

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Lichfield in Staffordshire

*May 2000*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>33</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Lichfield: Detailed Mapping	<i>35</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements – Lichfield District Council – Lichfield District Labour Party	<i>39</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>45</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Burntwood and Lichfield is inserted inside the back cover of this report.



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Lichfield on 28 September 1999.

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

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

- **in 13 of the 27 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is expected to deteriorate, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 16 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 101-102) are that:

- **Lichfield District Council should have 57 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 25 wards, instead of 27 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 24 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of two, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 21 of the proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average, with no ward varying by more than 20 per cent.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in 23 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the towns of Burntwood and Lichfield;**
- **revised warding arrangements for Drayton Bassett Parish Council;**
- **a reduction in the number of councillors serving Lichfield City Council;**
- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Longdon Parish Council.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 9 May 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 3 July 2000:

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Alrewas & Fradley	3	Alrewas ward (part – the parish of Alrewas & Fradley)	Map 2
2	Armitage with Handsacre	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Armitage & Handsacre)	Map 2
3	Boley Park (Lichfield)	3	Central ward (part); St John's ward (part)	Large map
4	Boney Hay (Burntwood)	2	Boney Hay ward; Chase Terrace ward (part); Highfield ward (part)	Large map
5	Bourne Vale	1	Bourne Vale ward (part – the parishes of Hints, Swinfen and Weeford and the proposed Village parish ward of Drayton Bassett parish)	Map 2 and Map A2
6	Chadsmead (Lichfield)	2	Chadsmead ward; Curborough ward (part); Leomansley ward (part)	Large map
7	Chase Terrace (Burntwood)	3	Chase Terrace ward (part)	Large map
8	Chasetown (Burntwood)	2	Chasetown ward (part)	Large map
9	Colton & Mavesyn Ridware	1	Colton & Ridwares ward (part – the parishes of Colton and Mavesyn Ridware)	Map 2
10	Curborough (Lichfield)	3	Curborough ward (part)	Large map
11	Fazeley	3	Drayton Bassett ward (part – the proposed parish ward of Coleshill); Fazeley ward	Map 2 and Map A2
12	Hammerwich & Wall	1	Hammerwich ward (part – Hammerwich parish ward of Hammerwich parish); Shenstone ward (part – the parish of Wall)	Map 2
13	Hammerwich Triangle (Burntwood)	3	Chasetown ward (part); Hammerwich ward (part – Ogley Hay and Triangle parish wards of Hammerwich parish); Summerfield ward (part)	Large map
14	Highfield (Burntwood)	3	Highfield ward (part)	Large map
15	King's Bromley	1	Colton & Ridwares ward (part – the parish of Hamstall Ridware); King's Bromley ward (part – the parishes of Curborough & Elmhurst and King's Bromley)	Map 2
16	Leomansley (Lichfield)	3	Central ward (part); Leomansley ward (part)	Large map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
17	Little Aston	2	<i>Unchanged</i> (Little Aston parish ward of Shenstone parish)	Map 2
18	Longdon	1	King's Bromley ward (part – the parish of Farewell & Chorley); Longdon ward	Map 2
19	Mease & Tame	2	Mease Valley ward; Tame ward	Map 2
20	Redslade (Burntwood)	2	<i>Unchanged</i>	Large map
21	St John's (Lichfield)	3	St John's ward (part)	Large map
22	Shenstone	3	Shenstone ward (part – Shenstone parish ward of Shenstone parish); Stonnall ward	Map 2
23	Stowe (Lichfield)	3	Central ward (part); Curborough ward (part); Stowe ward	Large map
24	Summerfield (Burntwood)	2	All Saints ward (part); Summerfield ward (part)	Large map
25	Whittington	2	Alrewas ward (part – the parish of Streethay); Whittington ward	Map 2

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

*2 Map 2, the maps in Appendix A and the large map at the back of this report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Lichfield

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Alrewas & Fradley	3	3,401	1,134	-13	4,239	1,413	1
2	Armitage with Handsacre	3	3,989	1,330	3	4,457	1,486	6
3	Boley Park (Lichfield)	3	4,011	1,337	3	4,187	1,396	0
4	Boney Hay (Burntwood)	2	2,617	1,309	1	2,685	1,343	-4
5	Bourne Vale	1	1,384	1,384	7	1,382	1,382	-1
6	Chadsmead (Lichfield)	2	2,802	1,401	8	2,814	1,407	0
7	Chase Terrace (Burntwood)	3	3,653	1,218	-6	4,148	1,383	-1
8	Chasetown (Burntwood)	2	2,746	1,373	6	2,775	1,388	-1
9	Colton & Mavesyn Ridware	1	1,384	1,384	7	1,571	1,571	12
10	Curborough (Lichfield)	3	3,979	1,326	2	4,066	1,355	-3
11	Fazeley	3	3,659	1,220	-6	3,820	1,273	-9
12	Hammerwich & Wall	1	1,217	1,217	-6	1,267	1,267	-10
13	Hammerwich Triangle (Burntwood)	3	4,246	1,415	9	4,271	1,424	2
14	Highfield (Burntwood)	3	3,990	1,330	3	4,502	1,501	7
15	King's Bromley	1	1,319	1,319	2	1,460	1,460	4
16	Leomansley (Lichfield)	3	3,198	1,066	-18	4,264	1,421	1
17	Little Aston	2	2,247	1,124	-13	2,520	1,260	-10
18	Longdon	1	1,531	1,531	18	1,585	1,585	13
19	Mease & Tame	2	2,677	1,339	3	2,948	1,474	5
20	Redslade (Burntwood)	2	2,701	1,351	4	2,797	1,399	0
21	St John's (Lichfield)	3	4,137	1,379	6	4,472	1,491	6
22	Shenstone	3	3,620	1,207	-7	3,827	1,276	-9

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
23 Stowe (Lichfield)	3	4,174	1,391	7	4,312	1,437	3
24 Summerfield (Burntwood)	2	2,591	1,296	0	2,658	1,329	-5
25 Whittington	2	2,596	1,298	0	2,730	1,365	-3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>73,869</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>79,839</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lichfield District 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Lichfield. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1976 (Report No. 138). The electoral arrangements of Staffordshire County Council were last reviewed in July 1980 (Report No. 386). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements shortly after completion of the district reviews to enable orders to be made by the Secretary of State in time for the 2005 county elections.

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

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

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

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

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

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

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

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including the Staffordshire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

12 Stage One began on 28 September 1999, when we wrote to Lichfield District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Staffordshire County Council, Staffordshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Staffordshire Parish Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with

constituency interests in the district and the Members of the European Parliament for the West Midlands Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 10 January 2000.

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

14 Stage Three began on 9 May 2000 and will end on 3 July 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The district of Lichfield is situated in the south-east of Staffordshire and is bordered by the West Midlands to the south, Cannock Chase to the west, Stafford and East Staffordshire to the north, and South Derbyshire and Tamworth to the west. It includes the town of Burntwood and the historic cathedral city of Lichfield. The remainder of the district is largely rural and agricultural in character, with some manufacturing industry. There is substantial residential development throughout the area, based on the district's proximity to Birmingham and the West Midlands, with which the district has good road and rail links. The area is wholly parished, containing 27 parishes.

17 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'.

18 The electorate of the district is 73,871 (February 1999). The Council presently has 56 members who are elected from 27 wards, 14 of which are rural in character, with the remainder being relatively urban. Nine of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 11 are each represented by two councillors and seven are single-member wards. Whole-council elections take place every four years.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate of Lichfield district, with around 14 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Central and Highfield wards.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,319 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,426 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 13 of the 27 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, five wards by more than 20 per cent and four wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Central ward where each councillor represents 71 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Lichfield*

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	All Saints	2	1,606	803	-39	1,659	830	-42
2	Alrewas	3	3,805	1,268	-4	4,679	1,560	9
3	Armitage with Handsacre	3	3,989	1,330	1	4,457	1,486	4
4	Boney Hay (Burntwood)	2	2,437	1,219	-8	2,497	1,249	-12
5	Bourne Vale	1	1,530	1,530	16	1,529	1,529	7
6	Central (Lichfield)	2	4,520	2,260	71	4,812	2,406	69
7	Chadsmead (Lichfield)	2	2,473	1,237	-6	2,477	1,239	-13
8	Chase Terrace (Burntwood)	3	3,735	1,245	-6	4,234	1,411	-1
9	Chasetown (Burntwood)	3	3,338	1,113	-16	3,373	1,124	-21
10	Colton & Ridwares	1	1,639	1,637	24	1,858	1,858	30
11	Curborough (Lichfield)	3	4,224	1,408	7	4,314	1,438	1
12	Fazeley	3	3,513	1,171	-11	3,673	1,224	-14
13	Hammerwich	3	3,305	1,102	-16	3,421	1,140	-20
14	Highfield (Burntwood)	2	4,092	2,046	55	4,604	2,302	61
15	King's Bromley	1	1,336	1,336	1	1,469	1,469	3
16	Leomansley (Lichfield)	2	2,437	1,219	-8	3,364	1,682	18
17	Little Aston	2	2,247	1,124	-15	2,520	1,260	-12
18	Longdon	1	1,259	1,259	-5	1,289	1,289	-10
19	Mease Valley	1	1,414	1,414	7	1,632	1,632	14
20	Redslade (Burntwood)	2	2,701	1,351	2	2,797	1,399	-2
21	St John's (Lichfield)	3	5,330	1,777	35	5,727	1,909	34
22	Shenstone	2	2,688	1,344	2	2,819	1,410	-1
23	Stonall	1	1,281	1,281	-3	1,374	1,374	-4

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
24 Stowe (Lichfield)	3	3,317	1,106	-16	3,421	1,140	-20
25 Summerfield (Burntwood)	2	2,202	1,101	-17	2,234	1,117	-22
26 Tame	1	1,263	1,263	-4	1,316	1,316	-8
27 Whittington	2	2,192	1,096	-17	2,290	1,145	-20
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>73,871</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>79,839</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,319</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,426</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lichfield District 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 1999, electors in All Saints ward were relatively over-represented by 39 per cent, while electors in Central ward were under-represented by 71 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the District Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received nine representations during Stage One, including district-wide schemes from the District Council and Lichfield District Labour Party, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission.

#### **Lichfield District Council**

23 The District Council proposed a council of 56 members, as at present, serving 26 wards, compared to the existing 27. It proposed nine three-member wards, 12 two-member wards, and five single-member wards. Overall, change was proposed to all but five of the existing wards. It supported retaining whole-council elections every four years.

24 Under the District Council's proposals there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average by more than 10 per cent in only seven wards. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average in only three wards by 2004. The District Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

#### **Lichfield District Labour Party**

25 Lichfield District Labour Party ("the Labour Party") proposed a council of 52 members, a reduction of four, serving 25 wards, compared to the existing 27. It proposed five three-member wards, 17 two-member wards, and three single-member wards, with the urban parts of the district being entirely comprised of two-member wards. Overall, change was proposed to all but two of the existing wards.

26 Under the Labour Party's proposals there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average by more than 10 per cent in only six wards. This level of electoral equality is expected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average in five wards by 2004. The Labour Party's proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

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

27 We received representations direct from six parish and town councils. Alrewas & Fradley with Streethay Parish Council argued that the Alrewas and Fradley, Orgreave and Streethay areas

should each be represented by two councillors. It opposed combining the parish in a ward with areas not within the current parish boundary. The joint parish council of Curborough, Elmhurst & Farewell and Chorley supported retaining the existing level of representation in King's Bromley ward, and, if change were necessary, argued that the parishes should be combined in a ward with similar parishes. Drayton Bassett Parish Council argued that the existing arrangements should be retained while King's Bromley Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals with regard to King's Bromley ward. Lichfield City Council supported the District Council's proposals for Lichfield City, and proposed that the number of councillors on the City Council should be reduced from 30 to 28 members. Longdon Parish Council proposed that the number of parish councillors representing Longdon parish ward should be increased by at least two.

### **Other Representations**

28 We received a further representation from a local resident, who argued that the number of city councillors representing Lichfield City Council should be reduced from 30 to 17.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

33 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 8 per cent from 73,871 to 79,839 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Leomansley ward, although a significant amount is also expected in the more rural Alrewas ward. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates.

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

## **Council Size**

35 As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

36 Lichfield District Council presently has 56 members and the District Council proposed that this level of representation should be retained. It argued that the existing electoral arrangements have “worked well over the years” and that it is not “necessary or desirable” to make radical changes to the council size.

37 The Labour Party proposed that the council size should be reduced from 56 to 52 members. It argued that a 52-member council would best meet “the requirements of the re-warding exercise” and “the requirement to balance the number of electors per councillor”.

38 We propose substantially adopting the District Council’s scheme in the district of Lichfield. However, we propose moving away from this scheme in Burntwood town and in the south of the district and in order to provide the correct level of representation in Burntwood, we propose increasing the council size by one to 57. We consider that this would achieve the best balance between securing reasonable electoral equality and reflecting the interests and identities of local communities. We have not been persuaded by the Labour Party’s proposal to reduce the existing council size, given that its scheme would offer worse electoral equality than the District Council’s scheme and that the Labour Party offered limited evidence as to the way in which a 52-member council would deliver more convenient and effective local government. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 57 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

39 After careful consideration of the evidence received at Stage One we consider that the District Council’s proposals would represent a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and we are content to endorse these proposals substantially. We consider that the District Council’s proposals would provide the best reflection of community identities and interests across the district, by respecting parish and parish ward boundaries to a large extent in the rural area and offering clearly identifiable boundaries within the towns of Burntwood and Lichfield. They would also offer improved electoral equality.

40 We note that the Labour Party offered little evidence in support of its proposal to reduce the size of the District Council and proposed a scheme with relatively poor electoral equality. It proposed combining rural and urban areas, which we do not consider would best reflect the identities and interests of the communities involved. Nevertheless, we note that there is a degree of consensus between the District Council’s and the Labour Party’s schemes and, where possible, we have reflected this in our draft recommendations. However, we propose departing from the District Council’s scheme in the parishes of Burntwood, Hammerwich and Shenstone in order to better reflect the interests and identities of communities.

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

**Burntwood (seven wards)**

- (a) Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Highfield and Redslade wards;
- (b) All Saints, Chasetown and Summerfield wards.

**Lichfield (six wards)**

- (c) Chadsmead, Curborough and Leomansley wards;
- (d) Central, St John's and Stowe wards.

**The rural areas**

- (e) Armitage with Handsacre, Colton & Ridwares, King's Bromley and Longdon wards;
- (f) Alrewas, Bourne Vale, Fazeley, Mease Valley, Tame and Whittington wards;
- (g) Hammerwich, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall wards.

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

**Burntwood (seven wards)**

**Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Highfield and Redslade wards**

43 The town of Burntwood comprises a single parish divided into seven parish wards which are the same as the district wards. The existing wards of Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Highfield and Redslade cover the northern area of Burntwood town. Boney Hay, Highfield and Redslade wards are each represented by two councillors, while Chase Terrace ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements of a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the district average by 8 per cent, 6 per cent, 55 per cent and 2 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Chase Terrace ward, to vary by 1 per cent from the district average in 2004, while Redslade ward would continue to vary by 2 per cent from the district average. The level of electoral equality in Boney Hay and Highfield wards is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, to vary by 12 per cent and 61 per cent respectively in 2004.

44 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed wards of Boney Hay, Highfield and Redslade each being represented by two councillors and the proposed Chase Terrace ward being represented by three councillors. It proposed that Boney Hay ward should comprise the existing Boney Hay ward with that part of Chase Terrace ward that includes houses on the western side of Rugeley Road, to the north of the High Street and that part of the existing Highfield ward that includes houses on the eastern side of Ogley Hay Road, to the north of Slade Avenue. It proposed that Chase Terrace ward should

comprise the remainder of the existing Chase Terrace ward which it considered to be a “well-defined” ward.

45 The District Council proposed that Highfield ward should comprise the remainder of Highfield ward, less that part bounded by Highfield Road and Rugeley Road. It proposed that Redslade ward should retain its existing boundaries, arguing that the ward “is well-defined and requires no adjustment”.

46 Under the District Council’s scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Highfield and Redslade wards by 1 per cent, 8 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally in Boney Hay and Highfield wards, varying by 6 per cent and 7 per cent from the district average respectively by 2004, but is projected to improve to a variance of 3 per cent in Chase Terrace ward, with the number of electors per councillor continuing to vary by 2 per cent from the district average in Redslade ward.

47 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed wards of Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, St Matthew’s and Slade each being represented by two councillors. It proposed that Boney Hay ward should comprise that part of the existing Boney Hay ward to the north of Mountbatten Close, Spinney Close and Spinney Lane, and that part of Chase Terrace ward to the north of Bleak House, High Street, School Lane and The Valley. It suggested that this ward could either be named Boney Hay or Chase Terrace North. It proposed that Chase Terrace ward should comprise the remainder of the existing Chase Terrace ward and that part of the existing Redslade ward to the west of Carlton Crescent, Cumberland Crescent, Fieldhouse Road, Lulworth Road and Myatt Avenue.

48 The Labour Party proposed that St Matthews ward should comprise the majority of the existing Highfield ward, less that part bounded by Highfield Road and Rugeley Road. It argued that the current electoral inequalities will improve in future, given the planned new housing on the site of the old St Matthew’s Hospital. It proposed a Slade ward comprising the remainder of Redslade and Boney Hay wards to the west of Boney Hay and Ogle Hay roads. It suggested that the ward could be named Slade or Burntwood Central. It argued that these proposals would work well “in terms of community”.

49 Under the Labour Party’s scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, St Matthew’s and Slade wards by 1 per cent, 9 per cent, 8 per cent and 3 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 3 per cent and 16 per cent in Boney Hay and Chase Terrace wards, while the electoral variance of St Matthew’s ward would improve to equal the district average, and in Slade ward would improve to 2 per cent from the district average by 2004.

50 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we consider that both the District Council’s and the Labour Party’s proposals have merit. Both schemes provide an

improved level of electoral equality, and utilise strong boundaries based on existing polling districts. However, we consider that the District Council's proposals for this area would offer the better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In particular, we have reservations regarding the Labour Party's proposed Chase Terrace ward which would have a high electoral variance under both a 52- and a 57-member scheme. We do not consider that this level of electoral inequality is justified given the alternative scheme that is available. However, as a result of our proposals in the south of Burntwood (detailed later), we propose amending the District Council's proposed Highfield ward in order to include that part of the existing Highfield ward to the south and west of Highfield Road and Rugeley Road to create an amended three-member Highfield ward.

51 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Highfield and Redslade wards by 1 per cent, 6 per cent, 3 per cent and 4 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years in Boney Hay and Highfield wards, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 4 per cent and 7 per cent in 2004 respectively. The electoral variance of Chase Terrace and Redslade wards would improve to 1 per cent and equal the district average respectively.

#### **All Saints, Chasetown and Summerfield wards**

52 The existing wards of All Saints, Chasetown and Summerfield cover the southern area of Burntwood town. All Saints and Summerfield wards are each currently represented by two councillors, while Chasetown ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements of a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the district average by 39 per cent, 16 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, to vary by 42 per cent, 21 per cent and 22 per cent in 2004.

53 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with the proposed wards of All Saints, Chasetown and Summerfield each being represented by two councillors. It proposed that the boundaries of Burntwood should be extended in order to address inequalities in the existing Hammerwich ward. It argued that, while other options had been considered, the Council was persuaded that the high level of electoral variance in Hammerwich ward would best be resolved by including part of the existing Hammerwich ward (and parish) in Chasetown ward. As a result of this proposal, the electorate of Burntwood would be increased, giving the correct level of councillor representation that it merits in relation to the rest of the district.

54 The District Council proposed that All Saints ward should comprise the existing All Saints ward together with that part of the existing Highfield ward bounded by Highfield Road and Rugeley Road. It proposed that Chasetown ward should combine the majority of the existing Chasetown ward, less that part to the east of Avon Road, Birch Avenue, Oakdene Road and Queen Street, with that part of Hammerwich ward to the south of Highfield Road. It recommended that Summerfield ward should contain the existing Summerfield ward with the remainder of Chasetown ward.

55 Under the District Council's scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in All Saints, Chasetown and Summerfield wards by 14 per cent, 12 per cent and 10 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 9 per cent, 5 per cent and 3 per cent from the district average in 2004.

56 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with the proposed wards of Chasetown, Summerfield and Swan each being represented by two councillors. It suggested that Chasetown ward should comprise the majority of Chasetown ward, less that part bounded by Church Street, Edwards Road, New Street, Queen Street, St Anne's Close and Willett Avenue. It proposed that Swan ward should comprise the existing All Saints ward, with that part of Highfield ward bounded by Highfield Road and those properties on Rugeley Road. It argued that the ward should be named after Swan Island, as the focus of the community. It proposed that Summerfield ward should combine the existing Summerfield ward and the remainder of Chasetown ward. It argued that there do not appear to be any "obvious community objections" to such proposals.

57 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Chasetown, Summerfield and Swan wards by 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 9 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years in Chasetown and Summerfield wards, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 9 per cent and 8 per cent, while the electoral equality of Swan ward would improve to vary by 4 per cent from the district average in 2004.

58 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we note the merit in both the District Council's and the Labour Party's schemes. However, the Labour Party's proposals would offer relatively poor electoral equality under a 57-member scheme, and we are particularly concerned about the District Council's proposal to include a small part of Hammerwich ward in Chasetown ward. This proposal would transfer a small section of Hammerwich parish, comprising five roads, to a ward within the town of Burntwood. We recognise that the north-western part of Hammerwich parish is of a similar suburban character to the adjoining wards of Chasetown and Summerfield, therefore, we consider that the Hammerwich Triangle and Ogle Hay parish wards of Hammerwich parish should be combined in their entirety with adjacent areas of Burntwood town in order to retain the community links that exist between the parish wards and the town. We consider that this proposal would achieve the best balance between securing reasonable electoral equality and reflecting the interests and identities of local communities, while utilising Hospital Road and Ogle Hay Road as easily identifiable boundaries.

59 As a result of our proposal to combine the more urban part of Hammerwich with parts of Burntwood town, we are putting forward our own proposals for the south of Burntwood, to provide wards with good electoral equality and clear boundaries. Our proposals reflect elements of both the District Council's and the Labour Party's schemes. We consider that Chasetown ward should comprise the existing ward, less those parts to the south of Church Street, Edwards Road,

New Street, Queen Street, St Anne's Close and Willett Avenue. We propose that the parish wards of Ogle Hay and Triangle of Hammerwich parish should be linked with the remainder of the existing Chasetown ward and that part of the existing Summerfield ward to the south of Chase Road and Queen Street, to form a new three-member Hammerwich Triangle ward. We propose naming this ward after the parish ward which forms the major part of the proposed ward, however, we would welcome further suggestions regarding an appropriate name for this ward at Stage Three. We propose that Summerfield ward should comprise the existing All Saints ward and the remainder of the existing Summerfield ward, to the north of Chase Road and Queen Street.

60 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Chasetown and Hammerwich Triangle wards by 6 per cent and 9 per cent from the district average, while equalling the district average in Summerfield ward. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Chasetown and Hammerwich Triangle wards, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 1 per cent and 4 per cent by 2004 respectively. The electoral variance of Summerfield ward is projected to deteriorate marginally to vary by 5 per cent from the district average in 2004.

## **Lichfield (six wards)**

### **Chadsmead, Curborough and Leomansley wards**

61 The City of Lichfield comprises a single parish divided into six parish wards which are the same as the district wards. The existing wards of Chadsmead, Curborough and Leomansley cover the north and west area of Lichfield City. Chadsmead and Leomansley wards are each represented by two councillors, while Curborough ward is represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements for a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the district average by 6 per cent, 7 per cent and 8 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Curborough ward, to vary by 1 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Chadsmead and Leomansley wards is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, varying by 13 per cent and 18 per cent in 2004.

62 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with Chadsmead ward being represented by two councillors and the proposed Curborough and Leomansley wards each being represented by three councillors. It proposed that Chadsmead ward should include the existing Chadsmead ward, which it argued is "mainly urban, compact and well-defined" with that part of Curborough ward, comprising Darwin Close, Lomax Close, Prince Rupert's Way, the Windings, Prince Rupert Mews and part of Anson Avenue and Beacon Street, and the western side of Grange Lane to the north of Weston Road from Leomansley ward. It suggested that Curborough ward should include the remainder of the existing Curborough ward. It put forward an enlarged Leomansley ward which would comprise the remainder of the existing Leomansley ward (less the area to the north of Eastern Avenue which would be transferred to Chadsmead ward) with that part of Central ward to the west of St John's Street.

63 Under the District Council's scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Chadsmead, Curborough and Leomansley wards by 6 per cent, 1 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years in Curborough ward, varying by 5 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality is projected to improve to 1 per cent variance in Chadsmead ward, while equalling the district average in Leomansley ward, due to projected housing development.

64 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed wards of Curborough, Grange, Leomansley and St Chad's each being represented by two councillors. It proposed that Curborough ward should comprise the majority of Curborough ward, less that part to the south of Dimbles Hill, Leyfields and Ponesfield Road. It suggested that Grange ward should combine that part of Chadsmead ward to the north of Weston Road with the northern part of the existing Leomansley ward. It argued that this ward "makes more sense" than the existing Leomansley ward because it contains "a continuous belt of housing in the north-east of the City". It put forward a Leomansley ward which would combine the remainder of the existing Leomansley ward with that part of Central ward to the west of Beacon Street and St John's Street. It commented that this would create a "compact ward" which "makes sense", arguing that electoral inequalities within the ward would improve over time given "the area of major housing development" within the proposed ward. It suggested that this proposed ward could be named either Leomansley or Christ Church & Friary. It proposed that St Chad's ward should comprise the remainder of the existing wards of Chadsmead and Curborough and that part of the existing Central ward to the east of Rotten Row and the Cattle Market with that part of the existing Stowe ward to the south of Wissage Road. It argued that renaming the ward would help to avoid confusion with the existing Chadsmead ward which bears "little resemblance" to the proposed ward.

65 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Curborough, Grange, Leomansley and St Chad's wards by 13 per cent, 7 per cent, 37 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 7 per cent, 3 per cent, 10 per cent and 11 per cent from the district average in 2004.

66 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we consider that the District Council's proposals would offer a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, utilising more clearly identifiable boundaries around established communities, and we are adopting these proposals as our draft recommendations for this area.

67 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Chadsmead, Curborough and Leomansley wards by 8 per cent, 2 per cent and 18 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years in Curborough ward, varying by 3 per cent from the district average in 2004, improve significantly to equal the district average in Chadsmead ward, while varying from the district average by 1 per cent in Leomansley ward.

## **Central, St John's and Stowe wards**

68 The existing wards of Central, St John's and Stowe cover the southern and eastern areas of Lichfield City. Central ward is represented by two councillors, while St John's and Stowe wards are each represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements for a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the district average by 71 per cent, 35 per cent and 16 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve marginally in Central and St John's wards, varying by 69 per cent and 34 per cent from the district average by 2004. The level of electoral equality in Stowe ward is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, varying by 20 per cent in 2004.

69 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with the proposed wards of Boley Park, St John's and Stowe each being represented by three councillors. It proposed that Boley Park ward should comprise that part of Central ward to the south-east of Tamworth Street and Trent Valley Road, and those parts of St John's ward to the east of Gorse Lane and Tamworth Road, thereby ensuring that the whole Boley Park development would be included in this single ward. It suggested the remainder of St John's ward should form a new St John's ward while Stowe ward should combine the existing Stowe ward with the remainder of Central and Curborough wards.

70 Under the District Council's scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boley Park, St John's and Stowe wards by 1 per cent, 5 per cent and 5 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Stowe ward, to vary by 1 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Boley Park and St John's wards would remain relatively stable, to vary from the district average by 2 per cent and 5 per cent respectively.

71 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed wards of Boley Park North & Streethay, Boley Park South, Brownsfield and St John's each being represented by two councillors. It proposed that Boley Park North & Streethay ward should combine that part of Central ward to the south-east of the railway line, Abbotsford Road and Carmichael Close with the parish of Streethay from the existing Alrewas ward. This proposal would combine part of the rural area of Alrewas with part of the City, and the Labour Party argued that Streethay is "for the most part a continuation of the Lichfield City built-up area, and is not dissimilar in character".

72 The Labour Party proposed a Boley Park South ward comprising the remainder of the Boley Park area of Central and St John's wards to the south-east of the railway line, the school grounds, King's Hill Road, Oakhurst and Shortbutts Lane. It suggested that Brownsfield ward should combine the remainder of Stowe ward and argued that this area should be renamed because Stowe Pool would not be included in the ward. It proposed that St John's ward should comprise the remaining parts of the existing Central and St John's wards, to combine areas of similar character in the south and centre of the City, which it argued "makes a lot of sense in community terms".

73 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boley Park North & Streethay, Boley Park South, Brownsfield and St John's wards by 6 per cent, 10 per cent, 3 per cent and 1 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years in Boley Park North & Streethay and Brownsfield wards, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 12 per cent and 7 per cent from the district average in 2004. The electoral variance of Boley Park South and St John's wards would improve to vary by 7 per cent from the district average in Boley Park South ward, while equalling the district average in St John's ward.

74 Alrewas & Fradley with Streethay Parish Council opposed any part of their parish being combined in a ward with areas outside the parish boundary as it argued that it would be "detrimental" to the electors of that ward. Lichfield City Council supported the District Council's proposals for six wards covering the City of Lichfield.

75 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we have concluded that the District Council's proposals offer a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria for this area. The District Council proposed easily identifiable boundaries which provide reasonable levels of electoral equality and have received support from Lichfield City Council. We note that the Labour Party's proposals offer worse levels of electoral equality, and we are particularly concerned about their proposal to link the rural parish of Streethay with part of the City of Lichfield. The Parish Council has opposed such a move, and we do not consider that it would be in the best interests of the communities involved to combine these areas of different character within a single ward. We note that the District Council's scheme also addresses the issue of Central ward which currently spans the width of the City.

76 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Boley Park, St John's and Stowe wards by 3 per cent, 7 per cent and 7 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Boley Park and St John's wards to equal the district average and 6 per cent more electors per councillor in 2004 respectively.

## **The rural areas**

### **Armitage with Handsacre, Colton & Ridwares, King's Bromley and Longdon wards**

77 The existing wards of Armitage with Handsacre, Colton & Ridwares, King's Bromley and Longdon cover the northern part of the district. Colton & Ridwares ward (comprising the parishes of Colton, Hamstall Ridware and Mavesyn Ridware), King's Bromley ward (comprising the parishes of Curborough & Elmhurst and King's Bromley) and Longdon ward (comprising the parish of Longdon) are each represented by one councillor, while Armitage with Handsacre ward (comprising the parish of Armitage with Handsacre) is represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements for a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the district average by 1 per cent, 24 per cent, 1 per cent and 5 per cent

respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, varying by 4 per cent, 30 per cent, 3 per cent and 10 per cent in 2004.

78 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed Armitage with Handsacre ward being represented by three councillors and the proposed wards of Colton & Ridwares, King's Bromley and Longdon each being represented by one councillor. It proposed no change to Armitage with Handsacre ward. In order to address existing electoral imbalances in Colton & Ridwares ward, it proposed that a revised Colton & Ridwares ward should be formed by transferring Hamstall Ridware parish to a revised King's Bromley ward. In addition, it suggested that the parish of Farewell & Chorley should be transferred from King's Bromley ward to a revised Longdon ward. It argued that this proposal "is acceptable locally", although it suggested that a possible alternative would be to combine the proposed wards of King's Bromley and Longdon to form a new two-member ward.

79 Under the District Council's scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Armitage with Handsacre, Colton & Ridwares, and Longdon wards by 1 per cent, 5 per cent and 16 per cent respectively, while King's Bromley ward would have a variance equal to the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years in Armitage with Handsacre, Colton & Ridwares and King's Bromley wards to 4 per cent, 10 per cent and 2 per cent from the district average by 2004. The level of electoral equality in Longdon ward would improve, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 11 per cent from the district average by 2004. If King's Bromley and Longdon wards were combined to form a two-member ward, they would have an electoral variance of 8 per cent, which would improve to 7 per cent by 2004.

80 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with the proposed Armitage with Handsacre ward being represented by three councillors, the proposed Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon ward being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Colton & Mavesyn Ridware ward being represented by one councillor. Its proposals for Armitage with Handsacre and Colton & Mavesyn Ridware used the same boundaries as the District Council's proposed Armitage with Handsacre and Colton & Ridwares wards. The Labour Party argued that Armitage with Handsacre forms a clear community which is "quite separate in character to the neighbouring villages". It proposed that the existing wards of King's Bromley and Longdon wards should be combined with the parish of Hamstall Ridware, from the existing Colton & Ridwares ward, to form a Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon ward. It argued that some residents in the area "have expressed reservations about one-member wards in the past".

81 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Armitage with Handsacre and Colton & Mavesyn Ridware wards by 6 per cent and 3 per cent respectively, while equalling the district average in Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon ward. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively stable over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 3 per cent, 3 per cent and 1 per cent in 2004 respectively.

82 The joint parish council of Curborough, Elmhurst & Farewell and Chorley supported retaining the existing boundaries of King's Bromley ward. However, it argued that, if change is necessary, the parishes of Curborough & Elmhurst and Farewell & Chorley should be linked with "similar parishes". King's Bromley Parish Council supported the District Council's proposal, arguing that there are geographical, parochial and shared amenities between King's Bromley and the Ridwares. It commented that it would prefer King's Bromley to remain as a single-member ward, however, it would also accept the area being combined with Longdon ward in a new two-member ward if this was necessary in terms of electoral equality.

83 We have given careful consideration to the representations received at Stage One. We have noted the similarity between the proposals of the District Council and the Labour Party and we are adopting elements of both these schemes as our draft recommendations for this area. We are content to recommend the proposed Armitage with Handsacre ward, given that it respects community identity and electoral equality and causes minimal disruption to the existing wards. We support the creation of a ward comprising the parishes of Colton and Mavesyn Ridware, as proposed by both the District Council and the Labour Party, and we consider that the Labour Party's proposal to name the ward Colton & Mavesyn Ridware would best reflect the area, given its composition. While there is merit in the Labour Party's proposal for a two-member Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon ward, we note that this has not received general support and we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that this area would be best represented as a two-member ward. Given both King's Bromley Parish Council's opposition to the creation of a two-member ward and that the parishes of Hamstall Ridware and Farewell & Chorley have little in common, we recommend adopting the District Council's proposals for single-member King's Bromley and Longdon wards. We would, however, welcome views on this proposal from interested parties at Stage Three.

84 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Armitage with Handsacre, Colton and Mavesyn Ridware, King's Bromley and Longdon wards by 3 per cent, 7 per cent, 2 per cent and 18 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years in Armitage with Handsacre, Colton and Mavesyn Ridware and King's Bromley wards to vary by 6 per cent, 12 per cent and 4 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Longdon ward would improve, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 13 per cent from the district average in 2004.

### **Alrewas, Bourne Vale, Fazeley, Mease Valley, Tame and Whittington wards**

85 The existing wards of Alrewas, Bourne Vale, Fazeley, Mease Valley, Tame and Whittington cover the eastern part of the district. Bourne Vale ward (comprising the parishes of Drayton Bassett, Hints, Swinfen & Packington and Weeford), Mease Valley ward (comprising the parishes of Clifton Campville, Edingale, Harlaston and Thorpe Constantine) and Tame ward (comprising the parishes of Elford and Wigginton & Hopwas) are each represented by one councillor, Whittington ward (comprising the parishes of Fisherwick and Whittington) is represented by two councillors, and Alrewas ward (comprising the parishes of Alrewas & Fradley and Streethay) and Fazeley ward (comprising the parish of Fazeley) are each represented by three councillors. Under

current arrangements for a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the six wards varies from the district average by 4 per cent, 16 per cent, 11 per cent, 7 per cent, 4 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate over the next five years in Alrewas, Fazeley, Mease Valley, Tame and Whittington wards, to vary by 9 per cent, 14 per cent, 14 per cent, 8 per cent and 20 per cent from the district average by 2004, while improving in Bourne Vale ward to vary by 7 per cent from the district average.

86 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise five wards, with the proposed wards of Alrewas and Fazeley each being represented by three councillors, the proposed wards of Mease & Tame and Whittington each being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Bourne Vale ward being represented by a single councillor. It proposed that Alrewas ward should comprise the existing ward of Alrewas less the parish of Streethay, which would be transferred to form an enlarged Whittington ward in order to improve electoral equality in both wards. To improve electoral equality in Bourne Vale and Fazeley wards, the District Council proposed creating two parish wards in the parish of Drayton Bassett, and transferring the proposed Coleshill parish ward to the enlarged three-member Fazeley ward. It stated that this was “the only option which is feasible in terms of the [statutory] criteria”. It proposed that Bourne Vale ward remain a single-member ward comprising the parishes of Hints, Swinfen & Packington, Weeford and the Village parish ward of Drayton Bassett parish. It proposed that the existing Mease Valley and Tame wards should be combined to form a two-member Mease & Tame ward. It emphasised that this was necessary in order to address the level of electoral inequality in the existing Mease Valley ward without dividing parishes.

87 Under the District Council’s scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Alrewas, Bourne Vale, Fazeley, Mease & Tame and Whittington wards by 14 per cent, 5 per cent, 8 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Alrewas and Bourne Vale wards, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by 1 per cent and 3 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Fazeley, Mease & Tame and Whittington wards is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, varying by 11 per cent, 3 per cent and 4 per cent from the district average by 2004.

88 The Labour Party proposed that this area should be represented by four wards, with the proposed wards of Alrewas & Fradley, Fazeley & Drayton and Whittington each being represented by three councillors and Mease Valley ward being represented by one councillor. It put forward an Alrewas & Fradley ward with the same boundaries as the District Council’s proposed Alrewas ward, arguing that the ward should be named Alrewas & Fradley after the recently renamed parish which reflects “the growing population in the Fradley area”. It proposed that Fazeley & Drayton ward should comprise the parishes of Drayton Bassett and Fazeley, arguing that Drayton Bassett is “as well placed” with Fazeley parish as it is with adjoining parishes in the existing Bourne Vale ward. It proposed that Mease Valley ward should retain its existing boundaries which it considered “satisfactory and not in need of change”, and suggested a Whittington ward comprising the existing wards of Bourne Vale, Tame and Whittington, less the parish of Drayton Bassett.

89 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Alrewas & Fradley ward by 20 per cent while equalling the district average in Fazeley & Drayton, Mease Valley and Whittington wards. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve dramatically in Alrewas & Fradley ward over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 8 per cent from the district average in 2004, due to significant population growth. The level of electoral equality in Fazeley & Drayton, Mease Valley and Whittington wards is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by 4 per cent, 7 per cent and 6 per cent respectively in 2004.

90 Alrewas & Fradley with Streethay Parish Council argued that the representation of the area at district level should be increased, and that Alrewas and the parishes of Fradley, Orgreave and Streethay should each be allocated two councillors. It argued that consideration should be given to possible moves to divide Alrewas from the rest of the parish in a future parish review. It also opposed combining parts of the parish with areas outside the existing parish boundary. Drayton Bassett Parish Council supported the retention of the existing arrangements, and stated that they "unanimously object to any change in electoral arrangements" for its parish.

91 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we consider that the District Council's proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. We note that the Labour Party's proposals would offer good electoral equality and would avoid parishes being re-warded, however, given that we are not adopting its proposal to link the parish of Streethay with Lichfield it would not be feasible for us to adopt its proposals elsewhere. However, we are persuaded that the proposed ward comprising the parish of Alrewas & Fradley should be named Alrewas & Fradley ward as proposed by the Labour Party, as we consider that this name would best reflect the area, given the warding composition. While we have some concerns regarding the District Council's proposal to ward the parish of Drayton Bassett, we have considered the alternatives and recognise that this is the best option in the interests of electoral equality, while having regard to community identity and interests. However, we would welcome further views and evidence on the configuration of wards in this area at Stage Three.

92 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Alrewas & Fradley, Bourne Vale, Fazeley and Mease & Tame wards varying by 13 per cent, 7 per cent, 6 per cent and 3 per cent respectively, while equalling the district average in Whittington ward. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Alrewas & Fradley and Bourne Vale wards, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 1 per cent from the district average in both wards in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Fazeley, Mease & Tame and Whittington wards is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, varying by 9 per cent, 5 per cent and 3 per cent from the district average in 2004.

## **Hammerwich, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall wards**

93 The existing wards of Hammerwich, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall cover the south-west part of the district. Stonnall ward (comprising the Stonnall parish ward of Shenstone parish) is represented by one councillor, Little Aston ward (comprising the Little Aston parish ward of Shenstone parish) and Shenstone ward (comprising the parish of Wall and the Shenstone parish ward of Shenstone parish) are each represented by two councillors, while Hammerwich ward (comprising the parish of Hammerwich) is represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements for a 56-member council, the number of electors per councillor in Hammerwich, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall wards varies from the district average by 16 per cent, 15 per cent, 2 per cent and 3 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve marginally in Little Aston and Shenstone wards, to vary from the district average by 12 per cent and 1 per cent in 2004 respectively. The level of electoral equality in Hammerwich and Stonnall wards is projected to deteriorate over the next five years, to vary by 20 per cent and 4 per cent in 2004 respectively.

94 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that this area should comprise four wards, with the proposed wards of Hammerwich, Little Aston and Shenstone each being represented by two councillors and the proposed Stonnall ward being represented by a single councillor. It proposed that Hammerwich ward should comprise the existing Hammerwich ward less Ogle Hay and Triangle parish wards, as detailed earlier, while Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall wards would retain their existing boundaries. It noted that electoral imbalances in Little Aston ward could be remedied by adding parts of the existing Shenstone or Stonnall wards. However, it argued that Little Aston “has only a tenuous affinity” with Stonnall and that further warding Shenstone parish would involve the creation of an “artificial ward”.

95 Under the District Council’s scheme for a 56-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Hammerwich, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stonnall wards by 13 per cent, 15 per cent, 2 per cent and 3 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Hammerwich, Little Aston and Shenstone wards, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 9 per cent, 12 per cent and 1 per cent from the district average in 2004, while the level of electoral equality in Stonnall ward would deteriorate marginally to 4 per cent in 2004.

96 The Labour Party proposed that this area should comprise three wards, with the proposed ward of Shenstone & Little Aston being represented by three councillors, the proposed Hammerwich ward being represented by two councillors, and the proposed Stonnall & Wall ward being represented by a single councillor. It proposed that Hammerwich ward should retain its existing boundaries, while Shenstone & Little Aston ward should comprise the existing wards of Little Aston and Shenstone, less Wall parish. It proposed that Stonnall & Wall ward should comprise the existing Stonnall ward and the parish of Wall from the existing Shenstone ward. It argued that this option was “probably a better solution” than including the parish of Wall in the proposed Shenstone & Little Aston ward.

97 Under the Labour Party's scheme for a 52-member council, there would be improved electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the district average in Hammerwich, Shenstone & Little Aston and Stonnall & Wall wards by 16 per cent, 8 per cent, and 15 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 11 per cent, 8 per cent and 14 per cent from the district average respectively in 2004.

98 Having considered carefully the representations received, we note the similarity between the schemes put forward by the District Council and the Labour Party and we recognise the merit in these proposals. However, as a result of our proposals to combine the Ogle Hay and Triangle parish wards of Hammerwich parish in a new Hammerwich Triangle ward, we are putting forward our own proposals for this area. We propose that the remainder of Hammerwich ward should be combined with Wall parish to form a single-member Hammerwich & Wall ward, while the existing boundaries of Little Aston ward should be retained as a two-member ward, as proposed by the District Council. We also propose an amended Shenstone ward comprising the Shenstone and Stonnall parish wards of Shenstone parish, represented by three councillors. We consider that these proposals offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and would involve combining areas with shared community interests and identity. We recognise that Little Aston ward would have a relatively high level of electoral variance under our proposals, however, we consider that this area is self-contained with a clear identity which would be best represented by a single councillor. We also consider that dividing the parish would not provide convenient or effective local government, or better reflect community identity, and it therefore should be treated exceptionally, particularly as the electoral equality is forecast to improve over the next five years.

99 Under our draft recommendations for a 57-member council there would be improved electoral equality with the number of electors per councillor in Hammerwich & Wall, Little Aston and Shenstone wards varying from the district average by 6 per cent, 13 per cent and 7 per cent. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate in Hammerwich & Wall and Shenstone wards over the next five years to vary by 10 per cent and 9 per cent from the district average in 2004. The level of electoral equality in Little Aston ward is projected to improve to 10 per cent from the district average in 2004.

## **Electoral Cycle**

100 We received one representation regarding the District Council's electoral cycle with the District Council supporting the retention of whole-council elections. We received no proposals to change the electoral cycle of the district, therefore, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

## **Conclusions**

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

- there should be an increase in council size from 56 to 57;

- there should be 25 wards, two fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 24 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of two wards;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

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

- In Burntwood we propose creating a new Hammerwich Triangle ward and consequently amending the District Council's proposed All Saints, Chasetown, Highfield and Summerfield wards, as detailed earlier;
- We propose that the Hammerwich parish ward of Hammerwich parish and Wall parish should be combined to form a new Hammerwich & Wall ward;
- We propose that Shenstone ward should comprise the Shenstone and Stonnall parish wards of Shenstone parish.

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

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

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	56	57	56	57
Number of wards	27	25	27	25
Average number of electors per councillor	1,319	1,296	1,426	1,401
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	13	4	16	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	7	0

104 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Lichfield District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district

average from 13 to four. By 2004 only two wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Lichfield District Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 25 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A, and on the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole council every four years.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

105 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parish of Burntwood, Drayton Bassett and Lichfield to reflect the proposed district wards. We are also proposing that the number of councillors representing Longdon parish be increased.

106 Burntwood Town is currently served by 21 councillors representing seven wards: All Saints, Boney Hay, Chase Terrace, Chasetown, Highfield, Redslade and Summerfield. We received no representations regarding Burntwood Town Council at Stage One, however, we propose that the Town Council’s parish wards should be amended as a consequence of the proposed district wards of Burntwood. We also suggest that the number of councillors within the proposed Town Council wards should be redistributed according to the percentage of the electorate in each town ward. The current 21 councillors do not divide fairly between the proposed seven wards, therefore, we propose that the size of Burntwood Town Council should be increased by one councillor to 22. We recommend that the proposed Town Council wards of Boney Hay, Chasetown, Redslade and Summerfield should each be represented by three town councillors, the proposed wards of Chase Terrace and Highfield should be represented by four town councillors and that part of the proposed Hammerwich Triangle ward that lies within the parish of Burntwood should be represented by two town councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Burntwood Town Council should comprise 22 councillors, one more than at present, representing seven wards: Boney Hay, Chasetown, Redslade and Summerfield (each returning three councillors); Chase Terrace and Highfield (each returning four councillors); and Hammerwich Triangle (returning two 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 this report.

107 The parish of Drayton Bassett is currently unwarded and is represented by seven councillors. As a result of our draft recommendations for Bourne Vale and Fazeley district wards, we are proposing that the parish should be divided into two wards, Coleshill and Village, which would be coterminous with the district ward boundaries as proposed by the District Council. Although Drayton Bassett Parish Council objected to this proposal we consider that it provides the most appropriate warding pattern at a district council level. We therefore recommend that the proposed Coleshill parish ward should be represented by two councillors while the proposed Village parish ward should be represented by five councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Drayton Bassett Parish Council should comprise two parish wards, Coleshill and Village. The parish council should continue to be represented by seven councillors, with two councillors representing Coleshill ward and five councillors representing Village ward. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

108 The City of Lichfield is currently served by 30 councillors representing six wards: Central, Chadsmead, Curborough, Leomansley, St John’s and Stowe. The City Council supported the amendment of the City Council’s parish wards, in line with the District Council’s proposed district wards for the city, and suggested that the proposed City wards of Boley, Curborough, Leomansley, St John’s and Stowe should each be represented by five city councillors, while the proposed Chadsmead ward should be represented by three city councillors. This would result in an overall reduction of two in the number of city councillors, resulting in a City Council size of 28. A local resident argued that the level of representation on the City Council should be reduced to 17 to make the council more effective and efficient, arguing that a council size of around 20 members would be ideal. However, given that the City Council did not support such a measure, we have not been persuaded that this would facilitate effective and convenient local government and therefore we are adopting the City Council’s proposals as our draft recommendations for Lichfield City Council.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Lichfield City Council should comprise 28 councillors, two fewer than at present, representing six wards: Boley, Curborough, Leomansley, St John’s and Stowe (returning five councillors) and Chadsmead (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 this report.

109 The parish of Longdon is currently served by nine councillors, with three councillors representing Gentleshaw parish ward and six councillors representing Longdon parish ward. The Parish Council of Longdon proposed that the number of councillors representing Longdon parish

ward should be increased by “at least two” and, given that there has been no opposition to this proposal, we consider that this increase should be adopted as part of our draft recommendations.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Longdon Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, two more than at present, representing two wards: Gentleshaw (returning three councillors) and Longdon (returning nine councillors). The existing parish ward boundaries should be retained.

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

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

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

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



## 5 NEXT STEPS

112 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Lichfield. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 4 July 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the District Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

113 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Lichfield: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Lichfield area.

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on Map A2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed warding of Drayton Bassett parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Burntwood and Lichfield.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Lichfield: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Drayton Bassett Parish*



## APPENDIX B

### Lichfield District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

*Figure B1: Lichfield District Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
All Saints (Burntwood)	All Saints ward; Highfield ward (part)
Chasetown (Burntwood)	Chasetown ward (part); Hammerwich ward (part – the proposed Pool parish ward of Hammerwich parish)
Hammerwich	Hammerwich ward (part – the proposed Hammerwich and Triangle parish wards of Hammerwich parish)
Highfield (Burntwood)	Highfield ward (part)
Shenstone	<i>Unchanged</i>
Stonnall	<i>Unchanged</i>
Summerfield (Burntwood)	Chasetown ward (part); Summerfield ward

*Figure B2: Lichfield District Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
All Saints (Burntwood)	2	3,006	1,503	14	3,111	1,556	9
Chasetown (Burntwood)	2	2,958	1,479	12	2,998	1,499	5
Hammerwich	2	2,993	1,497	13	3,098	1,549	9
Highfield (Burntwood)	2	2,594	1,297	-2	3,050	1,525	7
Shenstone	2	2,688	1,344	2	2,819	1,410	-1
Stonnall	1	1,281	1,281	-3	1,374	1,374	-4

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
Summerfield (Burntwood)	2	2,894	1,447	10	2,932	1,466	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>73,873</b>	–	–	<b>79,839</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,319</b>	–	–	<b>1,426</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lichfield District 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

## Lichfield District Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3: Lichfield District Labour Party's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Alrewas & Fradley	Alrewas & Fradley ward (part – the parish of Alrewas & Fradley)
Armitage with Handsacre	<i>Unchanged</i>
Boley Park North & Streethay (Lichfield)	Alrewas ward (part – the parish of Streethay); Central ward (part)
Boley Park South (Lichfield)	Central ward (part); St John's ward (part)
Boney Hay (Burntwood)	Boney Hay ward (part); Chase Terrace ward (part)
Brownsfield (Lichfield)	Stowe ward (part)
Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon	Colton & Ridwares ward (part – the parish of Hamstall Ridware); King's Bromley ward; Longdon ward
Chase Terrace (Burntwood)	Chase Terrace ward (part); Redslade ward (part)
Chasetown (Burntwood)	Chasetown ward (part)
Colton & Mavesyn Ridware	Colton & Ridwares ward (part – the parishes of Colton and Mavesyn Ridware)
Curborough (Lichfield)	Curborough ward (part)
Fazeley & Drayton	Bourne Vale ward (part – the parish of Drayton Bassett); Fazeley ward
Grange (Lichfield)	Chadsmead ward (part); Leomansley ward (part)
Hammerwich	<i>Unchanged</i>
Leomansley (Lichfield)	Central ward (part); Leomansley ward (part)
Mease Valley	<i>Unchanged</i>
St Chad's (Lichfield)	Central ward (part); Chadsmead ward (part); Curborough ward (part); Stowe ward (part)
St John's (Lichfield)	Central ward (part); St John's ward (part)

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
St Matthew's (Burntwood)	Highfield ward (part)
Shenstone & Little Aston	Little Aston ward; Shenstone ward (part – the Shenstone parish ward of Shenstone parish)
Slade (Burntwood)	Boney Hay ward (part); Redslade ward (part)
Stonnall & Wall	Shenstone ward (part – the parish of Wall); Stonnall ward
Summerfield (Burntwood)	Chasetown ward (part); Summerfield ward
Swan (Burntwood)	All Saints ward; Highfield ward (part)
Whittington	Bourne Vale ward (part – the parishes of Hints, Swinfen & Packington and Weeford); Tame ward; Whittington ward

*Figure B4: Lichfield District Labour Party's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (1999)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>	<b>Electorate (2004)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>
Alrewas & Fradley	3	3,401	1,134	-20	4,239	1,413	-8
Armitage with Handsacre	3	3,989	1,330	-6	4,457	1,486	-3
Boley Park North & Streethay (Lichfield)	2	2,672	1,336	-6	2,708	1,354	-12
Boley Park South (Lichfield)	2	3,113	1,557	10	3,274	1,637	7
Boney Hay (Burntwood)	2	2,873	1,437	1	2,982	1,491	-3
Brownsfield (Lichfield)	2	2,744	1,372	-3	2,835	1,418	-7
Bromley, Hamstall & Longdon	2	2,850	1,425	0	3,045	1,523	-1
Chase Terrace (Burntwood)	2	3,083	1,542	9	3,538	1,769	16
Chasetown (Burntwood)	2	2,746	1,373	-3	2,775	1,388	-9
Colton & Mavesyn Ridware	1	1,374	1,374	-3	1,571	1,571	3
Curborough (Lichfield)	2	3,210	1,605	13	3,284	1,642	7
Fazeley & Drayton	3	4,254	1,418	0	4,413	1,471	-4
Grange (Lichfield)	2	3,026	1,513	7	3,150	1,575	3
Hammerwich	2	3,305	1,653	16	3,394	1,697	11
Leomansley (Lichfield)	2	1,794	897	-37	2,741	1,371	-10
Mease Valley	1	1,414	1,414	0	1,632	1,632	7
St Chad's (Lichfield)	2	3,335	1,668	17	3,413	1,707	11

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
St John's (Lichfield)	2	2,798	1,399	-1	3,058	1,529	0
St Matthew's (Lichfield)	2	2,606	1,303	-8	3,063	1,532	0
Shenstone & Little Aston	3	4,586	1,529	8	4,973	1,658	8
Slade (Burntwood)	2	2,917	1,459	3	3,008	1,504	-2
Stonnall & Wall	1	1,630	1,630	15	1,739	1,739	14
Summerfield (Burntwood)	2	2,794	1,397	-2	2,832	1,416	-8
Swan (Burntwood)	2	3,092	1,546	9	3,200	1,600	4
Whittington	3	4,244	1,415	0	4,295	1,432	-6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>73,850</b>	–	–	<b>79,619</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,420</b>	–	–	<b>1,531</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lichfield District Labour Party.

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

2. Due to inaccuracies in the information provided, the total electorate figures differ marginally from the totals in Figures 2, 3 and B1; however, we would expect this to have a marginal impact on variances.

## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

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

(f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

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

(h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

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