

Final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council

Electoral review

September 2011

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary 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 100049926 2011

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Rural Rugby	8
Rugby Town	10
Conclusions	14
Parish electoral arrangements	14
3 What happens next?	16
4 Mapping	17
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	19
B Code of practice on written consultation	23
C Table C1: Final recommendations for Rugby	25

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Rugby Borough Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in July 2010.

This review was conducted in four stages:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
Council size	20 July 2010	Submission of proposals for council size to the LGBCE
One	28 Sept 2010	Submission of proposals of warding arrangements to the LGBCE
Two	21 December 2010	LGBCE's analysis and deliberation
Three	29 March 2011	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	20 June 2011	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

The Commission proposed a council size of 42 members, comprising a pattern of 13 three-member wards and three single-member wards. The proposals were broadly based on Rugby Borough Council's authority-wide scheme with some modifications. The draft recommendations would provide good levels of electoral equality.

Submissions received

During Stage Three, the Commission received 22 submissions, including one from the Rugby Green Party and a joint submission from the Rugby Labour Party and the Labour Group on Rugby Borough Council. The remainder of the submissions received were localised comments, predominantly from parish councils and members of the public. Some alternative proposals to the draft recommendations were put forward relating to the proposed wards in the central rural area, and some of the proposed wards in the town. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

Rugby Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for May 2016, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2011. This

is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% over this period. Although we had some concerns that this level of growth appeared somewhat high, the Council provided a robust methodology to support this increase. We are therefore content to accept the Council's electorate forecasts as the basis of our draft recommendations.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during Stage Three, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during Stage Three. We have moved away from the draft recommendations in Rugby town to reflect the evidence received.

Our final recommendations for Rugby are that the Council should have 42 members, with 13 three-member wards and three single-member wards. None of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2016.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Rugby Borough Council, in 2012.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Rugby Borough Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submissions received during Stage One of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council*, which were published on 29 March 2011. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 20 June 2011.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Rugby?

5 We have decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, the existing Brownsover North Ward has 51% more electors than the borough average.

How will our recommendations affect you?

6 Our recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also determine which electoral ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish ward you vote in. Your electoral ward name may change, as may the names of parish wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Rugby.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Rugby is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 The achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Rugby or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

13 Under the 2009 Act, where a council elects by thirds or halves (as opposed to the whole council being elected every four years), there is a presumption that the authority will have a uniform pattern of three-member and two-member wards respectively. We will only move away from this presumption where we receive compelling evidence to do so and where it can be demonstrated that an alternative warding pattern will better reflect our statutory criteria. Our starting point for this review was that Rugby Borough should have a uniform pattern of three-member wards given its current electoral cycle, but we could depart from this presumption if we received strong evidence in support of mixed- or single-member wards.

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

Submissions received

14 Prior to and during the initial stages of the review, members and officers of the Local Government Boundary Commission visited Rugby and met with officers, members and parish councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 11 representations during Stage One and 22 during Stage Three, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of Rugby Borough Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

15 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have also been assisted by officers at Rugby Borough Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, Rugby Borough Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2016, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% over the six-year period from 2010–16.

17 We had some concerns about whether the 8% growth would be realised. However, the Council provided a robust methodology to support this increase, citing planning forecasts, factoring in the expected level of void properties and having regard to inward and outward migration levels for the borough.

18 Noting the Council's supporting methodology, and the lack of evidence to contradict the electorate forecasts, we were content to accept the Council's forecasts as the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

19 The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) completed a Periodic Electoral Review of the district in 1999 which recommended a council size of 48 members elected from 20 borough wards. The Borough of Rugby (Electoral Changes) (No.2) Order 2000 implemented the LGCE's recommendations.

20 During the initial stage of the review, we received seven comments related to council size. However, of these respondents, only the Council submitted a specific proposal. The Council took an evidence-based approach in its consideration of council size and proposed a council size of 42 members, a reduction of six from the current number.

21 We considered the Council's proposal provided a comprehensive rationale for a council size of 42. The Council detailed its governance structure in addition to providing commentary on the roles, responsibilities and workload of members within the context of its committee structure.

22 During Stage Three we received little comment on the proposed council size. Rugby Borough Council did not submit a response, but the Labour Group on the council responded in support of the proposed council size.

23 Based on the evidence received we have decided to confirm a council size of 42 elected members for Rugby as part of our final recommendations. We are of the view that a council size of 42 members would provide for effective and convenient local government in the context of the Borough Council's internal political management structure and will facilitate the representational role of councillors.

Electoral fairness

24 As discussed in the introduction to this report, the prime aim of an electoral review is to achieve electoral fairness within a local authority.

25 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

26 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (74,096 in December 2010 and 80,036 by December 2016) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 42 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,764 in 2010 and 1,906 by 2016.

27 Under our final recommendations, all of our proposed 16 wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the district by 2016. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Rugby.

General analysis

28 Our draft recommendations were based broadly on the proposals from the Council with some modifications to better reflect community identity, improve communication links within the wards and reflect the comments received in other submissions. Our draft recommendations were for 13 three-member wards and three single-member wards, all of which had good electoral equality under 10% from the average for the borough by 2016.

29 As mentioned in paragraph 13, where a local authority elects by thirds, as in the case of Rugby, there is a presumption in favour of three-member wards. We considered sufficient evidence was received during Stage One to depart from this presumption and the draft recommendations included three single-member wards: Clifton, Newton & Churchover; Leam Valley; and Wolvey & Shilton. During Stage Three, we received opposition to the single-member wards from the Rugby Green Party.

30 During Stage Three, the majority of the submissions focused on specific areas, with only the Labour Party and Green Party providing comments on more than one area of the borough. We did not receive a submission from Rugby Borough Council itself.

31 We received opposition to the draft recommendations in the central rural area and some wards in Rugby town. We also received eight submissions suggesting

alternative names for some wards in Rugby town, namely Rocheberie, Eastlands, Central and Admirals.

32 Our final recommendations are for a pattern of 13 three-member wards and three single-member wards. We consider our recommendations to provide good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

33 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 25–26) and Map 1.

Electoral arrangements

34 This section of the report details our final recommendations for each area of Rugby. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Rural Rugby (pages 8–10)
- Rugby Town (pages 10–13)

35 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 25–26, and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Rural Rugby

36 Rural Rugby comprises the area of the borough surrounding the town and is entirely parished.

37 Our draft recommendations were for three single-member wards- Clifton, Newton & Churchover, Leam Valley and Wolvey & Shilton- and three three-member wards- Dunsmore, Revel & Binley Woods, and Wolston & The Lawfords.

38 Our draft recommendations were based largely on the Council's proposals for this area. However, we moved away from its proposal in the central rural area where the Council proposed a Lawford & Revel ward which incorporated Long Lawford with villages further north. We noted there is no access from Long Lawford northwards and, consequently, we included Long Lawford with Wolston to the west to create a three-member Wolston & The Lawfords ward and a three-member Revel & Binley Woods ward.

39 During Stage Three, Churchover Parish Council welcomed the proposed single-member Clifton, Newton & Churchover ward which it felt clearly kept the parish in a rural ward. We did, however, receive opposition to the single-member wards from the Rugby Green Party. It suggested that Leam Valley ward identifies with Dunsmore ward and proposed some alterations to include Leam Valley in Dunsmore. It also suggested that Clifton, Newton & Churchover has good communication and transport links to Coton & Boughton ward and should therefore be joined with it or with Hillmorton ward. Although it agreed there were some merits in having a single-member Wolvey & Shilton ward, it felt it was at odds with the other proposed three-member wards and suggested that the north rural wards be re-formatted to provide a uniform pattern of three-member wards.

40 We carefully considered the submission from the Green Party. However, to incorporate the changes it suggested would involve moving away from the draft recommendations in the majority of the borough. We felt that sufficient evidence had not been received to warrant such a significant departure from our draft recommendations. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the single-member wards as final.

41 We received seven submissions during Stage Three which opposed the Revel & Binley Woods ward. These included submissions from the Labour Group on Rugby Council, two from Combe Fields Parish Council, one from Monks Kirby Parish Council, a district councillor and two residents.

42 The general consensus from the submissions was that Binley Woods has no connection with the group of villages known as the Revel. They stated strongly that Binley Woods is much more urban in nature and has closer links with Coventry than Rugby or the surrounding villages. Several respondents commented that they felt the smaller villages in the ward would not be represented adequately as the district councillor would need to devote more time to the Binley Woods area. Councillor Gillias also mentioned that he felt the size of the ward would mean increased travelling time for the district councillors to attend all the parish council meetings.

43 The Labour Party and a resident from Binley Woods suggested alternative warding patterns for the central rural area. These included a single-member ward containing only Binley Woods parish, with a three-member ward containing the Revel villages and the villages to the north, including Wolvey and Shilton. This would result in 15% more electors by 2016 in Binley Woods ward and 8% fewer electors by 2016 in Revel, Wolvey & Shilton ward.

44 Another suggestion was for a two-member Revel ward containing the Revel villages with a single-member Binley Woods ward. To split the Revel & Binley Woods ward into a single-member ward and a two-member ward would result in 15% more electors in 2016 for the Binley Woods ward and 2% fewer electors by 2016 in the Revel ward.

45 The submission from the resident in Binley Woods also suggested changing Dunsmore ward into a two-member ward and including Ryton-upon-Dunsmore, Binley Woods and Brandon & Bretford in another two-member ward. This would result in 21% more electors by 2016 in a two-member Dunsmore ward and 10% more electors by 2016 in a ward including Ryton-upon-Dunsmore, Binley Woods and Brandon & Bretford. As a consequence of this arrangement, a two-member Revel ward would have 16% fewer electors by 2016.

46 The other suggestion from the resident was for a two-member Lawford ward with a three-member Earls Craven & Wolston ward including Binley Woods, Wolston, Branden & Bretford, Combe Fields and Ansty parishes. This would result in 14% fewer electors by 2016 in the two-member Lawfords ward and the Earls Craven & Wolston ward would have 9% fewer electors by 2016. As a consequence of this arrangement, the remaining parishes would form a two-member ward which would have 10% more electors by 2016.

47 Councillor Gillias suggested that the Revel & Binley Woods ward would be too large geographically and contain too many parishes to make it viable for a district councillor to attend all the parish council meetings. He suggested that the ward be

split into three single-member wards. As discussed, earlier this would result in under representation in a single-member Binley Woods ward of 15% more electors than the average by 2016. It would also result in 12% fewer electors than the average by 2016 in one of the single-member Revel wards and 9% more electors in the other single-member ward by 2016. Due to the high levels of electoral variances we decided this was not a viable option.

48 We considered the argument put forward in the submissions that there is poor access within the Revel & Binley Woods ward. The suggestion that there is limited access from Binley Woods to the villages in the east is a valid point. However, access can be achieved by travelling north on the A46 before turning east onto the B roads which link with the other villages.

49 We carefully considered all the alternative options. We found the arguments in terms of the community identity and interests between Binley Woods and the Revel persuasive. We appreciate that the residents of Binley Woods have a closer affinity with Coventry City, due to their close proximity and transport links. Consequently, this led to views from residents that Binley Woods would be better suited in a single-member ward. However, by 2016 a Binley Woods single-member ward is projected to have a variance of 15% more electors than the borough average. That is already a significant variance, which we would accept only in exceptional circumstances, and it could be considerably higher if the planned development across the rest of the borough does not proceed as planned in the five-year period following the end of the review.

50 In the circumstances, we have decided not to depart from the draft recommendations and propose that in the rural area, the draft recommendations are confirmed as final.

51 The final recommendations result in an electoral variance of 7% more for Wolvey & Shilton; 6% fewer for Wolston & The Lawfords; 4% more for Revel & Binley Woods; 6% more for Dunsmore; 4% more for Leam Valley; and 5% fewer for Clifton, Newton & Churchover than the borough average by 2016.

Rugby Town

52 This area comprises the town of Rugby, with the immediately surrounding urban areas. The only parishes in the town area are Cawston parish to the west and Cosford parish to the north of the town centre. There are no parishes within the town itself.

53 Our draft recommendations were for 10 three-member wards, all of which would have an electoral variance of less than 10% from the borough average by 2016. We based these largely on the Council's proposal. However, we moved away from the Council's proposal in the area north of the railway line. The Council proposed a Benn & Brownsover ward which straddled the railway line and did not provide for good communication links. We therefore proposed the railway line be used as a boundary between Newbold & Brownsover ward and Central ward. We also proposed some other smaller changes to the proposal to improve communication and provide for more identifiable boundaries.

54 We received 11 submissions during Stage Three in relation to the draft recommendations in Rugby town. Of these submissions, seven suggested changes to ward names, with only the Labour Party and the Green Party suggesting substantial changes to the ward boundaries in the town.

55 The Labour Party and Green Party proposed some modifications to the draft recommendations for Admirals, Bilton, Rocheberie, New Bilton, Eastlands, Central, Newbold & Brownsover and Coton & Boughton wards.

North

56 Our draft recommendations included Coton & Boughton ward just south of the M6 motorway and Newbold & Brownsover ward. The former contained the residential areas in the north of Rugby town and part of Churchover parish, which consisted of the Gateway Development Site. The latter included the areas of Newbold, the majority of Brownsover and the parish of Cosford.

57 Under our draft recommendations, Coton & Boughton would have 3% fewer and Newbold & Brownsover would have 2% more electors than the average by 2016.

58 At Stage Three, the Labour Party agreed with our proposed Newbold & Brownsover ward and that the railway line should be used as the southern boundary of the ward. However, they did suggest a small change to the boundary between Newbold & Brownsover and Coton & Boughton.

59 The Labour Party's submission noted that the main shopping area serving the Brownsover estate is located in the Coton & Boughton ward under the draft recommendations. It stated that the shops and community centre are often frequented by residents in the south of Brownsover and, as such, should be incorporated into the Newbold & Brownsover ward. It further suggested that the eastern boundary of the ward should follow Hellvellyn Way and Bow Fell so that the shops, schools, Elter Close and Hayes Close become part of the Newbold & Brownsover ward. Having reviewed the evidence, we considered it reasonable to locate the facilities with the Brownsover estate in the Newbold & Brownsover ward as requested by the Labour Party. However, we considered that insufficient evidence had been received to warrant a departure from the draft recommendations in altering the boundary to include Elter Close and Hayes Close.

60 For our final recommendations we recommend that the boundary be altered so that the school, community centre and shops are included in Newbold & Brownsover. However, we confirm as final all other aspects of our draft recommendations. This change does not affect the electoral variances in either ward.

South-east

61 Our draft recommendations were for four three-member wards: Hillmorton, Paddox, Eastlands and Central, which would have 2% fewer, 5% fewer, 3% more and 7% more electors respectively, than the borough average by 2016.

62 We did not receive any comments on Hillmorton and Paddox wards during Stage Three. We are therefore content to confirm as final our draft recommendations for these wards. Hillmorton ward includes part of Clifton upon Dunsmore parish where development is due to take place, this will affect the parish electoral arrangements and further details of this can be found on page 15.

63 The Green Party suggested the area west of the town centre, in the Central ward under the draft recommendations, should be included in the New Bilton ward as there are clear similarities of community, communication and transport. We note that the area is separated from the residential areas of Central ward by the town centre, resulting in better community links with the adjacent residential areas in the New Bilton ward. This would also provide for a more identifiable boundary following Corporation Road.

64 We recommend the boundary between Central and New Bilton be altered from the draft recommendations so the boundary follows Corporation Road and then along the back of the houses in Oliver Street and the back of the flats in Rounds Gardens.

65 The Green Party said that although it agreed with the draft recommendations to include Firs Drive in Eastlands ward, the entire left-hand side of Bilton Road from Russelsheim Way to Wentworth Road should be in Rocheberie ward. Under the draft recommendations the northern boundary of Rocheberie ward follows Sow Brook which we consider provides for a strong and identifiable boundary. We do not consider sufficient evidence has been received to change this view. Therefore we are content to confirm as final the three-member Eastlands ward.

66 During Stage Three, we received two submissions in relation to the name of Central ward. We suggested the name for the draft recommendations as the ward was radically different from that proposed by the Council during Stage One. The Labour Party suggested it be called Benn ward as it is a historical name which has been used for many years for the town centre area and, as such, should be continued to be used to avoid confusion. A local resident suggested that it could be called St Andrews after the name of the church or Clock Towers. However, both of these monuments are just outside the boundary of Central ward. We have therefore decided to adopt the name Benn ward as part of our final recommendations.

67 In relation to Eastlands ward, the Labour Party suggested that the name bears no relevance to the area as the new ward is made up of several different parts of existing wards, with Eastlands being just one of them. It suggested that a new name be used so that the local community can identify with the new ward. It recommended the name St Cross after The Hospital of St Cross which is the main hospital in Rugby and is situated in the centre of the ward. We agree with this proposal and therefore recommend that Eastlands ward be called St Cross.

68 The final recommendations result in an electoral variance of 2% fewer electors than the borough average by 2016 in Hillmorton, 5% fewer electors in Paddock, 3% more electors in St Cross and 1% fewer electors in Benn.

South-west

69 As part of our draft recommendations we proposed four three-member wards: New Bilton, Admirals, Bilton and Rocheberie, which would have 9% fewer, 5% fewer, 5% more and 0% more electors respectively, than the borough average by 2016.

70 The Labour Party opposed the draft recommendations in relation to Admirals ward, stating that Nelson Way and Cheshire Close should be included in Admirals ward rather than in Bilton ward. It stated that Nelson Way is the heart of the Admirals estate and that there are clear links with families, schools and community developments, alongside a shared bus service. We noted that the Admirals Affinity Sutton Residents' Association, which covers the Admiral estate, is located in Nelson

Way and the bus route forms a loop around the estate and along Nelson Way. We therefore considered that the arguments put forward by the Labour Party, in relation to the above, were persuasive and have decided to adopt its proposed modification.

71 The Labour Party also suggested altering the boundary between Rocheberie ward and Bilton ward. It suggested that the boundary should follow Sow Brook to include Lytham Road, Hudson Road, St Anne's Road and Ferndown Road in the Rocheberie ward. It said the residents in these roads have close links to Overslade shops, Harris School and Overslade Community Centre, all located in Rocheberie ward. It argued that including the four roads in Bilton would result in 'splitting up a long-existing community'. We agreed with the Labour Party's submission that Sow Brook should be used as the boundary as it would ensure the whole of the Overslade community is contained within one ward.

72 Having decided to adopt the Labour Party's two proposed modifications, there is a detrimental effect on the electoral variance in Bilton ward. The Labour Party therefore proposed to include an area south of Rocheberie ward into Bilton ward, stating the roads and the school 'have strong and long-standing links to Bilton'. The Green Party also suggested that Gilbert Avenue, currently in New Bilton ward under the draft recommendations, should be included in Bilton ward as it is an area that has much more in common with Bilton. We looked carefully at these areas and, although the evidence was not particularly conclusive, agreed that Gilbert Avenue looks more towards Bilton than into New Bilton and the roads and properties facing onto Bawnmore Road would look more towards Bilton than Rocheberie. These changes help to improve the electoral variance in Bilton and we have decided to adopt them as part of the final recommendations.

73 We received six submissions in relation to the naming of Rocheberie ward. Four of these agreed with the name Rocheberie rather than the name Overslade, as proposed by the Council in Stage One. A resident and the Labour Party suggested that it should be called Rokeby as it is easier to spell and pronounce, and it is the name of the local infant and junior schools within the ward. We also noted that the residents' association in the area is known as Hillside & Rokeby Community Association. The Labour Party further suggested that it could be called Rokeby & Overslade to represent both of the communities in the ward. We agreed with this proposal and the reasoning behind the name and recommend changing the name to Rokeby & Overslade for the final recommendations.

74 A submission from Councillor Stokes commented on the name of Admirals ward. He felt that as Cawston parish makes up a large proportion of the ward it should be included in the name of the ward to help recognise the part that Cawston plays in the ward. We considered that the councillor had raised a valid point and have decided to adopt the name Admirals & Cawston for the final recommendations.

75 Along with the changes as mentioned above between Benn and New Bilton ward, these changes result in 4% more electors than the borough average by 2016 in Admirals & Cawston; 9% fewer electors in Bilton; 4% fewer electors in New Bilton; and 9% more electors in Rokeby & Overslade.

76 The final recommendations for this area are shown on the detailed maps accompanying this report.

Conclusions

77 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 25–26, and illustrated on a number of large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are also available to be viewed on our website.

78 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements based on 2010 and 2016 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2010	2016
Number of councillors	42	42
Number of electoral wards	16	16
Average number of electors per councillor	1,764	1,906
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	8	0
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendation

Rugby Borough Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 16 wards, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

81 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Churchover and Clifton upon Dunsmore.

82 The parish of Churchover is currently unwarded, returning five members. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Churchover parish.

Final recommendation

Churchover Parish Council should return five councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Churchover North (returning four members) and Churchover South (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Maps 2 and 3.

83 The parish of Clifton upon Dunsmore is currently unwarded, returning eight members. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Clifton upon Dunsmore parish.

Final recommendation

Clifton upon Dunsmore Parish Council should return eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Clifton upon Dunsmore (returning seven members) and Rugby Radio Station (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Maps 2 and 3.

3 What happens next?

84 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Rugby Borough Council in 2012.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Rugby

85 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Rugby Borough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Rugby Borough Council.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2** illustrates the proposed wards in the west of Rugby town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed wards in the east of Rugby town.

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority

Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or ward represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'
Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council

PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or ward varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Consultation* (2008) (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 November 2008, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

We comply with this requirement.

Appendix C

Table C1 : Final recommendations for Rugby Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Admirals & Cawston	3	5,204	1,735	-2%	5,929	1,976	4%
2	Benn	3	5,257	1,752	-1%	5,681	1,894	-1%
3	Bilton	3	5,157	1,719	-3%	5,191	1,730	-9%
4	Clifton, Newton & Churchover	1	1,512	1,512	-14%	1,806	1,806	-5%
5	Coton & Boughton	3	4,691	1,564	-11%	5,522	1,841	-3%
6	Dunsmore	3	5,921	1,974	12%	6,065	2,022	6%
7	Hillmorton	3	4,198	1,399	-21%	5,600	1,867	-2%
8	Leam Valley	1	1,952	1,952	11%	1,974	1,974	4%
9	New Bilton	3	5,453	1,818	3%	5,491	1,830	-4%
10	Newbold & Brownsover	3	5,004	1,668	-5%	5,832	1,944	2%

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Rugby Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11	Rokeby & Overslade	3	6,032	2,011	14%	6,215	2,072	9%
12	Paddox	3	5,418	1,806	2%	5,457	1,819	-5%
13	Revel & Binley Woods	3	5,879	1,960	11%	5,939	1,980	4%
14	St Cross	3	5,576	1,859	5%	5,903	1,968	3%
15	Wolston & The Lawfords	3	4,825	1,608	-9%	5,385	1,795	-6%
16	Wolvey & Shilton	1	2,017	2,017	14%	2,046	2,046	7%
	Totals	42	74,096	-	-	80,036	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,764	-	-	1,906	-

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

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