

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Rushmoor in Hampshire

*January 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 (Deputy Chairman)  
Peter Brokenshire  
Kru Desai  
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.

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

© 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>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Rushmoor: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from:	
– Rushmoor Borough Council	
– Dr Appleton	<i>33</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>37</i>

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



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Rushmoor on 20 July 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 Rushmoor:

- **in eight of the 15 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and three wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in seven wards and by more than 20 per cent in three wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 67-68) are that:

- **Rushmoor Borough Council should have 42 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 14 wards, one fewer than at present;**
- **the boundaries of all the existing wards should be modified;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In all 14 proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all 14 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 18 January 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 13 March 2000:

**Review Manager  
Rushmoor 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)**

*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	Alexandra	3	Alexandra ward (part); Manor ward (part)	Maps 2 and A4
2	Cove	3	Cove ward (part)	Large map
3	Empress	3	Cove ward (part); Empress ward (part); Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part)	Large map
4	Fernhill	3	Fernhill ward (part)	Large map
5	Grange	3	Fernhill ward (part); Grange ward (part); Mayfield ward (part)	Large map
6	Heron Wood	3	Heron Wood ward (part); Newport ward (part)	Maps 2 and A5
7	Knellwood	3	Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part); St Mark's ward (part)	Large map
8	Manor	3	Manor ward (part); Newport ward (part)	Maps 2, A4 and A5
9	Mayfield	3	Grange ward (part); Mayfield ward (part); Westheath ward (part)	Large map
10	Newport & Belle Vue	3	Belle Vue ward (part); Newport ward (part)	Maps 2 and A5
11	Queens	3	Alexandra ward (part); Queens ward (part)	Maps 2, A2, A3 and A4
12	St John's	3	St John's ward (part)	Large map
13	St Mark's	3	Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part); St Mark's ward (part)	Maps 2, A2, A3 and Large map
14	Westheath	3	St John's ward (part); Westheath ward (part)	Large map

*Notes:* 1 The borough contains no parishes.

2 Map 2, 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 Rushmoor

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 Alexandra	3	4,117	1,372	-3	4,128	1,376	-4
2 Cove	3	4,201	1,400	-1	4,201	1,400	-2
3 Empress	3	4,554	1,518	8	4,586	1,529	7
4 Fernhill	3	4,158	1,386	-2	4,158	1,386	-3
5 Grange	3	3,936	1,312	-7	4,049	1,350	-6
6 Heron Wood	3	4,452	1,484	5	4,452	1,484	4
7 Knellwood	3	4,269	1,423	1	4,334	1,445	1
8 Manor	3	4,069	1,356	-4	4,350	1,450	1
9 Mayfield	3	4,300	1,433	2	4,300	1,433	0
10 Newport & Belle Vue	3	4,375	1,458	3	4,465	1,488	4
11 Queens	3	3,817	1,272	-10	4,108	1,369	-4
12 St John's	3	4,442	1,481	5	4,424	1,475	3
13 St Mark's	3	4,339	1,446	3	4,387	1,462	2
14 Westheath	3	4,158	1,386	-2	4,158	1,386	-3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>59,187</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,409</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,431</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rushmoor in Hampshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 11 districts in Hampshire and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils 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 Rushmoor. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1975 (Report No. 103). The electoral arrangements of Hampshire County Council were last reviewed in October 1980 (Report No. 397). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- (a) the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
  - (1) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (2) secure effective and convenient local government;
- (b) 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 Borough Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties*. 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 borough as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

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

12 Stage One began on 20 July 1999 when we wrote to Rushmoor Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Constabulary, the local authority associations, Hampshire Local Councils Association, the Members of Parliament and the Members of the European Parliament for the South East Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 18 January 2000 and will end on 13 March 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Rushmoor covers an area of some 4,000 hectares in northeast Hampshire, bordering Surrey county to the south and east, and Hart district to the west. The River Blackwater forms the eastern boundary of the borough. The M3 motorway and the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line divide Farnborough in the north of the borough, while the Alton to London Waterloo railway line runs through Aldershot in the south. Much of the land between the two urban areas of Farnborough and Aldershot is owned by the Ministry of Defence, including Farnborough Aerodrome, Aldershot Military Town and army training areas. The borough currently has no 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 borough 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 borough is 59,187 (February 1999). The Council presently has 45 members who are elected from 15 three-member wards. Nine wards currently cover the Farnborough area in the north of the borough, and the remaining six cover the town of Aldershot. The Council is elected by thirds.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Rushmoor borough, with around 21 per cent more electors than two decades ago. The most notable increases have been in Cove, Fernhill and St John's wards, and these imbalances are partly the result of a boundary review between Rushmoor borough and Hart district undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1986. Other increases in the electorate of Rushmoor have occurred as a result of new housing developments.

20 At present each councillor represents an average of 1,315 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,336 by 2004 if the current number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, as discussed earlier, the number of electors per councillor in eight of the 15 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, three wards vary by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St John's ward where each of the three councillors represents 37 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Rushmoor*

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 Alexandra	3	3,863	1,288	-2	3,855	1,285	-4
2 Belle Vue	3	3,223	1,074	-18	3,311	1,104	-17
3 Cove	3	4,938	1,646	25	4,920	1,640	23
4 Empress	3	3,686	1,229	-7	3,717	1,239	-7
5 Fernhill	3	4,447	1,482	13	4,454	1,485	11
6 Grange	3	3,460	1,153	-12	3,538	1,179	-12
7 Heron Wood	3	3,098	1,033	-21	3,099	1,033	-23
8 Knellwood	3	3,945	1,315	0	3,996	1,332	0
9 Manor	3	4,477	1,492	13	4,715	1,572	18
10 Mayfield	3	3,826	1,275	-3	3,812	1,271	-5
11 Newport	3	3,547	1,182	-10	3,599	1,200	-10
12 Queens	3	3,447	1,149	-13	3,851	1,284	-4
13 St John's	3	5,398	1,799	37	5,416	1,805	35
14 St Mark's	3	3,950	1,317	0	3,948	1,316	-1
15 Westheath	3	3,882	1,294	-2	3,869	1,290	-3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>59,187</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,315</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,336</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Heron Wood ward were relatively over-represented by 21 per cent, while electors in St John's ward were relatively under-represented by 37 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 Rushmoor Borough Council.

22 During this initial stage of the review officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers from the Borough Council and with members of the Council's working group responsible for the review. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received three representations during Stage One, including borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council and from a local resident, Dr Appleton, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the Borough Council.

#### **Rushmoor Borough Council**

23 The Borough Council proposed reducing the size of the council by three, to 42, and the number of wards from 15 to 14. The council proposed retaining the existing structure of three-member wards in the borough, and under its proposals all 15 of the current wards would undergo changes to their boundaries. As part of the review process the Borough Council stated that it had invited views and representations from individuals and local political organisations, and had undertaken its own comprehensive consultation process intended to encourage participation in the review.

24 The Borough Council proposed moving away from the existing division of the borough of nine wards for Farnborough and six wards for Aldershot. Under its proposals Farnborough would continue to be represented by nine wards, while Aldershot would be represented by five wards, one fewer than at present. The central area of the borough between the two towns would be divided and combined with wards to its north and south.

25 The Council's proposed warding arrangements would provide for improved electoral equality in the borough, with the number of electors per councillor in none of the 14 proposed wards varying from the borough average by more than 10 per cent, either now or in 2004. The Borough Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

#### **Dr Appleton**

26 We received an additional borough-wide scheme from a resident of Farnborough, Dr Appleton. Dr Appleton supported the Borough Council's proposals for a reduction in council size, and for the distribution of the 14 wards between Aldershot and Farnborough. While he supported the council's proposed five Aldershot wards, he suggested alternative warding arrangements for the nine wards covering the Farnborough area in the north of the borough.

27 Under a council size of 42, representing 14 three-member wards, Dr Appleton's proposals would provide for improved electoral equality in the borough, with the number of electors per councillor in none of the 14 proposed wards varying from the borough average by more than 10 per cent, either now or in 2004. Dr Appleton's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

## **Other Representations**

28 We received a further representation from Aldershot Branch of the Labour Party, welcoming the Borough Council's proposals for Rushmoor, and in particular the degree of cross-party support which the council's proposals had achieved.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

29 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Rushmoor 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 identities and interests 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 while 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 Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of less than 2 per cent from 59,187 to 60,100 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Queens ward, which will experience an increase in electorate of some 12 per cent by 2004, although the electorate in other wards will also increase as a result of housing developments scheduled to take place over the next five years. The Council noted the high degree of under-registration of electors in Alexandra and Queens wards due to the large transitory military population, and it further noted that the forthcoming Strategic Defence Review may have implications for Aldershot Garrison Town, currently in Queens 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. Dr Appleton concurred with the electorate forecasts provided by the Borough Council.

34 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council's figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We do not consider that it is appropriate to take into account claims of under-registration of electors unless credible evidence is provided, both of the existence of under-registration, and that steps are being taken which are very likely to increase registration in a particular area. Advice has been obtained from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries.

## **Council Size**

35 Rushmoor Borough Council presently has 45 members. At Stage One the Council stated that it had established a cross-party Electoral Arrangements Sub-Committee to consider the most appropriate warding arrangements for the borough, which subsequently identified several principles upon which the council's proposal should be based. The sub-committee recommended retaining a minimum council size of 40 members, and accepted the need "to move away from the existing division of nine Farnborough wards and six Aldershot wards". The Council also stated that it wished to retain the present pattern of three-member wards in the borough. It proposed reducing the number of wards in the borough by one to 14, and consequently reducing the council size from 45 to 42. Dr Appleton stated that he supported the Borough Council's proposed council size of 42.

36 As previously explained, the Commission's starting point in its PER work is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government. We are, however, willing to look at arguments why this might not be the case. We note that changes made to the borough boundaries since the last review of the electoral arrangements of Rushmoor have significantly affected the size and distribution of the borough's electorate. As a result, although the Farnborough area is currently entitled to between 28 and 29 councillors, it is represented by only 27 councillors. Conversely, while the Aldershot area is presently covered by six three-member wards, given the size of the town's electorate it is entitled to between 16 and 17 councillors under a council size of 45. Under the Borough Council's proposed council size of 42 the allocation of 27 councillors to the Farnborough area and 15 councillors to Aldershot would more accurately reflect the levels of representation to which each town is entitled.

37 We are satisfied that a council size of 42 would reflect the appropriate levels of representation needed by the towns of Aldershot and Farnborough and that, in the light of evidence presented to us at Stage One, such a reduction in council size would not be detrimental to convenient and effective local government in the area. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, as well as 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 42 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

38 As discussed previously we received two borough-wide schemes for Rushmoor, from the Borough Council and from Dr Appleton, a resident of Farnborough. Dr Appleton supported the Borough Council's proposals for Aldershot, and proposed alternative warding arrangements for

the nine Farnborough wards. We have considered carefully each of these schemes, and while Dr Appleton's proposals for the nine Farnborough wards would achieve marginally better electoral equality than the Borough Council's scheme, we are not persuaded that his proposed warding arrangements would better reflect the identities and interests of communities within Farnborough as a whole. Although his proposals would provide for the unification of areas such as Rafborough and Farnborough Park, they would divide communities elsewhere in the borough. In particular, his proposed Cove ward would unite areas either side of the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line which have no direct road links, and would divide the Southwood community. Similarly, in the north of the borough the Medway Drive area would be physically detached from the main body of his proposed Fernhill ward.

39 Given the degree of cross-party support for the Borough Council's proposals for Rushmoor, and in view of the extensive public consultation exercise which it undertook as part of the review process, we are satisfied that its proposals would achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality while also reflecting the identities and interests of the various communities of Aldershot and Farnborough. We are not persuaded that the marginal improvement in electoral equality provided by Dr Appleton's proposals for Farnborough would justify the potential impact on community identities and interests in the area, and consider that by building on existing ward structures the Borough Council's proposals would best reflect existing community ties. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or the alternative scheme submitted at Stage One, and have concluded that we should base our recommendations on the Borough Council's scheme. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Fernhill, Grange and Mayfield wards;
- (b) Cove, St John's and Westheath wards;
- (c) Empress, Knellwood and St Mark's wards;
- (d) Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards;
- (e) Belle Vue, Heron Wood and Newport wards.

40 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.

### **Fernhill, Grange and Mayfield wards**

41 Fernhill, Grange and Mayfield wards in the north of the borough currently cover part of Farnborough to the north of the M3 motorway and to the east of Mayfield Road. At present, Fernhill ward has 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Grange and Mayfield wards have 12 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively. These levels of electoral equality are not forecast to improve by 2004, when Fernhill ward is expected to contain 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, and Grange and Mayfield wards will have 12 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors than the average respectively.

42 The Borough Council proposed largely retaining the existing ward structure in this area, suggesting only minor modifications to the boundaries of the three wards in order to improve electoral equality. Under its proposals, Grange ward would be extended northwards to include the Hawley Lane area of Fernhill ward, and the eastern part of Chapel Lane, currently in Mayfield ward. The Council's proposed Mayfield ward would in turn be extended to include Austen Road, Ballantyne Road and Chaucer Road, which are all accessed from Mayfield Road, and are currently part of Westheath ward. The Council stated that it recognised the importance of the M3 as a community boundary and a barrier to movement between areas, and proposed no change to the southern boundary of Fernhill ward, which currently follows the M3 from the borough boundary in the west to Fernhill Road in the east. Under the Borough Council's proposed warding arrangements Fernhill, Grange and Mayfield wards would contain 2 per cent, 6 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (3 per cent, 5 per cent and 3 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

43 Dr Appleton proposed more significant change in this area, creating a new Hawley ward in the east of the borough, which would include part of the current Grange ward to the west of the A325 Farnborough Road and the parts of the current Fernhill and Mayfield wards to the east of Fernhill Road, North Farm Road and Blackthorn Crescent. Under his proposals Fernhill ward would be expanded to include the Medway Drive area south of the M3, and that part of the current Mayfield ward to the west of North Farm Road and south of Blackthorn Crescent. The remainder of the current Mayfield ward would be divided between a revised Westheath ward, to be discussed later, and a new Oak Farm ward. The proposed Oak Farm ward would be bounded in the east by Cherrywood Road and Prospect Road, in the south by West Heath Road, and in the west by Giffard Drive and Cove Brook. Dr Appleton argued that, under his proposals, the Prospect Estate area between Cherrywood Road and Mayfield Road would be contained within a single ward, and that "fragmentation of the area north of the M3 has been avoided by dividing it into its constituent parts and placing the ex-council housing of the eastern part with the very similar area around Sand Hill". His proposed Fernhill and Hawley wards would each contain 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, and the new Oak Farm ward would contain 2 per cent more than the average (2 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer and equal to the average by 2004).

44 We were not persuaded that Dr Appleton's proposals would better reflect community identities and interests in this area. While we acknowledge that his proposals would provide better levels of electoral equality than those of the Borough Council, we consider that community identity in the area outweighs the potentially negative effects of electoral imbalance. It is clear that the M3 forms a significant barrier to communication between areas in Farnborough, and that it provides a clear boundary. However, in order to achieve electoral equality and reflect other boundaries in the town, both schemes would unite areas either side of the motorway within their proposed wards. While the Council would place the Hawley Lane area in a revised Mayfield ward, Dr Appleton would place the area to the east of Fernhill Road in a new Hawley ward and the Medway Drive area in a revised Fernhill ward. On balance, we consider that the Borough Council's proposals would provide the best ward structure in this area. We consider that the interests of residents in the Medway Drive area south of the motorway would not be appropriately served by their inclusion in a Fernhill ward. Although Dr Appleton's proposals would divide the area to the north of the M3 between only two wards, residents of Blackthorn Crescent and North Farm Road would be divided between two wards. In addition, we are not persuaded that the area to the west of Fernhill School shares many ties with the Hawley Lane area.

45 We concur with the Borough Council, who recognised that while its proposals for the area to the north of the M3 were not ideal, “given the clear and identifiable boundaries which exist in this part of Farnborough ... this is the most suitable arrangement within the current framework”. The Borough Council’s proposals are largely based on existing ward structures, and would involve minor modifications to existing boundaries which we do not consider would adversely affect the statutory criteria.

46 We are therefore putting forward the Borough Council’s proposals for Fernhill, Grange and Mayfield wards as part of our draft recommendations. We do, however, propose several minor amendments. We propose that Peach Tree Close should be transferred from Grange ward to Mayfield ward as its only access is from Cherrywood Road, and that Burns Close, whose road access is from Chaucer Road and Mayfield Road, should form part of Mayfield ward. We also propose including properties on the southern side of Mayfield Road, between Fernhill Road and Cove Brook, within a revised Mayfield ward. Under our proposals Fernhill and Grange wards would contain 2 per cent and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, and Mayfield ward would have 2 per cent more electors than the borough average (3 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer and equal to the average respectively by 2004).

#### **Cove, St John’s and Westheath wards**

47 Cove, St John’s and Westheath wards in the north west of the borough cover the western part of Farnborough to the south of the M3 motorway. St John’s and Westheath wards cover the area between the M3 motorway and the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line, while Cove ward extends south of the railway line as far as Farnborough Airfield, and includes the Rafborough and Southwood areas. At present Cove and St John’s wards are the most acutely under-represented wards in the borough, a consequence of the boundary review between Hart district and Rushmoor borough, and contain 25 per cent and 37 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. Electoral inequality in these wards is not expected to improve significantly over the next five years, with Cove ward projected to contain 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004, and St John’s ward projected to contain 35 per cent more electors per councillor than the average. Westheath ward currently has 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (3 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

48 The Borough Council proposed only minor modifications to the boundaries of these three wards, in order to improve electoral equality in the area. The Council stated that it viewed the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line as a significant community boundary, and as such proposed retaining the railway line as the southern boundary of St John’s and Westheath wards and the northern boundary of Cove ward. In order to improve electoral equality it proposed transferring an area in the east of St John’s ward to Westheath ward. The modified boundary would follow its current course north along Fernhill Road as far as the junction with St John’s Road, before running to the rear of properties on Fernhill Road, Middleton Gardens, Newfield Avenue and Severn Road, and the centre of Sunnybank Road and Cove Brook. Under the Borough Council’s proposals, St John’s ward would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (3 per cent more than the average by 2004). The Council’s proposed Westheath ward would be enlarged westwards to include part of St John’s ward, with the Mayfield Road area being transferred to Mayfield ward as described earlier. The revised ward would contain 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (3 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

49 In order to further improve electoral equality the Borough Council proposed transferring part of the existing Cove ward to a revised Empress ward. The amended boundary would run north along Arrow Road, and then follow the centre of Fowler Road, Busk Crescent and St Christophers Road as far as Victoria Road. It would then rejoin the current boundary, running north along the centre of Highfield Road to the railway line. Under the Borough Council's proposals Cove ward would contain 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (equal to the average by 2004).

50 Dr Appleton again proposed a more radical reorganisation of warding arrangements in this area. Under his proposals the part of St John's ward to the west of Woodlands Road and Minley Road would be combined with the part of the current Cove ward to the west of Westglade, Southwood Road, Southwood Lane and The Copse, to form a revised Cove ward which would contain equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the borough (2 per cent fewer than the average by 2004). He also proposed creating a new Rafborough ward combining the eastern part of the current Cove ward with part of Empress ward. The eastern boundary of his new ward would follow Prospect Road south from the railway line, before running to the rear of properties on Marrowbrook Lane and Hinstock Close. It would then run south along the centre of Invincible Road and rejoin the existing boundary on Elles Road. This new Rafborough ward would contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent more than the average by 2004). Finally, Dr Appleton proposed a revised West Heath ward, which would combine the part of the current Westheath ward to the west of Cove Brook and Giffard Drive and to the south of West Heath Road, with the part of St John's ward to the east of Minley Road and Woodlands Road, excluding the Medway Drive area as discussed previously. The proposed ward would also contain the Cheyne Way area of Mayfield ward. The ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the borough (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

51 As a result of the boundary review between Rushmoor borough and Hart district both Cove and St John's wards expanded westwards, with the result that their respective electorates are currently far higher than the average for the borough as a whole. Consequently, electoral variances in these wards are the highest in the borough, and we consider that any proposed warding arrangement should address the under-representation in this area. Although reducing council size to 42 would improve electoral equality, both proposals accepted that these two wards must be reduced in size in order to achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality. Dr Appleton argued that Rafborough is the most readily identifiable community within this area, given that "Southwood is a much more recent development than Rafborough, and has not had time to establish an identity of its own", and his proposals would unite Rafborough within a single ward but would divide Southwood and combine part of it with part of the current Cove ward to the north of the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line. The Borough Council's proposals for the area, on the other hand, would divide Rafborough between Cove and Empress wards, rather than dividing Southwood.

52 We are not persuaded that the unification of Rafborough would justify the potential impact of Dr Appleton's proposals on the Southwood area, and are content to adopt the Borough Council's proposed Cove ward as the basis of our draft recommendations. We consider, in particular, that there are few links between the areas either side of the railway line. We do,

however, propose some minor amendments. We propose that both sides of Highfield Road form part of Empress ward, and that Wood Lane be included in Cove ward as it can only be accessed from St Christophers Road. Additionally, we propose that properties on both sides of Fowler Road and Busk Crescent, together with Halifax Close, be included in Empress ward. Under our proposals, Cove ward would contain 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

53 We are content to put forward the Borough Council's proposed St John's and Westheath wards as part of our draft recommendations, subject to some minor amendments to the boundary between Westheath and Mayfield wards as discussed earlier. Our proposed St John's and Westheath wards would contain 5 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (3 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

### **Empress, Knellwood and St Mark's wards**

54 Empress, Knellwood and St Mark's wards are located in the east of the borough and comprise the Empress Park area, and the Farnborough Park and South Farnborough areas to the east of the A325 Farnborough Road. At present Empress ward contains 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, and this level of electoral variance is not predicted to change over the next five years. Knellwood and St Mark's wards currently both have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (equal to and 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

55 The Borough Council proposed only minimal change to arrangements in these three wards, building on the reasonable levels of electoral equality which currently exist in the area. It proposed retaining the existing northern boundary of Empress ward, while the western boundary with Cove ward would be subject to some modifications, as discussed earlier. In the south, the Council proposed that the ward would be expanded to include Pinehurst Avenue and Elles Close from Queens ward, while in the east the boundary between Empress and Knellwood wards would remain unchanged, except that Empress ward would also include properties on both sides of Rectory Road. The Council proposed that Knellwood ward also remain largely unchanged. It would, however, be expanded to include areas of Ministry of Defence land to the west of the A325 Farnborough Road which can only be accessed from the main road. The southern boundary of the ward would be modified to run along the centre of Cambridge Road West, south along Oxford Road and east on Reading Road. The council also proposed including both sides of Whites Road within their modified St Mark's ward. Under the Borough Council's proposals St Mark's ward would also include the part of the current Queens ward to the north of the Basingstoke Canal, including Farnborough Airfield and North Camp. The southern boundary of St Mark's ward would follow the Basingstoke Canal west from the borough boundary, and would run to the north of the Bank Road area along Prince's Avenue to the borough boundary in the east. The Borough Council argued that by dividing the existing Queens ward and combining it with areas to its north and south, problems of historically low turnout in the area would be spread between two wards instead of one. The Council's proposed Empress, Knellwood and St Mark's wards would contain 5 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent more than the average by 2004).

56 Dr Appleton proposed largely retaining St Mark's ward but creating two new wards of Farnborough Park and Farnborough Town. He proposed that the part of Grange ward to the east of the A325 Farnborough Road should be combined with the Pierrefondes Avenue and Farnborough Park areas of Empress ward and the part of Knellwood ward to the north of Sycamore Road and Woburn Avenue to form a new Farnborough Park ward. Dr Appleton argued that his proposed ward would combine the low-density housing of Farnborough Park and Empress Park areas which share community ties. His proposed Farnborough Town ward would contain the remaining parts of the current Empress and Knellwood wards, together with the Farnborough Airfield area from Queens ward. The boundary between the proposed Farnborough Park and Farnborough Town wards would follow the Basingstoke to London Waterloo railway line, the A325 Farnborough Road, and the centre of Sycamore Road and Woburn Avenue. The proposed Farnborough Town ward would also include part of the current St Mark's ward east of Oxford Road and to the north of Reading Road. He supported the Borough Council's proposed St Mark's ward. Under Dr Appleton's proposals Farnborough Park and St Mark's wards would each contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent more than the average by 2004), while Farnborough Town ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (equal to the average by 2004).

57 We recognise that both of the borough-wide approaches to warding in this area have some merit. We note that Dr Appleton's proposal would unite the Farnborough Park area, but would separate this area from the adjacent town centre area. His proposal would also divide the relatively recent development based around Woburn Avenue, with the result that the eastern part of the estate would be isolated from the majority of Farnborough Town ward. Dr Appleton also argued that part of Farnborough Airfield should be included in Farnborough Town ward, in order that residents most affected by airfield activity could share an interest in decisions regarding the site. The Borough Council concurred with this view, and under their proposals areas of the airfield would be included in both Knellwood and St Mark's wards.

58 The Borough Council's proposals for Empress and Knellwood wards are largely based on existing ward structures and, in the absence of any substantive evidence that the current warding arrangements do not adequately reflect community identities and interests in this area, we are content to put forward their proposals as part of our draft recommendations, subject to amendments to the boundary between Cove and Empress wards, as discussed previously. Our proposed Empress and Knellwood wards would contain 8 per cent and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (7 per cent and 1 per cent more than the average by 2004). We are satisfied that the North Camp area of Queens ward shares some community interests with the area to the north of the A3011 Lynchford Road and are content to put forward a modified St Mark's ward. The proposed St Mark's ward would contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent more than the average by 2004). The proposed ward boundary between Queens and St Mark's wards is illustrated on Maps A2 and A3 at Appendix A.

### **Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards**

59 Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards comprise much of western Aldershot, as well as the Ministry of Defence land to its north, including Farnborough Airfield. Alexandra and Queens wards are both currently under-represented, with 2 per cent and 13 per cent fewer electors per

councillor than the borough average respectively (4 per cent and 4 per cent fewer than the average by 2004). Manor ward has 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average at present, and is expected to contain 18 per cent more electors per councillor than the average by 2004.

60 The Borough Council proposed substantially modifying existing warding arrangements in Aldershot, reducing the number of wards from six to five in order to provide reasonable electoral equality for the town. It proposed dividing the current Queens ward along the Basingstoke Canal. The northern part of the ward would be combined with Knellwood and St Mark's wards, as discussed earlier, while the southern part would be combined with part of the current Alexandra ward of Aldershot in a revised Queens ward. The Council's proposed Queens ward would be bounded in the east by the Alton to London Waterloo railway line, and in the south by Church Lane West. The western boundary of the ward would run to the rear of properties to the east of York Road and York Crescent, and the centre of Perowne Street northward to the existing boundary of the A323 Wellington Avenue. The remainder of the current Alexandra ward would be combined with the part of Manor ward to the west of the Alton to London Waterloo railway line to form a revised Alexandra ward. The Council proposed a revised Manor ward combining the eastern part of the current ward, together with parts of the current Newport and Belle Vue wards. The eastern boundary of the Council's proposed Manor ward would run north along the centre of Lower Farnham Road, Church Road and Elston Road, while the northern boundary would follow the centre of Crossways and Wolfe Road, to the rear of properties on Haig Road, Mount Pleasant and Windmill Road as far as the railway line. The Borough Council's proposed Alexandra and Manor wards would contain 3 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (4 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more than the average by 2004). The Council's proposed Queens ward would contain 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to 4 per cent fewer than average by 2004. Dr Appleton and Aldershot Branch Labour Party stated that they supported the Borough Council's proposals in this area.

61 We are satisfied that the Borough Council's proposals for west Aldershot provide substantially improved levels of electoral equality in this part of the town, while reflecting community identities and interests in the area. The Alton to London Waterloo railway line forms a significant community boundary in the town, and the Council's proposed warding arrangements recognise this. We gave further consideration to the proposed boundary between Alexandra and Queens wards in relation to Perowne Street, which would be divided under the Borough Council's proposals. We recognise that this proposal would achieve reasonable electoral equality, but would welcome further comments on this issue from interested parties at Stage Three. We are satisfied that the Borough Council's proposals for western Aldershot have a significant degree of cross-party support, and as such are prepared to put them forward as part of our draft recommendations. We do, however, propose one minor amendment. Under the Borough Council's proposals Mount Pleasant Road would be divided between its proposed Manor and Newport & Belle Vue wards, and we propose including both sides of the road in Manor ward. Our proposed Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards would contain 3 per cent, 4 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (4 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004). The proposed ward boundaries are illustrated on Map A4 at Appendix A.

## **Belle Vue, Heron Wood and Newport wards**

62 Belle Vue, Heron Wood and Newport wards cover the eastern half of Aldershot, including the North Town, Tices Meadow and Aldershot Park areas. All three wards are significantly over-represented at present, containing 18 per cent, 21 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. Levels of electoral inequality in these wards are not expected to improve over the next five years. Belle Vue ward is forecast to contain 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, Heron Wood 23 per cent fewer than the average and Newport 10 per cent fewer than the average by 2004.

63 The Borough Council proposed dividing the existing Newport ward between Manor, Heron Wood and Belle Vue wards. Under the Council's proposals Heron Wood ward would be expanded westwards to include the part of Newport ward to the east of Church Road and Elston Road and south of Ash Road. A new Newport & Belle Vue ward would comprise the current Belle Vue ward and the part of Newport ward to the east of Mount Pleasant Road, Haig Road, Wolfe Road and Crossways and to the north of Ash Road. The remainder of the ward would form part of a revised Manor ward, as outlined previously. The Council's proposed Heron Wood and Newport & Belle Vue wards would contain 5 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (4 per cent and 4 per cent more than the average respectively by 2004). Dr Appleton and Aldershot Branch Labour Party also supported the Borough Council's proposals in this area.

64 We are content to base our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals for this area. We consider that the Borough Council's proposals would address the problem of over-representation, combining parts of the existing Newport ward with the modified Heron Wood and Manor wards and the new Newport and Belle Vue ward, and would make good use of the A323 Ash Road as a ward boundary. As discussed earlier, we propose one minor amendment to the boundary between Manor and Newport & Belle Vue wards. Our proposed Heron Wood ward would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Newport & Belle Vue ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (4 per cent more and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the average by 2004). The proposed ward boundaries are illustrated on Map A5 at Appendix A.

## **Electoral Cycle**

65 We received one representation regarding the Borough Council's electoral cycle. The Borough Council stated that it wished to retain the current pattern of elections by thirds. It argued that the existing electoral cycle provides regular access to participation in the democratic process, and avoids major changes in the composition of the council, thus allowing for "greater continuity in direction and policies".

66 We have considered carefully all representations received and are content that the current pattern of elections by thirds should be retained.

## Conclusions

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

- (a) there should be a reduction in council size from 45 to 42;
- (b) there should be 14 wards, one fewer than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of all 15 of the existing wards should be modified; and
- (d) elections should continue to be held by thirds.

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

- (i) we propose minor amendments to boundaries between Grange, Mayfield and Westheath wards, between Cove and Empress wards and between Manor and Newport & Belle Vue wards.

69 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	45	42	45	42
Number of wards	15	14	15	14
Average number of electors per councillor	1,315	1,409	1,336	1,431
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	8	0	7	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	3	0	3	0

70 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Rushmoor Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from eight to none. By 2004 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough.

**Draft Recommendation**

Rushmoor Borough Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 14 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

**71 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Rushmoor and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle and ward names. 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 Rushmoor*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

72 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Rushmoor. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 13 March 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at our offices and those of the Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

73 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Rushmoor 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)

74 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 Rushmoor: Detailed Mapping**

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

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 to A5 and the large map at the back of this report.

**Maps A2 & A3** illustrate the proposed boundary between Queens and St Mark's wards.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed boundary between Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards.

**Map A5** illustrates the proposed boundary between Heron Wood, Manor and Newport & Belle Vue wards.

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

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

*Map A2: Proposed Boundary between Queens and St Mark's wards (part)*

*Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Queens and St Mark's wards (part)*

*Map A4: Proposed Boundary between Alexandra, Manor and Queens wards*

*Map A5: Proposed Boundary between Heron Wood, Manor and Newport & Belle Vue wards*

## APPENDIX B

### Rushmoor Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

*Figure B1: Rushmoor Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1	Alexandra	Alexandra ward (part); Manor ward (part)
2	Cove	Cove ward (part)
3	Empress	Cove ward (part); Empress ward (part); Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part)
4	Fernhill	Fernhill ward (part)
5	Grange	Fernhill ward (part); Grange ward (part); Mayfield ward (part)
6	Heron Wood	Heron Wood ward (part); Newport ward (part)
7	Knellwood	Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part); St Mark's ward (part)
8	Manor	Manor ward (part); Newport ward (part)
9	Mayfield	Mayfield ward (part); Westheath ward (part)
10	Newport & Belle Vue	Belle Vue ward (part); Newport ward (part)
11	Queens	Alexandra ward (part); Queens ward (part)
12	St John's	St John's ward (part)
13	St Mark's	Knellwood ward (part); Queens ward (part); St Mark's ward (part)
14	Westheath	St John's ward (part); Westheath ward (part)

Figure B2: Rushmoor Borough Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alexandra	3	4,117	1,372	-3	4,128	1,376	-4
2 Cove	3	4,312	1,437	2	4,312	1,437	0
3 Empress	3	4,443	1,481	5	4,475	1,492	4
4 Fernhill	3	4,158	1,386	-2	4,158	1,386	-3
5 Grange	3	3,976	1,325	-6	4,089	1,363	-5
6 Heron Wood	3	4,452	1,484	5	4,452	1,484	4
7 Knellwood	3	4,269	1,423	1	4,334	1,445	1
8 Manor	3	4,069	1,356	-4	4,350	1,450	1
9 Mayfield	3	4,169	1,390	-1	4,169	1,390	-3
10 Newport & Belle Vue	3	4,375	1,458	3	4,465	1,488	4
11 Queens	3	3,817	1,272	-10	4,108	1,369	-4
12 St John's	3	4,442	1,481	5	4,424	1,475	3
13 St Mark's	3	4,339	1,446	3	4,387	1,462	2
14 Westheath	3	4,249	1,416	1	4,249	1,416	-1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>59,187</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,409</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,431</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

## Dr Appleton's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3: Dr Appleton'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 %
1 Alexandra	3	4,117	1,372	-3	4,128	1,376	-4
2 Cove	3	4,220	1,407	0	4,202	1,401	-2
3 Farnborough Park	3	4,343	1,448	3	4,365	1,455	2
4 Farnborough Town	3	4,187	1,396	-1	4,284	1,428	0
5 Fernhill	3	4,202	1,401	-1	4,202	1,401	-2
6 Hawley	3	4,174	1,391	-1	4,265	1,422	-1
7 Heron Wood	3	4,452	1,484	5	4,452	1,484	4
8 Manor	3	4,069	1,356	-4	4,350	1,450	1
9 Newport & Belle Vue	3	4,375	1,458	3	4,465	1,488	4
10 Oak Farm	3	4,298	1,433	2	4,298	1,433	0
11 Queens	3	3,817	1,272	-10	4,108	1,369	-4
12 Rafborough	3	4,363	1,454	3	4,363	1,454	2
13 St Mark's	3	4,339	1,446	3	4,387	1,462	2
14 Westheath	3	4,234	1,411	0	4,234	1,411	-1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>59,190</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60,103</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,409</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,431</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Dr Appleton's submission.

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



## APPENDIX 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 boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

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

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

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

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

---

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

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- (a) the number of councillors;
- (b) the need for parish wards;
- (c) the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- (d) the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- (e) 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.

6 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.