

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Dover in Kent

November 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 local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (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. 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>27</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Dover: Detailed Mapping	<i>29</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements – Dover District Council – Liberal Democrats – River Parish Council – Conservative Association – District Council Officers	<i>31</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>41</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Dover, Deal and Walmer is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Dover on 9 May 2000.

- **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 Dover:

- **in 20 of the 31 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and eight wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation 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 19 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 78-79) are that:

- **Dover District Council should have 45 councillors, 11 fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 21 wards, instead of 31 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of 10, and two 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 20 of the proposed 21 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in none of the wards expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2005.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the town councils of Deal and Dover and the parish of Walmer;**
- **a reduction in the number of councillors serving Deal Town Council;**
- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Dover Town Council.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 14 November 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 22 January 2001:

**Review Manager
Dover 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
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1 Ash	3	Ash ward (the parish of Ash); Little Stour ward (the parishes of Stourmouth, Preston and Wingham); Woodnesborough with Staple ward (part – the parish of Staple); Nonistone ward (part – the parish of Goodnestone)	Map 2
2 Aylesham	2	Aylesham ward (the parish of Aylesham); Noningstone ward (part – the parish of Nonington)	Map 2
3 Buckland	3	Barton and Buckland wards (part – the proposed Buckland parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
4 Capel-le-Ferne	1	Capel-le-Ferne ward (part – the parishes of Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without)	Map 2
5 Castle	1	Castle and Town & Pier ward (part – the proposed Castle parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
6 Eastry	2	Eastry ward (the parish of Eastry); Noninstone ward (part – the parish of Tilmanstone); Cornilo ward (part – the parishes of Northbourne and Sutton); Mongeham ward (part – the parish of Great Mongeham)	Map 2
7 Eythorne & Shepherdswell	2	Eythorne ward (the parish of Eythorne); Shepherdswell with Coldred ward (the parishes of Denton with Wooton and Shepherdswell with Coldred)	Map 2
8 Lydden & Temple Ewell	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Lydden and Temple Ewell)	Map 2
9 Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory	3	Maxton & Elms Vale, Priory and Town & Pier wards (part – the proposed Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
10 Middle Deal & Sholden	3	Middle Deal ward (part – the proposed Middle Deal parish ward of Deal parish); Worth ward (part – the parish of Sholden)	Map 2 and large map
11 Mill Hill	3	Middle Deal, Mill Hill and Mongeham wards (part – the proposed Mill Hill parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
12 North Deal	3	North Deal ward (the proposed North Deal parish ward of Deal parish); Lower Walmer ward (part – the proposed Gladstone parish ward of Walmer parish)	Map 2 and large map
13 Ringwould	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Ringwould with Kingsdown)	Map 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
14	River	2	River ward (the parish of River); Capel-le-Ferne ward (part – the parish of Alkham)	Map 2
15	St Margaret's-at-Cliffe	2	St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parishes of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe and Langdon); Cornillo ward (part – the parish of Ripple); Pineham ward (part – the parish of Guston)	Map 2
16	St Radigunds	2	Barton, Tower Hamlets and St Radigunds wards (part – the proposed St Radigunds parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
17	Sandwich	3	Sandwich ward (the parish of Sandwich); Woodnesborough with Staple ward (part – the parish of Woodnesborough); Worth ward (part – the parish of Worth)	Map 2
18	Tower Hamlets	2	Castle, Priory and Tower Hamlets wards (part – the proposed Tower Hamlets parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
19	Town & Pier	1	Maxton & Elms Vale, Priory and Town & Pier wards (part – the proposed Town & Pier parish ward of Dover parish)	Map 2 and large map
20	Walmer	3	Lower Walmer ward (part – the Lower Walmer Wellington parish ward and the proposed Lower Walmer St Saviours parish ward of Walmer parish); Upper Walmer ward (the Upper Walmer parish ward of Walmer parish)	Map 2 and large map
21	Whitfield	2	Pineham ward (part – the parish of Whitfield)	Map 2

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Dover

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Ash	3	5,013	1,671	-7	5,013	1,671	-9
2 Aylesham	2	3,323	1,662	-8	3,479	1,740	-5
3 Buckland	3	5,527	1,842	3	5,527	1,842	1
4 Capel-le Ferne	1	1,811	1,811	1	1,811	1,811	-1
5 Castle	1	1,931	1,931	7	1,931	1,931	6
6 Eastry	2	3,782	1,891	5	3,834	1,917	5
7 Eythorne & Shepherdswell	2	3,644	1,822	1	3,684	1,842	1
8 Lydden & Temple Ewell	1	1,930	1,930	7	1,934	1,934	6
9 Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory	3	5,191	1,730	-4	5,207	1,736	-5
10 Middle Deal & Sholden	3	5,655	1,885	5	5,686	1,895	4
11 Mill Hill	3	5,693	1,898	6	5,732	1,911	4
12 North Deal	3	5,668	1,889	5	5,752	1,917	5
13 Ringwould	1	1,663	1,663	-7	1,663	1,663	-9
14 River	2	3,628	1,814	1	3,628	1,814	-1
15 St Margaret's-at-Cliffe	2	3,425	1,713	-5	3,480	1,740	-5
16 St Radigunds	2	3,492	1,746	-3	3,496	1,748	-4
17 Sandwich	3	5,461	1,820	1	5,744	1,915	5
18 Tower Hamlets	2	3,510	1,755	-2	3,561	1,781	-3
19 Town & Pier	1	1,399	1,399	-22	1,877	1,877	3
20 Walmer	3	5,544	1,848	3	5,605	1,868	2
21 Whitfield	2	3,558	1,779	-1	3,669	1,835	0
Totals	45	80,848	-	-	82,313	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,797	-	-	1,829	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Dover District 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 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 Dover in Kent on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 12 two-tier districts in Kent 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 2005.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Dover. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report No. 274). The electoral arrangements of Kent County Council were last reviewed in November 1980 (Report No. 402). We completed a directed electoral review of Medway in 1996. We expect to commence a periodic electoral review of Medway later this year, and of the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- the statutory criteria contained 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* contained 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 to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. 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

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 district and county councils would hold elections every two years, ie 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 Kent districts, that 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 have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities’ electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our present *Guidance*.

12 Stage One began on 9 May 2000, when we wrote to Dover District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Kent County Council, Kent Police Authority, the local authority associations, Kent Association of Parish Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, 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 District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 31 July 2000.

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

14 Stage Three began on 14 November 2000 and will end on 22 January 2001. 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 Dover is bounded by the English Channel along its eastern boundary, by the City of Canterbury to the west and by the districts of Thanet and Shepway to the north and south respectively. The district contains significant contrasts ranging from quiet rural villages to the town of Dover, the busiest passenger and roll-on/roll-off ferry port in the world. Covering some 31,186 hectares, and with a population of some 103,216, Dover has a population density of just over 3 people per hectare.

17 The district contains 35 parishes, and is entirely parished. Dover town comprises 26 per cent of the district's total electorate, while Deal and Walmer together comprise 28 per cent of the district's total electorate.

18 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'.

19 The electorate of the district is 80,848 (February 2000). The Council presently has 56 members who are elected from 31 wards, 14 of which are relatively urban in the Dover, Deal and Walmer areas, with the remainder being predominantly rural. Five of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 15 are each represented by two councillors and 11 are single-member wards. The Council is elected every four years.

20 Over the last 25 years there has been an increase in the electorate in Dover district, with around 7 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments.

21 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,444 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,470 by the year 2005 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 20 of the 31 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, in eight wards by more than 20 per cent and in four wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Little Stour ward where the councillor represents 45 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Dover

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Ash	2	2,215	1,108	-23	2,215	1,108	-25
2 Aylesham	2	2,730	1,365	-5	2,886	1,443	-2
3 Barton	2	3,326	1,663	15	3,326	1,663	13
4 Buckland	2	3,201	1,601	11	3,201	1,601	9
5 Capel-le-Ferne	2	2,359	1,180	-18	2,359	1,180	-20
6 Castle	2	2,388	1,194	-17	2,388	1,194	-19
7 Cornillo	1	1,449	1,449	0	1,449	1,449	-1
8 Eastry	1	1,746	1,746	21	1,798	1,798	22
9 Eythorne	1	1,882	1,882	30	1,922	1,922	31
10 Little Stour	1	2,097	2,097	45	2,097	2,097	43
11 Lower Walmer	3	4,103	1,368	-5	4,164	1,388	-6
12 Lydden & Temple Ewell	1	1,930	1,930	34	1,934	1,934	32
13 Maxton & Elms Vale	2	2,773	1,387	-4	2,773	1,387	-6
14 Middle Deal	3	5,043	1,681	16	5,074	1,691	15
15 Mill Hill	2	2,991	1,496	4	3,030	1,515	3
16 Mongeham	2	3,056	1,528	6	3,056	1,528	4
17 Noninstone	1	1,215	1,215	-16	1,215	1,215	-17
18 North Deal	3	5,066	1,689	17	5,150	1,717	17
19 Pineham	3	4,194	1,398	-3	4,360	1,453	-1
20 Priory	2	2,418	1,209	-16	2,434	1,217	-17
21 Ringwould	1	1,663	1,663	15	1,663	1,663	13
22 River	2	3,080	1,540	7	3,080	1,540	5
23 St Margaret's-at-Cliffe	2	2,499	1,250	-13	2,499	1,250	-15
24 St Radigunds	2	2,492	1,246	-14	2,496	1,248	-15
25 Sandwich	3	3,877	1,292	-10	4,160	1,387	-6

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
26 Shepherdswell with Coldred	1	1,762	1,762	22	1,762	1,762	20
27 Tower Hamlets	2	2,803	1,402	-3	2,854	1,427	-3
28 Town & Pier	2	1,649	825	-43	2,127	1,064	-28
29 Upper Walmer	1	2,043	2,043	42	2,043	2,043	39
30 Woodnesborough with Staple	1	1,207	1,207	-16	1,207	1,207	-18
31 Worth	1	1,591	1,591	-10	1,591	1,591	8
Totals	56	80,848	–	–	82,313	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,444	–	–	1,470	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Dover 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 2000, electors in Town & Pier ward were relatively over-represented by 43 per cent, while electors in Little Stour ward were relatively under-represented by 45 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 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 Dover District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 18 representations during Stage One, including district-wide schemes from the District Council, the Conservative Party (Dover & Deal Conservative Association), the Liberal Democrats (Dover Constituency and Sandwich Branch) and River Parish Council, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission.

Dover District Council

24 The District Council proposed a council of 45 members, 11 less than at present, serving 15 wards, compared to the existing 31. It proposed a three-member ward pattern throughout the district. The District Council consulted on this scheme, and two alternative options.

25 The Council proposed seven three-member wards in the rural area of the district, arguing that three-member wards gave a “suitable geographic and numeric balance” and that “problems that may be encountered with parochial feelings could be countered by the fact that each ward would have three representatives”. It also proposed four three-member wards in both the town of Dover and the Deal and Walmer area. Its proposals would provide improved levels of electoral equality, with no ward varying from the district average by more than 8 per cent by 2005. The Council’s proposal is summarised at Appendix B.

Dover & Deal Conservative Association

26 Dover & Deal Conservative Association proposed a council of 46 members representing 20 wards. It proposed a mix of two- and three-member wards throughout the district, with one single-member ward in the rural area. It argued that it had pursued “electoral equality while attempting to retain community identity”, stating that its approach had “broadly been to accept the established communities inherent in the existing ward system”.

Liberal Democrats (Dover Constituency & Sandwich Branch)

27 The Liberal Democrats proposed a council size of 38 members representing 19 two-member wards. They stated that their submission was based on the “best possible equalisation with electoral numbers per councillor”, and that they had grouped villages on a like for like basis. They also argued that a 38 member council would improve accountability. Their proposals would result in one ward varying by 11 per cent from the district average by 2005.

River Parish Council

28 River Parish Council proposed a council size of 38 members representing 19 two-member wards. It argued that a 38-member council would be appropriate for the working administration of Dover District Council, while a two-member ward pattern would provide greater accountability and would be easier for the public to understand. Its proposals would result in one ward varying by 11 per cent from the district average by 2005.

Parish and Town Councils

29 We received representations from 12 parish and town councils. Dover Town Council supported “the preservation, wherever possible, of existing natural communities” within the Dover area. The parish councils of Eastry, Northbourne, Sutton by Dover and Tilmanstone objected to the District Council’s proposals. The parish councils of Ripple and Sholden both supported the Conservative Party’s proposals, while the parish councils of Langdon and Lydden supported the District Council Officers’ proposals. Walmer Parish Council objected to any proposals that would split the parish. Goodnestone Parish Council proposed that it be grouped with the parishes of Ash and Staple and the current district ward of Little Stour. Worth Parish Council proposed that it be joined in a ward with Sandwich and Woodnesborough.

District Council Officers

30 We received a scheme produced by its officers, which had been considered, but not adopted, by the District Council. This proposed a council of 47 members serving 21 wards. It also proposed a mix of single- and multi-member wards in the rural areas, a mix of two- and three-member wards within the Deal and Walmer areas and a pattern of three-member wards within the town of Dover. The proposals would result in two wards varying by 11 per cent by 2005.

Other Representations

31 We received one further representation from Councillor Smith who objected to the District Council’s proposals, instead favouring those of the Conservative Association.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

32 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Dover is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of 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”.

33 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 next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

34 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.

35 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be 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 and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates.

Electorate Forecasts

36 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 2 per cent from 80,848 to 82,313 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects most of the growth to be in Town & Pier ward in Dover. 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.

37 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

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

39 Dover District Council presently has 56 members. The District Council proposed a council size of 45 members, a reduction of 11. It argued that a figure of around 46 had been agreed by all political parties at the first meeting of the Council's Electoral Review Working Group and that its proposals would best fit the guidance given by the Commission.

40 The scheme produced by the District Council Officers proposed a council size of 47, a reduction of nine councillors, while the Conservative Association proposed a council size of 46, a reduction of 10. The Liberal Democrats and River Parish Council both proposed a council size of 38, a reduction of 18. The Liberal Democrats argued that a 38-member council would "improve accountability with smaller committees resulting in better efficiencies", that fewer district councillors would enhance the role of town and parish councils and that the revenue cost of servicing council members would be reduced. River Parish Council argued further that some councillors had been representing 2000 electors for some time and that it had proven itself workable. They both argued that a pattern of two-member wards across the district would create uniformity, resulting in an easier system for the public to understand, would promote shared working responsibilities and facilitate elections every two years, resulting in greater accountability.

41 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One and note the lack of agreement regarding council size. We noted that there is largely a division between a significant decrease in council size, from 56 to 38 (as proposed by the Liberal Democrats and River Parish Council) and a council size in the region of 46 (as proposed by the District Council, District Council Officers and Conservatives). However, we consider that there is a lack of argumentation in support of the 38-member council, and given the lack of consultation we have not been convinced that there would be widespread support for such a large decrease. There has been a greater degree of support for a council size of around 46, and we have used this figure as our starting point. 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 a council of 45 members would provide for the best distribution of councillors within the rural area, Dover and Deal.

Electoral Arrangements

42 We have given careful consideration to the views which we received during Stage One, and in particular the five district-wide schemes received from the District Council, the scheme developed by the District Council Officers, the Conservative Association, the Liberal Democrats and River Parish Council. We have noted the general lack of consensus between the schemes in terms of both parish groupings in the rural area and specific boundaries in the towns. However, having noted a degree of consensus in the rural areas between the scheme produced by the District Council Officers and that of the Conservative Association, we have endeavoured to reflect this where possible. Moreover, in areas where agreement exists, we note that there would generally be substantial improvements to electoral equality while, we judge, satisfactorily reflecting the statutory criteria. Consequently, in the rural area we are adopting the proposals of both the District Council Officers and the Conservative Association in the north and west of the district, and a mixture of the two schemes in the south and east of the district. We have noted that the District Council proposed a pattern of all three-member wards, the Liberal Democrats and River

Parish Council proposed all two-member wards, while the Conservative Association and District Council Officers proposed mixed member ward patterns. We have not been persuaded that a pattern of solely two- or three-member wards would best reflect community identity in the district, and are therefore proposing a pattern of single- and multi-member wards. In view of the lack of consensus over warding arrangements in the town of Dover we are basing our draft recommendations on the proposals received from Dover Town Council, as we consider that they provide good levels of electoral equality while respecting community interests. However, in the Deal and Walmer area we are proposing our own draft recommendations based on easily identifiable boundaries. We also believe our proposals better reflect community identity than the other schemes received at Stage One. For district warding purposes the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Ash, Aylesham, Little Stour, Noninstone, Sandwich, Woodnesborough with Staple and Worth wards;
- (b) Capel-le-Ferne, Eythorne, Lydden & Temple Ewell, River and Shepherdswell with Coldred wards;
- (c) Cornillo, Eastry, Pineham, Ringwoud and St Margaret's-at-Cliffe wards;
- (d) Dover town (eight wards);
- (e) Lower Walmer, Middle Deal, Mill Hill, Mongeham, North Deal and Upper Walmer wards.

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

Ash, Aylesham, Little Stour, Noninstone, Sandwich, Woodnesborough with Staple and Worth wards

44 These seven wards are situated in the north and west of the district. Ash and Aylesham wards, comprising the parishes of the same name are both represented by two councillors and have 23 per cent fewer and 5 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (25 per cent fewer and 2 per cent fewer in 2005). Little Stour ward, comprising the parishes of Preston, Stourmouth and Wingham, is represented by one councillor and has 45 per cent more electors than the district average currently (43 per cent more in 2005) and Noninstone ward, comprising the parishes of Goodnestone, Nonington and Tilmanstone is represented by one councillor and has 16 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (17 per cent fewer in 2005). Sandwich ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is represented by three councillors and has 10 per cent fewer electors than the district council currently (6 per cent fewer in 2005). Woodnesborough with Staple ward comprises the parishes of Woodnesborough and Staple, is represented by one councillor, and has 16 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (18 per cent fewer in 2005). Worth ward, comprising the parishes of Sholden and Worth, is represented by one councillor and has 10 per cent more electors than the district average currently (8 per cent more in 2005).

45 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the parishes of Ash, Preston, Staple, Stourmouth, Wingham and Woodnesborough be combined to form a three-member ward in the north of the district. The resulting ward would have 2 per cent more electors than the district

average currently (1 per cent more in 2005). It proposed that the existing wards of Sandwich and Worth be combined to form a three-member ward in the north-east of the district which would have 1 per cent more electors than the district average currently (5 per cent more in 2005). It also proposed that the parishes of Aylesham, Eastry, Goodnestone and Nonington be combined to form a three-member ward to the west of the district, which would have equal to the district average currently (2 per cent more in 2005).

46 The District Council Officers and the Conservative Association proposed identical configurations in this area. They proposed that the parishes of Ash, Goodnestone, Preston, Staple, Stourmouth and Wingham be combined to form a three-member ward. The District Council Officers scheme commented that the proposal was supported by Goodnestone Parish Council; that Ash Parish Council had submitted a proposal to be linked with the parish of Staple and the current Little Stour ward; and that the parishes are rural and have established links. Under a district council size of 46, the Conservative Association's proposed Ash ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (7 per cent fewer in 2005). Under the District Council Officers' proposal for a 47-member council their proposed ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors currently (5 per cent fewer in 2005). They also proposed that the parishes of Sandwich, Worth and Woodnesborough be combined to form a three-member ward in the north-east of the district. The District Council Officers argued that this configuration of parishes had been supported by both Sandwich Town Council and Worth Parish Council. Under the Conservative Association's proposals for a 46-member council its proposed Sandwich ward would have 4 per cent more electors than the district average currently (7 per cent more in 2005). Under the District Council Officers' proposals for a 47-member council their proposed ward would have 6 per cent more electors than the district average currently (9 per cent more in 2005). The Conservative Association and District Council Officers also proposed that the parishes of Aylesham and Nonington be combined within a two-member ward in the west of the district. The District Council Officers argued that both parishes had previously been mining communities and that there is a rail link which serves both areas. Under the Conservative Association's proposals for a 46-member council its proposed Aylesham ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (3 per cent fewer in 2005). Under the District Council Officers' proposal for a 47-member council this ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors currently (1 per cent fewer in 2005).

47 Goodnestone Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposal to group it with the parishes of Aylesham, Eastry and Nonington, arguing that it is "markedly different in character". It stated that it would prefer to be linked with the the current wards of Ash, Little Stour and the parish of Staple, as they share similar rural concerns and there are already established links between the areas. Eastry Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposals to link Eastry with the parishes of Aylesham, Goodnestone and Nonington, arguing that they do not share any links, "not even rail and bus services". Worth Parish Council proposed that the parishes of Sandwich, Worth and Woodnesborough be combined to form a three-member ward.

48 We have given careful consideration to the views that we have received for this area. We note that the District Council's scheme would give a good level of electoral equality in the area but that it did not receive any support at Stage One. Given that the Conservative Association and the District Council Officers' proposals received a fair degree of support and resulted in good levels

of electoral equality we are content to propose adopting their proposals for this area in their entirety. Under a 45-member council our proposed Ash, Aylesham and Sandwich wards would have 7 per cent fewer, 8 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more electors than the district average currently (9 per cent fewer, 5 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more in 2005).

Capel-le-Ferne, Eythorne, Lydden & Temple Ewell, River and Shepherds well with Coldred wards

49 These five wards are situated in the west and south-west of the district. Capel-Le-Ferne ward comprises the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne and and Hougham Without and is represented by two councillors. Eythorne ward comprises the parish of the same name and is represented by a single councillor. Lydden & Temple Ewell ward comprises the parishes of Lydden and Temple Ewell and is represented by a single councillor. River ward comprises the parish of the same name and is represented by two councillors. Shepherds well with Coldred ward comprises the parishes of Denton with Wootton, and Shepherds well with Coldred and is represented by a single councillor. Capel-le-Ferne, Eythorne, Lydden & Temple Ewell, River and Shepherds well with Coldred wards currently have respectively 18 per cent fewer, 30 per cent more, 34 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 22 per cent more electors than the district average currently (20 per cent fewer, 31 per cent more, 32 per cent more, 5 per cent more and 20 per cent more in 2005).

50 The District Council proposed that the wards of Eythorne and Shepherds well with Coldred and the parishes of Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone be combined to form a three-member ward across the centre of the district which, under a 45-member scheme, would have 5 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer in 2005). It also proposed combining the current Lydden & Temple Ewell ward with the parish of Whitfield to form a three-member ward which would have 2 per cent more electors than the district average both now and in 2005. In the south of the district it proposed that the current Capel-le-Ferne and River wards be combined to form a three-member ward which would have 1 per cent more electors than the district average currently (1 percent fewer in 2005).

51 The Conservative Association proposed that Eythorne and Shepherds well with Coldred wards be combined to form a two-member Eythorne & Shepherds well ward which, under a 46-member scheme, would have 4 per cent more electors than the district average currently (3 per cent more in 2005). It also proposed that Lydden & Temple Ewell ward be maintained on its current boundaries and be represented by a single councillor, and that the existing Capel-le-Ferne and River wards be combined to form a three-member Capel ward which, under a 46-member scheme, would have 3 per cent more electors than the district average currently (1 per cent more in 2005).

52 The District Council Officers proposed that Eythorne and Shepherds well with Coldred wards be combined to form a two-member ward, stating that this proposal had received the support of Shepherds well with Coldred and Denton with Wootton parish councils. Under a 47-member scheme this ward would have 6 per cent more electors than the district average currently (5 per cent more in 2005). They also proposed that Lydden & Temple Ewell ward be maintained on its current boundaries and be represented by a single councillor. They proposed that the parishes of Alkham and River be combined in a two-member ward, arguing that a main road runs through

both villages and that, although neither parish wants to be joined in a ward with any other village, it would “obtain electoral balance”. Under a 47-member scheme this ward would have 5 per cent more electors than the district average currently (4 per cent more in 2005). They also proposed that the parishes of Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without combine to form a single-member ward which under a 47-member scheme would have 5 per cent more electors than the district average currently (3 per cent more in 2005).

53 Lydden Parish Council supported the District Council Officers’ proposals. It argued that the current Lydden & Temple Ewell ward “has always worked well for us in the past as we are very similar parishes”.

54 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One. Given the local support and the consensus between the Conservative Association and the District Council Officers for the parishes of Eythorne, Denton with Wootton and Shepherdsweil with Coldred and the current ward of Lydden & Temple Ewell we are content to endorse a two-member Eythorne & Shepherdsweil ward. We are also content that Lydden & Temple Ewell ward be maintained on its current boundaries as this would result in a reasonable level of electoral equality under a 45-member council, both now and in 2005. We have also carefully considered the representations regarding Capel-le-Ferne and River wards. We noted that the proposals of the District Council, the Conservative Association and the District Council Officers all provided equally good levels of electoral equality under a 45-member scheme, but consider that the District Council Officers’ proposals would provide for the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Due to the resulting levels of electoral inequality we are unable to retain River Parish on its current boundaries or place it in a district ward with the parish of Temple Ewell. We have therefore been persuaded that placing River parish in a two-member ward with Alkham parish, and combining the parishes of Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without in a single-member ward would provide for the least disruption in the area while providing reasonable levels of electoral equality. We have also considered placing these four parishes in a three-member ward and we would welcome views on this proposal at Stage Three.

55 Under a 45-member council our proposed two-member Eythorne & Shepherdsweil and single-member Lydden & Temple Ewell wards would respectively have 1 per cent more and 7 per cent more electors than the district average currently (1 per cent more and 6 per cent more in 2005). Our proposed two-member River and single-member Capel-le-Ferne wards would respectively have 1 per cent more and 1 per cent more electors than the district average currently (1 per cent fewer and 1 per cent fewer in 2005).

Cornillo, Eastry, Pineham, Ringwold and St Margaret’s-at-Cliffe wards

56 These five wards are situated in the centre and south-east of the district. Cornillo ward comprises the parishes of Northbourne, Ripple and Sutton and is represented by a single councillor. Eastry ward comprises the parish of the same name and is represented by a single councillor. Pineham ward comprises the parishes of Guston and Whitfield and is represented by three councillors. Ringwold ward comprises the parish of Ringwold with Kingsdown and is represented by a single councillor. St Margaret’s-at-Cliffe ward comprises the parishes of Langdon and St Margaret’s-at-Cliffe and is represented by two councillors. Cornillo, Eastry,

Pineham, Ringwould and St Margaret's-at-Cliffe wards have, respectively, equal to, 21 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer, 15 per cent more and 13 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (1 per cent fewer, 22 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer, 13 per cent more and 15 per cent fewer in 2005).

57 The District Council proposed combining the wards of Eythorne and Shepherdsweil with Coldred with the parishes of Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone to form a three-member ward which, under a 45-member council, would have 5 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer in 2005). It proposed that Eastry and Aylesham wards be combined with the parishes of Goodnestone and Noninstone to form a three-member ward which under a 45-member council would have equal to the average number of electors currently (2 per cent more in 2005). It also proposed that the current Lydden & Temple Ewell ward be combined with the parish of Whitfield (as discussed previously). In the south-east of the district the District Council proposed that the existing Ringwould and St Margaret's-at-Cliffe wards be combined with the parishes of Guston and Ripple to form a three-member ward which, under a 45-member council, would have 6 per cent fewer electors than the district average both now and in 2005.

58 The Conservative Association proposed a new Whitfield ward, comprising the parish of the same name and being represented by two councillors, which would have 6 per cent fewer electors than the district average both now and in 2005 under a 46-member scheme. It also proposed that the current St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward be combined with the parishes of Guston and Ripple to form a two-member St Margaret's ward which would have 3 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (4 per cent fewer in 2005). It proposed that the parishes of Eastry, Great Mongeham, Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone be combined to form a two-member Eastry ward, which would have 2 per cent fewer electors than the district average both now and in 2005.

59 The District Council Officers also proposed that the parish of Whitfield comprise a two-member ward, arguing that the area is distinct from the town of Dover. Under a 47-member scheme this ward would have 3 per cent more electors than the district average currently (5 per cent more in 2005). They also proposed that the current St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward be combined with the parish of Guston in a two-member ward, arguing that these are both rural villages and share rail and road transport links. This ward would have 9 per cent fewer electors than the district average both now and in 2005. They proposed that the parishes of Eastry, Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone be combined to form a two-member ward in the centre of the district. They argued that Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone share community identity as they were all previously mining communities. Under a 47-member scheme this ward would have 6 per cent fewer electors than the district average both now and in 2005.

60 Eastry Parish Council stated that it favoured the retention of its existing boundaries but said that, should it be combined with other parishes, it would prefer to be linked with Northbourne, Sutton and Tilmanstone, arguing that it has a "historic common interest" with these parishes. It objected to the District Council's proposals for the area. Northbourne Parish Council objected to large wards of more than two members and stated that it had community links with Eastry, Tilmanstone, Great Mongeham and Sutton. Sutton by Dover Parish Council proposed that the existing arrangements in its area be maintained, arguing that it shares links with the parishes of Ripple and Northbourne. Tilmanstone Parish Council objected to large wards of more than two

members and stated that it had community links with Eastry, Great Mongeham, Northbourne and Sutton. Langdon Parish Council supported the District Council Officers' proposals for the area, while Ripple Parish Council supported the Conservative Association's proposals for the area. Councillor Smith supported the Conservative Association's option in the centre of the district.

61 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. Given the consensus between the proposals of the Conservative Association and the District Council Officers we have adopted the proposal that the parish of Whitfield form a new two-member Whitfield ward. We consider that this proposal would best reflect the statutory criteria while leading to a good level of electoral equality. Given the local support and good levels of electoral equality we also propose adopting the Conservative Association's proposed Eastry and St Margaret's wards. However, in the light of the resulting electoral equality, we propose retaining Ringwoud ward on its current boundaries, as proposed by the District Council Officers.

62 Under a 45-member council our proposed Eastry, St Margaret's and Whitfield wards would have, respectively, 5 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and 1 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (5 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and equal to the average in 2005).

Dover town (eight wards)

63 The eight wards of Barton, Buckland, Castle, Maxton & Elms Vale, Priory, St Radigunds, Tower Hamlets and Town & Pier cover the urban area of Dover and are each represented by two councillors. However, the current ward boundaries do not provide for an equitable distribution of councillors throughout the town. Barton, Buckland, Castle and Maxton & Elms Vale wards have, respectively, 15 per cent more, 11 per cent more, 17 per cent fewer and 4 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (13 per cent more, 9 per cent more, 19 per cent fewer and 6 per cent fewer in 2005). Priory, St Radigunds, Tower Hamlets and Town & Pier wards have 16 per cent fewer, 14 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer and 43 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (17 per cent fewer, 15 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer and 28 per cent fewer in 2005).

64 The District Council and District Council Officers both proposed identical schemes, comprising four three-member wards in Dover. They proposed that St Radigunds ward should be combined with the southern part of the current Barton ward and the northern part of the current Castle ward which under a 45 and 47-member council would have 5 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (7 per cent and 1 per cent fewer in 2005). They proposed that the current Buckland ward should be combined with the remainder of Barton ward to form a three-member ward which under a 45- and 47-member council would have 3 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors than the district average (4 per cent fewer and equal to in 2005). They proposed that the current Maxton & Elms Vale and Tower Hamlets wards should be combined to form a three-member ward which under a 45- and 47-member council would have 3 per cent and 8 per cent more electors than the district average currently (3 per cent and 7 per cent more in 2005). They also proposed that Priory and Town & Pier wards should be combined with the southern area of Castle ward to form a three-member ward which under a 45- and 47-member council would have 5 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (2 per cent and 7 per cent more in 2005).

65 The Conservative Association stated that its main priority in warding Dover had been electoral equality but stated further that it had been mindful of the strong natural boundaries represented by London Road, High Street and York Street, and had relied upon the existing warding arrangements which “already reflects the community identity and boundary priorities”. It proposed transferring electors from the current Castle ward to a new two-member Barton ward, arguing that such a change would strengthen community identity in the area. It proposed that the southern part of the current Pineham ward be transferred to a new two-member Buckland ward arguing that the new road system isolates this area. Its proposed two-member Castle & Seafront ward incorporated parts of both the current Castle and Town & Pier wards, on the grounds that it would represent the whole of Dover seafront and that, although the ward looks geographically large, the electors would be concentrated in two areas. Its proposed three-member Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory ward was based on the existing Maxton & Elms Vale ward. Its proposed three-member Tower Hamlets & St Radigunds ward was based on the existing Tower Hamlets and St Radigunds wards but included parts of the existing Priory ward arguing that this would “carry forward the strong identities of those existing wards”. Under a 46-member council its proposed Barton, Buckland, Castle & Seafront, Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory and Tower Hamlets & St Radigunds wards would have 3 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more and 2 per cent more electors than the district average currently (2 per cent more, equal to, 5 per cent more, 4 per cent more and 1 per cent more in 2005).

66 Dover Town Council stated that the topography of the town had “generally resulted in the development of distinct and separate valley communities”, arguing that in some cases “there are no easy, direct routes between the valleys”. It further argued that there are six natural communities within Dover based on the current wards of Buckland, Castle, Maxton & Elms Vale, St Radigunds, Tower Hamlets and Town & Pier. It proposed that the electorates of the current Barton and Priory wards, together with a number of minor boundary adjustments, be used to create six new two-member wards. It proposed that the northern area of the current Barton ward be added to Buckland ward, the eastern area be added to Castle ward and the western area be added to St Radigunds wards. It also proposed that part of the north-western area of the current Castle ward be added to the current Tower Hamlets ward and that Priory ward be split between its proposed Maxton & Elms Vale and Town & Pier wards.

67 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One and have decided to base our draft recommendations on Dover Town Council’s submission. We consider that, of the schemes we have received, it provides the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and we have been persuaded that it reflects the local communities within the town. We propose that in the north of the town the current Barton ward be divided along Buckland Avenue and Barton Road with the eastern area being transferred to our proposed three-member Buckland ward and the western part to our proposed two-member St Radigunds ward. We propose that the boundary between our proposed single-member Castle and two-member Tower Hamlets wards run along the centre of Castle Avenue and Godwyne Road, thereby containing the area around the castle within a single ward. While we recognise that the Castle & Seafront ward, proposed by the Conservative Association, would unite the whole of the seafront area within a single ward we consider that those residents to the south of the pier would have little in common with those to the west of the castle. We propose that the current Maxton & Elms Vale and Priory wards be combined to form a new three-member Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory ward

as we consider that this arrangement would better reflect community identity than combining the current Maxton & Elms Vale and Tower Hamlets wards as proposed by the District Council and District Council Officers. We propose that the current Town & Pier ward be maintained as a single-member ward but that the boundary between our proposed Castle and Town & Pier wards be amended to run along the centre of York Street as we consider that this would provide for a more identifiable boundary. We note that our proposed Town & Pier ward would vary by 22 per cent currently but note that this would improve significantly by 2005 to 3 per cent.

68 Under our proposal for a council of 45 members, our proposed Buckland, Castle, Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory, St Radigunds, Tower Hamlets and Town & Pier wards would have 3 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer and 22 per cent more electors than the district average currently (1 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer, 4 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer and 3 per cent more respectively by 2005).

Lower Walmer, Middle Deal, Mill Hill, Mongeham, North Deal and Upper Walmer wards

69 These six wards cover the urban areas of Deal and the parish of Walmer on the eastern edge of the district. Lower Walmer, Middle Deal and North Deal wards are each represented by three councillors, while Mill Hill and Mongeham wards are represented by two councillors each and Upper Walmer ward by one councillor. Under the current arrangements, Lower Walmer, Middle Deal, Mill Hill, Mongeham, North Deal and Upper Walmer wards have 5 per cent fewer, 16 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 17 per cent more and 42 per cent more electors than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer, 15 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 17 per cent more and 39 per cent more respectively in 2005).

70 The District Council proposed four three-member wards in this area. It proposed that the northern parts of Middle Deal and North Deal wards be combined, and that the southern parts of Middle Deal and North Deal wards and the northern area of Lower Walmer wards be combined. It also proposed that the majority of the current Mill Hill ward and Mongeham ward be combined, and that the remainder of Mill Hill ward be combined with the current Upper Walmer ward and the southern part of the current Lower Walmer ward. Under a 45-member council its proposed wards would have 8 per cent more, 9 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors than the district average currently (7 per cent more, 8 per cent more, 6 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more in 2005).

71 The Conservative Association stated that its main priority in the area had been electoral equality but noted that the railway line represents a strong boundary. It also stated that “Walmer by custom and practice [is] a separate community within the Deal and Walmer area”. It proposed a three-member Lower Walmer & Victoria ward, arguing that Walmer has the well defined boundaries of the railway line and the sea to its east and west, and that the northern boundary of St Georges Road and Oak Street would “probably be widely accepted”. It proposed a two-member Deal & Mill Hill ward which would combine parts of the current Mill Hill, Upper Walmer and Middle Deal wards. Its proposed three-member Middle Deal ward would incorporate parts of North Deal ward across the railway line from the majority of the ward. It argued that this area, accessible via a level crossing, formed an integral group. It also argued that the areas transferred

from Sholden Parish are not connected to Sholden village and are “adjacent to the Middle Deal ward”. Its proposed Mongeham ward would combine part of Sholden parish with part of the current Mongeham ward, minus Great Mongeham parish. Its proposed Deal North ward would combine the remainder of the current North Deal ward with a small number of electors within Sholden parish, while its Upper Walmer, Kingsdown & Ringwoud ward would combine part of the current Upper Walmer ward with the current Ringwoud ward and a number of properties in the southern part of Lower Walmer ward which it considered isolated. Under a 46-member council its proposed Lower Walmer & Victoria, Deal & Mill Hill, Middle Deal, Mongeham, Deal North and Upper Walmer, Kingsdown & Ringwoud wards would have 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more, 2 per cent more and 1 per cent more electors than the district average currently (3 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 2 per cent more and equal to the average in 2005).

72 The District Council Officers proposed that Lower Walmer parish should be contained within two two-member wards and that it should not be combined with wards within Deal itself. Under a 47-member council both wards would have 11 per cent more electors than the district average by 2005. They also proposed combining the northern part of the current North Deal ward with Sholden parish in a three-member ward and proposed combining the southern part of North Deal ward with the majority of Middle Deal ward. They proposed that Mongeham ward should be combined with Ripple parish to form a two-member ward and that the current Mill Hill ward be combined with the southern area of the current Middle Deal ward to form a two-member ward. Under a 47-member council their proposed wards would have 11 per cent fewer, 10 per cent fewer, 8 per cent fewer, 10 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors than the district average currently (11 per cent fewer, 11 per cent fewer, 9 per cent fewer, 9 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more in 2005).

73 Sholden Parish Council supported the Conservative Association’s proposals, while Walmer Parish Council argued that splitting the parish would “dismantle communities”.

74 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One. We concluded that the railway line provides a very strong boundary between east and west in the area and have therefore used it in its entirety. We have considered the proposals of the District Council Officers to split Walmer parish between two wards, but note that both wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average by 2005. Therefore we propose that the area to the north of Gladstone Road in the current Lower Walmer ward be combined with the current North Deal ward to form a three-member North Deal ward, and we propose that the remainder of Walmer parish form a three-member Walmer ward, thereby retaining the majority of Walmer parish within a single ward. To the west of the railway line we propose that Sholden parish be combined in a three-member Middle Deal & Sholden ward with the current Middle Deal ward to the north of Manor Road as we consider that there are close links between the parish of Sholden and the existing Middle Deal ward. We are also proposing that the current Mill Hill ward, including all the properties on the southern side of Manor Road, be combined with the remainder of the current Mongeham ward to form a three-member Mill Hill ward.

75 Under these proposals Middle Deal & Sholden, Mill Hill, North Deal and Walmer wards would have 5 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 5 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors than

the district average currently (4 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 5 per cent more and 2 per cent more respectively in 2005).

Electoral Cycle

76 We received two representations regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. The Liberal Democrats and River Parish Council stated that elections by halves would result in greater accountability. However, a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards would not preclude a move to biennial elections. Furthermore, as stated earlier, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the Local Government Act 2000, we can only continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas. Statutorily, we have no power to recommend a change to biennial elections.

77 We have carefully considered all representations. At present there appears to be a majority view that the present electoral cycle should be retained, and we therefore propose no change to the current electoral cycle of whole-council elections for the District Council.

Conclusions

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

- there should be a reduction in council size from 56 to 45;
- there should be 21 wards;
- the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of 10 wards;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

79 Our draft recommendations would involve modifications to all but two of the existing wards in Dover district. As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on Conservative Association's and District Council Officers' proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- in Dover we propose basing our draft recommendations on Dover Town Council's proposals with our own modifications;
- in Deal and Walmer we propose basing our draft recommendations on our own proposals.

80 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2005.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	56	45	56	45
Number of wards	31	21	31	21
Average number of electors per councillor	1,444	1,797	1,470	1,829
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	20	1	19	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	8	1	7	0

81 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Dover District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 20 to 1. By 2005 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

Draft Recommendation
 Dover District Council should comprise 45 councillors serving 21 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 whole-council elections every four years.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

82 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible 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 parishes of Deal, Dover and Walmer to reflect the proposed district wards.

83 Dover Town Council is currently served by 16 councillors representing 15 wards: Barton North, Barton South, Buckland West, Buckland East, Castle North, Castle South, Maxton & Elms Vale, Priory East, Priory West, St Radigunds East, St Radigunds West, Tower Hamlets East, Tower Hamlets West, Town & Pier East and Town & Pier West. Dover Town Council proposed that the number of councillors serving the town council be increased to 18, an increase of two, with each town ward being represented by three councillors.

84 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Dover town, we propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with those of the district wards within the town.

Draft Recommendation
Dover Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, two more than at present, representing six wards: Buckland (returning three councillors), Castle (returning three councillors), Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory (returning three councillors), St Radigunds (returning three councillors), Tower Hamlets (returning three councillors) and Town & Pier (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

85 Deal Town Council is currently served by 16 councillors representing 11 wards: Middle Deal Manor, Middle Deal Park and Middle Deal Upper returning five councillors, Mill Hill North and Mill Hill South returning three councillors, North Deal Northwall, North Deal Sandown, North Deal St Andrews and North Deal Victoria returning five councillors and Mongeham East and Mongeham West returning three councillors.

Draft Recommendation
Deal Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, one fewer than present, representing three wards: Middle Deal, Mill Hill and North Deal, each returning five councillors. The boundaries between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

86 Walmer parish is currently served by 15 councillors representing three wards: Lower Walmer St Saviours and Lower Walmer Wellington together returning 10 councillors and Upper Walmer returning five councillors.

87 We propose that in light of our proposed district warding arrangements Walmer parish should comprise four parish wards. We propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with those of the district wards within the parish.

Draft Recommendation
Walmer Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Gladstone (returning two councillors), Lower Walmer St Saviours (returning four councillors), Lower Walmer Wellington (returning four councillors) and Upper Walmer (returning five councillors).

88 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.

89 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Dover 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 Dover

5 NEXT STEPS

90 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 22 January 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.

91 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Dover 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
www.lgce.gov.uk

92 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 Dover: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Dover 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 the large map at the back of the report.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Dover, Deal and Walmer.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Dover: Key Map

APPENDIX B

Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B1: Dover District Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
1	Ash ward (the parish of Ash); Little Stour ward (the parishes of Preston, Stourmouth and Wingham); Woodnesborough with Staple ward (the parishes of Staple and Woodnesborough)
2	Sandwich ward (the parish of Sandwich); Worth ward (the parishes of Sholden and Worth)
3	Cornilo ward (the parish of Ripple); Pineham ward (the parish of Guston); Ringwould ward (the parish of Ringwould with Kingsdown); St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parishes of Langdon and St Margaret's-at-Cliffe)
4	Lydden & Temple Ewell ward (the parishes of Lydden and Temple Ewell); Pineham ward (the parish of Whitfield)
5	Cornilo ward (the parishes of Northbourne and Sutton); Eythorne ward (the parish of Eythorne); Noninstone ward (the parish of Tilmanstone); Shepherdswell with Coldred ward (the parishes of Denton with Wootton and Shepherdswell with Coldred)
6	Aylesham ward (the parish of Aylesham); Eastry ward (the parish of Eastry); Noninstone ward (the parishes of Goodnestone and Nonington)
7	Capel-le-Ferne ward (the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without); River ward (the parish of River)
8	Barton ward (part – the Barton South parish ward of Dover parish); Castle ward (part – the Castle North parish ward of Dover parish); St Radigunds ward (the parish of Dover)
9	Barton ward (part – the proposed Barton North and Barton South parish wards of Dover parish); Buckland ward (part – the proposed Buckland East and Buckland West parish wards of Dover parish)
10	Maxton & Elms Vale and Tower Hamlets wards (the parish of Dover)
11	Castle ward (part – the Castle South parish ward of Dover parish); Priory ward (the parish of Dover); Town & Pier ward (the parish of Dover)
12	Lower Walmer ward (part – the proposed Wellington parish ward of Walmer parish); Mill Hill ward (part – the proposed South parish ward of Deal parish); Upper Walmer ward (the parish of Walmer)
13	Lower Walmer ward (part – the proposed St Saviours parish ward of Walmer parish); Middle Deal ward (part – the proposed Middle Deal Park and Middle Deal Upper parish wards of Deal parish); North Deal ward (part – the proposed Victoria parish ward of Deal parish)

Ward name	Constituent areas
14	Mill Hill ward (part – the proposed Mill Hill North and Mill Hill South parish wards of Deal parish); Mongeham ward (part – the proposed Mongeham East and Mongeham West parish wards of Deal parish)
15	North Deal ward (part – the proposed Northwall, St Andrews and Sandown parish wards of Deal parish); Middle Deal ward (part – the proposed Manor parish ward of Deal parish)

Figure B2: Dover District Council's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	3	5,519	1,840	2	5,519	1,840	1
2	3	5,468	1,823	1	5,751	1,917	5
3	3	5,088	1,696	-6	5,144	1,715	-6
4	3	5,488	1,829	2	5,602	1,867	2
5	3	5,123	1,708	-5	5,163	1,721	-6
6	3	5,371	1,790	0	5,579	1,860	2
7	3	5,439	1,813	1	5,439	1,813	-1
8	3	5,096	1,699	-5	5,100	1,700	-7
9	3	5,249	1,750	-3	5,249	1,750	-4
10	3	5,576	1,859	3	5,627	1,876	3
11	3	5,129	1,710	-5	5,623	1,874	2
12	3	5,509	1,836	2	5,559	1,853	1
13	3	5,875	1,958	9	5,947	1,982	8
14	3	5,116	1,705	-5	5,135	1,712	-6
15	3	5,802	1,934	8	5,876	1,959	7

Source: Electorate figures are based on Dover District 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B3: Liberal Democrat's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
1	Aylesham ward (the parish of Aylesham); Noninstone ward (the parish of Goodnestone); Woodnesborough ward (the parishes of Staple and Woodnesborough)
2	Ash ward (the parish of Ash); Little Stour ward (the parishes of Preston, Stourmouth and Wingham)
3	Capel-le-Ferne ward (the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without); Lydden & Temple Ewell ward (the parish of Lydden); Shepherdswell with Coldred ward (the parishes of Denton with Wootton and Shepherdswell with Coldred)
4	Cornilo ward (the parish of Northbourne); Eastry ward (the parish of Eastry); Mongeham ward (the parish of Great Mongeham); Worth ward (the parishes of Sholden and Worth)
5	Cornilo ward (the parish of Sutton); Eythorne ward (the parish of Eythorne); Noninstone ward (the parishes of Nonington and Tilmanstone); St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parish of Langdon)
6	Cornilo ward (the parish of Ripple); Ringwould ward (the parish of Ringwould with Kingsdown) St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parish of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe)
7	Lydden & Temple Ewell (the parish of Temple); River ward (the parish of River)
8	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Sandwich)
9	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Guston and Whitfield)
10	Upper Walmer ward (the parish of Walmer); Lower Walmer ward (part – the Wellington parish ward of Walmer parish)
11	Lower Walmer ward (part – the St Saviours parish ward of Walmer parish); Middle Deal ward (part – the Park parish ward of Deal parish); North Deal ward (part – the Victoria parish ward of Deal parish)
12	Middle Deal ward (part – the Manor and Upper parish wards of Deal parish); Mongeham ward (part – the Mongeham West parish ward of Deal parish)
13	Mill Hill ward (part – the Mill Hill North and Mill Hill South parish wards of Deal parish); Mongeham ward (part – the Mongeham East parish ward of Deal parish)
14	North Deal ward (part – the Northwall, St Andrews and Sandown parish wards of Deal parish)
15	Buckland ward (the parish of Dover); Barton ward (part – the Barton North parish ward of Dover parish)
16	Castle and Town & Pier wards (the parish of Dover)
17	Maxton & Elms Vale ward (the parish of Dover); Priory ward (part – the Priory West ward of Dover parish)

Ward name	Constituent areas
18	Barton ward (part – the Barton South parish ward of Dover parish); St Radigunds ward (the parish of Dover)
19	Priory ward (part – the Priory East parish ward of Dover parish); Tower Hamlets ward (the parish of Dover)

Figure B4: The Liberal Democrats' Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	2	4,239	2,120	0	4,395	2,198	1
2	2	4,312	2,156	1	4,312	2,156	-1
3	2	4,652	2,326	9	4,652	2,326	6
4	2	4,461	2,231	5	4,513	2,257	3
5	2	3,843	1,922	-10	3,883	1,942	-11
6	2	3,996	1,998	-6	3,996	1,998	-9
7	2	4,479	2,240	5	4,483	2,244	3
8	2	3,877	1,939	-9	4,160	2,080	-4
9	2	4,194	2,097	-1	4,360	2,180	0
10	2	4,578	2,289	0	4,578	2,289	4
11	2	4,189	2,095	-1	4,260	2,130	-3
12	2	4,139	2,070	-3	4,160	2,080	-4
13	2	4,568	2,284	7	4,607	2,304	5
14	2	4,271	2,136	0	4,355	2,178	0
15	2	4,314	2,157	1	4,314	2,157	-1
16	2	3,902	1,951	-8	4,380	2,190	0
17	2	4,470	2,235	5	4,478	2,239	2
18	2	4,096	2,048	-4	4,100	2,050	-6
19	2	4,268	2,134	0	4,327	2,164	-1

Source: Electorate figures are based on Liberal Democrats 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B5: River Parish Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
1	Aylesham ward (the parish of Aylesham); Noninstone ward (the parish of Goodnestone); Woodnesborough ward (the parishes of Staple and Woodnesborough)
2	Ash ward (the parish of Ash); Little Stour ward (the parishes of Preston, Stourmouth and Wingham)
3	Capel-le-Ferne ward (the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without); Lydden & Temple Ewell ward (the parish of Lydden); Shepherdswell with Coldred ward (the parishes of Denton with Wootton and Shepherdswell with Coldred)
4	Cornilo ward (the parish of Northbourne); Eastry ward (the parish of Eastry); Mongeham ward (the parish of Great Mongeham); Worth ward (the parishes of Sholden and Worth)
5	Cornilo ward (the parish of Sutton); Eythorne ward (the parish of Eythorne); Noninstone ward (the parishes of Nonington and Tilmanstone); St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parish of Langdon)
6	Cornilo ward (the parish of Ripple); Ringwould ward (the parish of Ringwould with Kingsdown) St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parish of St Margaret's-at-Cliffe)
7	Lydden & Temple Ewell (the parish of Temple); River ward (the parish of River)
8	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Sandwich)
9	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Guston and Whitfield)

Note: River Parish Council did not provide detailed warding arrangements for the five proposed wards for Dover and the five proposed wards for Deal and Walmer.

Figure B6: River Parish Council's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	2	4,239	2,120	0	4,395	2,198	1
2	2	4,312	2,156	1	4,312	2,156	-1
3	2	4,652	2,326	9	4,652	2,326	6
4	2	4,461	2,231	5	4,513	2,257	3
5	2	3,843	1,922	-10	3,883	1,942	-11
6	2	3,996	1,998	-6	3,996	1,998	-9
7	2	4,479	2,240	5	4,483	2,244	3

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
8	2	3,877	1,939	-9	4,160	2,080	-4
9	2	4,194	2,097	-1	4,360	2,180	0
10	2	4,349	2,175	-2	4,433	2,217	1
11	2	4,349	2,175	-2	4,380	2,190	0
12	2	4,349	2,175	-2	4,410	2,205	1
13	2	4,349	2,175	-2	4,387	2,194	1
14	2	4,349	2,175	-2	4,349	2,175	0
15	2	4,210	2,105	-1	4,688	2,344	7
16	2	4,210	2,105	-1	4,259	2,130	-3
17	2	4,210	2,105	-1	4,226	2,113	-3
18	2	4,210	2,105	-1	4,214	2,107	-4
19	2	4,210	2,105	-1	4,210	2,105	-4

Source: Electorate figures are based on River Parish 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B7: Conservative Association's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Barton	Barton ward (the parish of Dover); Castle ward (part – the Castle North parish ward of Dover parish)
Buckland	Buckland ward (the parish of Dover); Pineham ward (part – the Whitfield West parish ward of Whitfield parish)
Capel-le-Ferne	Capel-le-Ferne ward (the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne and Hougham Without); River ward (the parish of River)
Castle & Seafont	Castle ward (part – the Castle North and Castle South parish wards of Dover parish); Priory ward (part – the Priory East parish ward of Dover parish); Tower Hamlets ward (part – the Tower Hamlets East parish ward of Dover parish); Town & Pier ward (part – the Town & Pier East parish ward of Dover parish)
Lower Walmer & Victoria	North Deal ward (part – the St Andrews parish ward of Deal parish); Lower Walmer ward (part – the St Saviours and Wellington parish wards of Walmer parish)
Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory	Maxton & Elms Vale ward (the parish of Dover); Priory ward (part – the Priory East and Priory West parish wards of Dover parish); Town & Pier ward (part – the Town & Pier East parish ward of Dover parish)
Mill Hill	Lower Walmer ward (part – the Wellington parish ward of Walmer parish); Middle Deal ward (part – the Park parish ward of Deal parish); Mill Hill ward (part – the Mill Hill North and Mill Hill South parish wards of Deal parish); Upper Walmer ward (part – the Upper Walmer parish ward of Walmer parish)
Middle Deal	Middle Deal ward (part – the Middle Deal Manor, Middle Deal Park and Middle Deal Upper parish wards of Deal parish); North Deal ward (part – the Northwall, St Andrews and Victoria parish wards of Deal parish); Worth ward (part – the parish of Sholden)
Mongeham	Middle Deal ward (part – the Middle Deal Upper parish ward of Deal parish); Mill Hill ward (part – the Mill Hill South parish ward of Deal parish); Mongeham ward (part – the Mongeham East and Mongeham West parish wards of Deal parish); Worth ward (part – the parish of Sholden)
North	North Deal ward (part – the Northwall, Sandown and Victoria parish wards of Deal parish); Worth ward (part – the parish of Sholden)
Tower Hamlets & St Radigunds	Priory ward (part – the Priory East and Priory West parish wards of Dover parish); St Radigunds ward (the parish of Dover); Tower Hamlets ward (part – the Tower Hamlets East and Tower Hamlets West parish wards of Dover parish)
Upper Walmer, Kingsdown & Ringwold	Lower Walmer (part – the Wellington parish ward of Walmer parish); Ringwold ward (the parish of Ringwold with Kingsdown); Upper Walmer ward (part – the Upper Walmer parish ward of Walmer parish)

Figure B8: Conservative Association's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Barton	2	3,637	1,819	3	3,637	1,819	2
Buckland	2	3,465	1,733	-1	3,565	1,783	0
Capel-le-Ferne	3	5,439	1,813	3	5,439	1,813	1
Castle & Seafront	2	3,490	1,745	-1	3,740	1,870	5
Lower Walmer & Victoria	3	5,136	1,712	-3	5,215	1,738	-3
Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory	3	5,366	1,789	2	5,606	1,869	4
Mill Hill	2	3,477	1,739	-1	3,516	1,758	-2
Middle Deal	3	5,191	1,730	-2	5,222	1,741	-3
Mongeham	2	3,611	1,806	3	3,611	1,806	1
North	2	3,568	1,784	2	3,634	1,817	2
Tower Hamlets & St Radigunds	3	5,356	1,785	2	5,415	1,805	1
Upper Walmer, Kingsdown & Ringwould	2	3,564	1,782	1	3,564	1,782	0

Source: Electorate figures are based on the Conservative Association'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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number

Figure B9: District Council Officers' Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
5	Cornillo ward (the parishes of Northbourne and Sutton); Eastry ward (the parish of Eastry); Noninstone ward (the parish of Tilmanstone)
10	Pineham ward (the parish of Guston); St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parishes of Langdon and St Margaret's-at-Cliffe)
12	Lower Walmer ward (part – the St Saviours and Wellington parish wards of Walmer parish)
13	Upper Walmer ward (the parish of Walmer); Lower Walmer ward (part – the Wellington parish ward of Walmer parish)
14	Mongeham ward (part – the parish wards of Mongeham East and Mongeham West of Deal parish); St Margaret's-at-Cliffe ward (the parish of Ripple)
15	Mill Hill ward (part – the Mill Hill North and Mill Hill South parish wards of Deal parish); Middle Deal ward (part – the Park parish ward of Deal parish)
16	Middle Deal ward (part – the Middle Deal Manor, Middle Deal Park and Middle Deal Upper parish wards of Deal parish); North Deal ward (part – the Victoria parish ward of Deal parish)
17	North Deal ward (part – the Northwall, St Andrews and Sandown parish wards of Deal parish)
18	Barton ward (part – the Barton South parish ward of Dover parish); Castle ward (part – the Castle North parish ward of Dover parish); St Radigunds ward (the parish of Dover)
19	Barton ward (part – the proposed Barton North and Barton South parish wards of Dover parish); Buckland ward (part – the proposed Buckland East and Buckland West parish wards of Dover parish)
20	Maxton & Elms Vale and Tower Hamlets wards (the parish of Dover)
21	Castle ward (part – the Castle South parish ward of Dover parish); Priory ward (the parish of Dover); Town & Pier ward (the parish of Dover)

Figure B10: District Council Officers' Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
5	2	3,225	1,613	-6	3,277	1,639	-6
10	2	3,135	1,568	-9	3,191	1,596	-9
12	2	3,064	1,532	-11	3,102	1,551	-11
13	2	3,082	1,541	-10	3,105	1,553	-11

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
14	2	3,346	1,673	-3	3,346	1,673	-4
15	2	3,496	1,748	2	3,536	1,768	1
16	3	5,693	1,898	10	5,744	1,915	9
17	3	4,726	1,575	-8	4,789	1,596	-9
18	3	5,096	1,699	-1	5,100	1,700	-3
19	3	5,249	1,750	2	5,249	1,750	0
20	3	5,576	1,859	8	5,627	1,876	7
21	3	5,129	1,710	-1	5,623	1,874	7

Source: Electorate figures are based on District Council Officers 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 district. 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 Wear¹. 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.

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

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

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.