

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire County Council

Electoral review

September 2014

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 2014

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	5
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	7
Submissions received	7
Electorate figures	7
Council size	7
Electoral fairness	8
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
Broxbourne Borough	10
Dacorum Borough	11
East Hertfordshire District	13
Hertsmere Borough	14
North Hertfordshire District	16
St Albans City	17
Stevenage Borough	18
Three Rivers District	19
Watford Borough	21
Welwyn Hatfield Borough	21
Conclusions	23
Parish electoral arrangements	24
3 What happens next?	27
4 Mapping	29
Appendices	
A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council	30
B Glossary and abbreviations	39

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which 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 Hertfordshire County Council ('the 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 2014.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
15 April 2014	Submission of proposals of division arrangements to the LGBCE
24 June 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
9 September 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
4 November 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

The Commission received a submission from the Council on council size. Subsequently, we received 38 submissions on division boundaries. These included county-wide schemes from the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council, and from Hertfordshire Conservative Party. Stevenage Borough Council, North Hertfordshire District Council, nine town and parish councils, three county councillors, one borough councillor, and 18 members of the public also made submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a date five years on from the scheduled publication of our recommendations. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the county's electorate of approximately 8% over this period. The Commission is content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time.

Council size

The Council currently has 77 members. The Council proposed a council size of 77. The Council argued that it is functioning well at present under the current council size, and that this council size provides for effective and convenient local government. The Council did note, however, that the council size could have a 'small adjustment' for reasons of electoral equality based on the electorate forecasts.

We considered that the Council provided adequate evidence to justify retaining a council size of 77. We therefore decided to consult on division patterns based on a council size of 77 elected members.

However, during our formulation of our draft recommendations, it became apparent that it was difficult to create a pattern of divisions in Welwyn Hatfield which would meet our statutory criteria. Welwyn Hatfield presently has seven county councillors, and it contains a division, Hatfield North, which currently has 55% more electors than the county average. We considered that it was appropriate to add an eighth councillor to the district, in order to accommodate the increase in electorate in this district since the last electoral review of Hertfordshire in 1999. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed an eight-member scheme in Welwyn Hatfield, which would increase the council size by one.

Our draft recommendations are based on a council size of 78, with Welwyn Hatfield having eight councillors, an increase of one from its current seven county councillors.

General analysis

We have based our draft recommendations on a combination of both county-wide proposals which we received, having regard to those submissions which made more localised proposals. In most of the districts we have modified the proposals made by the Council and the Conservative Group in order to provide divisions which better reflect community identities, provide stronger boundaries, or give greater electoral equality. We have made no changes to Watford's existing county division boundaries. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the county.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire County Council contained in the report. **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 these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **3 November 2014**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

Review Officer
Hertfordshire Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

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 Hertfordshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We invited Hertfordshire County Council ('the Council') to submit proposals first on council size and then on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire County Council in early 2015.

What is an electoral review?

4 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.

5 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 Hertfordshire?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2012 electorate figures, 34% of divisions in the county have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the county average. In addition, one division, Hatfield North, has 55% more electors per councillor than the average for the county.

How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

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

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 3 November 2014. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in early 2015. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 27 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

9 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
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire County Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed division boundaries, division names and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire 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 2009,² (‘the 2009 Act’) with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- have regard to the boundaries of district and borough wards in drawing boundaries for county divisions
- ensure that proposed county divisions do not cross external district and borough boundaries
- 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

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

13 In reality, 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. 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. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Hertfordshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The 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.

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

Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Hertfordshire County Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

16 During the consultation on division patterns, we received 38 submissions, including county-wide schemes from Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council, and the Hertfordshire Conservative Party. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

17 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period approximately five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. 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.

18 We are satisfied the Council's forecasts provide a realistic projection of growth in Hertfordshire and have used these as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

19 Hertfordshire currently has 77 councillors elected from 77 single-member divisions. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal to retain the current council size of 77.

20 The Council argued that it is functioning well at present under the current council size, and that this council size provides for effective and convenient local government. The Council did note, however, that the council size could have a 'small adjustment' for reasons of electoral equality based on the electorate forecasts.

21 Therefore, we considered that the Council provided adequate evidence to justify retaining a council size of 77. We therefore decided to consult on division patterns based on a council size of 77 elected members.

22 However, during our formulation of our draft recommendations, it became apparent that it was difficult to create a pattern of divisions in Welwyn Hatfield which would meet our statutory criteria. Welwyn Hatfield presently has seven county councillors, and it contains a division, Hatfield North, which currently has 55% more electors than the county average. We considered that it was appropriate to add an eighth councillor to the district, in order to accommodate the increase in electorate in this district since the last electoral review of Hertfordshire in 1999. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed an eight-member scheme in Welwyn Hatfield, which would increase the council size by one.

23 We consider that there is a strong case to increase the council size to 78 in order to provide a more robust pattern of divisions that provide a good allocation of councillors across Hertfordshire. We are therefore minded to amend our initial decision on council size and recommend a council size of 78 elected members as

part of our draft recommendations.

Electoral fairness

24 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.

25 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The county average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (849,819 in 2013 and 918,135 by 2020) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 78 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 10,895 in 2013 and 11,771 by 2020.

26 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the county by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Hertfordshire.

General analysis

27 A consultation on division arrangements began on 15 April 2014 and ended on 23 June 2014. We received 38 submissions as a result of this consultation. We received two county-wide submissions, from Hertfordshire Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council.

28 The other submissions were from nine parish or town councils, three county councillors, one borough councillor, two local authorities, three political groups or parties, and 18 local residents. The submissions referred to particular local issues within specific districts, and many proposed changes to the external boundaries of councils. It should be noted that we do not have the power to amend the external boundaries of local authorities as part of an electoral review. This can be achieved by way of a principal area boundary review with the prior agreement of the authorities concerned.

29 When conducting an electoral review of a county council, we have regard for coterminosity between district wards and county divisions. Coterminosity is when a district ward is wholly contained within a county division. However, our primary aim is to provide the best balance between our statutory criteria. Therefore, we often find it necessary to divide district wards between county divisions in order to achieve good electoral equality or to better reflect communities. As part of our draft recommendations, the percentage of coterminous wards will decrease from 76% to 66% across the county.

30 Our draft recommendations are based on aspects of the county-wide schemes we have received with amendments in certain areas to better reflect our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations would result in 78 single-member divisions. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests in Hertfordshire.

31 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations and would encourage interested parties from all parts of the county to respond. As well as the pattern of division arrangements proposed, we welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Electoral arrangements

32 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of Hertfordshire. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Broxbourne Borough (pages 10–11)
- Dacorum Borough (pages 11–13)
- East Hertfordshire District (pages 13–14)
- Hertsmere Borough (pages 14–16)
- North Hertfordshire District (pages 16–17)
- St Albans City (pages 17–18)
- Stevenage Borough (page 18–19)
- Three Rivers District (pages 19–21)
- Watford Borough (page 21)
- Welwyn Hatfield Borough (page 21–23)

33 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 30–38 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Broxbourne Borough

34 Broxbourne Borough is in the south-east corner of the county, and its main settlements are Cheshunt, Goffs Oak, Hoddesdon and Waltham Cross. Under a council size of 78, the borough is allocated six county councillors. The borough is unparished.

35 In addition to the two county-wide submissions, we also received a submission from a local resident which did not refer to the division arrangements in Broxbourne, but instead expressed a desire for a Principal Area Boundary Review (PABR). As stated earlier, changing the boundaries of local authorities is beyond the scope of this particular review.

36 In the north of the borough we have recommended two divisions based on Hoddesdon town. Hoddesdon North largely comprises the area north of Hertford Road and east of Amwell Street, up to the northern boundary of the authority. This division would have 10% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

37 We also recommend a single-member division of Hoddesdon South. This division contains the southern and western areas of Hoddesdon, Broxbourne town, as well as part of Wormley. This division would have 6% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

38 Further south we are recommending the division of Flamstead End & Turnford. This division contains part of the Hammond Street settlement and Flamstead End and Turnford. The west and south-west boundary of this division follows the district ward boundary between the wards of Flamstead End and Goffs Oak. Where appropriate, we aim to reflect district ward boundaries in our county electoral divisions. This division would have 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

39 Neighbouring Flamstead End to the west we are recommending a division which contains the Goffs Oak and Bury Green areas, as well as Hammond Street. Our proposed Goffs Oak & Bury Green division has a strong boundary, following the A10 dual carriageway to the east. This division would have 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

40 Cheshunt Central division covers the main Cheshunt town area. In order to provide for good electoral equality, we have decided to include an area between Blindman's Lane and Turners Hill in Waltham Cross division to the south of Cheshunt Central.

41 Waltham Cross division is bounded on two sides by the county boundary and on one side by the A10. Its northern boundary with Cheshunt Central partially follows the district ward boundary between Cheshunt South & Theobalds and Waltham Cross wards. Cheshunt Central and Waltham Cross divisions would have 7% more and 7% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020 respectively.

42 We completed an electoral review of the borough in 2012, and in the development of our draft recommendations we have tried to have our proposed divisions follow the new borough ward boundaries. However, by ensuring good electoral equality for the electoral divisions in the borough we have not provided complete coterminosity with the borough's wards. The number of coterminous wards in Broxbourne Borough will increase from three to four as a result of our draft recommendations.

43 All of our proposed divisions for Broxbourne have electoral variances within 10% of the county average. We consider that all of the proposed divisions reflect community identities, and will provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Dacorum Borough

44 The borough of Dacorum is in the north-west corner of the county, and its main towns are Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead. Under the existing arrangements, Dacorum has 10 county councillors.

45 In addition to the two county-wide submissions, we received six other submissions for this area. Three of these were from parish or town councils, one from a borough councillor and two were from local residents.

46 In the north-west corner of the borough is our proposed Tring division. This division is similar to the existing division, which, using the projected electorate figures, would have 11% more electors than the county average by 2020. This is a

higher variance than we would usually accept without strong evidence. Therefore, we consider that an acceptable solution is to include Aldbury parish in neighbouring Bridgewater division. This would mean that Tring division would have 4% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

47 Our proposed Bridgewater division is to the east of our proposed Tring division. We received a submission from Northchurch parish, which we are proposing to include in Bridgewater division. The parish argued for the retention of the existing arrangements in this area. In addition to the inclusion of Aldbury parish in Bridgewater division, we are making a further change to the existing division boundaries.

48 Berkhamsted division, under the existing arrangements, covers the Berkhamsted parish area, the boundaries being identical. However, given the increase in electors in the town since the last electoral review, the division currently has 27% more electors per councillor than the county average, a variance from the average that is not expected to improve significantly.

49 Consequently, it is necessary to include some electors from Berkhamsted in a division outside of the town. Given Berkhamsted's position on the edge of the county, and with there being a gap between the eastern and northern edges of the town and any other populated area, we consider that the only solution is to take electors from the west of Berkhamsted and include them in Bridgewater division. We are proposing to include an area of properties between the A4251 and Shootersway, west of Finch Road and Barncroft Road, in Bridgewater division.

50 Berkhamsted Town Council stated in its submission that it favoured retaining the existing arrangements, but as mentioned above, given the electoral inequality that would arise, we have had to remove some electors from the town for the purposes of division arrangements. Our proposed Berkhamsted and Bridgewater divisions are proposed to have 8% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020 respectively.

51 To the east of Berkhamsted is the town of Hemel Hempstead. Under the existing arrangements, the town has six electoral divisions. In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we received two submissions from local residents regarding Hemel Hempstead.

52 We are not proposing to make significant changes to the existing arrangements for the town. However, we are making changes to improve electoral equality in the town's divisions and in some cases to provide stronger, more identifiable division boundaries.

53 A local resident argued that Piccotts End ought to be in a division with the Hemel Hempstead Old Town district ward, as it has little in common with the Grovehill area, to its west. We agree with this evidence, and have therefore decided to include Piccotts End in our proposed Hemel Hempstead St Pauls division. This division would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

54 Elsewhere in Hemel Hempstead we have sought to use strong, identifiable boundaries where possible. The boundary between our proposed Hemel Hempstead South East and Hemel Hempstead Town divisions will follow the Grand Union Canal,

which we consider forms an identifiable boundary. Our proposed Hemel Hempstead South East and Hemel Hempstead Town divisions will have 2% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020 respectively.

55 The remainder of our proposed divisions in Hemel Hempstead are Hemel Hempstead East, Hemel Hempstead North East and Hemel Hempstead North-West. These divisions would have 3% fewer, 9% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively. These divisions are largely identical to the existing divisions.

56 To the south of Hemel Hempstead is our proposed Kings Langley division. We received a submission from Kings Langley Parish Council, which favoured retaining the existing Kings Langley division, on the grounds that it would reflect the area's strong community identity. This view was supported by Councillor Alan Anderson (Kings Langley ward – Dacorum Borough Council). He considered that it would reflect the distinct community identities and interests of the settlements south and west of Hemel Hempstead. We are content to retain the existing division as part of our draft recommendations. Kings Langley division would have 5% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

57 We have aimed to achieve coterminosity where possible. However, given the need to propose electoral divisions which achieve good electoral equality, the number of coterminous wards in Dacorum Borough will decrease from 18 to 15.

58 All of our proposed divisions in Dacorum would have variances of less than 10% by 2020, and we consider that all of them meet our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

East Hertfordshire District

59 East Hertfordshire District covers the large, mainly rural area on the eastern edge of the county. The largest towns in the district are Bishop's Stortford and the county town of Hertford.

60 In addition to the two county-wide submissions, we received two submissions from local residents in relation to this district. Under the existing arrangements, East Hertfordshire has 10 county councillors.

61 Bishop's Stortford is on the eastern edge of the district and county. Given the number of electors in the town, it is necessary to include some of the town's electors in a rural division. Under the current arrangements, it is the south of the town which is included in a division with adjoining rural areas. We considered a number of different options for how to divide the town between divisions.

62 We concluded that the division pattern which best met our statutory criteria was to retain the existing divisions for Bishop's Stortford town – the urban divisions of Bishop's Stortford East and Bishop's Stortford West. Bishop's Stortford East would have an equal number of electors per councillor when compared with the average for the county by 2020. Bishop's Stortford West would have 7% more electors per councillor than the average for the county, by 2020.

63 We have decided to include High Wych parish in Sawbridgeworth division, as we consider that it has stronger links to the town of Sawbridgeworth, rather than Bishop's Stortford and the rural area to the north. Our proposed Bishop's Stortford Rural and Sawbridgeworth divisions would have 8% fewer and 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the county, by 2020 respectively.

64 Around the town of Hertford, we have decided to recommend largely retaining the existing divisions. The town of Ware lies to the north-east of Hertford. We are retaining the existing divisions here. Ware North division comprises the northern half of the town, as well as a rural area along the A10. Our proposed Ware South division covers the southern part of Ware town, and the rural area running south to the edge of the district. Ware North division is projected to have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020. Ware South would have an equal number of electors per councillor when compared with the county average by 2020.

65 We have decided to retain the two existing divisions in Hertford town – Hertford All Saints and Hertford St Andrew's. We received a submission from a local resident arguing that the parish of Hertingfordbury should be included in an urban Hertford division, rather than Hertford Rural as it presently is. However, this would have required the inclusion of the parishes of Bayford and Little Berkhamsted in a Hertford urban division, otherwise these two parishes would be disconnected from the remainder of Hertford Rural division. Including these two parishes in Hertford St Andrews would give that division an electoral variance of 12% by 2020 and leave Hertford Rural with a 17% variance.

66 Under our draft recommendations, Hertford All Saints and Hertford St Andrews divisions would have 6% fewer and an equal number of electors per councillor when compared to the county average by 2020 respectively.

67 We are proposing divisions which are different from the existing ones for the rural divisions of Braughing and Hertford Rural. Under the existing arrangements, Hertford Rural would have an unacceptably high electoral variance. By including Little Munden parish in Hertford Rural, both that division and Braughing would have variances within 10% of the county average. Braughing would have 10% fewer electors per councillor and Hertford Rural would have 5% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

68 We have taken coterminosity into account when formulating our proposals for the district. However, in order to provide good electoral equality for our proposed divisions, the number of coterminous wards in East Hertfordshire District will decrease from 30 to 26.

69 None of our proposed divisions in East Hertfordshire District are projected to have variances greater than 10% from the county average by 2020, and we consider that they all have strong boundaries and reflect communities. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Hertsmere Borough

70 Hertsmere Borough is in the south of the county, and contains the towns of Borehamwood, Bushey and Potters Bar. Hertsmere currently has seven county

councillors.

71 In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we received a further four submissions regarding Hertsmere. These were from Hertsmere Constituency Labour Party, two parish and town councils and a local resident. The Labour Party and local resident each provided division patterns for the whole borough.

72 Potters Bar, in the east of the borough, has too few electors to warrant having two county councillors. Therefore, it is necessary to combine part of the town in a division with areas to the west to ensure good electoral equality. Our proposed Potters Bar West & Shenley division is similar to the existing division but includes the village of Shenley as well as the community of Well End, on the eastern edge of Borehamwood. This division is projected to have 2% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020. Potters Bar East division is projected to have 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

73 Our proposed divisions for Borehamwood are similar to the existing divisions, with the main change being the transfer of Well End in to Potters Bar West & Shenley division, as mentioned above. We have also proposed a different boundary between Borehamwood North and Borehamwood South divisions. Our proposed boundary runs along Stratfield Road, and then south down the rear of properties on Eldon Avenue.

74 We considered an alternative option for divisions in Borehamwood which would combine Elstree with a part of Borehamwood. However, we concluded that the railway line provided a strong and clearly identifiable division boundary in this area. Using the railway line means that the two Borehamwood divisions have a clear western boundary, and that Watling division, to the west of Borehamwood, is retained. Watling division contains Elstree and Radlett, which are connected by the A5183, a strong communication link.

75 Aldenham Parish Council proposed including Elstree district ward in a division with Borehamwood. This would result in there being too many electors in Borehamwood South, and would cross the strong barrier of the railway line, as mentioned above. Therefore, we have decided not to adopt this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

76 Our proposed Borehamwood North, Borehamwood South and Watling divisions would have 2% more, 1% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

77 We have taken coterminosity into account when formulating our proposals for the district. However, given that we are dividing Borehamwood between divisions in a different way to the present arrangements, it is necessary for us to depart from coterminosity between wards and divisions in this borough. As a result of our proposals, the number of coterminous wards in Hertsmere Borough will decrease from 14 to 12.

78 To the west of Elstree is the town of Bushey, which is largely separated from the rest of the borough by the M1. We are proposing to retain the existing Bushey North and Bushey South divisions. These divisions will have 8% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020. Our draft recommendations

can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

North Hertfordshire District

79 North Hertfordshire District is on the northern edge of the county and contains the towns of Hitchin and Royston, and the city of Letchworth. It currently has nine county councillors.

80 In addition to the two county-wide submissions, we received submissions from North Hertfordshire District Council, two parish and town councils and six local residents.

81 In the north of the district is the town of Royston. Royston Town Council stated in its submission that it wished to retain the existing arrangements, which are for a single Royston division based on Royston parish. However, Royston division, on its present boundaries, is projected to have 15% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, which we consider is too high an electoral variance.

82 It is therefore necessary to divide Royston town between two divisions. In order to ensure good electoral equality, we consider it necessary to recommend divisions that contain both urban and rural areas. We are therefore proposing to divide the town east–west, with the boundary running along the A10, then Upper King Street, Lower King Street, Kneesworth Street, Old North Road, and then turning west along the rear of properties on Rock Road.

83 Our proposed Royston East division comprises the east of Royston town and the parishes of Barkway, Barley, Nuthampstead and Reed. Our Royston West & Rural division is larger, taking in a sparsely–populated rural area as far as Letchworth, with Graveley parish forming the south-western corner of the division. This division is similar to the existing North Herts Rural division.

84 Royston East and Royston West & Rural divisions would have 1% fewer and 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively.

85 To the west of our proposed Royston West & Rural division is the town of Letchworth. Under the existing arrangements, an area of Baldock is included in North Herts Rural division. We are proposing to include all of Baldock town in an urban division, with an area of Letchworth city. We consider that including all of Baldock in one division will reflect community identities, and provide for good electoral equality. Our proposed Baldock & Letchworth East division would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

86 Our other two proposed divisions for Letchworth city are Letchworth North West and Letchworth South. These divisions cover the remainder of Letchworth and the railway line forms the boundary between them, running east to west.

87 We considered the possibility of moving part of the community of Norton, in the north-east of the town, into our proposed Baldock & Letchworth East division. Our proposed Letchworth North West is projected to have 9% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, compared with 1% fewer for Baldock & Letchworth East. However, it would not be possible to improve the electoral variances here without dividing the Norton area. Norton is presently split between two

county divisions, and a local resident noted in their submission that this was not a satisfactory arrangement as there is little common community identity between this area and Baldock.

88 Therefore, our proposed Letchworth North West and Letchworth South divisions will have 9% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively.

89 To the south-west of Letchworth is the town of Hitchin. Hitchin Rural division presently has 19% fewer electors than the county average, and this is not projected improve significantly by 2020.

90 We have therefore decided to include the parish of St Paul's Walden in Knebworth & Codicote division to improve electoral equality in this area. Hitchin Rural and Knebworth & Codicote divisions would have 8% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively.

91 We are proposing to retain the existing Hitchin North and Hitchin South divisions. With 4% more and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively by 2020, these divisions have good electoral equality, and we received no persuasive evidence to change these divisions.

92 We have taken coterminosity into account when formulating our proposals for the district. We have managed to increase the number of coterminous wards in North Hertfordshire District from 16 to 17.

93 We consider that all of our proposed divisions in North Hertfordshire district meet our statutory criteria. None of them have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average and reflect community identities. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

St Albans City

94 St Albans City currently has 10 county councillors, and is located in the centre of the county. The authority's main areas of population are St Albans and Harpenden.

95 In addition to the two county-wide submissions, we received one other submission relating to this authority during our consultation on division patterns.

96 In the north of the authority is the town of Harpenden. The town currently has two divisions, Harpenden North East and Harpenden South West. As part of our draft recommendations, we are proposing to retain the two existing divisions. These divisions cover the urban area of Harpenden and, in our view, continue to reflect community identities and interests. Harpenden North East and Harpenden South West divisions would have 4% fewer and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020 respectively.

97 Under the existing arrangements, to the east, south and west of the town is the division of St Albans Rural. This division, and the neighbouring Sandridge division, currently have 12% fewer and 20% fewer electors per councillor than the

county average respectively, and this is not projected to improve significantly by 2020. Under our draft recommendations, we have decided to include Sandridge village in a rural division to the north. This division will be called Harpenden Rural – a change from the existing St Albans Rural – to reflect the fact that the majority of the division’s population is closer to Harpenden than St Albans. This division will have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

98 As mentioned above, Sandridge division has a large variance under the existing arrangements. We have decided to include part of the existing division in our proposed Colney Heath & Marshalswick division. This division covers an area on the eastern edge of St Albans, running down to the authority’s southern boundary. This division is projected to have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

99 To the south-west of our proposed Colney Heath & Marshalswick division we have put forward a single-member London Colney division. This division contains the London Colney area, as well as small parts of the fringes of St Albans itself, in order to provide for good electoral equality in this area. London Colney division is projected to have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

100 Our proposed St Stephen’s division is to the west of our proposed London Colney division. It contains the communities of Chiswell Green, Park Street and Bricket Wood. The A414 provides a clear boundary between this division and adjoining ones in the St Albans city area – it is identical to the existing division. Our proposed St Stephen’s division would have an equal number of electors per councillor when compared to the average for the county by 2020.

101 In St Albans city, we have decided to recommend four divisions covering the area. Our proposed divisions are very similar to the existing ones. The only change we are recommending is to the boundary of St Albans North division. We are including all of Marshalswick Lane and Marshal’s Drive in Colney Heath & Marshalswick division to provide for better electoral equality and to reflect community identities in the area.

102 We have taken coterminosity into account when formulating our proposals for the district. However, given the need to propose different divisions in St Albans from the existing ones in order to have good electoral equality, it is necessary for us to reduce the coterminosity between wards and divisions in this authority. The number of coterminous wards in St Albans City will decrease from 20 to 15.

103 Our proposed St Albans East, St Albans Central, St Albans North and St Albans South divisions will have 9% fewer, 3% more, 7% fewer and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Stevenage Borough

104 Stevenage has six county councillors at present, and has the lowest electorate of the 10 districts in Hertfordshire. The borough is entirely based on the town of Stevenage and has no significant rural areas.

105 In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we received one other submission, from Stevenage Borough Council, which stated that it would prefer the electoral divisions to remain coterminous with the borough ward boundaries.

106 Four of the six existing divisions have electoral variances higher than we would normally accept. As part of our draft recommendations, we have used the existing divisions as a basis for our proposals, but have made amendments in several areas in order to improve electoral equality.

107 Our proposed Stevenage South division contains the Poplar area, and the communities in the southern part of the city. Gresley Way provides a clear connection between the areas and this division is projected to have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

108 Next to Stevenage South is our proposed Stevenage West division. This division includes the centre of the town, and extends almost the length of the authority. The division has strong communication links throughout, and contains a mixture of residential and commercial properties. This division would have 6% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

109 In the north of the town we are recommending the single-member divisions of Chells, Old Town and Pin Green. These divisions have clear and identifiable boundaries following main roads in the area. All three divisions enjoy good electoral equality, having 3% fewer, 8% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020 respectively.

110 The final division we are recommending in Stevenage is Shephall. This division is in the middle of the borough, but to the east of the town centre area. Its southern boundary follows the A602 dual carriageway, and we consider that the division reflects existing community identities in the area. It is projected to have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

111 We have taken coterminosity into account when formulating our proposals for the district. However, the high electoral variances in the existing divisions have obliged us to propose a largely new pattern of electoral divisions to meet our statutory criterion of providing good electoral equality. As a consequence, the number of coterminous wards in Stevenage Borough will decrease from 12 to six.

112 Overall, our proposed divisions for Stevenage will have good electoral equality and, we consider, reflect communities and provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Three Rivers District

113 Three Rivers District is in the south-west corner of the county, and we completed an electoral review of the district in autumn 2013. The district currently has six county councillors. Its main areas of population are Chorleywood, Oxhey and Rickmansworth. In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we also received three other submissions during the consultation on division arrangements. These were from Watford Rural Parish Council, a county councillor and a local resident.

114 Starting with the south of the district, the existing divisions of Rickmansworth and South Oxhey both have electoral variances which are far greater than the county average. Therefore, it is necessary to provide for different electoral arrangements as part of our draft recommendations.

115 The existing South Oxhey division, in the south of the district, has 19% fewer electors per councillor than the county average currently, a figure not projected to improve by 2020. Therefore, it is necessary to include more electors in this division. Councillor King (South Oxhey) argued in her submission that the community of South Oxhey ought not to be altered, as it has a strong community identity. However, leaving the division as it is would result in an unacceptably high electoral variance.

116 We are recommending the inclusion of the Eastbury community in our proposed South Oxhey division. There are clear road links between the communities. Furthermore, we considered that adding electors from the east of South Oxhey, thus crossing the railway line, would not reflect community identities. Our proposed South Oxhey & Eastbury division is projected to have 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

117 As mentioned above, Rickmansworth division currently has a high electoral variance, containing 20% more electors per councillor than the county average. We are proposing to create three divisions focused on Rickmansworth. Rickmansworth East & Oxhey Park will contain the area of Rickmansworth town centre south of the railway line as well as Moor Park. Rickmansworth West would contain the majority of Rickmansworth town, as well as the community of Maple Cross. Croxley division contains the area of the town centre north of the railway line, as well as the Croxley Green and Loudwater areas.

118 Given the number and distribution of electors in this area, and constraining factors such as the proximity of the authority boundary, we consider that this is the best arrangement of divisions for this area. Our proposed divisions of Croxley and Rickmansworth East & Oxhey Park would have 6% more and 9% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively. Our proposed Rickmansworth West division would have an equal number of electors per councillor when compared with the average for the county by 2020.

119 In the northern part of the district, under the current arrangements Abbots Langley division has 28% more electors per councillor than the county average, and this figure is projected to worsen by 2020. Therefore, it is necessary to make changes to the division boundaries in this area.

120 We are proposing a Three Rivers Rural division which runs from Chorleywood to Bedmond in the north of the district. This leaves a smaller Abbots Langley division, which, with the reduction in electors that this proposal entails, will give this division 5% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020.

121 Our proposed Three Rivers Rural division will have 3% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2020. We accept that this is a large division, containing somewhat distant communities, and we are particularly keen to hear views on our draft recommendations for this area during consultation.

122 We recently completed an electoral review of this district, and as such carefully considered the issue of coterminosity here. However, we were unable to

propose a pattern of divisions which improved coterminosity in the district. This was due to the geographic spread of electors, and the need to provide for good electoral equality. Therefore, the number of coterminous wards in Three Rivers District will decrease from six to five.

123 Overall, all of our recommended divisions in Three Rivers district have good electoral equality and provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Watford Borough

124 Watford Borough is positioned between the districts of Hertsmere and Three Rivers. It currently has six county councillors. In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we also received submissions from the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council (Councillor Giles-Medhurst) and from Watford Constituency Labour Party.

125 Given that all of Watford's divisions are projected to have good electoral equality on their existing boundaries, we are recommending that the existing divisions remain unchanged. We consider that the existing divisions reflect community identities, and will provide for effective and convenient local government.

126 We are, however, adopting different names for some of Watford's divisions, in order to make the division names more reflective of their communities. Callowland Leggatts will be named North Watford, Central Oxhey will be named Central Watford & Oxhey, and Vicarage Holywell will be named West Watford.

127 The number of coterminous wards in Watford District will remain the same as it is at present, at 12 wards.

128 Our proposed divisions for Watford are all projected to have good electoral equality by 2020. Central Watford & Oxhey, Meriden Tudor, Nascot Park, North Watford, West Watford and Woodside Stanborough will have 4% more, 7% fewer, 6% more, 2% fewer, 8% more, and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Welwyn Hatfield Borough

129 Welwyn Hatfield is in the centre of the county, and is bordered by five of the other districts in Hertfordshire. The main towns in the borough are Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield. The borough currently has seven county councillors. In addition to the two county-wide schemes, we received three other submissions relating to the borough.

130 Hatfield North has the largest electoral variance of any division in the county. It has 55% more electors per councillor than the county average and this figure is projected to worsen by 2020. During our formulation of these draft recommendations, we considered that it was necessary to add a county councillor to the borough. We could not determine a pattern of divisions which involved retaining seven county councillors which also met our statutory criteria. Therefore, our draft

recommendations for Welwyn Hatfield borough contain eight single-member divisions.

131 Given the spread of electors in the borough, the divisions around Welwyn Garden City and in the north of the borough have more electors than the county average, and the divisions around Hatfield have fewer electors than the county average. Where possible, we have avoided proposing divisions which cover both areas.

132 In the south of the borough our draft recommendations are for the divisions of Hatfield Rural and Hatfield South. Our proposed Hatfield Rural division is identical to the existing division of the same name. Our proposed Hatfield South division covers part of Hatfield town and is very similar to the existing division. However, we have amended the boundary slightly to make it coterminous with a borough ward boundary in Hatfield.

133 Our proposed Hatfield Rural and Hatfield South divisions are projected to have 10% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2020, respectively.

134 We also recommend the single-member divisions of Hatfield East and Hatfield North which contain the remainder of Hatfield town, as well as rural areas outside the town. Part of Hatfield North's eastern boundary follows the A1(M), which we consider to be an easily identifiable feature on which to base our division boundary. This division also covers the centre of Hatfield town. Hatfield East division contains the Old Hatfield area and uses the railway line as part of its boundary with Hatfield North.

135 Our proposed Hatfield East division also contains a small area on the edge of Welwyn Garden City, (Bennett Close and Wyndhams End) which is in Hatfield parish. This area has spilled over the parish boundary from the town. We are obliged to create parish wards in any area where a parish is contained within more than one division. In this case, we are of the view that there are too few electors (66) for it to be a viable parish ward and provide for effective and convenient local government. Therefore, we have decided that this area will be included in Hatfield East division. It is for Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council to consider carrying out a Community Governance Review to address this anomaly.

136 Hatfield North and Hatfield East divisions are projected to have 1% fewer and 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2020, respectively.

137 We have decided to recommend three divisions based on the Welwyn Garden City area: Haldens, Handside & Peartree and Welwyn Garden City South. Haldens division comprises the north of the urban area, and contains the community of Panshanger, as well as Haldens itself. The boundary between Haldens and Handside & Peartree follows the borough ward boundary, providing a well-established boundary between these divisions.

138 Handside & Peartree division comprises the borough wards of Handside and Peartree, using the A1(M) as its western boundary and part of the railway line as its eastern boundary. We consider that both Haldens and Handside & Peartree divisions have strong, clear boundaries, and these divisions are each projected to have 9% more electors than the county average by 2020, respectively.

139 Our proposed Welwyn Garden City South division covers the remainder of the area. As mentioned above, this division follows the parish boundary between Hatfield parish and the unparished area of the city. The division uses borough ward boundaries for much of its boundary, and largely uses main roads elsewhere. We consider that this division has clear and identifiable boundaries, and has good electoral equality, with 8% more electors than the county average by 2020.

140 We have added an additional councillor to this district, and have taken coterminosity of borough wards and county divisions into account when proposing our draft recommendations here. The number of coterminous wards in Welwyn Hatfield Borough will increase from 10 to 11.

141 The final division we are proposing, Welwyn, is in the north of the borough. This division contains the parishes of Ayot St Lawrence, Ayot St Peter, Welwyn and Woolmer Green. It also contains the community of Digsweil on the edge of Welwyn Garden City. Its boundaries are very similar to those of the existing Welwyn division. Our proposed Welwyn division is projected to have 8% more electors than the county average by 2020. Our draft recommendations can be viewed in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

142 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2020 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements:

	Draft recommendations	
	2013	2020
Number of councillors	78	78
Number of electoral divisions	78	78
Average number of electors per councillor	10,895	11,771
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	12	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation

Hertfordshire County Council should comprise 78 councillors serving 78 divisions as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map(s) accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

143 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 divisions 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.

144 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 division arrangements. However the district councils in Hertfordshire have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

145 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Berkhamsted.

Draft recommendation

Berkhamsted Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Berkhamsted Castle (returning five members), Berkhamsted East (returning five members), Berkhamsted West ward (returning three members), and Berkhamsted Shootersway (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

146 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Sandridge.

Draft recommendation

Sandridge Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Jersey Farm (returning four members), Marshalswick East (returning four members), Marshalswick West (returning four members), and Village (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

147 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Colney Heath.

Draft recommendation

Colney Heath Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Colney Heath (returning three members), High Field (returning four members) and Hill End (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

148 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Abbots Langley.

Draft recommendation

Abbots Langley Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Abbots Langley (returning four members), Abbots Langley West (returning two members), Bedmond (returning one member), Hunton Bridge & Langleybury (returning one member) Leavesden (returning five members), and Primrose Hill (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

149 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Chorleywood.

Draft recommendation

Chorleywood Parish Council should return 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Chorleywood Cedars (returning two members), Chorleywood Common (returning three members), Chorleywood East (returning two members), Chorleywood North-east (returning two members) Chorleywood Quickswood (returning one member), and Chorleywood South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

150 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Elstree & Borehamwood.

Draft recommendation

Elstree & Borehamwood Town Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Borehamwood Brookmeadow (returning two members), Borehamwood Cowley Hill (returning four members), Borehamwood Hillside (returning three members), Borehamwood Kenilworth North (returning one member) Borehamwood Kenilworth South (returning one member), Borehamwood Shenley Road (returning one member), and Elstree (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

151 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Hatfield.

Draft recommendation

Hatfield Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Central (returning three members), East (returning three members), Newgate Street & Wildhill (returning one member), Oxlease (returning two members) South (returning two members), Villages (returning three members), and West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

152 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Royston.

Draft recommendation

Royston Town Council should return six parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Royston Meridian (returning two members), Royston Palace (returning two members), Royston South (returning one member) and Royston West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

153 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Watford Rural.

Draft recommendation

Watford Rural Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Ashridge (returning one member), Carpenders Park (returning four members), Hayling (returning two members), Oxhey Hall (returning two members) and South Oxhey (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

154 There will now be a consultation period of 10 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire County Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 3 November 2014. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

155 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Hertfordshire and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors, division names and parish electoral arrangements. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during the consultation. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

156 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer
Hertfordshire Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG**

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, www.lgbce.org.uk or by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk

157 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations are available to view at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk>. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

158 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

159 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and 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 the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

160 After the publication of our final recommendations, 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 draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Hertfordshire County Council in 2017.

161 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire

162 The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Hertfordshire County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Hertfordshire County Council.

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Broxbourne Borough								
1	Cheshunt Central	1	11,835	11,835	9%	12,633	12,633	7%
2	Flamstead End & Turnford	1	12,013	12,013	10%	12,759	12,759	8%
3	Goffs Oak & Bury Green	1	11,877	11,877	9%	12,693	12,693	8%
4	Hoddesdon North	1	12,165	12,165	12%	12,986	12,986	10%
5	Hoddesdon South	1	11,784	11,784	8%	12,469	12,469	6%
6	Waltham Cross	1	11,722	11,722	8%	12,575	12,575	7%
Dacorum District								
7	Berkhamsted	1	12,103	12,103	11%	12,767	12,767	8%
8	Bridgewater	1	11,307	11,307	4%	12,767	12,767	8%
9	Hemel Hempstead East	1	10,760	10,760	-1%	11,854	11,854	1%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
10	Hemel Hempstead North East	1	9,930	9,930	-9%	11,379	11,379	-3%
11	Hemel Hempstead North West	1	11,703	11,703	7%	10,724	10,724	-9%
12	Hemel Hempstead South East	1	11,394	11,394	5%	12,272	12,272	4%
13	Hemel Hempstead St Pauls	1	11,062	11,062	2%	12,058	12,058	2%
14	Hemel Hempstead Town	1	10,603	10,603	-3%	11,604	11,604	-1%
15	Kings Langley	1	10,602	10,602	-3%	11,632	11,632	-1%
16	Tring	1	11,651	11,651	7%	11,164	11,164	-5%
East Hertfordshire District								
17	Bishop's Stortford East	1	10,621	10,621	-3%	11,818	11,818	0%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
18	Bishop's Stortford Rural	1	9,968	9,968	-9%	10,883	10,883	-8%
19	Bishop's Stortford West	1	11,466	11,466	5%	12,637	12,637	7%
20	Braughing	1	9,445	9,445	-13%	10,564	10,564	-10%
21	Hertford All Saints	1	9,897	9,897	-9%	11,008	11,008	-6%
22	Hertford Rural	1	9,956	9,956	-9%	11,175	11,175	-5%
23	Hertford St Andrews	1	10,483	10,483	-4%	11,715	11,715	0%
24	Sawbridgeworth	1	11,427	11,427	5%	13,002	13,002	10%
25	Ware North	1	10,390	10,390	-5%	11,544	11,544	-2%
26	Ware South	1	10,653	10,653	-2%	11,808	11,808	0%
Hertsmere Borough								
27	Borehamwood North	1	10,954	10,954	1%	11,952	11,952	2%
28	Borehamwood South	1	10,729	10,729	-2%	11,883	11,883	1%
29	Bushey North	1	9,720	9,720	-11%	10,789	10,789	-8%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
30	Bushey South	1	10,053	10,053	-8%	10,895	10,895	-7%
31	Potters Bar East	1	11,683	11,683	7%	12,684	12,684	8%
32	Potters Bar West & Shenley	1	10,711	10,711	-2%	12,007	12,007	2%
33	Watling	1	11,259	11,259	3%	11,662	11,662	-1%
North Hertfordshire District								
34	Baldock & Letchworth East	1	10,851	10,851	0%	11,675	11,675	-1%
35	Hitchin North	1	11,404	11,404	5%	12,278	12,278	4%
36	Hitchin Rural	1	9,997	9,997	-13%	10,879	10,879	-8%
37	Hitchin South	1	10,665	10,665	-10%	11,554	11,554	-2%
38	Knebworth & Codicote	1	9,957	9,957	-17%	10,899	10,899	-7%
39	Letchworth North West	1	11,947	11,947	5%	12,828	12,828	9%
40	Letchworth South	1	11,351	11,351	-8%	12,296	12,296	4%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
41	Royston East	1	11,682	11,682	-2%	11,641	11,641	-1%
42	Royston West & Rural	1	10,784	10,784	-1%	12,699	12,699	8%
St Albans City								
43	Colney Heath & Marshalswick	1	10,374	10,374	-5%	10,960	10,960	-7%
44	Harpenden North East	1	10,714	10,714	-2%	11,269	11,269	-4%
45	Harpenden Rural	1	11,098	11,098	2%	11,500	11,500	-2%
46	Harpenden South West	1	11,032	11,032	1%	11,622	11,622	-1%
47	London Colney	1	9,433	9,433	-13%	10,987	10,987	-7%
48	St Albans Central	1	10,959	10,959	1%	12,078	12,078	3%
49	St Albans East	1	9,816	9,816	-10%	10,678	10,678	-9%
50	St Albans North	1	10,160	10,160	-7%	10,934	10,934	-7%
51	St Albans South	1	10,443	10,443	-4%	11,313	11,313	-4%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
52	St Stephen's	1	10,981	10,981	1%	11,726	11,726	0%
Stevenage Borough								
53	Chells	1	11,157	11,157	2%	11,371	11,371	-3%
54	Old Town	1	10,712	10,712	-2%	10773	10773	-8%
55	Pin Green	1	11,085	11,085	2%	11229	11229	-5%
56	Shephall	1	10,701	10,701	-2%	10,738	10,738	-9%
57	Stevenage South	1	10,510	10,510	-4%	10,691	10,691	-9%
58	Stevenage West	1	11,070	11,070	1%	11,111	11,111	-6%
Three Rivers District								
59	Abbots Langley	1	10,962	10,962	1%	12,319	12,319	5%
60	Croxley	1	11,896	11,896	9%	12,455	12,455	6%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
61	Rickmansworth East & Oxhey Park	1	11,773	11,773	8%	12,803	12,803	9%
62	Rickmansworth West	1	11,002	11,002	1%	11,827	11,827	0%
63	South Oxhey & Eastbury	1	11,701	11,701	7%	12,678	12,678	8%
64	Three Rivers Rural	1	11,329	11,329	4%	12,077	12,077	3%
Watford Borough								
65	Central Watford & Oxhey	1	11,715	11,715	8%	12,273	12,273	4%
66	Meriden Tudor	1	10,785	10,785	-1%	10,923	10,923	-7%
67	Nascot Park	1	12,189	12,189	12%	12,435	12,435	6%
68	North Watford	1	11,344	11,344	4%	11,563	11,563	-2%
69	West Watford	1	12,161	12,161	12%	12,770	12,770	8%
70	Woodside Stanborough	1	10,949	10,949	0%	11,106	11,106	-6%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Hertfordshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Welwyn Hatfield Borough								
71	Haldens	1	10,988	10,988	1%	12,809	12,809	9%
72	Handside and Peartree	1	11,034	11,034	1%	12,798	12,798	9%
73	Hatfield East	1	8,928	8,928	-18%	11,090	11,090	-6%
74	Hatfield North	1	9,483	9,483	-13%	11,607	11,607	-1%
75	Hatfield Rural	1	9,858	9,858	-10%	10,628	10,628	-10%
76	Hatfield South	1	9,082	9,082	-17%	10,891	10,891	-7%
77	Welwyn	1	10,890	10,890	0%	12,727	12,727	8%
78	Welwyn Garden City South	1	10,941	10,941	0%	12,756	12,756	8%
	Totals	78	849,819	–	–	918,135	–	–
	Averages	–	–	10,895	–	–	11,771	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Hertfordshire County 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 county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix B

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
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 on 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 division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
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

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division 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 division 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 Commission 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 division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division 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
------	--