

# Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Warwickshire County Council

Electoral review

February 2015

### **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](mailto: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 2015

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	7
Final recommendatrions	7
Detailed divisions	10
North Warwickshire Borough	11
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough	12
Rugby Borough	16
Stratford-on-Avon District	18
Warwick District	22
Conclusions	25
Parish electoral arrangements	25
3 What happens next?	29

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council	30
B Submissions received	36
C Glossary and abbreviations	38

# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Warwickshire?

We have conducted an electoral review of Warwickshire County Council because the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality, where some councillors represent many more or many fewer electors than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Warwickshire. Currently, 57% of divisions have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the County. The Lawford & New Bilton division currently has 24% more electors than the average for Warwickshire whilst the Bishop's Tachbrook division has 23% fewer.

## Our proposals for Warwickshire

Warwickshire County Council currently has 62 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that reducing the Council size to 57 members will provide for effective governance of the Council whilst ensuring that it can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Warwickshire's 57 county councillors should represent 57 single-member divisions across the county. One of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average by 2020. This is the Coleshill North & Water Orton division which would have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Warwickshire by 2020.

**We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Warwickshire.**



## 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review the electoral arrangements for Warwickshire County Council ('the Council') to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

### What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents;
- Reflect community identity;
- Provide for effective and convenient local government.

3 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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation, first on division patterns for Warwickshire and then on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
15 April 2014	Division pattern consultation
9 September 2014	Draft recommendations consultation
4 November 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
17 February 2015	Publication of final recommendations

### How will the recommendations affect you?

5 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's 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.

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 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  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>2</sup> 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.

8 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2014	2020
Electorate of the county	424,575	443,465
Number of councillors	57	57
Average number of electors per councillor	7,449	7,780

10 Under our final recommendations, only one of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average by 2020. This is the Coleshill North & Water Orton division which would have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Warwickshire by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Warwickshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between borough wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Warwickshire 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.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected both at our offices and those of the Council. All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Electors refers to people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Electorate figures

14 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of 4% to 2020.

15 Rugby Borough Council, responding to the draft recommendations, questioned the electorate projections prepared by the County Council. The Borough Council suggested that the rate of housebuilding would be greater in the next five years than implied in the county forecasts, resulting in an increase in electorate of 7.6%. This is greater than the Rugby electorate increase of 6.2% forecast by the County Council and ONS forecasts for an increase in the population aged 17 and over of 4.6%. We recognised that forecasting electorate is an inexact science and, having considered the information provided, we are satisfied that the County Council's projected figures are the best available at the present time. These figures therefore form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

16 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to us to reduce the council size from the current 62 to 57 members. The effect of this would be to reduce the representation of each of the five district council areas by one. In making its proposal, the Council described the steps taken to streamline decision-making and governance procedures. However, it also acknowledged future increases in electorate and the role which councillors have in engaging with those whom they represent. The Council stated that a reduction in council size by more than five would lead to an unacceptable level of workload for individual members.

17 We were satisfied that the evidence provided in relation to the management and committee structures and councillor workloads would support a council size of 57. We therefore invited division arrangements based on a council size of 57.

18 During consultation on division patterns we received submissions relating to council size but considered we received no persuasive evidence to move us away from our proposal of 57. Therefore, our draft recommendations were based on a council size of 57.

19 In response to consultation on our draft recommendations we received four submissions relating to council size. Two supported a reduction from 62 to 57 whilst two suggested a greater, but unspecified, reduction. Furthermore, they offered no persuasive evidence in support of their proposals. Having considered the submissions we are not persuaded to modify our proposed council size of 57. Therefore, we have decided to base our final recommendations on a council size of 57.

## Division patterns

20 We received 28 submissions on division patterns for Warwickshire. The Council submitted a county-wide scheme which proposed four two-member and 49 single-member divisions. The Conservative Group on the Council ('the Conservative

Group') submitted a scheme based on a uniform pattern of 57 single-member divisions.

21 Broadly speaking, the Council's and the Conservative Group's proposals shared a number of similarities. The submissions presented identical proposals for seven single-member divisions in North Warwickshire. In each of the remaining districts, the two submissions had some common elements, but differed in their proposed boundaries elsewhere. In particular, the Council's proposal included two-member divisions whilst the Conservative Group, as described above, proposed single-member divisions throughout.

22 We also received 24 submissions which made proposals for particular areas within the county. These localised representations supported either of the county-wide submissions or proposed alternative boundaries.

## Draft Recommendations

23 We based our draft recommendations on a combination of the Council's and the Conservative Group's proposals. We recommended that there be 57 single-member divisions. Our draft recommendations for the rural parts of the county were broadly similar to the proposals put to us. However, they differed more significantly in the towns. Our draft recommendations for Bedworth and Warwick more closely reflected the Council's proposals whilst in Kenilworth, Rugby and Stratford-upon-Avon they more reflected proposals made by the Conservative Group.

24 When conducting an electoral review of a county council, we seek to provide for coterminosity between district wards and county divisions. Coterminosity is when a county division shares common boundaries with one or more district wards. 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 better reflect communities. Largely as a result of reducing the number of county councillors in each district, our draft recommendations would reduce coterminosity.

## Final recommendations

25 We received 63 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are listed in Appendix B. In response to our draft recommendations, the Council asked us to revisit its original proposals. The Liberal Democrat Group expressed support for the Council's response, making additional comments regarding Rugby, Stratford-upon-Avon and Warwick, whilst the Conservative Group asked us only to reconsider the names of three of our proposed divisions.

26 The majority of comments related to issues for individual communities within the county. Our proposals for Kenilworth, Stratford-upon-Avon and Newbold on Avon in particular attracted comments and counter-proposals.

### **North Warwickshire Borough**

27 The Council and the Conservative Group welcomed the draft recommendations. Whilst Fillongley Parish Council also supported them, we received an objection to include the Warton parish ward in our Baddesley & Dordon division from a

Polesworth parish councillor. We received no other comments which related specifically to any part of North Warwickshire.

28 We found that if we were simply to add Warton to our proposed Polesworth division, the remaining Baddesley & Dordon division would have 19% fewer electors than the average for a single-member division. We considered this to be an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality. Given this, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for North Warwickshire as final.

### **Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough**

29 Our draft recommendations were based on the proposals of the Council and Conservative Group subject to some modifications to better reflect our statutory criteria.

30 We received objections to some details of our proposals, including suggested alterations to our Bedworth North and Bedworth Central divisions and to the names of divisions in the Nuneaton area.

31 We received submissions concerning our division boundaries in the Newtown Road area of Bedworth. Having considered these submissions, we have decided to modify our division pattern in this area. We also propose to rename the divisions of Nuneaton Central and Nuneaton West to Nuneaton Abbey and Stockingford, respectively, as suggested to us in representations.

### **Rugby Borough**

32 The Council proposed a mix of single-member and two-member divisions for Rugby Borough whilst the Conservative Group proposed single-member divisions across the whole borough. Our draft recommendations were for single-member divisions. Our recommended divisions differed considerably from those of the Council, and to a lesser extent those of the Conservative Group, in Rugby town and its environs.

33 During consultation on our draft recommendations, Rugby Borough Council completed a Community Governance Review that modified parish boundaries in parts of the borough. The Rugby Borough Council (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order 2014 transferred land from Dunchurch parish to Cawston and from Cawston parish to Long Lawford. Our final recommendations reflect these changes to parish boundaries.

34 In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations we received objections to the splitting of the Newbold on Avon area between divisions and the inclusion of part of the Newbold on Avon area in the Fosse division. Respondents suggested that Newbold on Avon should be included in our Brownsover division. Our investigations of this proposal indicated that it would result in the Brownsover division having 30% more electors per councillor than the average for the county by 2020. We consider this to be an unacceptable level of electoral inequality. Our investigations also found that Newbold on Avon could all be included in our Fosse division whilst still providing for reasonable levels of electoral equality. We have therefore decided to make this modification as part of our final recommendations.

35 We also received representations about New Bilton, arguing that our draft recommendations would divide that community. Those representations presented

good evidence and we are persuaded to adopt as part of our final recommendations, a New Bilton & Overslade division as suggested to us. In order to provide for good electoral equality, we recommend a Benn division which embraces the town centre and residential areas to the north of it.

36 We confirm as final our draft recommendations for the remaining divisions in Rugby Borough

### **Stratford-on-Avon District**

37 In making our draft recommendations, we had regard to the District Council's request that we make, as far as possible, divisions and new district wards coterminous. The new district wards were made by the Stratford-on-Avon (Electoral Changes) Order and will come into effect at elections held in May 2015. We have also had regard to the Stratford-on-Avon (Reorganisation of Community Governance) Order 2013 which has changed the boundaries of some parishes and abolished the parish of Old Stratford & Drayton.

38 The Council and the Conservative Group proposed identical division boundaries in the rural parts of Stratford-on-Avon district, but disagreed about division boundaries in the town. The Council proposed a single-member and a two-member division. The Conservative Group proposed a pattern of three single-member divisions for the town. Under this pattern, which we included as part of our draft recommendations, both the Stratford East and a Stratford South division spanned the River Avon.

39 Those who objected to our recommendations for the town argued that the area south of the river should be included in a single division. We are persuaded by the evidence received and have decided to modify our draft recommendations. However, whilst it remains necessary for this division to span the river in order to provide for good electoral equality, we were not persuaded to propose a two-member division as originally proposed by the Council. Our final recommendations are therefore for three single-member divisions of Stratford South, Stratford West and Stratford North.

40 Our draft recommendations for the rural part of the borough were largely based on the Council's and Conservative Group's proposals. In response to our draft recommendations we received evidence from Moreton Morrell and Newbold Pacey Parish Councils proposing they both be included in our Wellesbourne division. Having considered the evidence received, we are persuaded to make this modification.

41 We also received submissions regarding our Alcester division. Great Alne parish proposed it be included in the Alcester division, as the town provided services to the village. We investigated this alternative and found that including Great Alne parish in our Alcester division would result in it having 20% more electors per councillor than the average for the county by 2020. Such a modification would also result in our Studley division having 16% fewer electors than the average. We consider these to be unacceptable levels of electoral equality and have decided not to make these modifications. Therefore, we have decided to confirm the remaining rural divisions in the district as final.

## **Warwick District**

42 The Council and the Conservative Group made identical proposals for divisions for Warwick town, which we included as part of our draft recommendations. We received no objection to our proposed Warwick North, Warwick South and Warwick West divisions. However, our final recommendations reflect those of the community governance review to amend parish boundaries of parishes in Warwick district. In particular, this affects residents in the southern part of our recommended Warwick South division at Bolingbroke Drive, Othello Avenue and the residents of Heathcote Park.

43 In our draft recommendations, we proposed a Lapworth & West Kenilworth division which combined parts of Kenilworth town with parishes to the west. This attracted opposition from four residents who argued that people living in the Lapworth area had little connection with Kenilworth. The Council asked that we revisit its original submission. However, we received no evidence which persuaded us to alter our view about the Council's initial proposal. Reflecting the community governance review recommendation for a modified Burton Green parish means, however, that good electoral equality is achieved by including only the open land in the west of Kenilworth parish and the Castle Green area in the Lapworth & West Kenilworth division. We consider that this will reduce the disparity in the character of the division and have therefore decided to include it as part of our final recommendations. This modification does require consequential changes to the Kenilworth Park Hill and Kenilworth St John's divisions.

44 We have modified our draft recommendations for Leamington Milverton, Leamington Clarendon and Leamington North divisions in order to reflect the need to provide for good electoral equality whilst also reflecting the recommendations of the community governance review relating to Old Milverton.

45 Our final recommendations for Warwickshire are summarised in the table on page 25 and can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## **Detailed divisions**

46 The tables on pages 11–24 detail our final recommendations for each area of Warwickshire. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

## North Warwickshire Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Atherstone	1	-3%	This division comprises Atherstone town only.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Baddesley & Dordon	1	-3%	This division comprises the parishes of Baddesley Ensor, Dordon and Grendon together with parish wards of Wood End (Kingsbury parish) and Warton (Polesworth).	We received a proposal that Warton parish ward, a part of Polesworth parish, be included in the Polesworth division. Were we to do so, the Baddesley & Dordon division would have 19% fewer electors than the average, by 2020. We do not consider that the evidence we received would justify such a high degree of electoral inequality. We therefore confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Coleshill North & Water Orton	1	-11%	This division comprises the Coleshill North parish ward together with the rural parishes of Curdworth, Lea Marston, Water Orton and Wishaw to the north.	Evidence indicated that a division having 11% fewer electors than the average by 2020 is justifiable in this case. The part of Coleshill which we propose to include is the Coleshill North district council ward. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Coleshill South & Arley	1	-8%	This division comprises the Coleshill South parish ward together with the rural area parishes of Astley, Corley, Fillongley, Great and Little Packington, Maxstoke and Shustoke and the Gun Hill parish ward (Arley).	The part of Coleshill which we propose to include is the Coleshill South district council ward. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Hartshill & Mancetter	1	-9%	This area comprises the parishes of Ansley, Caldecote, Hartshill and Mancetter and Arley parish	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

			ward (Arley).	
Kingsbury	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Baxterley, Bentley, Merevale, Middleton, Nether and Over Whitacre and with the exception of the Wood End parish ward, the parish of Kingsbury.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Polesworth	1	-8%	This division comprises Birchmoor, Polesworth East and Polesworth West parish wards (Polesworth) and the parishes of Austrey, Newton Regis, Seckington and Shuttington.	As part of the objection which we received to our proposed Baddesley & Dordon division, we were asked to consider including the whole of Polesworth parish in this division. We were, however, unable to agree to this request whilst reaching an acceptable balance of our statutory considerations. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations. The boundaries of this division are therefore unchanged as a consequence of this review.

### Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Arbury	1	-4%	This division stretches from the western boundary of the borough to the Coventry Canal in the east. It contains communities in the Heath End and Hill Top areas. Much of the division comprises Arbury Park and farmland and woodland surrounding it.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

Attleborough	1	0%	This division, is bounded by the Coventry Canal in the west and, for the most part, the West Coast Main Line in the east In the southern part of the division however, the Magyar Crescent area lying to the east of the rail line is included in the division.	Having regard to the observations made during our tour of the area, we modified slightly the proposal made by the Council. We received a proposal that the Raveloe Drive and Tulliver Road areas, separated by the Coventry Canal, be included in the same division. We note, however, that such an approach would result in an Attleborough division with either 15% more or 12% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the county. We do not consider such levels of electoral inequality to be acceptable in this case.
Bedworth Central	1	-7%	This division comprises the town centre together with the residential areas of the town to the north-east and to the south-west.	Whilst our draft recommendations were supported by the Conservative Group and those political groups and organisations who concurred with it, a local resident proposed that the area around the Bedworth Sloughs nature reserve and the Frances Crescent area be excluded. We agree with the inclusion of the former in the Bedworth North division as proposed by the Labour Group in its initial representation as this provides better road links within that division. The inclusion of Frances Crescent in Bedworth North would, however, result in poor levels of electoral equality.
Bedworth East	1	-4%	This division comprises the eastern part of the town, combining the borough's Poplar ward with the housing area served by Hayes Lane and School Lane.	Our draft recommendation matched the proposal made by the Council. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Bedworth North	1	-5%	This division combines in a single division, the housing areas which form the northern parts of the town.	We received submissions which proposed amendments to the boundary of this division with Bedworth Central and Bedworth West. We are modifying our draft recommendations by the inclusion of the area around the Bedworth Sloughs nature reserve in this division.

Bedworth West	1	-2%	The M6 motorway runs through the centre of this division, but the Goodyers End and Bedworth Little Heath residential areas to the north of it are linked to Ash Green to the south by Royal Oak Lane and Church Lane.	We received a submission asking that Smorrall Lane form the boundary of this division with Bedworth North. However, such a change to boundaries would result in an unacceptable level of electoral inequality and we have confirmed as final our draft recommendation.
Bulkington & Whitestone	1	1%	This division combines the village of Bulkington which is physically separate from both Nuneaton and Bedworth towns, with the eastern part of Whitestone, a residential area lying on the eastern periphery of Nuneaton's built-up area.	Having regard to the observations made during our tour of the area, we modified slightly the proposal made by the Council. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Camp Hill	1	4%	This division takes its name from the Camp Hill area of Nuneaton town. It is a largely residential area contiguous with Snow Hill in North Warwickshire district.	Our draft recommendation matched the proposal made by the Council. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Galley Common	1	5%	This is the north-western part of Nuneaton & Bedworth borough and is a mix of residential and open areas on the periphery of the town.	Our draft recommendation matched the proposal made by the Council. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Nuneaton Abbey	1	0%	This division includes Nuneaton's central	The Conservative Group proposed that we name the Nuneaton Central division of our draft recommendations 'Abbey' whilst

			commercial and civic area, combining the housing areas which lie around the south, west and east of it. The West Coast Main Line forms the eastern boundary of the division.	the Nuneaton Labour Party proposed the name 'Manor Park'. We note that both names are reflected in road names and community assets in the division. The division we recommend however, retains much of the boundary of the existing Nuneaton Abbey division and, in balancing the names suggested to us, we modify our draft recommendation by proposing to retain the existing division name.
Nuneaton East	1	-3%	This division includes the Crowhil Road and Horeston Grange housing areas together with the Attleborough Fields Industrial Estate.	Having regard to the observations made during our tour of the area, we modified slightly the proposal made by the Council. We received one suggestion that this ward be named St Nicolas & Crowhill, another that it be named Eastboro. We note that the St Nicolas school and St Nicolas Park Drive lie outside of the division and do not consider therefore that a division name which includes St Nicolas would be appropriate. Whilst Eastboro Way lies wholly within the division and links the housing areas in the south to those in the north, we note that the name Eastboro is not associated with any community facilities or local services. We therefore propose to confirm this division named Nuneaton East as part of our final recommendations.
Stockingford	1	-7%	This division is the residential district which lies to the west of Nuneaton town's inner housing areas.	The Conservative Group and a local resident suggested that our Nuneaton West ward be named Stockingford. We note that this is the name of the library and a school in the division and are content that the name reflects community interests. We therefore have modified our draft recommendation in this respect.
Weddington	1	4%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of the borough and includes the Higham Lane, St Nicolas Park Drive and Weddington housing areas.	Having regard to the observations made during our tour of the area, we modified slightly the proposal made by the Council. We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

## Rugby Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Admirals & Cawston	1	2%	This area combines residential areas in the western part of Rugby town with Cawston parish as amended by the Reorganisation of Community Governance order made by the Borough Council in 2014.	We received requests to reflect changes to Cawston parish boundary in our final recommendations. We also received requests to include Lime Tree Avenue in the parish of Dunchurch. However, this would require the creation of an unviable parish ward. We therefore propose to confirm this division as modified to reflect the Reorganisation of Community Governance order as part of our final recommendations.
Benn	1	5%	This division covers Rugby's town centre and residential areas adjacent to it.	We have accepted the evidence about Newbold on Avon and New Bilton. Consequentially, we have moved the Norman Road and Pinfold Road areas from the Benn & New Bilton division shown in our draft recommendations. In order to ensure good electoral equality, we have included the Bath Street area in this division. We propose the name Benn for this division to reflect these changes.
Bilton & Hillside	1	1%	This principally residential area forms the south-western part of Rugby town.	Rugby Borough Council commented that the boundaries of our Bilton & Hillside division cut through urban districts affecting small numbers of electors, but did not specify those cuts. Councillor Edwards supported our proposal for this division. There being no other comment regarding this division we propose to confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
Brownsover & Coton Park	1	7%	This is the northern area of Rugby town lying immediately to the south of the M6 motorway and includes the whole of the Swift Valley Industrial Estate	Submissions relating to Newbold on Avon proposed changes to our draft recommendations which would result in considerable electoral inequality. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for this area, but propose the name Brownsover & Coton Park in order to reflect more appropriately the communities which in this division.

Dunsmore & Leam Valley	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Birdingbury, Bourton & Draycote, Dunchurch, Frankton, Grandborough, Leamington Hastings, Marton, Princethorpe, Ryton-on-Dunsmore, Stretton-on-Dunsmore, Thurlaston, Willoughby and Wolfhampcote.	Submissions asked us to requests to reflect changes to Cawston parish boundary and exclude the Lime Tree Avenue area of Dunchurch parish from this division. We could only do so by creating a parish ward for this area, but consider a parish ward to be unviable. We received no further submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as modified to reflect the Reorganisation of Community Governance order part of our final recommendations.
Earl Craven	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Binley Woods, Brandon & Bretford, Church Lawford, King's Newnham, Little Lawford, Long Lawford and Wolston.	Submissions asked us to reflect changes to Cawston parish boundary. We received no further submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as modified to reflect the Reorganisation of Community Governance order part of our final recommendations.
Eastlands	1	4%	This largely residential area lies to the east of Rugby town centre. Its principal roads are Hillmorton Road and Lower Hillmorton Road.	Submissions asked us to include a small area lying to the north of Hillmorton Road in a Brownsover & Benn division. However, having changed our draft recommendations for the New Bilton and Benn area, we consider it inappropriate to exclude from this division, Hillmorton Road. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Fosse	1	9%	This division comprises the parishes of Ansty, Brinklow, Burton Hastings, Churchover, Combe Fields, Copston Magna, Easenhall, Harborough Magna, Newton & Biggin, Pailton, Shilton, Stretton Baskerville, Stretton-under-Fosse,	We received objections to the draft recommendations that part of Newbold on Avon be included in the Fosse division. However, whilst we were persuaded by evidence that Newbold on Avon in its entirety should be included in a single division we were not persuaded that the community would be disadvantaged were it to be included in the Fosse division. Furthermore, we were unable to conclude that Newbold on Avon could be included in a division with the Brownsover and Coton Park areas whilst reflecting an appropriate balance of

			Wibtoft, Willey and Wolvey together with Newbold on Avon and that part of Clifton upon Dunsmore which does not lie within the scope of the Rugby radio masts site development.	our statutory considerations. We therefore have modified our draft recommendation for the Fosse division and now propose that it include the whole of Newbold on Avon.
Hillmorton	1	7%	This principally residential area forms the south-eastern part of Rugby town and includes the site of major urban extension proposals at the Rugby radio masts site.	We received no submissions specifically relating to the boundaries of this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
New Bilton & Overslade	1	0%	This division includes the residential areas which lie to the south and west of the town centre. It also includes extensive areas of open and non-residential land to the south of St Cross Hospital.	We received a number of submissions which argued that our draft recommendations would divide the New Bilton community. Respondents presented evidence of community interactions which has persuaded us to move away from our draft recommendations. We also accept the proposal made by respondents to our consultation that this division be named New Bilton & Overslade.

### Stratford-on-Avon District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Alcester	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Alcester, Arrow with Weethley, Billesley, Binton, Exhall, Haselor, Kinwarton, Temple Grafton, Wilmcote and Wixford.	We received proposals which would include the parish of Great Alne in the Alcester division. Such a change from our draft recommendations would lead to high levels of electoral inequality. We have examined whether other patterns of division boundaries would lead to good electoral equality but found that to accommodate Great Alne within an Alcester

				division would require radical changes to our draft recommendations, extending across most of the district.
Arden	1	10%	This division comprises the parishes of Beaudesert, Claverdon, Henley-in-Arden, Langley, Preston Bagot, Tanworth-in-Arden, Ullenhall, Wolverton and Wootton Wawen.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Bidford & Welford	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Atherstone on Stour, Bidford-on-Avon, Clifford Chambers & Milcote, Dorsington, Long Marston, Luddington, Salford Priors, Welford-on-Avon and Weston-on-Avon.	We received a proposal that the part of Luddington Road area added to Luddington parish upon the abolition of Old Stratford & Drayton parish should be included within a Stratford West division. However, we consider that the outcome of the community governance review reflects the community identity of the area and therefore confirm as final, our draft recommendation.
Feldon	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Bishop's Itchington, Chapel Ascote, Chesterton & Kingston, Farnborough, Fenny Compton, Harbury, Hodnell & Wills Pastures, Ladbroke, Long Itchington, Priors Hardwick, Priors Marston, Radbourn, Stoneton, Ufton, Watergall and Wormleighton.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore confirm our draft recommendation as final.
Kineton & Red Horse	1	-3%	This division comprises the parishes of Avon Dassett, Burton Dassett, Butlers	We received objections to our draft recommendations from the Parish Councils of Moreton Morrell and Newbold Pacey to their inclusion in this division. Objections were based on the

			Marston, Chadshunt, Compton Verney, Compton Wynyates, Combrook, Gaydon, Kineton, Lighthorne, Lighthorne Heath, Oxhill, Radway, Ratley & Upton, Shotteswell, Tysoe, Warmington and Whatcote.	physical and community relationship of those parishes to Wellesbourne. We have moved from our draft recommendations by including both parishes in the Wellesbourne division.
Shipston	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Barcheston, Barton-on-the-Heath, Brailes, Burmington, Cherington, Great Wolford, Honington, Idlicote, Little Compton, Little Wolford, Long Compton, Shipston on Stour, Stretton-on-Fosse, Stourton, Sutton-under-Brailes, Tidmington and Whichford.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations. The boundaries of this division are therefore unchanged as a consequence of this review.
Southam, Stockton & Napton	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of Napton on the Hill, Southam, Stockton and Upper & Lower Shuckburgh	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations. The boundaries of this division are therefore unchanged as a consequence of this review.
Stour & the Vale	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Admington, Alderminster, Ettington, Ilmington, Loxley, Pillerton Hersey, Pillerton Priors, Preston on Stour, Quinton, Tredington and Whitchurch.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this division. We therefore propose to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

Stratford North	1	6%	This division comprises the Bishopton, Clopton and Welcombe areas of Stratford-upon-Avon town.	We received objections to our draft recommendations for the town of Stratford-upon-Avon. Objectors proposed that the part of the town which lies to the south and east of the River Avon should be included in a single division. In accepting the evidence of community interactions in this part of the town, we have moved from our draft recommendations for the whole of the town area although we have maintained our approach to the provision of single-member divisions for the town. We have based our proposals upon those made by the Council, but depart from their suggestions where necessary in order to provide for good levels of electoral equality whilst continuing to reflect community identities and interests. We acknowledge that our final recommendations are no longer fully coterminous with district ward boundaries but we consider that we have reached the most appropriate balance between all of our statutory considerations. As a consequence, we propose as part of our final recommendations, parish wards as shown on the large map accompanying this report.
Stratford South	1	6%	This division comprises those parts of Stratford-upon-Avon town which lie to the east and south of the River Avon with the Old Town area on the western side.	
Stratford West	1	4%	This division comprises the Shottery area of Stratford-upon-Avon town with the Borden Hill and adjacent open areas which lie to the west of the town's built-up area.	
Studley	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Aston Cantlow, Coughton, Great Alne, Mappleborough Green, Morton Bagot, Oldberrow, Sambourne, Sperrall and Studley.	
Wellesbourne	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Bearley, Charlecote, Fulbrook, Hampton Lucy, Moreton Morrell, Newbold Pacey, Snitterfield and Wellesbourne.	

## Warwick District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Budbrooke & Bishop's Tachbrook	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Barford, Bishop's Tachbrook, Budbrooke, Hatton, Norton Lindsey, Sherbourne, Shrewley and Wasperton.	We have moved from our draft recommendation in order to reflect the recommendations of the Warwick community governance review in respect of Bolingbroke Drive, Heathcote Park and Othello Avenue.
Cubbington & Leek Wootton	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashow, Baginton, Blackdown, Bubbenhall, Eathorpe, Hunningham, Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe, Offchurch, Old Milverton, Radford Semele, Stoneleigh, Wappenbury, Weston under Wetherley and Cubbington, excepting the Beaufort Avenue area.	We have moved from our draft recommendation in order to reflect the recommendations of the Warwick community governance review in respect of Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe parish. Cubbington Parish Council objected to our draft recommendation to include the Beaufort Avenue area in our Leamington North division. However, we consider this area and the contiguous Telford Road area of Royal Leamington Spa to have interests in common. In the absence of evidence to persuade us to move from our draft recommendations, we therefore confirm them as final in that respect
Kenilworth Park Hill	1	1%	This area is the eastern part of Kenilworth town.	We have moved from our draft recommendation for this area by excluding the University ward of Ashow & Stoneleigh Joint Parish Council which the final recommendations of the Warwick community governance review would place in Burton Green parish and by including the Albion Street area.
Kenilworth St John's	1	0%	This division includes Kenilworth town centre and the residential areas of the town lying to the south of it.	We have moved from our draft recommendation for this area by including the whole of the area centred on The Square bringing into one division, the town centre.

Lapworth & West Kenilworth	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Baddesley Clinton, Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall, Burton Green, Bushwood, Lapworth, Rowington and the Castle Green area of Kenilworth.	We received objections to our draft recommendation to combine part of Kenilworth town and rural parishes to the west in a single division. We are unable to provide a pattern of divisions which would reflect the objections whilst having regard to all of our statutory criteria. We have, however, moved from our draft recommendations by reflecting those of the Warwick community governance review and by limiting the parts of Kenilworth included in the division to the Castle Green area and the open land which forms part of the parish.
Leamington Brunswick	1	-7%	This area is the south-western part of Royal Leamington Spa.	Our final recommendations move away from our draft recommendations in order to reflect changes to the boundary between Royal Leamington Spa and Old Milverton recommended by the Warwick community governance review.
Leamington Clarendon	1	-7%	This is the central and eastern part of Royal Leamington Spa.	
Leamington Milverton	1	-3%	This area is the north-western part of Royal Leamington Spa.	
Leamington North	1	7%	This area is the north-eastern part of Royal Leamington Spa and the Beaufort Avenue area of Cubbington parish.	
Leamington Willes	1	-6%	This area is the south-western part of Royal Leamington Spa and the eastern part of Whitnash.	
Warwick North	1	0%	This is the northern part of Warwick town.	
Warwick South	1	-1%	This is the southern part of Warwick town.	We received no submissions specifically relating to Warwick. We have, however, made minor modifications to our draft recommendations for these divisions in order to reflect the recommendations of the Warwick community governance review.

Warwick West	1	5%	This is the western part of Warwick town.	
Whitnash	1	0%	This is those parts of the parish of Whitnash lying to the west of the railway line which runs through the parish.	We received objections to the inclusion of the eastern part of the parish of Whitnash in our draft recommendation for a Leamington Willes division. We note, however, that housing development in the area is accessed from and oriented towards that division. We have made modifications to our draft recommendations for the Harbury Lane and Othello Drive areas of this division in order to reflect the recommendations of the Warwick community governance review.

## Conclusions

47 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2020 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	57	57
Number of electoral divisions	57	57
Average number of electors per councillor	7,449	7,780
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	6	1
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

### **Final recommendation**

Warwickshire County Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 57 single-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Warwickshire. **You can also view our final recommendations for Warwickshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

## Parish electoral arrangements

48 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 or divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward or division. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

49 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, the district councils in Warwickshire 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.

50 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Kenilworth parish.

**Final recommendation**

Kenilworth Town Council should return 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Abbey (returning three members); Clock Tower (returning one member); Park Hill (Returning six members); St John's (returning six members) and St Nicholas (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

51 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Royal Leamington Spa parish.

**Final recommendation**

Royal Leamington Spa Town Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing 13 wards: Arlington (returning one member), Brunswick North (returning two members), Brunswick South (returning one member), Clarendon (returning one member), Cloisters (returning one member), Leam (returning one member), Lillington (returning two members), Lime (returning one member), Milverton (returning two members), Northumberland (returning one member), Prince's (returning one member), Sydenham (returning one member) and Victoria Park (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

52 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Stratford-upon-Avon.

**Final recommendation**

Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council should return 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing 11 wards: Avenue (returning two members), Bishopton (returning two members), Bridgetown (returning two members), Brookside (returning one member), Clopton (returning two members), Hathaway (returning one member), Old Town (returning one member), Shottery (returning two members), Tiddington (returning two members), Welcombe (returning two members) and Willows (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

53 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Warwick parish.

**Final recommendation**

Warwick Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Aylesford (returning two members), Cliffe (returning one member), Emscote (returning two members), Heathcote (returning two members), Leafield (returning one member), Myton (returning one member), Saltisford (returning two members), Saltisford Common (returning one member) and Woodloes Park

(returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

54 We have now completed our review of Warwickshire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in May 2017.

#### Equalities

55 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

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
North Warwickshire Borough								
1	Atherstone	1	6,923	6,923	-7%	7,519	7,519	-3%
2	Baddesley & Dordon	1	7,651	7,651	3%	7,578	7,578	-3%
3	Coleshill North & Water Orton	1	6,815	6,815	-9%	6,926	6,926	-11%
4	Coleshill South & Arley	1	7,047	7,047	-5%	7,141	7,141	-8%
5	Hartshill & Mancetter	1	7,181	7,181	-4%	7,047	7,047	-9%
6	Kingsbury	1	7,079	7,079	-5%	7,187	7,187	-8%
7	Polesworth	1	7,288	7,288	-2%	7,162	7,162	-8%
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough								
8	Arbury	1	7,110	7,110	-5%	7,449	7,449	-4%

**Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
9	Attleborough	1	7,629	7,629	2%	7,806	7,806	0%
10	Bedworth Central	1	7,011	7,011	-6%	7,220	7,220	-7%
11	Bedworth East	1	7,336	7,336	-2%	7,465	7,465	-4%
12	Bedworth North	1	7,215	7,215	-3%	7,363	7,363	-5%
13	Bedworth West	1	7,314	7,314	-2%	7,651	7,651	-2%
14	Bulkington & Whitestone	1	7,956	7,956	7%	7,842	7,842	1%
15	Camp Hill	1	7,217	7,217	-3%	8,099	8,099	4%
16	Galley Common	1	7,864	7,864	6%	8,189	8,189	5%
17	Nuneaton Abbey	1	7,700	7,700	3%	7,805	7,805	0%
18	Nuneaton East	1	7,222	7,222	-3%	7,508	7,508	-3%
19	Stockingford	1	7,436	7,436	0%	7,217	7,217	-7%
20	Weddington	1	7,632	7,632	2%	8,058	8,058	4%

**Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
	Rugby Borough							
21	Admirals & Cawston	1	7,828	7,828	5%	7,968	7,968	2%
22	Benn	1	7,017	7,017	-6%	8,152	8,152	5%
23	Bilton & Hillside	1	7,944	7,944	7%	7,880	7,880	1%
24	Brownsover & Coton Park	1	7,213	7,213	-3%	8,301	8,301	7%
25	Dunsmore & Leam Valley	1	7,855	7,855	5%	8,148	8,148	5%
26	Earl Craven	1	7,756	7,756	4%	8,026	8,026	3%
27	Eastlands	1	7,809	7,809	5%	8,095	8,095	4%
28	Fosse	1	8,676	8,676	16%	8,492	8,492	9%
29	Hillmorton	1	6,510	6,510	-13%	8,342	8,342	7%
30	New Bilton & Overslade	1	7,782	7,782	4%	7,747	7,747	0%

**Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Warwickshire 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 %	
Stratford-on-Avon District								
31	Alcester	1	8,243	8,243	11%	8,425	8,425	8%
32	Arden	1	8,454	8,454	13%	8,534	8,534	10%
33	Bidford & Welford	1	7,825	7,825	5%	8,380	8,380	8%
34	Feldon	1	7,598	7,598	2%	7,767	7,767	0%
35	Kineton & Red Horse	1	7,139	7,139	-4%	7,528	7,528	-3%
36	Shipston	1	7,755	7,755	4%	7,972	7,972	2%
37	Southam, Stockton & Napton	1	7,272	7,272	-2%	7,672	7,672	-1%
38	Stour & the Vale	1	6,262	6,262	-16%	7,311	7,311	-6%
39	Stratford North	1	7,625	7,625	2%	8,240	8,240	6%
40	Stratford South	1	8,126	8,126	9%	8,209	8,209	6%
41	Stratford West	1	6,726	6,726	-10%	8,071	8,071	4%

**Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
42	Studley	1	6,996	6,996	-6%	7,464	7,464	-4%
43	Wellesbourne	1	7,732	7,732	4%	8,418	8,418	8%
Warwick District								
44	Budbrooke & Bishop's Tachbrook	1	7,720	7,720	4%	8,032	8,032	3%
45	Cubbington & Leek Wootton	1	7,209	7,209	-3%	7,278	7,278	-6%
46	Kenilworth Park Hill	1	7,958	7,958	7%	7,828	7,828	1%
47	Kenilworth St John's	1	7,728	7,728	4%	7,810	7,810	0%
48	Lapworth & West Kenilworth	1	7,616	7,616	2%	8,065	8,065	4%
49	Leamington Brunswick	1	6,803	6,803	-9%	7,238	7,238	-7%
50	Leamington Clarendon	1	6,962	6,962	-7%	7,241	7,241	-7%
51	Leamington Milverton	1	7,008	7,008	-6%	7,514	7,514	-3%

**Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Warwickshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
52	Leamington North	1	8,402	8,402	13%	8,338	8,338	7%
53	Leamington Willes	1	7,252	7,252	-3%	7,328	7,328	-6%
54	Warwick North	1	6,981	6,981	-6%	7,770	7,770	0%
55	Warwick South	1	7,053	7,053	-5%	7,690	7,690	-1%
56	Warwick West	1	8,070	8,070	8%	8,170	8,170	5%
57	Whitnash	1	7,044	7,044	-5%	7,789	7,789	0%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>424,575</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>443,465</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,449</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,780</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Warwickshire 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

## Submissions received in response to the draft recommendations

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/west-midlands/warwickshire/warwickshire-county-council>

### Local authorities

- Warwickshire County Council
- Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council
- Rugby Borough Council

### Town & parish councils

- Budbrooke PC
- Cubbington PC
- Fillongley PC
- Great Alne PC
- Moreton Morrell PC
- Newbold Pacey & Ashorne PC
- Old Milverton & Blackdown PC
- Royal Leamington Spa TC
- Whitnash TC

### Political parties

- Kenilworth & Southam Liberal Democrats
- Nuneaton & Bedworth BC Conservative Group
- Nuneaton Conservative Association
- Nuneaton Labour CLP
- Rugby Constituency Labour Party
- Warwick & Leamington Liberal Democrats
- Warwickshire CC Conservative Group
- Warwickshire CC Liberal Democrat Group
- Wembrook Labour Party

### Councillors

- Councillor H. Avis (Rugby BC)
- Councillor S. Birkett (Rugby BC)
- Councillor R. Cheney (Stratford-on-Avon DC)
- Councillor J. Clarke (Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor A. Coles (Rugby BC)
- Councillor C. Edwards (Rugby BC)

- Councillor M. Gittus (Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor S. Margrave (Nuneaton & Bedworth BC)
- Councillor P. Moorse (Stratford-on-Avon DC)
- Councillor M. O'Rourke (Rugby BC, Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor K. Rolfe (Stratford-on-Avon DC, Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor M. Gittus (Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor R. Srivastava (Rugby BC)
- Councillor A. Webb (Warwickshire CC)
- Councillor M. Webb (Warwickshire CC)

### **Community organisations**

- New Bilton Community Association
- Newbold on Avon Community Partnership (x2)
- Pakistani Association
- Wembrook Community Centre
- Whitnash Society
- Whitnash WI

### **Residents**

- 21 local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
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
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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