

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Stroud in Gloucestershire

*January 2001*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Peter Brokenshire  
Kru Desai  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

© Crown Copyright 2000

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.  
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

|   | page      |
|---|-----------|
| SUMMARY   | <i>v</i>  |
| 1 INTRODUCTION  | <i>1</i>  |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL<br>ARRANGEMENTS   | <i>5</i>  |
| 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED  | <i>9</i>  |
| 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT<br>RECOMMENDATIONS   | <i>13</i> |
| 5 NEXT STEPS  | <i>35</i> |
| <br>  |           |
| APPENDICES  |           |
| A Draft Recommendations for Stroud:<br>Detailed Mapping   | <i>37</i> |
| B Stroud District Council's and<br>Stroud Conservative Association's<br>Proposed Electoral Arrangements | <i>43</i> |
| C The Statutory Provisions  | <i>51</i> |

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Stroud town is inserted inside the back cover of the report.



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Stroud on 27 June 2000.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Stroud:

- **in 19 of the 31 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and nine wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 17 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 11 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 103 – 104) are that:

- **Stroud District Council should have 51 councillors, four fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 27 wards, instead of 31 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four, and four wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In 25 of the proposed 27 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in 24 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2005.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and/or the re-distribution of councillors for Cam, Dursley, Randwick, Rodborough, Stroud and Thrupp parishes;**
- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Cam Parish Council and Stroud Town Council.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 9 January 2001. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 5 March 2001:

**Review Manager  
Stroud Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

| Ward name               | Number of councillors | Constituent areas  | Map reference |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|
| 1 Berkeley              | 2                     | Berkeley ward (part – Berkeley parish); Hinton ward (Hinton parish); Vale ward (part – Hamfallow parish)   | Map 2         |
| 2 Bisley                | 1                     | <i>Unchanged</i> Bisley ward (Bisley-with-Lypiatt parish)  | Map 2         |
| 3 Cainscross            | 3                     | Cainscross ward (Cainscross parish); Randwick ward (part – the proposed Lower Westrip parish ward of Randwick parish)  | Map A3        |
| 4 Cam East              | 2                     | Cam ward (part – part of Upper and Lower parish wards of Cam parish); Woodfield ward (part – part of Woodfield parish ward of Cam parish)                              | Map A2        |
| 5 Cam West              | 2                     | Cam ward (part – part of Upper and Lower parish wards of Cam parish); Woodfield ward (part – part of Woodfield parish ward of Cam parish)                              | Map A2        |
| 6 Chalford              | 3                     | Chalford ward (Chalford parish); Thrupp ward (part – the proposed Bourne parish ward of Thrupp parish)   | Map A5        |
| 7 Coaley & Uley         | 1                     | Cambridge ward (part – Coaley parish); Uley ward (the parishes of Nympsfield, Owlpen and Uley)   | Map 2         |
| 8 Dursley               | 3                     | <i>Unchanged</i> Dursley ward (Dursley parish)   | Map 2         |
| 9 Eastington & Standish | 1                     | Eastington ward (part – Eastington parish); Parklands ward (part – Standish parish)  | Map 2         |
| 10 Hardwicke            | 2                     | Hardwicke ward (the parishes of Elmore, Hardwicke and Longney); Parklands ward (part – Haresfield parish)  | Map 2         |
| 11 Kingswood            | 1                     | Wotton & Kingswood ward (part – the parishes of Alderley, Hillesley & Tresham and Kingswood)   | Map 2         |
| 12 Minchinhampton       | 2                     | Minchinhampton ward (part – Brimscombe, North and South parish wards of Minchinhampton parish)   | Map 2         |
| 13 Nailsworth           | 3                     | <i>Unchanged</i> Nailsworth ward (the parishes of Horsley and Nailsworth)  | Map 2         |
| 14 Over Stroud          | 1                     | Painswick ward (part – Pitchcombe parish); Randwick ward (part – the proposed Randwick parish ward of Randwick parish); Whiteshill ward (Whiteshill & Ruscombe parish) | Map A3        |
| 15 Painswick            | 2                     | Painswick ward (part – Cranham, Miserden and Painswick parishes)   | Map 2         |

| <b>Ward name</b>     | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>  | <b>Map reference</b> |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 16 Rodborough        | 2                            | Rodborough ward (part – North, South and West parish wards of Rodborough parish)  | Map A4               |
| 17 Severn            | 2                            | Cambridge ward (part – Slimbridge parish); Parklands ward (part – the parishes of Moreton Valence and Whitminster); Severn ward (the parishes of Arlingham, Frampton on Severn and Frethern with Saul)  | Map 2                |
| 18 Stonehouse        | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> Stonehouse ward (Stonehouse parish)  | Map 2                |
| 19 Stroud East       | 2                            | Central ward (part – part of Central parish ward of Stroud parish); Trinity ward (part – part of Slade and Trinity parish wards of Stroud parish)   | Large map            |
| 20 Stroud North      | 2                            | Trinity ward (part – part of Slade parish ward of Stroud parish); Uplands ward (part – parts of Uplands and Valley parish wards of Stroud parish)   | Large map            |
| 21 Stroud West       | 2                            | Central ward (part – part of Central parish ward of Stroud parish); Trinity ward (part – part of Trinity parish ward of Stroud parish); Uplands ward (part – Farmhill and Paganhill parish wards and parts of Uplands and Valley parish wards of Stroud parish) | Large map            |
| 22 The Stanleys      | 2                            | Eastington ward (part – Frocester parish); King’s Stanley ward (part – King’s Stanley parish); Leonard Stanley ward (Leonard Stanley parish)  | Map 2                |
| 23 Thrupp            | 1                            | Rodborough ward (part – the proposed Butterow parish ward of Rodborough parish); Thrupp ward (part – the proposed Thrupp parish ward of Thrupp parish)  | Maps A4 and A5       |
| 24 Upton St Leonards | 1                            | Parklands ward (part – Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon and Harescombe parishes); Upton St Leonards ward (Upton St Leonards parish)   | Map 2                |
| 25 Vale              | 1                            | Berkeley ward (part – Ham & Stone parish); Nibley ward (part – Stinchcombe parish); Vale ward (part – Alkington parish)   | Map 2                |
| 26 Woodchester       | 1                            | King’s Stanley ward (part – Woodchester parish); Minchinhampton ward (part – Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton parish)   | Map 2                |
| 27 Wotton-under-Edge | 3                            | Nibley ward (part – North Nibley parish); Wotton & Kingswood ward (part – Wotton-under-Edge parish)   | Map 2                |

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

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



Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Stroud

| Ward name               | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Berkeley              | 2                     | 3,324             | 1,662                             | -1                      | 3,377             | 1,689                             | -3                      |
| 2 Bisley                | 1                     | 1,807             | 1,807                             | 7                       | 1,870             | 1,870                             | 7                       |
| 3 Cainscross            | 3                     | 5,183             | 1,728                             | 3                       | 5,444             | 1,815                             | 4                       |
| 4 Cam East              | 2                     | 3,326             | 1,663                             | -1                      | 3,354             | 1,677                             | -4                      |
| 5 Cam West              | 2                     | 3,295             | 1,648                             | -2                      | 3,323             | 1,662                             | -5                      |
| 6 Chalford              | 3                     | 4,845             | 1,615                             | -4                      | 5,041             | 1,680                             | -4                      |
| 7 Coaley & Uley         | 1                     | 1,881             | 1,881                             | 12                      | 1,901             | 1,901                             | 9                       |
| 8 Dursley               | 3                     | 4,568             | 1,523                             | -9                      | 5,008             | 1,669                             | -4                      |
| 9 Eastington & Standish | 1                     | 1,534             | 1,534                             | -9                      | 1,595             | 1,595                             | -8                      |
| 10 Hardwicke            | 2                     | 3,223             | 1,612                             | -4                      | 3,463             | 1,732                             | -1                      |
| 11 Kingswood            | 1                     | 1,539             | 1,539                             | -9                      | 1,565             | 1,565                             | -10                     |
| 12 Minchinhampton       | 2                     | 3,524             | 1,762                             | 5                       | 3,596             | 1,798                             | 3                       |
| 13 Nailsworth           | 3                     | 4,950             | 1,650                             | -2                      | 5,154             | 1,718                             | -1                      |
| 14 Over Stroud          | 1                     | 1,693             | 1,693                             | 1                       | 1,706             | 1,706                             | -2                      |
| 15 Painswick            | 2                     | 3,269             | 1,635                             | -3                      | 3,371             | 1,686                             | -3                      |
| 16 Rodborough           | 2                     | 3,582             | 1,791                             | 6                       | 3,709             | 1,855                             | 6                       |
| 17 Severn               | 2                     | 3,564             | 1,782                             | 6                       | 3,633             | 1,817                             | 4                       |
| 18 Stonehouse           | 3                     | 5,432             | 1,811                             | 8                       | 5,779             | 1,926                             | 11                      |
| 19 Stroud East          | 2                     | 3,334             | 1,667                             | -1                      | 3,366             | 1,683                             | -3                      |
| 20 Stroud North         | 2                     | 3,358             | 1,679                             | 0                       | 3,445             | 1,723                             | -1                      |
| 21 Stroud West          | 2                     | 3,194             | 1,597                             | -5                      | 3,407             | 1,704                             | -2                      |
| 22 The Stanleys         | 2                     | 3,466             | 1,733                             | 3                       | 3,515             | 1,758                             | 1                       |

| Ward name            | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 23 Thrupp            | 1                     | 1,743             | 1,743                             | 4                       | 1,798             | 1,798                             | 3                       |
| 24 Upton St Leonards | 1                     | 1,801             | 1,801                             | 7                       | 1,941             | 1,941                             | 11                      |
| 25 Vale              | 1                     | 1,492             | 1,492                             | -11                     | 1,510             | 1,510                             | -13                     |
| 26 Woodchester       | 1                     | 1,800             | 1,800                             | 7                       | 1,831             | 1,831                             | 5                       |
| 27 Wotton-under-Edge | 3                     | 5,080             | 1,693                             | 1                       | 5,176             | 1,725                             | -1                      |
| <b>Totals</b>        | <b>51</b>             | <b>85,807</b>     | –                                 | –                       | <b>88,878</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>      | –                     | –                 | <b>1,682</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,743</b>                      | –                       |

Source: *Electorate figures are based on Stroud District Council's submission.*

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

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Stroud in Gloucestershire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the six districts in Gloucestershire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Stroud. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in March 1979 (Report No. 325). The electoral arrangements of Gloucestershire County Council were last reviewed in May 1982 (Report No. 424). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the District Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

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

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 2000/2001 PER programme, including the Gloucestershire districts, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000

which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities' electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our present *Guidance*.

12 Stage One began on 27 June 2000, when we wrote to Stroud District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Gloucestershire County Council, Gloucestershire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Gloucestershire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 2 October 2000.

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

14 Stage Three began on 9 January 2001 and will end on 5 March 2001. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 Stroud is bordered by the Gloucestershire districts of Forest of Dean to the west, Tewkesbury and Gloucester to the north, and Cotswold to the east. South Gloucestershire Unitary Authority is to the south. It covers an area of 45,318 hectares, and has a population of 108,000. The district includes the towns of Stroud and Dursley, with the Severn Vale to the west of the district and the Cotswold Hills to the east, and is bisected by the M5 motorway. The area is predominantly rural, and local industries include agriculture, the wool industry, light engineering and an inland estuarial port at Sharpness.

17 The district contains 52 parishes and is entirely parished.

18 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

19 The electorate of the district is 85,807 (February 2000). The Council presently has 55 members who are elected from 31 wards. Stroud is represented by seven members and Dursley is represented by three members. Nine of the wards are each represented by three councillors, six are each represented by two councillors and 16 are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Stroud District, with around 6 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments, the most notable increases being in Chalford and Cam wards (78 per cent and 42 per cent respectively). However, due to external boundary changes there has been a decrease in the electorate in Hardwicke, as a result of the transfer of Quedgeley parish to Gloucester City, and an increase in the electorate of Wotton & Kingswood ward as a result of the transfer of Hillesley & Tresham parish from Northavon District.

21 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,560 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,616 by the year 2005 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 19 of the 31 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, nine wards by more than 20 per cent and five wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Chalford ward where the councillor represents 48 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Stroud*



Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| Ward name            | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Berkeley           | 1                     | 2,097             | 2,097                             | 34                      | 2,160             | 2,160                             | 34                      |
| 2 Bisley             | 1                     | 1,807             | 1,807                             | 16                      | 1,870             | 1,870                             | 16                      |
| 3 Cainscross         | 3                     | 4,480             | 1,493                             | -4                      | 4,727             | 1,576                             | -2                      |
| 4 Cam                | 2                     | 3,997             | 1,999                             | 28                      | 4,033             | 2,017                             | 25                      |
| 5 Cambridge          | 1                     | 1,532             | 1,532                             | -2                      | 1,555             | 1,555                             | -4                      |
| 6 Central            | 1                     | 1,322             | 1,322                             | -15                     | 1,481             | 1,481                             | -8                      |
| 7 Chalford           | 2                     | 4,618             | 2,309                             | 48                      | 4,806             | 2,403                             | 49                      |
| 8 Dursley            | 3                     | 4,568             | 1,523                             | -2                      | 5,008             | 1,669                             | 3                       |
| 9 Eastington         | 1                     | 1,465             | 1,465                             | -6                      | 1,527             | 1,527                             | -6                      |
| 10 Hardwicke         | 2                     | 2,907             | 1,454                             | -7                      | 3,138             | 1,569                             | -3                      |
| 11 Hinton            | 1                     | 903               | 903                               | -42                     | 905               | 905                               | -44                     |
| 12 King's Stanley    | 2                     | 3,066             | 1,533                             | -2                      | 3,128             | 1,564                             | -3                      |
| 13 Leonard Stanley   | 1                     | 1,241             | 1,241                             | -20                     | 1,241             | 1,241                             | -23                     |
| 14 Minchinhampton    | 3                     | 4,281             | 1,427                             | -9                      | 4,364             | 1,455                             | -10                     |
| 15 Nailsworth        | 3                     | 4,950             | 1,650                             | 6                       | 5,154             | 1,718                             | 6                       |
| 16 Nibley            | 1                     | 1,006             | 1,006                             | -36                     | 1,012             | 1,012                             | -37                     |
| 17 Painswick         | 2                     | 3,489             | 1,745                             | 12                      | 3,593             | 1,797                             | 11                      |
| 18 Parklands         | 1                     | 1,716             | 1,716                             | 10                      | 1,768             | 1,768                             | 9                       |
| 19 Randwick          | 1                     | 1,183             | 1,183                             | -24                     | 1,206             | 1,206                             | -25                     |
| 20 Rodborough        | 3                     | 4,208             | 1,403                             | -10                     | 4,350             | 1,450                             | -10                     |
| 21 Severn            | 1                     | 1,939             | 1,939                             | 24                      | 1,970             | 1,970                             | 22                      |
| 22 Stonehouse        | 3                     | 5,432             | 1,811                             | 16                      | 5,779             | 1,926                             | 19                      |
| 23 Thrupp            | 1                     | 1,385             | 1,385                             | -11                     | 1,433             | 1,433                             | -11                     |
| 24 Trinity           | 3                     | 3,989             | 1,330                             | -15                     | 4,030             | 1,343                             | -17                     |
| 25 Uley              | 1                     | 1,248             | 1,248                             | -20                     | 1,258             | 1,258                             | -22                     |
| 26 Uplands           | 3                     | 4,575             | 1,525                             | -2                      | 4,707             | 1,569                             | -3                      |
| 27 Upton St Leonards | 1                     | 1,357             | 1,357                             | -13                     | 1,485             | 1,485                             | -8                      |

| Ward name             | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 28 Vale               | 1                     | 1,475             | 1,475                             | -5                      | 1,479             | 1,479                             | -8                      |
| 29 Whiteshill         | 1                     | 993               | 993                               | -36                     | 995               | 995                               | -38                     |
| 30 Woodfield          | 2                     | 2,624             | 1,312                             | -16                     | 2,644             | 1,322                             | -18                     |
| 31 Wotton & Kingswood | 3                     | 5,954             | 1,985                             | 27                      | 6,072             | 2,024                             | 25                      |
| <b>Totals</b>         | <b>55</b>             | <b>85,807</b>     | –                                 | –                       | <b>88,878</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>       | –                     | –                 | <b>1,560</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,616</b>                      | –                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Stroud District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Chalford ward were relatively under-represented by 48 per cent, while electors in Hinton ward were relatively over-represented by 42 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Stroud District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 11 representations during Stage One, including five district-wide schemes, three from the District Council and one each from Stroud Constituency Labour Party and Stroud Conservative Association, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission.

#### **Stroud District Council**

24 The District Council submitted three district-wide schemes, all of which proposed a council of 51 members, four fewer than at present. The first, known as Scheme 3, was developed by officers and was supported by one member; the second, known as the Administration's scheme, was developed by the Labour-led Administration Group and was supported by 20 members; the third, known as Councillor Priest's scheme, was developed by a Conservative member and was supported by 20 members.

25 Scheme 3 proposed 27 wards, with the boundaries of four wards remaining unchanged. This scheme proposed new parish warding for Randwick, Rodborough and Thrupp parishes, and revised warding for Cam and Stroud parishes. By 2005, all but three wards would have variances of 10 per cent or less. The Administration's scheme proposed 31 wards, with the boundaries of 11 wards remaining unchanged. The scheme strongly favoured single-member wards in rural areas, but proposed new parish warding for Chalford, Minchinhampton, Randwick and Rodborough parishes, and revised warding for Cam and Stroud parishes. By 2005, all but 11 wards would have variances of 10 per cent or less. Councillor Priest's scheme proposed 29 wards, with the boundaries of 11 wards remaining unchanged. The objective of this scheme was minimal change, reasoning that the existing arrangements provide a good reflection of communities and achieve effective local government. This scheme proposed new parish warding for Ham & Stone and Randwick parishes, and revised warding for Cam and Stroud parishes. By 2005, all but six wards would have variances of 10 per cent or less.

26 All three of the District Council's proposed schemes reflected proposals from Cam Parish Council and Stroud Town Council for their respective areas. The District Council had undertaken local consultation on two schemes, Scheme 1 and Scheme 2, one after the other, and stated that Scheme 3 was developed from Scheme 2 and "took account of as many representations as could be accommodated within the overall scheme". The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

## **Stroud Constituency Labour Party**

27 Stroud Constituency Labour Party (“the Labour Party”) submitted a similar proposal to the District Council’s Administration’s scheme, proposing 31 wards, of which 16 would be single-member wards. It stated that the majority of members considered single-member wards would “lead to greater accountability”, but accepted that, “in urban areas this is less satisfactory”. The Labour Party objected to Scheme 3, particularly proposals for multi-member wards in the rural areas, considering they would not provide for effective representation or recognise the identities of small communities. It argued that its proposals “do reflect what many parishes would actually like to see happen”. The Labour Party also proposed a system of biennial elections.

## **Stroud Conservative Association**

28 Stroud Conservative Association (“the Conservative Association”) stated its scheme proposed change “where numerically desirable and where constraints of community, geography and history allow”. The Conservative Association proposed 29 wards, with the boundaries of nine wards remaining unchanged. This scheme also proposed new parish warding for Ham & Stone and Randwick parishes, and revised warding for Cam and Stroud parishes. By 2005 all but six wards would have variances of 10 per cent or less. The Conservative Association proposed whole council elections every four years. The Conservative Association’s proposal is summarised at Appendix B.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

29 We received representations from six parish and town councils. Eastington Parish Council objected to the parish forming part of the existing Severn ward, and stated its preference to be linked with Frocester and Standish parishes. Horsley Parish Council proposed that the existing three-member Nailsworth ward be retained, and that a cycle of elections by thirds also be retained. Owlpen Parish Meeting, in reply to the District Council’s consultation, objected to the proposal to transfer the parish from Uley ward to North Nibley ward. Of the District Council’s two consultation schemes Pitchcombe Parish Council stated its preference for Scheme 1, while Uley Parish Council stated its preference for Scheme 2, with the condition that Owlpen be included in a ward with Uley. Uley Parish Council also proposed a cycle of biennial elections for the District Council.

30 Stroud Town Council proposed that the parish be served by six district councillors, one fewer than at present, representing (as first preference) three two-member wards, or six single-member wards, and 18 town councillors, one more than at present, representing six three-member parish wards. It also proposed a cycle of biennial elections for the District Council.

## **Other Representations**

31 We received a further two representations from a district councillor and a local resident. Councillor Read, member for Cainscross district ward and Slade parish ward, proposed that Stroud be served by six district councillors, one fewer than at present, representing six single-member wards, and 18 town councillors, one more than at present, representing six three-member

parish wards. He argued that single-member wards would improve “public understanding and interest in who represents them whilst also allowing councillors to be far more effective and efficient”. He also proposed that the District Council be elected as a whole every four years. A resident of Trinity ward proposed a reduction in the number of district councillors.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

32 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Stroud is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

33 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

34 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

35 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

36 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4 per cent from 85,807 to 88,878 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects most of the growth to be in Dursley ward (some 440 electors), although significant growth is also expected in Stonehouse ward. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

37 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the District Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

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

39 Stroud District Council presently has 55 members. The District Council, Stroud Conservative Association and Stroud Constituency Labour Party all proposed a council of 51 members, a decrease of four. The District Council stated that "there is no apparent evidence to support a contention that the size of the Council should be altered radically". Given this, the Council stated "due regard has been taken of the Commission's general assumption that the existing number of Councillors ... already secures effective and convenient local government". The Conservative Association stated "there is a general feeling" that the size of the council "could be reduced by this small amount".

40 A resident of Trinity ward argued "in view of voter apathy, a reduction in the total number of councillors ... would be a method of making both electors and elected sit up and take notice". The resident did not propose a specific council size.

41 We note that a local resident proposed a reduction in council size. We also note that there is consensus for a reduction of four amongst parties represented on the Council, Stroud Conservative Association and Stroud Constituency Labour Party. A council of 51 would provide the correct allocation of councillors across the district. Therefore, having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 51 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

42 Having proposed a council size of 51, we have carefully considered all district-wide schemes proposed at Stage One and have found that each would provide for some improvement in electoral equality by 2005.

43 From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our recommendations.

44 First, there is consensus that four wards, Bisley, Dursley, Nailsworth and Stonehouse remain unchanged. Second, there is general agreement that a new ward comprising the parishes of Coaley, Nympsfield, Owlpen and Uley be formed. Third, there is consensus that Randwick parish be warded so that part of the parish form a ward with Cainscross parish. Fourth, there is some agreement that Woodchester parish, together with Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton form a new ward. Finally, all schemes except that from the Conservative Association adopted proposals from Cam Parish Council and Stroud Town Council for their respective parishes.



45 No scheme provided particularly good evidence in relation to the extent to which they met the statutory criteria. However, we note that Scheme 3 would provide for the best levels of electoral equality, with no ward varying by more than 13 per cent by 2005. We have also noted that Scheme 3 was developed from an earlier consultation scheme, Scheme 2, taking into account “as many representations as could be accommodated within the overall scheme”. We consider therefore, that Scheme 3 would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. We have therefore decided to base our draft recommendations on Scheme 3. However, to improve electoral equality further we have decided to move away from the scheme in Cam and Stroud. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Stroud town (Central, Trinity and Uplands wards);
- (b) Cainscross, Chalford, King’s Stanley, Leonard Stanley, Minchinhampton, Rodborough, Stonehouse and Thrupp wards;
- (c) Bisley, Painswick, Randwick and Whiteshill wards;
- (d) Cambridge, Eastington, Hardwicke, Parklands, Severn and Upton St Leonards wards;
- (e) Cam, Dursley, Nailsworth, Uley and Woodfield wards;
- (f) Berkeley, Hinton, Nibley, Vale and Wotton & Kingswood wards.

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

### **Stroud town (Central, Trinity and Uplands wards)**

47 The principal urban area in Stroud district is centred on Stroud town, in the eastern part of the district. Stroud is the largest town in the district, and is the point where five valleys converge. The town area is represented by three district wards: Central ward is represented by a single member, while Trinity and Uplands wards are each represented by three members. The number of electors per councillor is 15 per cent below the district average in Central ward (8 per cent in 2005), 15 per cent below in Trinity ward (17 per cent in 2005) and 2 per cent below in Uplands ward (3 per cent in 2005).

48 We received five representations regarding Stroud town. All three of the District Council’s schemes proposed that Stroud town be represented by three district wards, as at present. All three wards would be represented by two members, resulting in a reduction of one to six members for the town. The District Council proposed that Central ward be extended, so that the area around Farmhill Lane and Stratford Road, including the Leisure Centre, would be transferred from Uplands ward. Uplands ward would be extended to the south, to include parts of Central and Trinity wards, so that the boundary follow Locking Hill and Ryleaze Road south to Parliament Street, then run east along the backs of properties on Summer Street to the parish boundary. The District Council further proposed that the western boundary of Trinity ward be modified, so that Castle Rise, currently split between Central and Trinity wards, be transferred to Central ward. Finally, the District Council proposed that Central, Trinity and Uplands wards be renamed Stroud West, Stroud East and Stroud North respectively. Under the District Council’s proposals for Stroud the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average in

Stroud East ward (1 per cent in 2005), 7 per cent below in Stroud North ward (8 per cent in 2005) and 2 per cent below in Stroud West ward (equal to the average in 2005).

49 The Labour Party stated “we wish to support the proposals put forward by Stroud Town Council”.

50 The Conservative Association proposed that Stroud be represented by two district wards, one fewer than at present. Both wards would be represented by three members, resulting in a reduction of one to six members for the area. It proposed that Uplands ward remain unchanged, stating “the polling districts of Stroud Valley, Farmhill, Stroud Uplands and Paganhill all enjoy a natural affinity in geographical and social terms”. It proposed that Trinity ward be combined with the existing Central ward, noting that under the existing arrangements both wards are over-represented. Under the Conservative Association’s proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be 6 per cent above the district average in Trinity ward and 10 per cent below the average in Uplands ward. Existing-year electorates were not provided.

51 Stroud Town Council proposed that Stroud town be represented by six district councillors, a reduction of one, in a uniform pattern of three two-member wards. As a second preference, it proposed six single-member district wards. It proposed that the Town Council be represented by six three-member wards, an increase of one. Based on the District Council’s proposed district wards, under the Town Council’s proposals Stroud West ward would comprise Central and Farmhill & Paganhill parish wards, Stroud East ward would comprise Slade and Trinity parish wards, and Stroud North ward would comprise Uplands and Valley parish wards. Under the Town Council’s preferred three ward option the number of electors per councillor would be as proposed by the District Council. Under its six ward option the number of electors per councillor would be 12 per cent below the district average in Central ward (4 per cent above in 2005), 27 per cent above in Farmhill & Paganhill ward (6 per cent in 2005), 32 per cent above in Slade ward (equal to the average in 2005), 7 per cent above in Trinity ward (equal to the average in 2005), 3 per cent below in Valley ward (8 per cent in 2005) and 45 per cent below in Uplands ward (2 per cent in 2005).

52 Councillor Read, member for Cainscross district ward and Slade parish ward, proposed that the Stroud area be served by six district councillors, representing six single-member wards, and 18 town councillors, representing six three-member wards. Boundaries would be as proposed by Stroud Town Council. Councillor Read argued that “one single councillor representing a single community would be easy to understand for local residents and provide direct accountability”.

53 We have carefully considered all the representations we have received regarding Stroud town. We have noted that the District Council, the Labour Party and Stroud Town Council (as its preference) proposed that Stroud be represented by two three-member wards, while the Conservative Association proposed two three-member wards and Councillor Read and Stroud Town Council (as second option) proposed six single-member wards. We have also noted that there is consensus that Stroud Town Council be represented by 18 members, representing six three-member wards. Given this consensus, and the fact that the Conservative Association’s proposals would utilise significantly different boundaries, we have compared the three two-member wards option and the six single-member wards option. We note Councillor Read’s

arguments in favour of single-member wards, but note the consensus on the District Council for three two-member wards and Stroud Town Council's preference for such a warding pattern and therefore propose adopting the District Council's proposals for Stroud as part of our draft recommendations, subject to two minor amendments.

54 We note that by 2005 Stroud East and Stroud West wards would have variances from the average of no more than 1 per cent, but Stroud North ward would be over-represented by 8 per cent. We consider that further improvements to electoral equality could be made in Stroud without adversely affecting community identities in the area, and therefore propose that the area around Bisley Old Road, Nouncell Cross and Middle Hill be transferred to Stroud North ward, and that the area around Lovedays Mead and West Grange Court be transferred from Stroud West ward to Stroud North ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Stroud East ward (3 per cent in 2005), equal to the average in Stroud North ward (1 per cent below in 2005) and 5 per cent below in Stroud West ward (2 per cent in 2005). Our proposals for boundaries in Stroud town are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Cainscross, Chalford, King's Stanley, Leonard Stanley, Minchinhampton, Rodborough, Stonehouse and Thrupp wards**

55 The seven wards of Cainscross, Chalford, Leonard Stanley, Minchinhampton, Rodborough, Stonehouse and Thrupp each contain the parish of the same name, while King's Stanley ward contains King's Stanley and Woodchester parishes. These wards run horizontally across the district and circle Stroud town to the south. Leonard Stanley and Thrupp wards are each represented by a single member, Chalford and King's Stanley wards are each served by two members, while Cainscross, Minchinhampton, Rodborough and Stonehouse wards are each represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 4 per cent below the district average in Cainscross ward (2 per cent in 2005), 48 per cent above in Chalford ward (49 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent below in King's Stanley ward (3 per cent in 2005), 20 per cent below in Leonard Stanley ward (23 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Minchinhampton ward (10 per cent in 2005), 10 per cent below in Rodborough ward (unchanged in 2005), 16 per cent above in Stonehouse ward (19 per cent in 2005) and 11 per cent below in Thrupp ward (unchanged in 2005).

56 At Stage One the District Council proposed three different schemes for this area: Scheme 3, the Administration's scheme and Councillor Priest's scheme. The District Council proposed in Scheme 3 that Chalford ward be extended to the west to include that part of Thrupp ward east of Toadsmoor Road and north of London Road, and that the ward be represented by three members, one more than at present. It proposed that Thrupp ward be amended to the west, so that that part of Rodborough ward east of Butterow Hill, and the properties on Bownham Park, currently in Minchinhampton ward, be included in Thrupp ward. The remainder of Rodborough ward would be represented by two members, a decrease of one. Cainscross ward would be extended in the north to include that part of Randwick ward bounded by Redhouse Lane and Park End Road. It proposed that Stonehouse ward remain unchanged, arguing that the projected electorate for Stonehouse ward was only "just over 10 per cent above the average".

57 The District Council also proposed that Frocester parish, currently linked with Eastington parish, be combined with Leonard Stanley and King's Stanley parishes in a new two-member ward, to be named The Stanleys. Woodchester parish would form a new Woodchester ward, together with Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton parish, to be served by a single member. The remainder of Minchinhampton ward would be represented by two members, one fewer than at present. Under Scheme 3 the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average in Cainscross ward (4 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent below in Chalford ward (unchanged in 2005), 4 per cent above in Minchinhampton ward (2 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above in Rodborough ward (unchanged in 2005), 8 per cent above in Stonehouse ward (11 per cent in 2005), 3 per cent above in The Stanleys ward (1 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above in Thrupp ward (unchanged in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Woodchester ward (5 per cent in 2005).

58 In the Administration's scheme the District Council proposed that Chalford ward be split into three single-member wards, to be named Chalford-Brownhill, Chalford-Manor and Chalford-Village. It proposed that Thrupp ward be extended to include part of Brimscombe parish ward of Minchinhampton parish, and that part of Rodborough ward be transferred to Minchinhampton ward. The remainder of Rodborough ward would be represented by two members, one fewer than at present. The District Council proposed that part of Randwick parish be transferred to Cainscross ward, and that Stonehouse ward remain unchanged. It further proposed that the parishes of Leonard Stanley and King's Stanley form a new two-member The Stanleys ward. It proposed a new Woodchester ward, containing Woodchester parish and Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton parish, to be represented by a single member. Minchinhampton ward, to be represented by two members, would be modified so that part of Rodborough parish would be included in the ward, and part of Minchinhampton parish would be transferred to Thrupp ward, as described earlier. Under the Administration's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent below the district average in Cainscross ward (6 per cent in 2005), 26 per cent below in Chalford-Brownhill ward (25 per cent in 2005), 3 per cent below in Chalford-Manor ward (2 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent above in Chalford-Village ward (2 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above the district average in Minchinhampton ward (5 per cent in 2005), 13 per cent above in Rodborough ward (unchanged in 2005), 8 per cent above in Stonehouse ward (11 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent below in The Stanleys ward (4 per cent in 2005), equal to the average in Thrupp ward (unchanged in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Woodchester ward (5 per cent in 2005).

59 The District Council proposed, in Councillor Priest's scheme, that the boundaries of Chalford ward remain unchanged, but that it be represented by three members, one more than at present. It proposed that Thrupp ward be included in an enlarged Minchinhampton ward, represented by three members, as at present. Rodborough ward would be modified to include Woodchester parish, and would be represented by three members, as at present. Cainscross ward would be extended to include part of Randwick parish, and Stonehouse ward would remain unchanged. It also proposed a modified two-member King's Stanley ward, comprising the parishes of King's Stanley and Leonard Stanley. Under Councillor Priest's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Cainscross ward (1 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Chalford ward (8 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent below in King's Stanley ward (4 per cent in 2005), 12 per cent above in Minchinhampton ward (11 per cent in 2005), 3

per cent above in Rodborough ward (unchanged in 2005) and 8 per cent above in Stonehouse ward (11 per cent in 2005).

60 Stroud Labour Party proposed a three-member Cainscross ward, single-member Chalford-Brownhill, Chalford-Manor and Chalford-Village wards, two-member Minchinhampton and Rodborough wards, a three-member Stonehouse ward, a two-member The Stanleys ward and single-member Thrupp ward, with boundaries identical to those proposed under the District Council's Administration scheme. It also proposed that the Administration's Woodchester ward be named Woodchester & Amberley.

61 The Conservative Association proposed that the boundaries of Chalford ward remain unchanged, but it be represented by three members, an increase of one, that Rodborough ward be combined with Thrupp ward to form an extended Rodborough ward, and that Cainscross ward be enlarged to include part of Randwick parish. Stonehouse ward would remain unchanged. It also proposed that King's Stanley parish be transferred to Leonard Stanley ward, to be renamed The Stanleys, which would be represented by two members, an increase of one. Woodchester parish would be combined with Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton, forming a new single-member Woodchester ward, while the remainder of Minchinhampton ward would be represented by two members, one fewer than at present. Under the Conservative Association's proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be equal to the district average in Cainscross ward, 8 per cent below in Chalford ward, 2 per cent above in Minchinhampton ward, 11 per cent above in Rodborough ward, 11 per cent above in Stonehouse ward, 4 per cent below in The Stanleys ward and 5 per cent above in Woodchester ward. Existing-year electorates were not provided.

62 We have carefully considered all the proposals for this area. We note that all three of the schemes submitted by the District Council, and those schemes submitted by the Labour Party and Conservative Association, proposed that Stonehouse ward remain unchanged. While we note that this would retain a variance from the average of 11 per cent by 2005, we consider that Stonehouse is relatively separated from the Stroud urban area, and alternative configurations would not reflect the statutory criteria as well. We are therefore retaining Stonehouse ward unchanged. We also note the general consensus that a new Lower Westrip parish ward of Randwick parish be combined with Cainscross parish to form an enlarged Cainscross ward. Officers from the Commission having visited the area, we consider that those boundaries proposed in Scheme 3 would provide for good electoral equality while utilising strong boundaries, and therefore propose adopting the District Council's Scheme 3 proposals for Cainscross ward as part of our draft recommendations. We have examined the four options for the Rodborough, Thrupp and Chalford areas and consider that the District Council's Scheme 3 provides for the best balance between the need to secure electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

63 However, we note that in Scheme 3 the District Council proposed that the Bownham Park area of Minchinhampton parish be transferred to Thrupp ward. This would require the creation of a parish ward for 41 electors. We do not consider that this would best reflect the statutory criteria, and therefore propose that these electors remain in Minchinhampton ward.

64 We note that all schemes proposed that King's Stanley and Leonard Stanley be placed in a ward together, and we consider that not only do these two parishes have a community of interest, they also have good links with Frocester parish. We are therefore adopting Scheme 3's The Stanleys ward as part of our draft recommendations. We also consider that Woodchester and Amberley parish ward of Minchinhampton share a community of interest, and given our proposals for Thrupp ward, propose adopting a new Woodchester ward, and a two-member Minchinhampton ward as part of our draft recommendations, as proposed in Scheme 3 and by the Conservative Association.

65 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average in Cainscross ward (4 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent below in Chalford ward (unchanged in 2005), 5 per cent above in Minchinhampton ward (3 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above in Rodborough ward (unchanged in 2005), 8 per cent above in Stonehouse ward (11 per cent in 2005), 3 per cent above in The Stanleys ward (1 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent above in Thrupp ward (3 per cent in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Woodchester ward (5 per cent in 2005). Our proposals for these wards are illustrated on Map 2, Maps A3–A5 and the large map at the back of the report.

### **Bisley, Painswick, Randwick and Whiteshill wards**

66 The three single-member wards of Bisley, Randwick and Whiteshill and the two-member Painswick ward encircle Stroud town to the north, and border Cotswolds district to the east. Bisley ward contains the parish of Bisley-with-Lypiatt, Painswick ward contains the parishes of Cranham, Miserden, Painswick and Pitchcombe, Randwick ward contains the parish of the same name, and Whiteshill ward contains Whiteshill & Ruscombe parish. The number of electors per councillor is 16 per cent above the district average in Bisley ward (unchanged in 2005), 12 per cent above in Painswick ward (11 per cent in 2005), 24 per cent below in Randwick ward (25 per cent in 2005) and 36 per cent below in Whiteshill ward (38 per cent in 2005).

67 We received submissions regarding these wards from the District Council, the Labour Party, the Conservative Association and Pitchcombe Parish Council. At Stage One the District Council proposed three different schemes for this area: Scheme 3, the Administration's scheme and Councillor Priest's scheme. The District Council proposed in Scheme 3 that Randwick parish be warded into two: Lower Westrip parish ward, to be combined with Cainscross ward, as described earlier, and Randwick parish ward, the majority of the parish, to be combined with Whiteshill ward and Pitcombe parish, currently part of Painswick ward, in a new single-member Over Stroud ward. The two-member Painswick ward would be otherwise unchanged, and Bisley ward would remain as at present. Under Scheme 3 the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the district average in Bisley ward (unchanged in 2005), 1 per cent above in Over Stroud ward (2 per cent in 2005) and 3 per cent below in Painswick ward (unchanged in 2005).

68 In the Administration's scheme the District Council proposed that Randwick parish be warded, so that part of the parish be transferred to Cainscross ward, as described above. The remainder of Randwick parish would be combined with Whiteshill ward in a new single-member Randwick & Whiteshill ward. Painswick and Bisley wards would both remain unchanged. Under the Administration's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the

district average in Bisley ward (unchanged in 2005), 4 per cent above in Painswick ward (3 per cent in 2005) and 17 per cent above in Randwick & Whiteshill ward (14 per cent in 2005).

69 The District Council proposed, in Councillor Priest's scheme, that a new Lower Westrip parish ward of Randwick parish form part of an enlarged Cainscross ward, as described earlier. Randwick Village ward, the remainder of the parish, would be linked with Whiteshill ward, forming a new single-member Randwick & Whiteshill ward. The two-member Painswick ward and the single-member Bisley ward would remain as at present. Under Councillor Priest's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the district average in Bisley ward (unchanged in 2005), 4 per cent above in Painswick ward (3 per cent in 2005) and 2 per cent above in Randwick & Whiteshill ward (equal to the average in 2005).

70 The Labour Party proposed a single-member Bisley ward, a two-member Painswick ward and a single-member Randwick & Whiteshill ward, with boundaries identical to those proposed under the District Council's Administration scheme.

71 The Conservative Association proposed that part of Randwick parish be transferred to Cainscross ward, as described earlier. The remainder of the parish would be linked to Whiteshill ward, forming a new single-member Over Stroud ward. It proposed no change for Painswick ward and Bisley ward. Under the Conservative Association's proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be 7 per cent above the district average in Bisley ward, 2 per cent below in Over Stroud ward and 3 per cent above in Painswick ward. Existing-year electorates were not provided.

72 Pitchcombe Parish Council stated that, with regard to Stroud's two consultation schemes, it preferred Scheme 1. Under this proposal Pitchcombe parish would be placed with the parishes of Painswick and Miserden in a two-member ward.

73 We note the consensus that Bisley ward remain unchanged, and given the good levels of electoral equality that would be retained, are adopting this proposal as part of our draft recommendations. The District Council also proposed, in the Administration's and Councillor Priest's schemes, that Painswick ward remain unchanged. However, we note that, although this would result in good levels of electoral equality in Painswick ward, as a consequence of our proposals for Cainscross ward, the retention of Painswick ward would result in an imbalance of 12 per cent below the district average (rising to 15 per cent by 2005), in the new ward containing Randwick Village and Whiteshill & Ruscombe parish. We cannot look at any area of the district in isolation, moreover we must seek to achieve electoral equality across the district. We therefore consider that the District Council's Scheme 3 proposal for a new Over Stroud ward and an amended Painswick ward would provide for the best balance between the need to secure electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

74 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the district average in Bisley ward (unchanged in 2005), 1 per cent above in Over Stroud ward (2 per cent in 2005) and 3 per cent below in Painswick ward (unchanged in 2005).

## **Cambridge, Eastington, Hardwicke, Parklands, Severn and Upton St Leonards wards**

75 The five single-member wards of Cambridge, Eastington, Parklands, Severn and Upton St Leonards and the two-member Hardwicke ward are situated in the far north of the district, and are bounded by River Severn to the west and Tewkesbury district and Gloucester city to the north. Cambridge ward comprises Coaley and Slimbridge parishes; Eastington ward contains the parishes of Eastington and Frocester; Hardwicke ward contains the parishes of Elmore, Hardwicke and Longney; Parklands ward contains the parishes of Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon, Harescombe, Haresfield, Moreton Valance, Standish and Whitminster; Severn ward comprises Arlingham, Frampton on Severn and Frethern with Saul parishes; and Upton St Leonards ward contains the parish of the same name.

76 The number of electors per councillor is 2 per cent below the district average in Cambridge ward (4 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent below in Eastington ward (unchanged in 2005), 7 per cent below in Hardwicke ward (3 per cent in 2005), 10 per cent above in Parklands ward (9 per cent in 2005), 24 per cent above in Severn ward (22 per cent in 2005) and 13 per cent below in Upton St Leonards ward (8 per cent in 2005).

77 At Stage One Stroud District Council proposed three options for this area. Its Scheme 3 proposed that Upton St Leonards ward be combined with the parishes of Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon and Harescombe to form an enlarged single-member Upton St Leonards ward. It stated that this proposed ward could achieve even further improvements to electoral equality if Harescombe parish were excluded from the ward. However, it argued that “the nucleus of the village of Brookthorpe is split by the parish boundary with Harescombe”, and therefore these parishes should not be split. The District Council further proposed that the two-member Hardwicke ward should be extended to include Haresfield parish, and that Standish parish be linked to Eastington parish, forming a new single-member Eastington & Standish ward. Frocester parish, currently part of Eastington ward, would be transferred to a new ward containing King’s Stanley and Leonard Stanley parishes. Moreton Valance and Whitminster parishes, currently part of Parklands ward, and Slimbridge parish, currently part of Cambridge ward, would be transferred to an extended single-member Severn ward. Under Scheme 3 the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent below the district average in Eastington & Standish ward (8 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent below in Hardwicke ward (1 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above in Severn ward (4 per cent in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Upton St Leonards ward (11 per cent in 2005).

78 The District Council’s Administration scheme proposed that Upton St Leonards, Parklands, Hardwicke, Severn and Eastington wards remain unchanged. It proposed that Slimbridge parish, currently part of Cambridge ward, be linked with Hinton ward to form a new Hinton & Slimbridge ward, to be served by a single member. Under the Administration’s scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 13 per cent below the district average in Eastington ward (12 per cent in 2005), 14 per cent below in Hardwicke ward (10 per cent in 2005), 7 per cent above in Hinton & Slimbridge ward (4 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent above in Parklands ward (1 per cent in 2005), 15 per cent above in Severn ward (13 per cent in 2005) and 19 per cent below in Upton St Leonards ward (15 per cent in 2005).



79 In the third option, Councillor Priest's scheme, the District Council proposed no change for the wards of Upton St Leonards, Parklands, Hardwicke, Severn and Eastington. It proposed that Slimbridge parish be combined with Hinton ward, forming a new single-member Hinton & Slimbridge ward. Under Councillor Priest's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 13 per cent below the district average in Eastington ward (12 per cent in 2005), 14 per cent below in Hardwicke ward (10 per cent in 2005), 7 per cent above in Hinton & Slimbridge ward (4 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent above in Parklands ward (1 per cent in 2005), 15 per cent above in Severn ward (13 per cent in 2005) and 19 per cent below in Upton St Leonards ward (15 per cent in 2005).

80 The Labour Party proposed a single-member Eastington ward, a two-member Hardwicke ward, and single-member Hinton & Slimbridge, Parklands, Severn and Upton St Leonards wards, with boundaries identical to those proposed under the District Council's Administration scheme.

81 The Conservative Association proposed that Upton St Leonards ward be combined with Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon parish in a new single-member Upton ward. The remainder of Parklands ward would be represented by a single-member, as at present. Hardwicke, Severn and Eastington wards would remain unchanged. A new Slimbridge & Hinton ward, to be represented by a single member, would be formed, comprising the parishes of the same name. Under the Conservative Association's proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be 12 per cent below the district average in Eastington ward, 10 per cent below in Hardwicke ward, 13 per cent below in Parklands ward, 13 per cent above in Severn ward, 4 per cent above in Slimbridge & Hinton ward and equal to the average in Upton ward. Existing-year electorates were not provided.

82 Eastington Parish Council expressed a preference for being linked with the parishes of Frocester and Standish in a single-member ward. Alternatively, the Council proposed a single-member ward comprising Eastington and Standish parishes. The Council objected to its place in the existing Severn ward, considering it did not share "common ground" with the other parishes.

83 We note that the District Council's Administration and Councillor Priest schemes, the Labour Party and the Conservative Association, proposed that most of the northern and western part of the district remain unchanged. However, this would fail to address imbalances of up to 24 per cent above the district average in this area. We note that the District Council's Scheme 3 would provide for improved electoral equality in this area, while appearing to have regard to communities, in particular adopting Eastington Parish Council's proposal to create a new Eastington & Standish ward and retaining Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon and Harescombe parishes in a ward together, and therefore we are adopting the District Council's Scheme 3 for this area as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent below the district average in Eastington & Standish ward (8 per cent in 2005), 4 per cent below in Hardwicke ward (1 per cent in 2005), 6 per cent above the district average in Severn ward (4 per cent in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Upton St Leonards ward (11 per cent in 2005). Our proposals for Eastington & Standish, Hardwicke, Severn and Upton St Leonards wards are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Cam, Dursley, Nailsworth, Uley and Woodfield wards**

84 Cam and Woodfield wards are each represented by two members and together comprise Cam parish, while the three member Dursley ward contains the parish of the same name, the three-member Nailsworth ward contains the parishes of Horsley and Nailsworth and the single-member Uley ward comprises Nympsfield, Owlpen and Uley parishes. These five wards are situated to the west of the M5 and north of Cotswold district. The number of electors per councillor is 28 per cent above the district average in Cam ward (25 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent below in Dursley ward (3 per cent above in 2005), 6 per cent above in Nailsworth ward (unchanged in 2005), 20 per cent below in Uley ward (22 per cent in 2005) and 16 per cent below in Woodfield ward (18 per cent in 2005).

85 At Stage One we received representations regarding these wards from the District Council, the Labour Party, the Conservative Association, Horsley Parish Council, Owlpen Parish Meeting and Uley Parish Council. All three of the District Council's schemes proposed that Dursley and Nailsworth wards remain unchanged. There was also consensus that Cam parish be re-warded to form two new two-member wards, to be named Cam East and Cam West, a proposal originating from the Parish Council. The boundary between the two wards would follow Dursley Road west, then run north along the backs of properties on Springfield and Meadow Vale to Cam Pitch. It would then run west between Hague Avenue and Little Quillet Court, then follow the backs of properties on Larkrise north, then south along the backs of properties on May Evans Close, returning to Cam Pitch, and continuing generally northwards to the parish boundary. Finally in this area, all the District Council's schemes proposed a new single-member Coaley & Uley ward, comprising Coaley parish and Uley ward. Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent below the district average in Cam East ward (8 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent above in Cam West ward (equal to the average in 2005), 12 per cent above in Coaley & Uley ward (9 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Dursley ward (4 per cent in 2005) and 2 per cent below in Nailsworth ward (1 per cent in 2005).

86 The Labour Party proposed a single-member Coaley & Uley ward and three-member Dursley and Nailsworth wards, with boundaries identical to those proposed by the District Council. It also stated "we wish to support the proposals put forward by Cam parish".

87 The Conservative Association proposed that Cam be represented by four single-member wards, to be named Cam Central, Cam Lower, Cam Upper and Cam Woodfield. It proposed that Dursley and Nailsworth wards be retained, and that Coaley parish be transferred to Uley ward, forming a new single-member Cotswold Edge ward. Under the Conservative Association's proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be 7 per cent below the district average in Cam Central ward, 5 per cent below in Cam Lower ward, 10 per cent below in Cam Upper ward, 3 per cent above in Cam Woodfield ward, 9 per cent above in Cotswold Edge ward, 4 per cent below in Dursley ward and 1 per cent below in Nailsworth ward. Existing-year electorates were not supplied.

88 Horsley Parish Council proposed that the existing three-member Nailsworth ward be retained, considering it to provide for good electoral equality while reflecting local communities. Owlpen Parish Meeting objected to the District Council's consultation proposal to transfer the

parish to a new Wotton-under-Edge/North Nibley ward, and stated its preference to remain in Uley ward. Uley Parish Council stated its preference for the District Council's consultation Scheme 2, specifically that a new Coaley, Nympsfield & Uley ward be formed. However, it proposed that Owlpen also be included in this ward.

89 We have carefully considered the representations received regarding wards in this area. We note that, as a consequence of representations received, the District Council amended its proposed Coaley, Nympsfield & Uley ward to include Owlpen parish, as requested by Owlpen Parish Meeting and Uley Parish Council. Given the general consensus for this ward, we propose adopting the District Council's Coaley & Uley ward as part of our draft recommendations. We also note the general support for the retention of Dursley and Nailsworth wards, and given the good electoral equality which would be retained, are adopting this proposal as part of our draft recommendations. Regarding Cam parish, we note that while the District Council and the Labour Party proposed two two-member wards for Cam, the Conservative Association proposed four single-member wards. Given that the District Council's proposals are the result of local consultation, involving the parish council, and the Conservative Association have not provided any evidence to show how its proposal better reflects the statutory criteria, we propose adopting the District Council's Cam East and Cam West wards as part of our draft recommendations, subject to a minor amendment.

90 We note that by 2005 Cam East would be over-represented by 8 per cent, while Cam West would be equal to the district average. We consider that a further improvement to electoral equality in Cam could be achieved, while providing a clearer boundary between the two wards. We therefore propose that the area bounded by The Hawthorns and High Furlong be transferred to Cam East ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Cam East ward (4 per cent in 2005), 2 per cent below in Cam West ward (5 per cent below in 2005), 12 per cent above in Coaley & Uley ward (9 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Dursley ward (4 per cent in 2005) and 2 per cent below in Nailsworth ward (1 per cent in 2005). Our proposals for these five wards are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

### **Berkeley, Hinton, Nibley, Vale and Wotton & Kingswood wards**

91 The four single-member wards of Berkeley, Hinton, Nibley and Vale, and the three-member Wotton & Kingswood ward are situated in the south-west of the district, and are bordered by the River Severn to the west and South Gloucestershire Unitary Authority to the south. Berkeley ward contains the parishes of Berkeley and Ham & Stone, Hinton ward contains the parish of the same name, Nibley ward consists of the parishes of North Nibley and Stinchcombe, Vale ward contains Alkington and Hamfallow parishes and Wotton & Kingswood ward contains the parishes of Alderley, Hillesley & Tresham, Kingswood and Wotton-under-Edge. The number of electors per councillor is 34 per cent above the district average in Berkeley ward (unchanged in 2005), 42 per cent below in Hinton ward (44 per cent in 2005), 36 per cent below in Nibley ward (37 per cent in 2005), 5 per cent below in Vale ward (8 per cent in 2005) and 27 per cent above in Wotton & Kingswood ward (25 per cent in 2005).

92 The District Council proposed three different schemes for this area. It proposed in Scheme 3 that Hinton ward be combined with Berkeley and Hamfallow parishes to form a modified Berkeley ward, to be represented by two members. The District Council proposed an amended Vale ward, comprising of Alkington, Ham & Stone and Stinchcombe parishes, which would be represented by a single member, as at present. It noted that its proposed Vale ward would be over-represented, but argued that “the pattern of adjacent parishes does not permit a workable alternative”. North Nibley parish would be linked with Wotton-under-Edge parish, forming a new Wotton-under-Edge ward. Finally in this area, the remaining parishes of Wotton & Kingswood ward (Alderley, Hillesley & Tresham and Kingswood parishes) would comprise a new single-member Kingswood ward. The District Council argued that the variance from the average in Kingswood is “small”, and the pattern of parishes “does not permit a reasonable alternative”. Under Scheme 3 the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Berkeley ward (3 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Kingswood ward (10 per cent in 2005), 11 per cent below in Vale ward (13 per cent in 2005) and 1 per cent above in Wotton-under-Edge ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

93 In the Administration’s scheme the District Council proposed that Hinton ward be combined with Slimbridge parish, as described earlier. It proposed that Ham & Stone and Hamfallow parishes be combined to form a new single-member Ham ward. Berkeley ward would then comprise the parish of the same name only, and would be represented by a single member, as at present. The single-member Vale ward would be modified to comprise the parishes of Alkington, North Nibley and Stinchcombe. The boundaries of Wotton & Kingswood ward would remain unchanged, but it would be renamed Wotton. Under the Administration’s scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 11 per cent below the district average in Berkeley ward (12 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Ham ward (11 per cent in 2005), 8 per cent below in Vale ward (11 per cent in 2005) and 18 per cent above in Wotton ward (16 per cent in 2005).

94 Finally, the District Council proposed in Councillor Priest’s scheme that Hinton ward be combined with Slimbridge parish, as described earlier. It proposed that Stone parish ward of Ham & Stone parish be transferred from Berkeley ward to Vale ward. The single-member Berkeley and Vale wards would otherwise remain unchanged. North Nibley ward would be combined with Wotton-under-Edge parish, to form a new three-member Wotton ward. The remainder of Wotton & Kingswood ward would be renamed Kingswood, and would be served by a single member. Under Councillor Priest’s scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Berkeley ward (2 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Kingswood ward (10 per cent in 2005), 14 per cent above in Vale ward (11 per cent in 2005) and 7 per cent above in Wotton ward (6 per cent in 2005).

95 The Labour Party proposed single-member Berkeley and Vale wards, and a three-member Wotton ward, with boundaries identical to those proposed under the District Council’s Administration scheme. Additionally, it proposed that the Administration’s Ham ward be named Hamfallow, Ham & Stone.

96 The Conservative Association proposed that Slimbridge parish be transferred to Hinton ward, forming a new Slimbridge & Hinton ward, as described earlier. Vale ward would be extended to include Stone parish ward of Ham & Stone parish. The single-member Berkeley ward would be

otherwise unchanged. It proposed that North Nibley ward and Wotton-under-Edge parish be combined to form a new three-member Wotton & Nibley ward. The remainder of Wotton & Kingswood ward would be represented by a single member, and would be named Kingswood. Under the Conservative Association's proposals the number of electors per councillor by 2005 would be 2 per cent below the district average in Berkeley ward, 10 per cent below in Kingswood ward, 11 per cent above in Vale ward and 4 per cent above in Wotton & Nibley ward.

97 We note that the District Council's Scheme 3 and Councillor Priest schemes, together with the Conservative Association, proposed that the parishes of Alderley, Hillesley & Tresham and Kingswood form a new single-member Kingswood ward, while the District Council's Administration scheme proposed that the existing Wotton & Kingswood ward remain unchanged. We do not consider that under-representation of 18 per cent can be justified, given that no significant evidence was provided to justify such an imbalance, and therefore we are adopting the District Council's Kingswood ward as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that the District Council's Scheme 3 provides a good balance between the need to secure electoral equality and the statutory criteria in its proposed Berkeley, Wotton-under-Edge and Vale wards, particularly regarding its proposals for Ham & Stone parish. We consider that proposals to split the parish between two wards would not best reflect local communities, and are therefore proposing to adopt Berkeley, Wotton-under-Edge and Vale wards, as proposed in Scheme 3, as part of our draft recommendations.

98 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Berkeley ward (3 per cent in 2005), 9 per cent below in Kingswood ward (10 per cent in 2005), 11 per cent below in Vale ward (13 per cent in 2005) and 1 per cent above in Wotton-under-Edge ward (1 per cent below in 2005). Our proposals for these four wards are illustrated on Map 2 in Appendix A.

## **Electoral Cycle**

99 We received seven representations regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. The District Council proposed "continuing with elections by thirds at present", but expressed a preference for biennial elections "when such powers become available to principal local authorities such as Stroud District Council". Horsley Parish Council supported the retention of elections by thirds, stating that "the present system best suits the local electorate".

100 The Conservative Association proposed whole council elections every four years, arguing "this system conveys more power onto the electorate", adding that whole-council elections would "enhance accountability and will improve the incentives for democratic participation". This was also proposed by Councillor Read, member for Cainscross district ward and Slade parish ward of Stroud parish, who considered it would "increase voter turnout, improve the efficiency of the council and follow the principals [*sic*] of Best Value".

101 The Labour Party proposed a cycle of biennial elections. This was also proposed by Stroud Town Council, and Uley Parish Council.

102 We note that the District Council proposed that elections by thirds be maintained, with a view to moving to biennial elections if such an option became available. A mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards, as recommended for Stroud, would not preclude a move to biennial elections were such a cycle to become available. However, as stated earlier, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the Local Government Act 2000, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas. Statutorily, we are unable to recommend any election cycle other than whole council elections or elections by thirds. We have considered the proposals for whole-council elections, but in the absence of widespread support for such a change, we propose no change to the Council's present system of elections by thirds at this time.

## **Conclusions**

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

- there should be a reduction in council size from 55 to 51;
- there should be 27 wards;
- the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four wards;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

104 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's Scheme 3, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- in Stroud town we propose two boundary changes to further improve electoral equality;
- in Cam we propose a boundary change to further improve electoral equality and provide a clearer boundary;
- in Minchinhampton we propose that the Bownham Park area of the parish remain in Minchinhampton ward.

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

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

|  | 2000 electorate      |                       | 2005 forecast electorate |                       |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | Current arrangements | Draft recommendations | Current arrangements     | Draft recommendations |
| Number of councillors  | 55                   | 51                    | 55                       | 51                    |
| Number of wards  | 31                   | 27                    | 31                       | 27                    |
| Average number of electors per councillor                              | 1,560                | 1,682                 | 1,616                    | 1,743                 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 19                   | 2                     | 17                       | 3                     |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 9                    | 0                     | 11                       | 0                     |

106 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Stroud District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 19 to two. By 2005 only three wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Stroud District Council should comprise 51 councillors serving 27 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

107 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Cam, Randwick, Rodborough, Stroud and Thrupp to reflect the proposed district wards.

108 Cam Parish Council is currently served by 15 councillors representing the three parish wards of Lower, Upper and Woodfield, which are represented by six, three and six councillors respectively.

109 The District Council proposed that Cam parish be served by two district wards and four parish wards: Cam East district ward would comprise the parish wards of Central and Upper,

while Cam West district ward would comprise the parish wards of Lower and Woodfield. The number and distribution of parish councillors was not proposed.

110 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Cam parish, reflecting the District Council’s proposals for Cam East and Cam West district wards, we propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with the district wards within the parish. In addition we propose that Central, Lower, Upper and Woodfield parish wards each be represented by four councillors, a total of 16, an increase by one. We would welcome comments on this distribution at Stage Three.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Cam Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, one more than at present, representing four wards: Central, Lower, Upper and Woodfield, each returning four councillors. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

111 Randwick Parish Council is currently served by nine councillors and the parish is not warded. In order to facilitate its proposals for district warding in this area, the District Council proposed that Randwick parish should be warded into two: one parish ward covering the settlement nearest to Cainscross parish, to be named Lower Westrip ward, and the other covering the remainder of the parish, to be named Randwick ward. The number and distribution of parish councillors was not proposed.

112 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Randwick parish, reflecting the District Council’s proposals for Cainscross and Over Stroud wards, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposed parish ward boundaries to correspond with the district wards within the parish. In addition we propose that Lower Westrip parish ward be represented by five councillors and Randwick parish ward be represented by four councillors, a total of nine. We would welcome comments on this distribution at Stage Three.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Randwick Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Lower Westrip and Randwick, represented by five and four councillors respectively. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A3 in Appendix A.

113 Rodborough Parish Council is currently served by 12 councillors representing the three parish wards of North, South and West, which are each represented by four councillors.

114 The District Council proposed that Rodborough parish be served by two district wards and four parish wards: Rodborough district ward would comprise the parish wards of North, South



and West, while Butterow parish ward would form part of Thrupp district ward. The number and distribution of parish councillors was not proposed.

115 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Rodborough parish, reflecting the District Council’s proposals for Rodborough and Thrupp wards, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposed parish ward boundaries to correspond with the district wards within the parish. In addition we propose that Butterow parish ward be represented by two councillors, North parish ward be represented by four parish councillors, South parish ward be represented by one parish councillor and West parish ward be represented by five parish councillors, a total of 12. We would welcome comments on this distribution at Stage Three.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Rodborough Parish Council should comprise 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Butterow (returning two councillors), North (four), South (one) and West (five). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A4 in Appendix A.

116 Stroud Town Council is currently served by 17 councillors representing the seven parish wards of Central (represented by two councillors), Farmhill (two), Paganhill (two), Slade (four), Trinity (three), Uplands (two) and Valley (two).

117 The District Council proposed that Stroud parish be served by three district wards and six parish wards: Stroud East district ward, comprising the parish wards of Slade and Trinity, Stroud North district ward, comprising the parish wards of Uplands and Valley, and Stroud West district ward comprising the parish wards of Central and Farmhill/Paganhill.

118 This warding pattern was also proposed by Stroud Town Council and Councillor Read, both additionally proposing that each parish ward be represented by three parish councillors, resulting in a net increase by one to 18.

119 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Stroud parish, reflecting the District Council’s proposals for Stroud East, Stroud North and Stroud West wards, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposed parish ward boundaries to correspond with the district wards within the parish.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Stroud Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, one more than at present, representing six wards: Central, Farmhill/Paganhill, Slade, Trinity, Uplands and Valley, each represented by three councillors. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in this area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

120 The parish of Thrupp is currently served by nine councillors and the parish is not warded. In order to facilitate its proposals for district warding in this area, the District Council proposed that Thrupp parish should be warded into two: one parish ward covering that part of the parish east of Toadsmoor Road, to be named Bourne ward, and the other covering the remainder of the parish, to be named Thrupp ward. The number and distribution of parish councillors was not proposed.

121 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Thrupp parish, reflecting the District Council's proposals for Chalford and Thrupp wards, we propose adopting the District Council's proposed parish ward boundaries to correspond with the district wards within the parish. In addition we propose that Bourne parish ward be represented by one councillor and Thrupp parish ward be represented by eight councillors, a total of nine. We would welcome comments on this distribution at Stage Three.

**Draft Recommendation**

Thrupp Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bourne, to be represented by one councillor, and Thrupp, to be represented by eight councillors. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in this area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

122 The parish of Dursley is currently divided into three parish wards, Central, Highfields and Kingshill, which are represented by five, seven and five councillors respectively. In agreement with the District Council, Dursley Town Council proposed that Central and Highfields parish wards should each be served by six councillors. This would not alter the total number of parish councillors.

123 Our proposed district warding arrangements would not result in change to this area and we are content to put forward the Town Council's proposal for consultation.

**Draft Recommendation**

Dursley Town Council should comprise 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Central (returning six councillors), Highfields (six) and Kingshill (five).

124 The District Council, in response to a request from Hardwicke Parish Council, proposed a change to the electoral cycle of the Parish Council, so that ordinary parish council elections would be held in the same year as the ordinary election for a district councillor representing the parish.

125 We have carefully considered the District Council's request to change the parish council's electoral cycle so that parish elections are held in either of the two years when Hardwicke parish

elections are elected. We consider the request to be reasonable, and therefore propose that the parish council elections should be held at the same time as those for the District Council.

**Draft Recommendation**

For parish and town councils, elections should continue to be held at the same time as elections for the principal authority.

**126 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Stroud and welcome comments from the District Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

*Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Stroud*

## 5 NEXT STEPS

127 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 5 March 2001. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the District Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

128 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Stroud Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

129 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Stroud: Detailed Mapping**

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

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

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed warding of Cam parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed warding of Randwick parish.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed warding of Rodborough parish.

**Map A5** illustrates the proposed warding of Thrupp parish.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Stroud town.

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



*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Cam Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed Warding of Randwick Parish*

*Map A4: Proposed Warding of Rodborough Parish*

*Map A5: Proposed Warding of Thrupp Parish*

## APPENDIX B

### Stroud District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

#### Scheme 3

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from the District Council's Scheme 3 only in five wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

*Figure B1: Stroud District Council's Scheme 3: Constituent Areas*

| Ward name      | Constituent areas   |
|----------------|---|
| Cam East       | Cam ward (part – part of Upper and Lower parish wards of Cam parish); Woodfield ward (part – part of Woodfield parish ward of Cam parish)   |
| Cam West       | Cam ward (part – part of Upper and Lower parish wards of Cam parish); Woodfield ward (part – part of Woodfield parish ward of Cam parish)   |
| Minchinhampton | Minchinhampton ward (part – Brimscombe, North and South parish wards of Minchinhampton parish)  |
| Stroud East    | Central ward (part – part of Central parish ward of Stroud parish); Trinity ward (part – part of Slade and Trinity parish wards of Stroud parish)   |
| Stroud North   | Trinity ward (part – part of Slade parish ward of Stroud parish); Uplands ward (part – parts of Uplands and Valley parish wards of Stroud parish)   |
| Stroud West    | Central ward (part – part of Central parish ward of Stroud parish); Trinity ward (part – part of Trinity parish ward of Stroud parish); Uplands ward (part – Farmhill and Paganhill parish wards and parts of Uplands and Valley parish wards of Stroud parish) |
| Thrupp         | Minchinhampton ward (part – the proposed Bownham Park parish ward of Minchinhampton parish); Rodborough ward (part – the proposed Butterow parish ward of Rodborough parish); Thrupp ward (part – the proposed Thrupp parish ward of Thrupp parish)             |

*Figure B2: Stroud District Council's Scheme 3: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

| Ward name      | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cam East       | 2                     | 3,180             | 1,590                             | -5                      | 3,208             | 1,604                             | -8                      |
| Cam West       | 2                     | 3,441             | 1,721                             | 2                       | 3,469             | 1,735                             | 0                       |
| Minchinhampton | 2                     | 3,483             | 1,742                             | 4                       | 3,555             | 1,778                             | 2                       |
| Stroud East    | 2                     | 3,474             | 1,737                             | 3                       | 3,506             | 1,753                             | 1                       |

| Ward name    | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Stroud North | 2                     | 3,123             | 1,562                             | -7                      | 3,210             | 1,605                             | -8                      |
| Stroud West  | 2                     | 3,289             | 1,645                             | -2                      | 3,502             | 1,751                             | 0                       |
| Thrupp       | 1                     | 1,784             | 1,784                             | 6                       | 1,839             | 1,839                             | 6                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Stroud District Council's submission.

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

### The Administration's scheme

Figure B3: Stroud District Council's Administration scheme: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name              | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Berkeley             | 1                     | 1,490             | 1,490                             | -11                     | 1,539             | 1,539                             | -12                     |
| 2 Bisley               | 1                     | 1,807             | 1,807                             | 7                       | 1,870             | 1,870                             | 7                       |
| 3 Cainscross           | 3                     | 4,685             | 1,562                             | -7                      | 4,936             | 1,645                             | -6                      |
| 4 Cam East             | 2                     | 3,180             | 1,590                             | -5                      | 3,208             | 1,604                             | -8                      |
| 5 Cam West             | 2                     | 3,441             | 1,721                             | 2                       | 3,469             | 1,735                             | 0                       |
| 6 Chalford-Manor       | 1                     | 1,628             | 1,628                             | -3                      | 1,709             | 1,709                             | -2                      |
| 7 Chalford-Brownshill  | 1                     | 1,244             | 1,244                             | -26                     | 1,311             | 1,311                             | -25                     |
| 8 Chalford-Village     | 1                     | 1,746             | 1,746                             | 4                       | 1,786             | 1,786                             | 2                       |
| 9 Coaley & Uley        | 1                     | 1,881             | 1,881                             | 12                      | 1,901             | 1,901                             | 9                       |
| 10 Dursley             | 3                     | 4,568             | 1,523                             | -9                      | 5,008             | 1,669                             | -4                      |
| 11 Eastington          | 1                     | 1,465             | 1,465                             | -13                     | 1,527             | 1,527                             | -12                     |
| 12 Ham                 | 1                     | 1,538             | 1,538                             | -9                      | 1,554             | 1,554                             | -11                     |
| 13 Hardwicke           | 2                     | 2,907             | 1,454                             | -14                     | 3,138             | 1,569                             | -10                     |
| 14 Hinton & Slimbridge | 1                     | 1,802             | 1,802                             | 7                       | 1,817             | 1,817                             | 4                       |

| Ward name                | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 15 Minchinhampton        | 2                     | 3,581             | 1,791                             | 6                       | 3,657             | 1,829                             | 5                       |
| 16 Nailsworth            | 3                     | 4,950             | 1,650                             | -2                      | 5,154             | 1,718                             | -1                      |
| 17 Painswick             | 2                     | 3,489             | 1,745                             | 4                       | 3,593             | 1,797                             | 3                       |
| 18 Parklands             | 1                     | 1,716             | 1,716                             | 2                       | 1,768             | 1,768                             | 1                       |
| 19 Randwick & Whiteshill | 1                     | 1,971             | 1,971                             | 17                      | 1,992             | 1,992                             | 14                      |
| 20 Rodborough            | 2                     | 3,806             | 1,903                             | 13                      | 3,939             | 1,970                             | 13                      |
| 21 Severn                | 1                     | 1,939             | 1,939                             | 15                      | 1,970             | 1,970                             | 13                      |
| 22 Stonehouse            | 3                     | 5,432             | 1,811                             | 8                       | 5,779             | 1,926                             | 11                      |
| 23 Stroud East           | 2                     | 3,474             | 1,737                             | 3                       | 3,506             | 1,753                             | 1                       |
| 24 Stroud North          | 2                     | 3,123             | 1,562                             | -7                      | 3,210             | 1,605                             | -8                      |
| 25 Stroud West           | 2                     | 3,289             | 1,645                             | -2                      | 3,502             | 1,751                             | 0                       |
| 26 The Stanleys          | 2                     | 3,305             | 1,653                             | -2                      | 3,347             | 1,674                             | -4                      |
| 27 Thrupp                | 1                     | 1,689             | 1,689                             | 0                       | 1,742             | 1,742                             | 0                       |
| 28 Upton St Leonards     | 1                     | 1,357             | 1,357                             | -19                     | 1,485             | 1,485                             | -15                     |
| 29 Woodchester           | 1                     | 1,800             | 1,800                             | 7                       | 1,831             | 1,831                             | 5                       |
| 30 Vale                  | 1                     | 1,550             | 1,550                             | -8                      | 1,558             | 1,558                             | -11                     |
| 31 Wotton                | 3                     | 5,954             | 1,985                             | 18                      | 6,072             | 2,024                             | 16                      |
| <b>Totals</b>            | <b>51</b>             | <b>85,807</b>     | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                | <b>88,878</b>     | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                |
| <b>Averages</b>          | <b>-</b>              | <b>-</b>          | <b>1,682</b>                      | <b>-</b>                | <b>-</b>          | <b>1,743</b>                      | <b>-</b>                |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Stroud District Council's submission.

Notes: 1 The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 Stroud Constituency Labour Party's proposals were identical to those proposed in the District Council's Administration scheme, except in respect of three ward names, where the Labour Party proposed that Ham ward be named Hamfallow, Ham & Stone; Woodchester ward be named Woodchester & Amberley; and Wotton ward be named Wotton & Kingswood.

## Councillor Priest's scheme

Figure B4: Stroud District Council's Councillor Priest scheme: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name                | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Berkeley               | 1                     | 1,659             | 1,659                             | -1                      | 1,712             | 1,712                             | -2                      |
| 2 Bisley                 | 1                     | 1,807             | 1,807                             | 7                       | 1,870             | 1,870                             | 7                       |
| 3 Cainscross             | 3                     | 4,938             | 1,646                             | -2                      | 5,194             | 1,731                             | -1                      |
| 4 Cam Upper              | 1                     | 1,598             | 1,598                             | -5                      | 1,612             | 1,612                             | -8                      |
| 5 Cam Central            | 1                     | 1,582             | 1,582                             | -6                      | 1,596             | 1,596                             | -8                      |
| 6 Cam Lower              | 1                     | 1,651             | 1,651                             | -2                      | 1,664             | 1,664                             | -5                      |
| 7 Cam Woodfield          | 1                     | 1,790             | 1,790                             | 6                       | 1,805             | 1,805                             | 4                       |
| 8 Chalford               | 3                     | 4,618             | 1,539                             | -9                      | 4,806             | 1,602                             | -8                      |
| 9 Coaley & Uley          | 1                     | 1,881             | 1,881                             | 12                      | 1,901             | 1,901                             | 9                       |
| 10 Dursley               | 3                     | 4,568             | 1,523                             | -9                      | 5,008             | 1,669                             | -4                      |
| 11 Eastington            | 1                     | 1,465             | 1,465                             | -13                     | 1,527             | 1,527                             | -12                     |
| 12 Hardwicke             | 2                     | 2,907             | 1,454                             | -14                     | 3,138             | 1,569                             | -10                     |
| 13 Hinton & Slimbridge   | 1                     | 1,802             | 1,802                             | 7                       | 1,817             | 1,817                             | 4                       |
| 14 King's Stanley        | 2                     | 3,305             | 1,653                             | -2                      | 3,347             | 1,674                             | -4                      |
| 15 Kingswood             | 1                     | 1,539             | 1,539                             | -9                      | 1,565             | 1,565                             | -10                     |
| 16 Minchinhampton        | 3                     | 5,666             | 1,889                             | 12                      | 5,797             | 1,932                             | 11                      |
| 17 Nailsworth            | 3                     | 4,950             | 1,650                             | -2                      | 5,154             | 1,718                             | -1                      |
| 18 Painswick             | 2                     | 3,489             | 1,745                             | 4                       | 3,593             | 1,797                             | 3                       |
| 19 Parklands             | 1                     | 1,716             | 1,716                             | 2                       | 1,768             | 1,768                             | 1                       |
| 20 Randwick & Whiteshill | 1                     | 1,718             | 1,718                             | 2                       | 1,734             | 1,734                             | 0                       |
| 21 Rodborough            | 3                     | 5,210             | 1,737                             | 3                       | 5,372             | 1,791                             | 3                       |
| 22 Severn                | 1                     | 1,939             | 1,939                             | 15                      | 1,970             | 1,970                             | 13                      |
| 23 Stonehouse            | 3                     | 5,432             | 1,811                             | 8                       | 5,779             | 1,926                             | 11                      |
| 24 Stroud East           | 2                     | 3,474             | 1,737                             | 3                       | 3,506             | 1,753                             | 1                       |



| Ward name            | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 25 Stroud North      | 2                     | 3,123             | 1,562                             | -7                      | 3,210             | 1,605                             | -8                      |
| 26 Stroud West       | 2                     | 3,289             | 1,645                             | -2                      | 3,502             | 1,751                             | 0                       |
| 27 Upton St Leonards | 1                     | 1,357             | 1,357                             | -19                     | 1,485             | 1,485                             | -15                     |
| 28 Vale              | 1                     | 1,913             | 1,913                             | 14                      | 1,927             | 1,927                             | 11                      |
| 29 Wotton            | 3                     | 5,421             | 1,807                             | 7                       | 5,519             | 1,840                             | 6                       |
| <b>Totals</b>        | <b>51</b>             | <b>85,807</b>     | –                                 | –                       | <b>88,878</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>      | –                     | –                 | <b>1,682</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,743</b>                      | –                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Stroud District Council's submission.

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

## Stroud Conservative Association's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B5: Stroud Conservative Association's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name              | Number of councillors | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Berkeley             | 1                     | 1,712             | 1,712                             | -2                      |
| 2 Bisley               | 1                     | 1,870             | 1,870                             | 7                       |
| 3 Cainscross           | 3                     | 5,227             | 1,742                             | 0                       |
| 4 Cam Upper            | 1                     | 1,565             | 1,565                             | -10                     |
| 5 Cam Central          | 1                     | 1,612             | 1,612                             | -7                      |
| 6 Cam Lower            | 1                     | 1,651             | 1,651                             | -5                      |
| 7 Cam Woodfield        | 1                     | 1,790             | 1,790                             | 3                       |
| 8 Chalford             | 3                     | 4,806             | 1,602                             | -8                      |
| 9 Cotswold Edge        | 1                     | 1,901             | 1,901                             | 9                       |
| 10 Dursley             | 3                     | 5,007             | 1,669                             | -4                      |
| 11 Eastington          | 1                     | 1,527             | 1,527                             | -12                     |
| 12 Hardwicke           | 2                     | 3,138             | 1,569                             | -10                     |
| 13 Kingswood           | 1                     | 1,565             | 1,565                             | -10                     |
| 14 Minchinhampton      | 2                     | 3,555             | 1,778                             | 2                       |
| 15 Nailsworth          | 3                     | 5,154             | 1,718                             | -1                      |
| 16 Over Stroud         | 1                     | 1,699             | 1,699                             | -2                      |
| 17 Painswick           | 2                     | 3,594             | 1,797                             | 3                       |
| 18 Parklands           | 1                     | 1,515             | 1,515                             | -13                     |
| 19 Rodborough          | 3                     | 5,783             | 1,928                             | 11                      |
| 20 Severn              | 1                     | 1,970             | 1,970                             | 13                      |
| 21 Slimbridge & Hinton | 1                     | 1,817             | 1,817                             | 4                       |
| 22 Stonehouse          | 3                     | 5,778             | 1,926                             | 11                      |
| 23 The Stanleys        | 2                     | 3,348             | 1,674                             | -4                      |
| 24 Trinity             | 3                     | 5,511             | 1,837                             | 6                       |
| 25 Uplands             | 3                     | 4,707             | 1,569                             | -10                     |

| Ward name          | Number of councillors | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 26 Upton           | 1                     | 1,738             | 1,738                             | -0                      |
| 27 Vale            | 1                     | 1,927             | 1,927                             | 11                      |
| 28 Woodchester     | 1                     | 1,831             | 1,831                             | 5                       |
| 29 Wotton & Nibley | 3                     | 5,420             | 1,807                             | 4                       |
| <b>Totals</b>      | <b>51</b>             | <b>88,718</b>     | -                                 | -                       |
| <b>Averages</b>    | -                     | -                 | <b>1,740</b>                      | -                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Stroud Conservative Association's submission. Current-year electorates were not provided.

Notes: 1 The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 The total number of electors under the Conservative Association's scheme varies from the District Council's total forecast electorate for 2005 by 160 electors. This would have a minor affect on ward variances.



## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

#### Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear<sup>1</sup>. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

#### **Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements**

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.