member ward for the rural area, largely based on the existing warding arrangements with certain amendments to improve electoral equality. The Council proposed a revised single-member Barnack ward with Etton parish moving from Barnack ward into Northborough ward and Wothorpe parish moving from Wittering ward into Barnack ward. It proposed retaining the majority of the existing two-member Eye & Thorney ward but proposed warding Eye parish to take account of the urban overspill in the Finchfield area. This parish ward would transfer the urban overspill area from Eye & Thorney district ward into East district ward. It proposed an amended single-member Glinton ward, with Ailsworth parish moving from Glinton ward into Wittering ward. The Council proposed retaining the existing single-member Newborough ward with just one small change to the south-western boundary with Werrington North ward, which would only affect two electors. This amendment would involve moving the existing boundary between Newborough ward and Werrington North ward to run along the Glinton Bypass. It put forward an amended single-member Northborough ward with Etton parish moving from Barnack ward into Northborough ward. Finally, the Council proposed an amended single-member Wittering ward with Ailsworth parish moving from Glinton ward into Wittering ward and Wothorpe parish moving from Wittering ward into Barnack ward.

98 Ailsworth Parish Council opposed the Council’s proposal to place them in a different ward to Castor parish. Castor Parish Council opposed the Council’s proposals to place them in a different ward to Ailsworth parish and stated that “separate ward councillors would be uneconomic, duplicate effort and could lead to conflicting views and lack of alignment regarding the needs of what is actually one community”.

99 Etton Parish Council wished to remain within Barnack ward. Maxey Parish Council stated that it “is pleased to note that the City Council proposes that Maxey shall remain within the ward of Northborough”. Southorpe Parish Council stated that they were “absolutely adamant

that Southorpe should remain connected with Barnack as we share many services with them, eg church and cemetery". A resident of Finchfield requested that they be transferred from Eye & Thorney ward into a Peterborough city ward.

100 The LGCE carefully considered all the representations received regarding this area. In general it was content to endorse the proposals put forward by the City Council as it considered that they provided a good balance between electoral equality and community identity. However, it considered that the level of electoral inequality provided by the Council's proposal for Wittering ward (17 per cent above the district average) was unacceptably high and did not provide a good reflection of community identity. It was persuaded by the argumentation put forward by Ailsworth and Castor parish councils and, having visited the area, was of the opinion that these two parish councils form part of the same community and should not be placed in separate wards. Therefore, in the absence of any alternative, it proposed its own two-member Glinton & Wittering ward comprising all the parishes in the existing Glinton and Wittering wards with the exception of Wothorpe parish which, as proposed by the Council, would transfer to Barnack ward. While the LGCE accepted that two single-member wards would be preferred locally, it was unable to achieve this without either warding parishes, or proposing wards that would result in unacceptably high levels of electoral equality.

101 In the remainder of the rural area the LGCE was content to endorse the proposals put forward by the City Council with the exception of its proposal to move the boundary between Newborough ward and Werrington North ward to run along Glinton by-pass. Moving this boundary would involve moving the external boundary of Newborough parish which did not fall within the remit of a Periodic Electoral Review, or creating a parish ward containing very few electors which the LGCE did not consider provided effective and convenient local government. In the rest of the rural area it considered that the Council's proposals provided a good balance between electoral equality and the recognition of community identity.

102 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Barnack ward (comprising the parishes of Bainton, Barnack, Helpston, Southorpe, St Martin's Without, Ufford and Wothorpe), Eye & Thorney ward (comprising Thorney parish and the parish wards of Eye and Eye Green of Eye parish), Glinton & Wittering ward (comprising the parishes of Ailsworth, Castor, Glinton, Marholm, Sutton, Thornhaugh, Upton, Wansford and Wittering) and Northborough ward (comprising the parishes of Deeping Gate, Etton, Maxey and Northborough) would be 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 4 per cent and 7 per cent above the district average respectively (7 per cent, 7 per cent, 11 per cent and 8 per cent above the district average by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in the proposed Newborough ward (comprising the parishes of Borough Fen, Newborough and Peakirk) would be 10 per cent below the district average (4 per cent above the district average by 2006).

103 At Stage Three both the Council and the Labour Party supported the draft recommendations for the rural area. Ailsworth and Barnack parish councils supported the draft recommendations. Etton Parish Council opposed moving Etton parish from Barnack ward into Northborough ward and considered that "a major concern of many parishioners – primary education – will be best served by the parish of Etton remaining within the ward of Barnack, within which ward Etton's youngsters traditionally attend the primary school at Helpston".

104 Marholm Parish Council stated that it "made no comment" on the draft recommendations and Maxey Parish Council supported the draft recommendations. Sutton Parish Council opposed the amalgamation of Glinton and Wittering wards and preferred retaining the existing single-member Wittering ward. Wansford Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations and wished to retain the status quo.

105 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we propose confirming the draft recommendations in their entirety as final. Although Etton, Sutton and Wansford parishes opposed the draft recommendations, no alternative proposals were put

forward that offered an improvement on them and, in light of the support of the Council and the Labour Party for the draft recommendations, we are content that this warding arrangement provides the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

106 Under our final recommendations the electoral variances would remain the same as in the draft recommendations and the proposed wards are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

107 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

108 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE's consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse those draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- in the southern area of Peterborough we propose that the two-member South ward and the single-member Woodston ward be combined to form a three-member Orton with Hampton ward;
- in the western area we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Ravensthorpe and West wards;
- in the eastern area we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Dogsthorpe and Paston wards;
- in Orton Waterville we propose amending the boundary between the parish wards of Orton Brimbles and Southgate and Orton Village.

109 We conclude that, in Peterborough:

- a council of 57 members should be retained;
- there should be 24 wards, the same number as at present;
- the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified.

110 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	57	57	57	57
Number of wards	24	24	24	24
Average number of electors per councillor	1,914	1,914	2,070	2,070
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	3	5	5	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	2	1	2	0

111 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would initially result in an increase in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from three to five, with just one ward varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. However, this level of electoral equality would improve in 2006, with only one ward, Glinton & Wittering, varying by more than 10 per cent from the average, at 11 per cent. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation

Peterborough City Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 24 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of this report.

Parish Council Electoral Arrangements

112 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards, it should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. In the LGCE’s draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for Bretton, Eye, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville parish to reflect the proposed district wards.

113 The parish of Bretton is currently served by 20 councillors representing two wards: North Bretton ward (represented by 13 councillors) and South Bretton ward (represented by seven councillors). The LGCE proposed amending the boundary between North and South Bretton parish wards in order to facilitate the district warding arrangements in the area, with the proposed parish ward boundary following the proposed district ward boundary. It proposed that the amended North Bretton ward should be represented by 15 councillors and the amended South Bretton ward should be represented by five councillors.

114 At Stage Three the Council put forward alternative parishing arrangements for this area in light of the scheme it proposed for district warding arrangements. It proposed that Bretton North parish ward and Bretton South parish ward should each return 10 councillors and that the parish ward boundaries should reflect its proposed district ward boundaries in the area. It also proposed changing the names of the parish and district wards to put the name of the community first, as it is in other areas of Peterborough. No further comments were received at Stage Three.

115 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Bretton parish as final with the only change being to put the name of the community first.

Final Recommendation

Bretton Parish Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bretton North (returning 15 councillors) and Bretton South (returning five councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

116 The parish of Eye is currently served by 15 councillors representing two wards: Eye ward (represented by 12 councillors) and Eye Green ward (represented by three councillors). As put forward by the City Council the LGCE proposed to create a third parish ward in Eye parish in order to transfer the urban overspill in the Finchfield area from Eye & Thorney district ward into East district ward. It proposed that this new parish ward should be named Finchfield and should be represented by one councillor while Eye parish ward should be represented by 11 councillors, a reduction of one.

117 No representations were received regarding the parishing arrangements in this area at Stage Three and we therefore propose endorsing the draft recommendations as final.

Final Recommendation

Eye Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Eye ward (represented by 11 councillors), Eye Green ward (represented by three councillors) and Finchfield ward (represented by one councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

118 The parish of Orton Longueville is currently served by 11 councillors representing two parish wards: Botolph (represented by three councillors) and Longueville (represented by eight councillors). As put forward by the City Council and in light of the scheme the LGCE adopted for district warding in the area, the LGCE proposed amending the boundary between Botolph and Longueville parish wards so that the area to the west of Nene Parkway and north of Oundle Road (currently part of Botolph parish ward and West district ward) becomes part of Longueville parish ward and Orton Longueville district ward. This amendment would affect very few electors and the allocation of parish councillors between these two wards would remain unchanged. In the light of the LGCE's proposed district warding scheme the LGCE also proposed that Botolph parish ward becomes part of the proposed Woodston district ward.

119 No representations were received regarding the parishing arrangements in this area at Stage Three. However, in light of the warding arrangement we have adopted at district level in this area we propose that the proposed Botolph parish ward becomes part of the proposed

Orton with Hampton district ward. We propose endorsing the remainder of the draft recommendations in this area as final.

Final Recommendation

Orton Longueville Parish Council should comprise 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Botolph (returning three councillors) and Longueville (returning eight councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

120 The parish of Orton Waterville is currently served by 12 councillors representing five parish wards: Orton Brimbles & Southgate (represented by three councillors), Orton Goldhay East (represented by one councillor), Orton Goldhay West (represented by two councillors), Orton Village (represented by three councillors) and Orton Wistow (represented by three councillors). In light of the scheme for district warding that the LGCE proposed in this area, it proposed amending the boundary between the parish wards of Orton Goldhay East and Orton Goldhay West to reflect the proposed district ward boundary amendment. To improve equality of representation in the area the LGCE also proposed increasing the number of councillors representing Orton Goldhay East from one to two.

121 The LGCE also proposed an amendment to the boundary between Orton Brimbles & Southgate and Orton Goldhay West parish wards to rectify a mistake in the Final Recommendations on the Future Electoral Arrangements for Peterborough report of December 1996. As put forward by a resident of Orton Waterville it proposed moving the boundary between Orton Brimbles & Southgate and Orton Goldhay West from its current position (running north along Orton Parkway from the roundabout near Orton Centre to Oundle Road) to run south along Orton Parkway from the roundabout near Orton Centre to Fletton Parkway.

122 At Stage Three a resident pointed out a mapping error in the draft recommendations regarding the boundary between the parish wards of Orton Brimbles and Southgate and Orton Village. The housing estate, Chandlers, is shown as being in Orton Village parish ward where it should be included in Orton Brimbles and Southgate parish ward. No further representations were received regarding the parishing arrangements in this area at Stage Three.

123 Having carefully considered the representation received at Stage Three, we are content to confirm the draft recommendations as final with just one amendment to transfer Chandlers from Orton Village parish ward to Orton Brimbles and Southgate parish ward.

Final Recommendation

Orton Waterville Parish Council should comprise 13 parish councillors, one more than at present, representing five wards: Orton Brimbles & Southgate (returning three councillors), Orton Goldhay East (returning two councillors), Orton Goldhay West (returning two councillors), Orton Village (returning three councillors) and Orton Wistow (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Peterborough

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

124 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Peterborough and submitted our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692).

125 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 20 August 2002.

126 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW