

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for East Hampshire

Report to the Secretary of State for the  
Environment, Transport and the Regions

*July 2000*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

This report sets out the Commission's final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of East Hampshire.

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)

© 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.

Report no: 166

# CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>3</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>7</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>9</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>15</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>43</i>
APPENDICES	
A Final Recommendations for East Hampshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>45</i>
B Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire	<i>51</i>

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Alton, Petersfield and Whitehill is inserted inside the back cover of this report.





## Local Government Commission for England

25 July 2000

Dear Secretary of State

On 20 July 1999 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of East Hampshire under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in January 2000 and undertook a 10-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraph 156) in the light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in East Hampshire.

We recommend that East Hampshire District Council should be served by 44 councillors representing 38 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

The Local Government Bill, containing legislative proposals for a number of changes to local authority electoral arrangements, is currently being considered by Parliament. However, until such time as that new legislation is in place we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

I would like to thank members and officers of the District Council and other local people who have contributed to the review. Their co-operation and assistance have been very much appreciated by Commissioners and staff.

Yours sincerely

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT  
Chairman



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of East Hampshire on 20 July 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 18 January 2000, after which we undertook a 10-week period of consultation.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Secretary of State.**

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

- **in 23 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 16 wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality 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 22 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 15 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 156-157) are that:

- **East Hampshire District Council should have 44 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 38 wards, instead of 31 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified and four wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These 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 32 of the proposed 38 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in six wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Alton, Liss, Petersfield and Rowlands Castle;**
- **revised warding arrangements and an increase in the number of councillors serving Alton, Horndean and Whitehill parish councils.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an Order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 4 September 2000:

**The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU**



Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Alton Amery	1	Alton ward (part - Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
2	Alton Ashdell	1	Alton ward (part - Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part - Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part - Alton South West & Beech parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
3	Alton Eastbrooke	1	Alton ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
4	Alton Westbrooke	1	Alton ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
5	Alton Whitedown	1	Alton ward (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West & Beech parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
6	Alton Wooteys	1	Alton ward (part – Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and large map
7	Binsted & Bentley	1	Binsted ward (the parish of Binsted); Froyle & Bentley ward (part – the parish of Bentley)	Map 2
8	Bramshott & Liphook	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Bramshott & Liphook)	Map 2
9	Clanfield	2	Clanfield & Buriton ward (part – the parish of Clanfield); Rowlands Castle ward (part – part of Rowlands Castle parish)	Maps 2 and A5
10	East Meon	1	Clanfield & Buriton ward (part – the parish of Buriton); East Meon & Langrish ward (the parishes of East Meon and Langrish)	Map 2
11	Farringdon	1	Alton South West & Beech ward (part – the parish of Beech); Farringdon ward (part – the parishes of Chawton and Farringdon); North Downland ward (part – the parishes of Bentworth and Wield)	Map 2
12	Four Marks & Medstead	2	Four Marks ward (the parish of Four Marks); Medstead ward (the parish of Medstead)	Map 2

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
13 Froxfield & Steep	1	Froxfield & Steep ward (the parishes of Froxfield and Steep); The Hangers ward (part – the parish of Colemore & Priors Dean); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – the parish of Stroud)	Map 2
14 Grayshott	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Grayshott)	Map 2
15 Headley	2	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Headley)	Map 2
16 Holybourne & Froyle	1	Alton ward (part – Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish); Froyle & Bentley ward (part – the parish of Froyle); North Downland ward (part – the parishes of Lasham and Shalden)	Map 2 and large map
17 Horndean Catherington & Lovedean	1	Horndean Catherington ward (part – Horndean Catherington parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Kings ward (part – Horndean Kings parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2 and A3
18 Horndean Downs	1	Horndean Catherington ward (part – Horndean Catherington parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2 and A3
19 Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth	1	Horndean Hazleton ward (part – Horndean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Murray ward (part – Horndean Murray parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2 and A4
20 Horndean Kings	1	Horndean Hazleton ward (part – Horndean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Kings ward (part – Horndean Kings parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2 and A4
21 Horndean Murray	1	Horndean Catherington ward (part – Horndean Catherington parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Hazleton ward (part – Horndean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Murray ward (part – Horndean Murray parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2, A3 and A4
22 Lindford	1	Whitehill Lindford ward (the parish of Lindford)	Map 2
23 Liss Forest & Greatham	1	Liss ward (part – part of Liss parish); The Hangers ward (part – the parishes of Greatham and Hawkley)	Maps 2 and A2
24 Liss	2	Liss ward (part – part of Liss parish)	Maps 2 and A2
25 Petersfield Bell Hill	1	Petersfield St Peters ward (part – Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
26	Petersfield Causeway	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map
27	Petersfield Heath	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Marys ward (part – Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map
28	Petersfield St Marys	1	Petersfield St Marys ward (part – Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map
29	Petersfield Rother	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Marys ward (part – Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map
30	Petersfield St Peters	1	Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – part of Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and large map
31	Rowlands Castle	1	Rowlands Castle ward (part – part of Rowlands Castle parish)	Maps 2 and A5
32	Ropley & Tisted	1	Farringdon ward (part – the parishes of East Tisted and Newton Valence); Ropley & West Tisted ward (the parishes of Ropley and West Tisted)	Map 2
33	Selborne	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Kingsley, Selborne and Worldham)	Map 2
34	Whitehill Chase	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and large map
35	Whitehill Deadwater	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill ward) (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and large map
36	Whitehill Hogmoor	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and large map
37	Whitehill Pinewood	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and large map
38	Whitehill Walldown	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and large map

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for East Hampshire

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alton Amery	1	1,886	1,886	-1	1,979	1,979	-2
2 Alton Ashdell	1	1,769	1,769	-7	1,864	1,864	8
3 Alton Eastbrooke	1	1,951	1,951	3	2,044	2,044	1
4 Alton Westbrooke	1	1,962	1,962	3	2,056	2,056	2
5 Alton Whitedown	1	1,882	1,882	-1	1,977	1,977	-2
6 Alton Wooteys	1	1,846	1,846	-3	1,939	1,939	-4
7 Binsted & Bentley	1	2,111	2,111	11	2,233	2,233	11
8 Bramshott & Liphook	3	5,864	1,955	3	6,318	2,106	4
9 Clanfield	2	3,670	1,835	-3	3,675	1,838	-9
10 East Meon	1	1,750	1,750	-8	1,838	1,838	-9
11 Farrington	1	1,857	1,857	-2	2,051	2,051	2
12 Four Marks & Medstead	2	4,159	2,080	10	4,458	2,229	11
13 Froxfield & Steep	1	1,897	1,897	0	1,942	1,942	-4
14 Grayshott	1	1,888	1,888	-1	2,012	2,012	0
15 Headley	2	4,216	2,108	11	4,603	2,302	14
16 Holybourne & Froyle	1	2,147	2,147	13	2,282	2,282	13
17 Horndean Catherington & Lovedean	1	1,948	1,948	3	1,926	1,926	-4
18 Horndean Downs	1	2,072	2,072	9	2,048	2,048	2
19 Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth	1	1,902	1,902	0	1,879	1,879	-7
20 Horndean Kings	1	2,150	2,150	13	2,125	2,125	5
21 Horndean Murray	1	1,878	1,878	-1	1,854	1,854	-8
22 Lindford	1	1,764	1,764	-7	2,015	2,015	0
23 Liss Forest & Greatham	1	1,928	1,928	2	1,906	1,906	-5
24 Liss	2	3,913	1,957	3	4,202	2,101	4

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
25	Petersfield Bell Hill	1	1,815	1,815	-4	1,877	1,877	-7
26	Petersfield Causeway	1	1,839	1,839	-3	1,902	1,902	-6
27	Petersfield Heath	1	1,776	1,776	-6	1,843	1,843	-9
28	Petersfield St Marys	1	1,567	1,567	-17	1,830	1,830	-9
29	Petersfield Rother	1	1,766	1,766	-7	1,933	1,933	-4
30	Petersfield St Peters	1	1,770	1,770	-7	1,830	1,830	-9
31	Rowlands Castle	1	2,131	2,131	12	2,182	2,182	8
32	Ropley & Tisted	1	1,773	1,773	-7	1,798	1,798	-11
33	Selborne	1	1,762	1,762	-7	1,782	1,782	-12
34	Whitehill Chase	1	1,821	1,821	-4	2,129	2,129	6
35	Whitehill Deadwater	1	1,788	1,788	-6	2,102	2,102	4
36	Whitehill Hogmoor	1	1,811	1,811	-5	2,129	2,129	6
37	Whitehill Pinewood	1	1,779	1,779	-6	2,087	2,087	4
38	Whitehill Walldown	1	1,740	1,740	-8	2,045	2,045	1
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>83,548</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>88,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,016</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Hampshire 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of East Hampshire. We have now reviewed the 11 districts in Hampshire and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils 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 was our first review of the electoral arrangements of East Hampshire. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1976 (Report No. 134). The electoral arrangements of Hampshire County Council were last reviewed in October 1980 (Report No. 397). We intend reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we have had 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.

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 have also had regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999), which 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 configurations 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, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to our statutory criteria. 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 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, i.e. 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. The proposals were taken forward in a Local Government Bill, published in December 1999, and are currently being considered by Parliament.

10 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/00 PER programme, including the Hampshire 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.

11 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 20 July 1999, when we wrote to East Hampshire District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Hampshire Association of Parish and Town Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district and the Members of the European Parliament for the South East region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

12 Stage Three began on 18 January 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for East Hampshire*, and ended on 27 March 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

13 The district of East Hampshire covers an area of some 200 square miles, extending from Alton in the north to Rowlands Castle in the south. It is essentially rural in character, with the main centres of population being Alton, Petersfield, Horndean and Whitehill. More than 80 per cent of the district is countryside, most of which is in active agricultural production. The district is well connected by road and rail; rail links are available to London from Alton and Bentley, and to London and the south coast from Liphook, Liss, Petersfield and Rowlands Castle. The A3/A3M, A339 and A32 roads offer good north-south routes, while the A272 and the A31 cross the district from east to west.

14 The district contains 39 parishes and is entirely parished. Alton town and Petersfield town comprise 15 per cent and 13 per cent of the district's total electorate respectively.

15 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'.

16 The electorate of the district is 83,548 (February 1999). The Council presently has 42 members who are elected from 31 wards, 14 of which are relatively urban in Alton, Horndean, Petersfield and Whitehill, while the remainder are predominantly rural. Two of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and 22 are single-member wards. The Council is elected together every four years.

17 Since the last electoral review there has been a large increase in the electorate in East Hampshire district, with around 68 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Petersfield St Marys wards, with approximately 55 per cent and 49 per cent more electors respectively than 20 years ago.

18 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,989 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 2,112 by the year 2004 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 23 of the 31 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, 16 wards by more than 20 per cent and nine wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Horndean Kings ward, where the councillor represents 62 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in East Hampshire*

Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alton Holybourne	1	1,800	1,800	-10	1,833	1,833	-13
2 Alton North East	2	3,122	1,561	-22	3,313	1,657	-22
3 Alton North West	1	2,502	2,502	26	2,542	2,542	20
4 Alton South East	1	1,501	1,501	-25	1,751	1,751	-17
5 Alton South West & Beech	2	3,947	1,973	-1	4,223	2,111	0
6 Binsted	1	1,337	1,337	-33	1,389	1,389	-34
7 Bramshott & Liphook	3	5,864	1,955	-2	6,318	2,106	0
8 Clanfield & Buriton	2	4,101	2,051	3	3,984	1,992	-6
9 East Meon & Langrish	1	1,140	1,140	-43	1,254	1,254	-41
10 Farringdon	1	1,137	1,137	-43	1,278	1,278	-39
11 Four Marks	1	2,570	2,570	29	2,837	2,837	34
12 Froxfield & Steep	1	1,532	1,532	-23	1,561	1,561	-26
13 Froyle & Bentley	1	1,294	1,294	-35	1,337	1,337	-37
14 Grayshott	1	1,888	1,888	-5	2,012	2,012	-5
15 Headley	2	4,216	2,108	6	4,603	2,302	9
16 Horndean Catherington	1	2,959	2,959	49	2,927	2,927	39
17 Horndean Hazleton	1	1,639	1,639	-18	1,720	1,720	-19
18 Horndean Kings	1	3,219	2,319	62	3,200	3,200	52
19 Horndean Murray	1	2,133	2,133	7	2,081	2,081	-1
20 Liss	2	4,803	2,402	21	5,092	2,546	21

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
21 Medstead	1	1,589	1,589	-20	1,621	1,621	-23
22 North Downland	1	1,114	1,114	-44	1,120	1,120	-47
23 Petersfield Heath	1	2,328	2,328	17	2,325	2,325	10
24 Petersfield St Marys	2	4,402	2,201	11	4,996	2,498	18
25 Petersfield St Peters	2	4,064	2,032	2	4,175	2,088	-1
26 Ropley & West Tisted	1	1,430	1,430	-28	1,439	1,439	-32
27 Rowlands Castle	1	2,310	2,310	16	2,361	2,361	12
28 Selborne	1	1,762	1,762	-11	1,780	1,780	-16
29 The Hangers	1	1,142	1,142	-43	1,116	1,116	-47
30 Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill)	3	8,939	2,980	50	10,492	3,497	66
31 Whitehill Lindford	1	1,764	1,764	-11	2,015	2,015	-5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>83,548</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>88,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,989</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,112</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Hampshire 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 1999, electors in North Downland ward were relatively over-represented by 44 per cent, while electors in Horndean Kings ward were significantly under-represented by 62 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

19 During Stage One we received 14 representations, including district-wide schemes from the District Council, the North East Hampshire Conservative Association, the East Hampshire Conservative Association, the East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party and a district councillor. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for East Hampshire*.

20 With the exception of the northern part of the district, we noted the consensus between the District Council's scheme and the Conservative Associations' scheme. We also noted that there was consensus between the Constituency Labour Party's scheme and the Conservative Associations' scheme in the north of the district. We further noted that there was a significant amount of local support for the District Council scheme (as a result of its extensive consultation) and that it had the general support of the Conservative Associations. In view of the broad degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council's proposals, we based our draft recommendations on the District Council's scheme, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and predominantly provided a pattern of single-member wards in the district. However, we put forward our own proposals in the town of Alton and in Holybourne & Froyle and Binsted & Bentley wards in order to improve electoral equality further while having regard to local community identities and interests. We proposed that:

- East Hampshire District Council should be served by 44 councillors, compared with the current 42, representing 34 wards, three more than at present;
- the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified, while two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for the parishes of Alton, Horndean, Liss, Petersfield, Rowlands Castle and Whitehill.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

East Hampshire District Council should comprise 44 councillors, serving 34 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

21 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 29 of the 34 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. Only five wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

22 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, 62 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of East Hampshire District Council and the Commission.

### **East Hampshire District Council**

23 The District Council largely supported our draft recommendations but commented on the areas where we had moved away from its own Stage One proposals. It proposed that Alton should be represented by six single-member wards and put forward an alternative ward pattern for the town. It stated that although it supported our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward it “may not be popular with a number of people within Holybourne”. It also supported our proposed Binsted & Bentley ward but objected to our proposal to combine the parishes of Headley and Grayshott to create a three-member ward, stating that “both communities have separate identities”.

### **Liberal Democrats**

24 The Liberal Democrats stated that they supported our proposals for six single-member wards in Petersfield and for five single-member wards in Whitehill. However, it objected to our proposals for Bramshott & Liphook ward, arguing that the area should be represented by all single, or a single- and a two-member ward, as “there are distinctions” between the two villages in the parish. It also opposed our proposed for Alton & Holybourne ward, stating that Holybourne does not relate to the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham and considers itself as being part of Alton.

### **East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party**

25 The East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party supported our draft recommendations for three two-member wards in Alton, and the inclusion of Holybourne with the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham. It also supported the consequential town council electoral arrangements.

### **Petersfield Branch of East Hampshire Labour Party**

26 The Petersfield Branch of East Hampshire Labour Party was “broadly in agreement” with our draft recommendations, stating that it found the proposals for Rowlands Castle and Horndean “very acceptable”. However, it put forward a number of minor boundary amendments within the town of Petersfield.

### **Members of Parliament**

27 James Arbuthnot MP largely welcomed our proposals stating that they seemed “to be consistent and very well thought through” but expressed strong reservations about our proposed three-member Headley & Grayshott ward, stating that the two parishes are “completely separate

communities”. He also contended that single-member wards are preferable as electors know more easily who is responsible for them.

28 Michael Mates MP stated that our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward gave him “cause for concern”, contending that the proposed ward would be in two parliamentary constituencies and served by two county councillors.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

29 We received representations direct from 27 parish councils and parish meetings. Alton Town Council objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward. It also objected to the inclusion of part of the industrial area of Alton within Holybourne & Froyle ward. It supported our proposal that Alton should be represented by six district councillors overall but proposed that there should be six single-member wards (including the Holybourne area) instead of three two-member wards. Alton Town Council also objected to our proposal that the Town Council consist of 11 councillors.

30 Froyle Parish Council objected to our proposal to include Holybourne with the parishes of Froyle, Lasham and Shalden in a single-member ward. It stated that it would have preferred that no changes take place, but that it appeared there were only two practical options for the parish of Froyle: the Commission’s proposed arrangements and the option favoured by East Hampshire District Council which grouped the parishes of Bentley, Froyle, Shalden and Lasham.

31 Shalden Parish Council objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward. Bentworth Parish Council stated that historically Bentworth is linked with the parishes of Shalden and Lasham and proposed that the parishes of Bentworth and Wield should remain linked to Shalden and Lasham, and that the parishes of Beech and Froyle be added to these parishes to form a new North Downland ward.

32 The parish councils of Headley and Grayshott both objected to our proposals for their areas, proposing that the current arrangements be retained. Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council supported our draft recommendations with regard to its area.

33 Farringdon Parish Council objected to the Commission’s proposals, stating that it would prefer to remain linked with the parishes of Newton Valence, East Tisted and Chawton. Beech Parish Council supported our draft recommendations, preferring to be included in Farringdon ward with the parishes of Bentworth, Chawton, Farringdon and Wield rather than in the current urban Alton South West ward.

34 The parish councils of Bentley and Binsted both supported our proposals to combine the parishes in a single-member Binsted & Bentley ward. Froxfield and Stroud parish councils also supported our proposals to group the parishes of Stroud, Froxfield and Steep in a ward but Stroud Parish Council requested that the name Stroud be added to the proposed Froxfield & Steep ward name. Priors Dean & Colemore Parish Meeting stated that it did not “have any particular objections” to being included in a ward with the parishes of Froxfield, Steep and Stroud.



35 Hawkley Parish Council stated that it was “disappointed” that the parish had not been included in a ward with the parishes of East Tisted, Colemore & Priors Dean, Newton Valence and Selborne but accepted the Commission’s draft proposal combining the parishes of Hawkley and Greatham and the Liss Forest area. However it proposed that the ward be renamed Hangers & Forest ward or Liss Forest with Hawkley & Greatham. Liss Parish Council accepted our proposals “reluctantly” but stated that “If the numbers were not such an important element we would have wished to retain Liss Forest with Liss”.

36 Four Marks and Medstead parish councils objected to our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward arguing that the pairing of the parishes of Four Marks and Medstead was something that neither parish “wants or believes to be appropriate”. Four Marks Parish Council preferred to be linked with Ropley parish while Medstead Parish Council stated a preference to be placed in a ward with the parishes of Wield and Bentworth.

37 Buriton Parish Council objected to our proposals, proposing instead that Buriton be linked to the parishes of Langrish, Stroud and Steep. East Meon Parish Council stated that they “would have preferred that no change took place” but considered that our proposals were “the least harmful”.

38 Rowlands Castle Parish Council opposed our proposals to ward the parish of Rowlands Castle, requesting that the current arrangements be maintained. It also included a petition signed by 51 residents of Finchdean objecting to our proposals.

39 Horndean Parish Council stated that our recommendations did not take into account parish boundary changes between the parishes of Horndean and Clanfield. Clanfield Parish Council expressed surprise at the “small predicted growth of the Clanfield ward over the next five years to 2004”.

40 Whitehill Town Council supported all our draft recommendations for the town with particular regard to ward names. Lindford Parish Council stated that Lindford parish council should be referred to as such and not as ‘Whitehill Lindford’. Kingsley Parish Council and Worldham Parish Council both supported our draft recommendations for their area.

## **Other Representations**

41 A further 29 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from 12 district councillors, 1 county councillor, four local Residents’ Associations, 11 local residents and Hampshire County Council.

42 Councillor Cartwright, Leader of the Council, commented on the statutory criteria governing periodic electoral reviews stating that “rural areas do not fit into neat, equally sized, wards”. She stated further that “some flexibility should be permitted in order to avoid such a diverse ward [as Holybourne & Froyle] being created”.

43 Councillor Booker proposed that the town of Alton (including Holybourne Village) be represented by six-single member wards, suggesting ward names for six single-member wards and three two-member wards depending on our final recommendations. Councillor Clegg

(representing Rowlands Castle ward) objected to our proposals for the Rowlands Castle area, but stated that if our draft recommendations were not changed then the ward name should reflect all the communities within Clanfield ward.

44 Councillor Cowper (representing Grayshott ward) objected to our proposed three-member Headley & Grayshott ward on community grounds. Councillor Crowhurst (representing St Peters ward) supported our draft proposals for Petersfield but expressed doubts about our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward. He also questioned why Liss and Bramshott & Liphook wards had not been warded. Councillor Halstead (representing Liss ward) objected to our proposal to split the Liss Forest area from the remainder of Liss Parish. Councillor James supported our recommendation to retain the current three-member Bramshott & Liphook ward, but objected to our proposed three-member Headley & Grayshott ward, contending that it would comprise “two distinct and separate communities”.

45 Councillor Jamieson (Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group) supported our proposals for an extra councillor and six single-member wards in Petersfield and for five single-member wards in Whitehill. However, she objected to our proposed Bramshott & Liphook ward, and our proposals to split Holybourne from Alton, stating that they are “physically connected”. Councillor Janes objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward. Councillor Johnson proposed adopting a more “neutral name” for our proposed Farringdon ward, suggesting it be named Austen, Valley or Downland ward. Councillor Standen and Councillor Whittle both objected to our proposals for Headley & Grayshott ward, stating that the existing ward should remain unchanged.

46 County Councillor West (representing Petersfield Division) welcomed our proposals stating that a “very difficult job has been done well”. He supported our proposals for Petersfield Town Council and for six single-member district wards in Petersfield, putting forward a number of boundary amendments. He accepted our proposed East Meon, Froxfield & Steep and Liss Forest & Greatham wards but strongly requested that Liss Forest & Greatham ward be named Greatham & Liss Forest ward. He supported our proposed boundary between Liss ward and Liss Forest & Greatham ward and stated that our boundary between Clanfield ward and Rowlands Castle ward was an improvement on the boundary between Clanfield and Buriton. He objected to our proposed Headley & Grayshott ward.

47 Holybourne Village Association objected to our proposals for Holybourne & Froyle ward arguing that the two areas had very different outlooks. The Headley Down Residents’ Association and the Headley Residents Association opposed our proposed Headley & Grayshott ward. Idsworth Park Residents Association also objected to our proposals for Rowlands Castle ward, stating that Idsworth is “geographically separate from Clanfield and Chalton”.

48 We received five representations from local residents who objected to our proposed Rowlands Castle ward. Three local residents objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward. A local resident in Lasham Parish stated that they were happy with the current arrangements, while a resident of Shalden Parish stated that the area has more in common with the parishes of Lasham and Bentworth. A resident of Bentworth stated they were “opposed to the idea of Bentworth being amalgamated with Farringdon” arguing that the area has more in common with the parishes of Lasham and Shalden. A resident of Four Marks objected to our

proposals for Four Marks & Medstead ward stating that Four Marks would be more more logically combined with Ropley. Another local resident supported our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward.

49 Hampshire County Council stated that it had no comment to make with regard to the East Hampshire review.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

50 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for East Hampshire 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”.

51 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 ensuing five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

52 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.

53 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, such an objective 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 absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorates.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

54 At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 6 per cent from 83,548 to 88,695 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expected most of the growth to be in Whitehill, although a significant amount was also expected in the towns of Alton and Petersfield. The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, and the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

55 We received three comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three. Clanfield Parish Council stated that its members were “surprised at the small predicted growth of the Clanfield ward over the next five years”. Four Marks Parish Council stated that the electorate figures “could easily alter drastically in the next very few years”, contending that

consideration had not been given to the “Government’s latest proposed housing growth figures for the South and particularly for Hampshire”. A local resident contended that “projected housing figures ... can not be relied upon”.

56 We have considered the representations received. However, we have not been persuaded that sufficient evidence has been submitted to move away from the projected forecasts provided by East Hampshire District Council. We therefore remain satisfied that the electorate projections it put forward at Stage One represent the best estimates presently available.

## **Council Size**

57 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.

58 East Hampshire District Council is at present served by 42 councillors. At Stage One the District Council proposed a council of 44 members which would serve a general pattern of single-member wards, with some two- and three-member wards. It proposed allocating one extra councillor in Petersfield and in Horndean, and two extra councillors in Whitehill. The District Council argued that 44 councillors would provide for better electoral equality and reflect increases in population that have taken place, and the substantial development that is forecast. It also compared itself to neighbouring authorities, arguing that they share similarities in size and distribution of electors and are served by a similar number of councillors. The Conservative Associations and District Councillor Rodgers also proposed that East Hampshire be represented by 44 councillors.

59 In our draft recommendations report we stated that we would not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but would be prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. We considered the Constituency Labour Party’s scheme for retaining the current council size, but noted that this would give slightly higher levels of electoral inequality throughout the district and had not been as widely consulted on as the District Council’s proposals. We further noted that Horndean, Petersfield and Whitehill were all currently significantly under-represented, and given the general support for an increase of two councillors and the much-improved electoral equality which would be achieved under these schemes, while reflecting local communities, we considered that an increase in council size would facilitate convenient and effective local government in East Hampshire.

60 During Stage Three East Hampshire District Council, the Liberal Democrats, Councillor Jamieson, County Councillor West and Grayshott Parish Council all supported our proposed increase in council size from 42 to 44. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, and given the local support in favour of a council size of 44, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 44 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

61 We considered carefully all the representations received at Stage One, including the district-wide schemes submitted by East Hampshire District Council, the Conservative Associations, the Constituency Labour Party and the scheme put forward by District Councillor Rodgers. With the exception of the northern part of the district, we noted the consensus between the District Council's scheme and the Conservative Associations scheme. We also noted that there was consensus between the Constituency Labour Party's scheme and the Conservative Associations' scheme in the north of the district. All the district-wide schemes used whole parishes as building blocks wherever possible and allocated the same number of councillors to each urban area.

62 At Stage One Councillor Barron requested that coterminosity with electoral divisions be maintained, if necessary at the expense of electoral equality. We noted that this was an issue which has arisen in a number of review areas. It is indicative of the tensions which can arise between the achievement of electoral equality within the individual districts of a county, each of whose electoral arrangements can vary significantly in terms of councillor:elector ratios and ward sizes, and across county council electoral divisions, while also seeking some measure of coterminosity between the two. Those tensions are not readily reconciled.

63 In our draft recommendations report we noted that, in certain cases, it has been put to us that in reviewing district electoral arrangements we should prescribe that ward patterns and sizes should be compatible with county council divisions but we stated that we do not believe this to be an approach the Commission should take. We further stated that as a Commission, we rely heavily on local authorities and others to put proposals to us on how the electoral arrangements within their individual areas might be improved. We stated that we believe that the interests of local democracy are best served by basing our recommendations on schemes which are generated locally, address the statutory criteria and achieve a high level of electoral equality.

64 In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we concluded that we should generally base our recommendations on the District Council's scheme, with the exception of the parishes in the north of the district where we based our draft recommendations on Conservative associations' scheme. We considered that these schemes would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One.

65 At Stage Three the Liberal Democrats and Councillor Jamieson both stated that they supported the "desire for single -member wards wherever that is possible". The District Council stated that it preferred the retention of "manageably sized single-or two-member wards, wherever possible".

66 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three and judge that modifications should be made to a number of boundaries in Alton and to the proposed Headley & Grayshott ward. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Clanfield & Buriton, East Meon & Langrish, Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings, Horndean Murray and Rowlands Castle wards;
- (b) Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters wards;
- (c) Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards;
- (d) Farringdon, Four Marks, Medstead, Ropley & West Tisted and Selborne wards;
- (e) Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Whitehill (Lindford) wards;
- (f) Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley wards;
- (g) Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards.

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

**Clanfield & Buriton, East Meon & Langrish, Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings, Horndean Murray and Rowlands Castle wards**

68 These wards lie in the south of the district. Clanfield & Buriton (comprising the parishes of those names), East Meon & Langrish (comprising the parishes of those names) and Rowlands Castle (comprising only that parish) wards are predominantly rural, with Clanfield & Buriton ward returning two councillors and East Meon & Langrish and Rowlands Castle wards each returning one councillor. Under the existing electoral arrangements, the number of electors per councillor is 3 per cent above, 43 per cent below and 16 per cent above the district average respectively. Horndean is relatively urban in comparison to the other wards in the area and is divided between the wards of Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings and Horndean Murray, which each return one councillor, with the number of electors per councillor being 49 per cent above, 18 per cent below, 62 per cent above and 7 per cent above the district average respectively.

69 At Stage One the District Council proposed that Rowlands Castle parish be warded between two district wards “to identify the two distinct parts of the parish, namely the rural area at the northern part of the parish and the rest of the more built-up southerly part of the parish”. It proposed placing the northern part of the existing Rowlands Castle ward with the parish of Clanfield in a new Clanfield ward, which would then be represented by two councillors. The remainder of Rowlands Castle parish would then form a modified Rowlands Castle ward. In Horndean, the District Council proposed creating an additional ward, dividing the village into five single-member wards, involving an increase in one councillor in the area in order to address the existing under-representation “due to development that has taken place here in recent years”. It proposed that these wards be named Horndean Catherington & Lovedean, Horndean Downs, Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth, Horndean Kings and Horndean Murray. Under these arrangements, the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above, 9 per cent above, equal to, 13 per cent above and 1 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent below, 2 per cent above, 7 per cent below, 5 per cent above and 8 per cent below by 2004).



70 The District Council proposed that the existing East Meon & Langrish ward be modified to include Buriton parish in a new single-member Buriton, East Meon & Langrish ward. It argued that all three parishes comprising this new ward are rural communities with farming being the main activity, and are connected by country lanes. Under these arrangements the District Council's proposed East Meon ward would have 8 per cent fewer electors than the district average (9 per cent fewer in 2004). The Conservative Associations generally supported the District Council's warding arrangements for this area, although they did not submit specific warding arrangements for the Horndean area.

71 We received one other representation regarding this area, from East Meon Parish Council, who stated its preference for no change to the existing warding arrangements – however in our draft recommendations we contended that this was not viable given the high electoral inequalities that currently exist.

72 We were content to endorse the District Council's proposals as our draft recommendations as they provided for improved electoral equality in the area. We noted the continued levels of electoral inequality in the proposed Horndean Kings ward, however, due to future development in the area, this figure would be greatly improved by 2004. We further concluded that it would be in the interests of community identity to accept a temporary imbalance in the proposed Horndean Kings ward. We therefore proposed adopting the District Council's proposals for the area in their entirety.

73 At Stage Three the District Council supported our draft proposals. Clanfield Parish Council stated that as a result of a parish boundary change from 1 April 2000 a number of additional dwellings would be incorporated into its parish, thus increasing the size of Clanfield ward whilst “reducing the size of the northern ward in Horndean”. Horndean Parish Council also stated that our recommendations “do not take account of recent parish boundary changes between Horndean and Clanfield Parish Councils”.

74 East Meon Parish Council stated that it would have preferred that no change took place but considered our proposals for East Meon ward to be the “least harmful”. Buriton Parish Council objected to our proposals stating that it would be “overwhelmed due to the size of East Meon”, and proposing that it be linked with the parishes Langrish, Stroud and Steep, “parishes of comparable size with common interests and concerns”.

75 Rowlands Castle Parish Council objected to our proposals to split Rowlands Castle ward and include the areas of Finchdean, Idsworth and Old Idsworth in Clanfield ward. It proposed that the current arrangements be maintained, arguing that the electorate of Rowlands Castle ward have been well served by one district councillor, are geographically close together, identify with one another and are socially linked. It also stated that the A3M “creates a huge geographical divide between Rowlands Castle, Finchdean and Idsworth and Clanfield”. It argued that “the excess in numbers of electorate in Rowlands Castle could be tolerated” as they were based on projected figures and “not actual figures”. It stated that our proposal to move Finchdean and Idsworth into Clanfield ward was “unfair” and unnecessary if “the electorate of Buriton were not moving to a [ward north] of Butser”.

76 Petersfield Branch of East Hampshire Labour Party supported our proposed Rowlands Castle ward stating that it found it “very acceptable”. Councillor Clegg objected to our proposals, arguing that they did not make a “sensible community- based division”. He argued that Clanfield and Chalton are geographically distant from Finchdean and Idsworth, contending further that “the proposal is environmentally and economically unfriendly, if not socially”. He proposed that should our draft recommendations be confirmed as final the ward name should reflect the separate communities and not just Clanfield. Idsworth Park Residents Association also objected to our proposals for this area stating that “Idsworth Park is situated less than a mile from Rowlands Castle and the residents of Idsworth fully participate in the life of that village”. It stated further that “we see Rowlands Castle, Idsworth and Finchdean as one community”, arguing that Idsworth is geographically separated from Clanfield and Chalton by the A3M.

77 At Stage Three we also received five representations from local residents objecting to our proposals for Rowlands Castle ward. One resident stated that social contact would be impossible for non-driving or cycling residents of Finchdean and that the A3M is a “large geographical divide”. Two Finchdean residents stated that Finchdean, Idsworth and Rowlands Castle have “for generations ... been closely associated”. A resident of Old Idsworth stated that “we have no connection with Clanfield on any basis and only rarely pass through it en route to somewhere further afield”. A petition signed by 51 Finchdean residents objecting to our proposed Rowlands Castle ward was also submitted by Rowlands Castle Parish Council.

78 We have considered carefully all the representations received at Stage Three. However, as we have received no specific comments with regard to our draft recommendations for Horndean, we are content to confirm our proposed Horndean Catherington & Lovedean, Horndean Downs, Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth, Horndean Kings and Horndean Murray wards as final.

79 We have also considered the alternative configuration put forward by Buriton Parish Council, to combine the parishes of Buriton, Langrish, Stroud and Steep in a district ward. Although this combination of parishes would secure good electoral equality in itself, we cannot consider any area in isolation without having regard to the impact which any change would have upon the achievement of electoral equality across the whole district, and such an arrangement would have an adverse effect on the electoral equality in the surrounding wards. We are therefore content to confirm our proposed East Meon ward as final.

80 We have noted that there has been local opposition to our draft recommendations for Rowlands Castle and Clanfield wards, however, we have not been persuaded to amend our proposals. Officers from the Commission having visited the area, we concluded that there are good road links between the different areas within Clanfield ward and are of the view that while the A3 is a notable boundary, it can be crossed. We have also not been persuaded to change Clanfield ward name, as proposed by Councillor Clegg, as we consider that including all the composite parts of the ward within the name would prove to be unwieldy. In view of the fact that we did not receive a viable alternative to our proposals and the fact that we cannot view areas in isolation without having regard to the impact which any change would have upon the electoral equality across the whole of the district, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations for Clanfield and Rowlands Castle wards as final. Under our final recommendations Clanfield ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (9 per

cent fewer in 2004). Rowlands Castle would have 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (8 per cent more in 2004).

### **Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters wards**

81 The town of Petersfield is the administrative centre of the district, providing a range of shops, employment and services. It comprises the parishes of Petersfield and Stroud. It is divided into three wards, Petersfield Heath ward returning one councillor, Petersfield St Marys ward and Petersfield St Peters ward (currently comprising the parish of Stroud) each returning two councillors. Under the existing electoral arrangements the area is under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor in Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters wards being 17 per cent above, 11 per cent above and 2 per cent above the district average.

82 At Stage One, in order to address the under-representation in the area, the District Council proposed that Petersfield be divided into six single-member wards, an overall increase of one councillor. It proposed a modified Petersfield St Marys ward comprising the north-eastern part of the current ward. The remainder of the southern area of this ward would then join with part of the existing Petersfield Heath ward to comprise a new Petersfield Rother ward. The remainder of this ward, less the area to the east of the stream/drainage channel, would then become a modified Petersfield Heath ward. The remainder of Petersfield Heath ward (to the west of the stream) would then be joined with the southern part of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward to comprise a new Petersfield Causeway ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward would become a new Petersfield Bell Hill ward, less the parish of Stroud, to be included in a new ward with the parishes of Froxfield, Steep and Colemore & Priors Dean. Finally, the District Council proposed that the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward be joined with the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Marys ward to form a modified Petersfield St Peters ward in the centre of the town.

83 The Council argued that the proposed boundaries “recognise the separate identities in the town, such as the housing estates, road links and physical features”. Under these proposals Petersfield Bell Hill, Petersfield Causeway, Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys, Petersfield Rother and Petersfield St Peters would have 4 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer, 18 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer and 7 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (7 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer, 9 per cent fewer, 10 per cent fewer, 4 per cent fewer and 9 per cent fewer in 2004).

84 The Conservative Associations did not submit specific warding arrangements for Petersfield, but allocated six councillors to the area.

85 We considered carefully the District Council’s proposed warding for the area and noted that the proposed Petersfield St Marys ward would initially be over-represented by 18 per cent. We therefore considered alternatives while trying to build on the District Council’s scheme in Petersfield. On the proposed council size Petersfield would merit 5.5 councillors, hence the slight over-representation under the District Council’s proposals. We attempted to re-ward Petersfield with a total of five councillors. However, this would have resulted in significant under-representation, particularly by 2004. We therefore looked at other alternatives based on six councillors for the area. However, we found that any alternative for the area would worsen the

electoral equality in the remainder of Petersfield, or result in higher levels of electoral inequality by 2004. We therefore adopted the District Council's proposals for Petersfield as part of our draft recommendations, as we judged that they would reflect local communities and give improved levels of electoral equality by 2004.

86 At Stage Three the District Council and the Liberal Democrats supported our proposals for Petersfield. Petersfield Branch of East Hampshire Labour Party stated that it was "broadly in agreement" with our recommendations but proposed a number of minor boundary amendments within Petersfield. It proposed that the north-eastern boundary of Bell Hill ward should run along the railway line and Tilmore Road, as it felt that "the exclusion of the Kimber houses [to be] quite artificial". It also proposed including three houses at the western end of Love Lane in St Marys ward and that the boundary for Heath ward should follow Heath Road West and include a section of housing on the corner with Sussex Road. It also proposed using the Herne Farm estate as the western boundary of Rother ward. It also stated that if further electors were required in Heath ward "to maintain numerical balance", the Heathfield Road and Barnfield Road area could be included in the ward and Drum Stream could be used as a natural boundary.

87 County Councillor West supported our proposals for six single-member wards in Petersfield and an increase in the number of councillors in the town. He also proposed a number of minor boundary amendments, proposing that Love Lane, Readon Close, Merryfield Road and Churchfield Road be transferred from St Marys ward to Rother ward. He also stated that Heath Road and Sussex Road should be included within Heath ward, and that the Borough and Borough Hill be transferred to St Peters ward. Councillor Jamieson supported our proposals stating that they "reflect local neighbourhoods".

88 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage Three and given the local support received we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final, albeit with one minor modification. We consider that the Petersfield Branch of the Labour Party's proposals for the western end of Love Lane, would better reflect community identity, as access to these houses is from Love Lane, within St Marys ward. This modification would improve electoral equality in Petersfield St Marys ward which would have 17 per cent fewer electors than the district average initially (9 per cent fewer in 2004). However, we have not been persuaded to change our draft recommendations elsewhere in Petersfield as the other amendments put forward would have a detrimental affect on electoral equality across the town. Our final recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of this report.

### **Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards**

89 These three wards lie in the centre of the district. The wards of Froxfield & Steep (comprising the parishes of those names) and The Hangers (comprising the parishes of Colemore & Priors Dean, Greatham and Hawkley) currently return one councillor each, while Liss ward (comprising only that parish) returns two councillors. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards is 23 per cent below, 21 per cent above and 43 per cent below the district average respectively.

90 At Stage One, in order to address the over-representation in Froxfield & Steep ward, the District Council proposed that Stroud parish, in the existing Petersfield St Peters ward, and

Colemore & Priors Dean parish, in the existing The Hangers ward, be included in a modified Froxfield & Steep ward, to be represented by one councillor. It further proposed that the parish of Liss be divided between two district wards to address the under-representation in the current ward, with the Liss Forest area being included in a ward with the parishes of Hawkley and Greatham and represented by one councillor, and the remainder of the existing Liss ward forming a two-member ward. The District Council argued that the two areas of Liss Forest and Liss Village are separate communities. It suggested that these proposed wards be named Colemore & Priors Dean, Froxfield, Steep & Stroud ward, Liss Forest, Hawkley & Greatham ward, and Liss ward.

91 At Stage One Hawkley Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposals and proposed that the parishes of Hawkley, East Tisted, Newton Valence and Selborne be placed together, on the grounds that they share common identities. Greatham Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals, highlighting its preference for remaining linked to Hawkley parish. It stated that "since the construction of the A3 Petersfield by-pass, part of Greatham has been cut off from the rest of the village, and now has close ties with Liss Forest. There is a natural boundary between Liss and Liss Forest and a local gap separating the two".

92 We considered carefully the proposals for this area and looked at the alternative put forward by Hawkley Parish Council which combined the parishes of Hawkley, East Tisted, Newton Valence and Selborne in a district ward. Although this combination of parishes would give good electoral equality in itself, we could not consider any area in isolation without having regard to the impact which any change may have upon the rest of the district, and such an arrangement would have an adverse effect on electoral equality in the surrounding area. We therefore considered that the District Council's proposals would provide the best levels of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and put them forward as part of our draft recommendations. However, we proposed that the wards be named Froxfield & Steep ward, Liss Forest & Greatham ward, and Liss ward. Under our draft proposals Froxfield & Steep, Liss Forest & Greatham and Liss wards have equal to, 2 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors than the district average currently (4 per cent fewer, 5 per cent fewer and 4 per cent more in 2004).

93 At Stage Three Hawkley Parish Council stated that it was "disappointed that the Commission [had] not been able to recommend ... a ward comprising Hawkley, East Tisted, Colemore & Priors Dean, Newton Valence and Selborne", but accepted the Commission's proposal to create a new Liss Forest & Greatham ward. It did not accept the omission of the name Hawkley from the new ward name, arguing that omitting the name whilst retaining the names of the other parishes would "lead to a loss of identity and subsequently a loss of interest in electoral procedures". It proposed that the new ward could be named Hangers & Forest ward or Liss Forest with Hawkley & Greatham ward, although the latter was considered "very much as a second choice".

94 Liss Parish Council reluctantly accepted our proposals but stated that if "numbers were not such an important element we would have wished to retain Liss Forest with Liss". Stroud Parish Council supported our proposal for Froxfield & Steep ward, but proposed that the ward name include its parish name (ie Froxfield, Steep and Stroud).

95 Priors Dean & Colemore Parish Meeting stated that it had no “particular objections” to our proposal to include Priors Dean & Colemore Parish in Froxfield & Steep ward, but stated that it was “very far from convinced that this represents any advantages from the proposal which we put forward to the District Council”. County Councillor West accepted our proposed Froxfield & Steep and Liss Forest & Greatham wards but requested that our Liss Forest & Greatham ward be renamed Greatham & Liss Forest ward. He also stated that he considered the use of the railway line as a boundary to be “very sensible ... to delineate Liss Forest”. Councillor Crowhurst questioned why Liss ward was to be retained as a two-member ward, contending that it was “unfair to the voters”. Councillor Halstead objected to the Commission’s “equality of number criteria” and argued that the splitting of Liss and Liss Forest had no “logic”, contending that the people of Liss Forest were “intrinsicly part of Liss” with limited links with Greatham and none with Hawkley. She argued further that the councillor representing Liss Forest & Greatham ward would have an “almost impossibly large geographic area to cover” and that the communities being represented would “often [have] competing interests”.

96 We have considered carefully the representations received during the consultation period but have not been persuaded to move away from our draft recommendations. We consider that the alternative ward names put forward of Liss Forest with Hawkley & Greatham and Froxfield, Steep & Stroud would be unwieldy and we are not convinced that any of the alternative ward names had received wide local support.

97 We remain of the view that our draft proposals would best provide for electoral equality whilst having regard to the statutory criteria and are therefore content to confirm them as final.

#### **98 Farringdon, Four Marks, Medstead, Ropley & West Tisted and Selborne wards**

99 These five wards lie in the north-west of the district and comprise a number of small rural communities, returning one councillor each. Farringdon ward comprises the parishes of Chawton, East Tisted, Farringdon and Newton Valence; Four Marks and Medstead wards each comprise only the parish of the same name; Ropley & West Tisted ward comprises the parishes of those names; and Selborne ward comprises the parishes of Kingsley, Selborne and Worldham. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor is 43 per cent below the district average in Farringdon, 29 per cent above in Four Marks, 20 per cent below in Medstead, 28 per cent below in Ropley & West Tisted and 11 per cent below in Selborne wards.

100 The Council’s Stage One scheme proposed an alternative configuration of parishes for the three wards in the area, in order to address the general over-representation. It proposed that the existing Ropley & West Tisted ward be extended to include the parishes of East Tisted and Newton Valence, currently in Farringdon ward, in a new single-member Ropley, West Tisted, East Tisted & Newton Valence ward. The District Council argued that Ropley and West Tisted are historically linked and that “the addition of the other two parishes would ensure a ward covering areas linked by their rural nature”. It also pointed out that the parishes of East Tisted, West Tisted and Newton Valence are linked by the A32 road.

101 The District Council further proposed that the existing Four Marks and Medstead wards be amalgamated to comprise a new two-member Medstead & Four Marks ward. It did, however, recognise that the two parishes are quite different “in respect of character and appearance”, but

stated that their geographical proximity makes their establishment in a new ward logical. The District Council recommended no change to the existing Selborne ward, which comprises the parishes of Kingsley, Worldham and Selborne. It argued that “Kingsley and Worldham in particular have very strong links, with each sharing local services, facilities and community events; both are linked by the B3004”.

102 The Conservative Associations put forward identical warding arrangements to the District Council for the area. Worldham Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposals that the parishes of Kingsley, Worldham and Selborne remain in a single district ward.

103 After considering carefully all the evidence available, we concluded that the District Council’s scheme for the area provided an appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, while also enjoying local support. We therefore put forward these proposals as part of our draft recommendations. However, we recommended that the proposed Ropley, West Tisted, East Tisted & Newton Valence ward be named Ropley & Tisted as we considered the suggested name to be over-complex.

104 At Stage Three the District Council fully supported our draft recommendations. Four Marks Parish Council objected to our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward, arguing that Four Marks parish would be better paired with Ropley parish and that our proposed ward would be, “even on statistical grounds ... inappropriate”. Medstead Parish Council also objected to our proposals, arguing that Four Marks parish has developed a “marked suburban character” while Medstead parish is more rural in nature with more in common with the parishes of Wield and Bentworth. It also contended that Four Marks parish has more in common with Ropley parish and has better road links. It proposed that the parishes of Wield, Bentworth and Medstead be brought together in a single-member ward, that the parishes of Four Marks and Ropley be placed in a two member ward and that the parishes of Beech, Chawton, Farringdon, Newton Valence, East Tisted and West Tisted be placed in a single-member ward. It argued that this latter ward, although geographically larger “would be counter balanced by the smaller number of electors to be represented when compared to the district average”. A local resident also objected to our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward stating that the “two parishes differ widely”, arguing that Ropley parish has stronger links with Four Marks parish than Medstead parish. Worldham Parish Council and Kingsley Parish Council both fully supported our recommendations for Selborne ward.

105 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received at Stage Three, however we have not been persuaded to modify our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward. We consider that the two areas are geographically close together, there are good road links between the two and that our proposal would secure the best balance between the statutory criteria. We considered the alternative warding arrangements put forward by Medstead Parish Council, and although the three wards would have reasonable electoral equality, their proposals did not appear to have been the subject of wider consultation. Furthermore, Bentworth Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be linked with the parishes of Wield, Shalden and Lasham. We therefore confirm our proposed Four Marks & Medstead ward, which would have 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (11 per cent more in 2004), as final.

106 Given the broad support we have received at Stage Three for the remainder of our draft recommendations in this area, we are content to confirm them as final. Under our final recommendations the proposed Ropley & Tisted ward would have 7 per cent fewer electors than the district average initially (11 per cent fewer in 2004) and the proposed Selborne ward would have 7 per cent fewer electors initially (12 per cent fewer in 2004).

### **Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Whitehill (Lindford) wards**

107 These two wards lie to the east of the district and form the second-largest settlement in East Hampshire. Whitehill has experienced some of the highest rates of development in the district over the last 10 years. Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward comprises the parish of Whitehill, while Whitehill (Lindford) ward comprises the parish of Lindford. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor in the three-member Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward and the single-member Whitehill (Lindford) ward is 50 per cent above and 11 per cent below the district average respectively (66 per cent above and 5 per cent below by 2004).

108 At Stage One the District Council proposed that in order to address the under-representation in the area, and to accommodate proposed future development, the number of councillors be increased from three to five. It proposed that the existing Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward be split into five single-member wards while Whitehill (Lindford) ward would remain unchanged although the ward should be renamed simply Lindford. The District Council argued that “Bordon and Whitehill have separate identities and the wards have been created to take account of this”.

109 It proposed that a new Whitehill Hogmoor ward be created, comprising the relatively rural western area of Whitehill. It further proposed that a new Whitehill Pinewood ward be created comprising the remainder of the northern part of the area, bordering the proposed Lindford ward to the east. A new Whitehill Bordon East ward would cover the area to the south of the existing Whitehill (Lindford) ward and a new Whitehill Bordon West ward would cover the area to the west of the proposed Whitehill Bordon East ward. Finally, it proposed a new Whitehill Walldown ward, comprising the remainder of Whitehill in the south of the settlement.

110 The Conservative Associations did not submit specific warding arrangements for this area, but they did, however, allocate a total of five councillors to Whitehill. Whitehill Town Council supported the District Council’s proposals to split Whitehill into five single-member wards. However, it stated that the proposed Whitehill Bordon East ward and Whitehill Bordon wards should be renamed Whitehill Deadwater ward and Whitehill Chase ward respectively, to better reflect the areas covered.

111 In our draft recommendations report, we stated that we considered that an increase in councillors from three to five was justified, due to the existing under-representation and the projected development in the area. We also noted that these proposals were supported by Whitehill Town Council, and would provide for substantially improved levels of electoral equality, while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore put forward the District Council’s proposals as part of our draft recommendations for the area, but also recommended that the Town Council’s proposals for Whitehill Bordon East ward to be named Whitehill Deadwater, and Whitehill Bordon West ward to be named Whitehill Chase, be adopted.



112 At Stage Three the District Council supported our draft recommendations in this area. Whitehill Town Council supported our draft recommendations for five single-member district wards in Whitehill Town and five parish wards each returning three parish councillors. It also reiterated its Stage One proposals with regard to ward names, supporting our proposals. Lindford Parish Council commented that in our draft recommendations report we referred to our proposed ward of Lindford as Whitehill Lindford, stating further that “Lindford is not a part of Whitehill, any more than Headley or Selborne”.

113 We have given careful consideration to the representations received at Stage Three and given the local support for our proposals, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations as final. We have noted the comments of Lindford Parish Council and we agree that the existing ward of Whitehill Lindford should be retained unchanged but should be named Lindford ward to reflect the fact that it wholly comprises the parish of Lindford. Under our final recommendations Lindford ward would have 7 per cent fewer electors than the district average currently (equal to the average in 2004).

114 Under our final recommendations Whitehill Chase, Whitehill Deadwater, Whitehill Hogmoor, Whitehill Pinewood and Whitehill Walldown wards would have 4 per cent, 6 per cent, 5 per cent, 6 per cent and 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (6 per cent, 4 per cent, 6 per cent, 4 per cent and 1 per cent more than the average in 2004. These proposals are shown on the large map at the back of this report.

### **Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley wards**

115 These three wards lie to the east of the district, with the wards of Headley and Grayshott bordering Surrey. The number of electors per councillor in the three-member Bramshott & Liphook ward (comprising the parish of the same name) is currently 2 per cent below the district average (equal to the average by 2004). In the single-member Grayshott ward (comprising the parish of the same name) this figure is 5 per cent below the district average (5 per cent below by 2004), while in the two-member Headley ward (comprising Headley parish) is 6 per cent above the district average (9 per cent by 2004).

116 The District Council proposed no change to Bramshott & Liphook ward at Stage One. It argued that “the area is a distinct community served by its own shops, schools, pubs, restaurants and railway station”. It further argued that although some of the parish is rural in nature, much development has taken place over the last few years with more expected, and therefore proposed that the ward remain unchanged. The District Council also proposed that the existing Grayshott and Headley wards remain unchanged, arguing that both these areas and the surrounding parishes have a distinct identity and that “a grouping or division of parishes would not allow for an area with combined community interests”.

117 The Conservative Associations also proposed that the wards of Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley be retained unchanged. However, the Constituency Labour Party proposed that Headley and Grayshott wards be combined to create a new three-member ward.

118 Given the generally good levels of electoral equality that already existed in the area, we adopted the District Council’s proposal for an unchanged Bramshott & Liphook ward as part of

our draft proposals. However, we noted that, under the Council's scheme, Headley ward would be under-represented by 14 per cent by 2004. While recognising the distinct identity of both Headley and Grayshott wards, we proposed that both wards be combined to create a new three-member Headley & Grayshott ward, as proposed by the Constituency Labour Party. We considered that these proposals would still have regard to both communities while significantly improving electoral equality.

119 At Stage Three the District Council objected to our draft proposals for Headley & Grayshott ward stating that "both communities have separate identities and ... the rural gap between the existing communities means that they have little commonality of interest". It stated further that it did not want "local democratic accountability [to be weakened] in its rural areas by the creation of large multi-member wards". James Arbuthnot MP also objected to our proposals, stating that Headley and Grayshott "are separated by a broad band of countryside". He stated further that the "concept of a three-member ward is also unfortunate", arguing that "there is a closer link between single-member than triple-member wards".

120 Headley Parish Council objected to our proposals for this area, arguing that the two areas are separated by four miles of National Trust land and that each community has its "own cultural and resident's organisations". It stated that if the current arrangements were maintained Grayshott ward would be "virtually in line with the district average" and that Headley ward would have 14 per cent more electors than the district average by 2004. However, it noted that five other proposed wards would have electoral imbalances of more than 10 per cent. Grayshott Parish Council also objected to our proposals, stating that the distinct identities of these two wards justifies the under-representation in Headley ward, arguing that "Grayshott is a small compact area" while "Headley is a spread out community with distinct pockets of residential accommodation".

121 Headley Resident's Association and Headley Down Resident's Association both objected to our proposals; Headley Down Resident's Association stated that each area has "its own unique identity and individual problems" and that "the electors of Headley would far rather be under-represented, than to be represented by a councillor from a separate parish which does not share the same identity or problems". Headley Resident's Association proposed that the existing arrangements be maintained, stating that our proposals "besides not having any positive benefits will also confuse the electorate".

122 District Councillors Cowper, James, Standen and Whittle, and County Councillor West also objected to our proposed Headley & Grayshott ward. Councillor Cowper argued that the "parish of Grayshott wishes [the Commission] to recognise its identity". He further stated that the two areas differ by demographic profile, local economy, social cohesion and local issues and that the rural gap between the two areas was "specifically designed to prevent the communities from coalescing and developing into [a] rural conurbation". Councillor James stated that Headley and Grayshott are "two distinct and separate communities, which have an overwhelming desire to remain so" and proposed maintaining the existing arrangements. Councillor Whittle stated that the "numbers involved in the Commission's proposal... are so marginal as to be irrelevant in the larger scene of parish and community identity" and proposed that the current Headley and Grayshott wards be retained.

123 The District Council supported our proposed three-member Bramshott & Liphook ward. Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council also supported our proposals, stating that they “would like to commend the Commission on their draft recommendations”. Councillor James supported our draft proposals for Bramshott & Liphook ward, stating that he believed his feelings “reflect the view of the vast majority of the parishioners”. The Liberal Democrats stated that they would prefer to see Bramshott and Liphook parish split into single-member wards or one single-member and one two-member ward. They argued that it is a “large area and there are distinctions between the rural (Bramshott) and the more urban (Liphook) areas”. Councillor Crowhurst stated that Bramshott and Liphook had “the right to be warded” and that our proposals were “quite unfair to voters”.

124 We considered carefully the representations made at Stage Three and, after visiting the area, we have been persuaded that Headley and Grayshott do have their own distinct identities. We also accept the argument that the four mile rural gap between the two areas provides a significant geographical boundary. Therefore, in order to better reflect local community identity, we propose that the existing Headley and Grayshott wards should remain unchanged. We consider that the increased electoral inequality within Headley ward is justified, given the better reflection of community ties. Our final recommendations would result in the two-member Headley ward having 11 per cent more electors than the district average initially (14 per cent more in 2004), while the single-member Grayshott ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors than the district average initially (equal to the average in 2004).

125 Given the generally good levels of electoral equality that already exist in the area and the support we received at Stage Three for our proposals, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations for Bramshott & Liphook ward as final. The number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bramshott & Liphook ward would be 3 per cent above the district average currently (4 per cent above in 2004).

### **Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards**

126 These eight wards cover the northern part of the district. Alton is the largest town in the district and acts as the main focus for services, providing a wide range of community and public facilities. Alton North East returns two councillors, while the rest of the above wards each return one councillor. Binsted ward returns one councillor and comprises the parish of the same name, Froyle & Bentley ward comprises those two parishes, while North Downland ward comprises the parishes of Bentworth, Lasham, Shalden and Wield. The other wards comprise only parts of Alton town, except for Alton South West & Beech which additionally comprises the newly created parish of Beech. Under the current arrangements the number of electors per councillor in Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards is 10 per cent below, 22 per cent below, 26 per cent above, 25 per cent below, 1 per cent below, 33 per cent below, 35 per cent below and 44 per cent below the district average respectively (13 per cent below, 22 per cent below, 20 per cent above, 17 per cent below, equal to, 34 per cent below, 37 per cent below and 47 per cent below by 2004).

127 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the town of Alton be divided into six single-member wards, requiring the re-warding of the parish, so that the number of district councillors representing the town would decrease from seven to six. It argued that “the new wards take account of the housing estates and areas of shared community interest within the town”. It proposed that a new Alton Holybourne & Manor ward be created comprising the existing Alton Holybourne ward plus the whole of the Anstey Lane and Wooteys Way area. The number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the district average both initially and in 2004.

128 The District Council also proposed that the existing Alton North East ward be modified so that it no longer includes part of Anstey Lane, Wooteys Way, Plovers Way and Allen Close. It proposed that this new ward be named Alton Wooteys. The number of electors per councillor in the proposed Alton Wooteys ward would be 9 per cent above the district average (8 per cent above in 2004). It further proposed a new Alton West & Eastbrooke ward, comprising the remainder of the existing Alton North East ward, part of the existing Alton North West ward and part of the existing Alton South East ward. The number of electors in Alton West & Eastbrooke ward would vary by 9 per cent above the district average in 1999 (8 per cent above in 2004).

129 The District Council proposed that the new parish of Beech, created in 1999, form part of a modified North Downland ward (as discussed below) and that the remainder of the existing Alton South West & Beech ward be divided in two. The remainder of Alton South East ward and part of Alton South West & Beech ward would then form a new Alton Ashdell ward, the western boundary of which would run along Butts Road and then along the railway line. The remainder of Alton South West & Beech ward would then form a new Alton Whitedown ward, the northern boundary of which would follow Lenten Street, excluding Barton End and Whitedown Cottages. The number of electors per councillor in Alton Ashdell and Alton Whitedown wards would vary by 7 per cent and 1 per cent below the average respectively (8 per cent above and 7 per cent below by 2004).

130 Finally in this area, the District Council proposed that a new Alton Amery ward be created, comprising the remainder of Alton North West ward, with both its eastern and western boundaries remaining the same. The number of electors in Alton Amery ward would vary by less than 2 per cent from the average both initially and in 2004.

131 The District Council proposed that the existing Froyle & Bentley ward be modified to include the parishes of Shalden and Lasham in a single-member Bentley, Froyle, Lasham & Shalden ward. It argued that Bentley and Froyle are historically linked and that all the parishes are small and rural “looking towards Alton, Farnham and possibly Basingstoke for facilities and services”.

132 The District Council further proposed that the parishes of Wield and Bentworth from the existing North Downland ward be joined with the parish of Beech and the parishes of Chawton and Farringdon, from the existing Farringdon ward, to create a new single-member Wield, Bentworth, Beech, Chawton & Farringdon ward. It argued that although all these parishes have their own distinct communities there are a number of similarities in their outlook. Finally, the District Council argued that, due to its strong community identity, the existing Binsted ward, comprising the parish of the same name, should remain unchanged.

133 The Conservative Associations put forward alternative arrangements for the area, proposing that the Holybourne area be placed with the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham in a single-member ward. They further proposed that the remainder of Alton be represented by six councillors but did not give detailed warding. The Constituency Labour Party proposed that Binsted be placed with Bentley to create a single-member ward. We received a further representation from Beech Parish Council regarding this area, which stated its preference for being included in a more rural ward, such as North Downland.

134 We considered carefully the proposals for this area and noted that the District Council's proposed Binsted ward would be significantly over-represented, and that the proposed Alton wards would all be slightly under-represented. We therefore looked at a number of alternative arrangements for the area. We concluded that the most suitable alternative arrangement for the area was that put forward by the Conservative Associations, and the Constituency Labour Party. We therefore proposed placing the parishes of Bentley and Binsted in a new single-member Binsted & Bentley ward, to address the significant over-representation in Binsted, and proposed placing the Holybourne area with the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham. While we noted the opposition of Alton Town Council during the District Council's Stage One consultation to the separation of the Holybourne area from the remainder of Alton, we considered that placing Holybourne in a new district ward would secure an appropriate level of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria.

135 While we noted that further improvements to electoral equality could be made by dividing the Holybourne area between wards, we considered that Holybourne is a small and distinct community, and should therefore be left intact. We therefore proposed placing the whole of Holybourne in a new single-member Holybourne & Froyle ward which would also address some of the under-representation in the remainder of Alton, which would then merit six councillors. We recognised that this arrangement would not be ideal, however, we considered every alternative for the area, and were unable to find a suitable alternative that would provide for a more appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

136 As a consequence of our proposals to include the Holybourne area in a new Holybourne & Froyle ward, and in order to improve electoral equality further, we proposed that Alton be divided into three two-member wards. Our proposals for this area largely followed the community areas identified by the District Council. However, we noted the preference for single-member wards in the urban areas and we therefore stated that we would welcome further comments, or alternative warding arrangements that would secure similar levels of electoral equality based on single-member wards. We proposed that these three wards be named Alton Amery & Whitedown, Alton West & Ashdell and Alton Wooteys & Manor.

137 At Stage Three the District Council supported our proposed Binsted & Bentley, Farringdon, and Holybourne & Froyle wards although it stated that our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward "may not be popular with a number of people within Holybourne". However, it objected to our proposals for Alton, stating that it considered that Alton should comprise six single-member wards in "order to give [it] synergy with the draft recommendations for Horndean, Petersfield and Whitehill". It put forward an alternative scheme based on single-member wards: Alton Amery, Alton Ashdell, Alton Eastbrooke, Alton Westbrooke, Alton Whitedown and Alton Wooteys.

138 The Council's proposed Alton Amery ward would comprise part of the current Alton North West ward. The western boundary of the proposed ward would run down New Odiham Road while the eastern boundary would run down Old Odiham Road. The southern boundary of the ward would run to the north of Amery Hill School and along the rear of the houses to the north of the River Wey. Its proposed Alton Whitedown ward would comprise that part of the current Alton North West ward to the west of New Odiham Road. Its eastern boundary would run along the current boundary lines of Lenton Street and Ackender Road as far as Butts Road where it would then run south west along Butts Road as far as the railway line. Its proposed Alton Westbrooke ward would comprise the remainder of the current Alton North West ward. Its southern boundary would run along the railway line including the area to the north of it, and south of Butts Road in the current Alton South West ward. It would include the area of the current Alton South East ward as far as the rear of the buildings on the south-western side of Paper Mill Lane. It would also comprise part of the current Alton North East ward to the south of the cemetery. The boundary would run to the south of the cemetery along Spitalfields Road, up until house number 14, and then run southwards to meet Normandy Street between the properties numbered 70 and 72. Its proposed Alton Amery, Alton Whitedown and Alton Westbrooke wards would have 1 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer and 8 per cent more electors than the district average currently (2 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer and 7 per cent more in 2004)

139 Its proposed Alton Ashdell ward would comprise the parts of Alton South West ward and Alton South East ward to the south of the railway line. Its proposed Alton Eastbrooke ward would comprise the remainder of Alton South East ward and part of the existing Alton North East ward. Its northern boundary would run between Old Odiham Road and Anstey Road running behind the houses on Widgeons and Wooteys Way as far as Plovers Way, where it would run south behind the houses on Pound Gate and east along Geale's Crescent to Anstey Lane. In addition, the District Council proposed that a new Alton Wooteys ward would comprise the remainder of Alton North East ward. Its eastern boundary would include part of the current Alton Holybourne ward, running north from Anstey Road behind Anstey Park and to the rear of the properties on Manor Road. Its proposed Alton Ashdell, Alton Eastbrooke and Alton Wooteys wards would have 7 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer electors than the district council initially (8 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer in 2004).

140 Alton Town Council stated that it did not object to our proposal that Alton have six district councillors but stated that it supported the District Council's proposal for six single-member wards in the town, adding that it still supported the District Council's original proposal for six single-member wards, including the Holybourne area. It also objected to a number of our proposed boundaries in Alton, and to our proposed Alton Wooteys & Manor and Holybourne & Froyle wards, stating that it "cuts the Anstey Park extension from the main area of the park". It also objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward, arguing that although Holybourne has a village identity it has more links with Alton and has "no community of interest with the parishes in the new ward". It argued further that the councillor for the new ward would be required to liaise with four parish and town councils, two county councillors and two MPs.

141 Michael Mates MP stated that our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward gave him "cause for concern" and also commented on possible consequential county council and parliamentary representation of our proposed wards.

142 The Liberal Democrats objected to our proposals, arguing that there should be seven single-member wards for Alton and Holybourne and that Holybourne as a community does not relate to the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham. East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party supported all our draft proposals for Alton Town, specifically the “warding of Holybourne village with Froyle to create a single-member District ward”, and our proposal that Alton comprise three two-member wards and the allocation of Town Council seats.

143 Froyle Parish Council stated that it would have preferred no change to the current arrangements and that its link with “Bentley as a district ward [had] worked well”. However, it stated further that it agreed “reluctantly that equalisation of the electorate and enlargement of the current District Council ward has to be accepted”. It stated that there appeared to be only two practical options for Froyle parish, the option proposed by East Hampshire District Council combining the parishes of Bentley, Froyle, Shalden and Lasham which it stated would result in a large ward, but one that grouped “four similarly rural areas without any individual parish being numerically dominant”, or our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward which it argued would group Holybourne with smaller parishes who would “not consider themselves to be fairly represented”. It argued further that by “adhering to the numerical equality criterion” our proposals would be “unacceptable to the electorate of Froyle”.

144 Holybourne Village Association also objected to our proposals, stating that it wished Holybourne to remain linked to Alton. It argued that Froyle parish is “two small scattered villages” while “Holybourne is semi-urban”. Shalden Parish Council objected to our proposals, stating that it has always had close links with the parishes of Wield, Bentworth and Lasham. It proposed that Beech be included in North Downland in order to “balance electoral numbers”.

145 Councillor Booker proposed that Alton be represented by six single-member wards, arguing that these wards should also represent Holybourne village. He also proposed alternative ward names should his proposals be accepted: Amery, Ashdell, Eastbrooke, Westbrooke, Whitedown and Wooteys (if Holybourne was not included). Councillor Jamieson objected to our proposals, stating that Holybourne “is physically connected to Alton”. Councillor Janes objected to our proposals, arguing that they “create a geographically massive ward”. He proposed that Brockham Hill be included within Holybourne and that the parish boundaries be amended accordingly.

146 Three local residents also objected to our proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward, one Lasham resident stating that they were happy with the current arrangements, while another stated that Shalden has more in common with Bentworth and Lasham.

147 Farringdon Parish Council objected to our proposals, arguing that “equality of representation is not practicable, neither does it make for effective and convenient local government.” It stated further that councillors in rural wards would have to cover more area than councillors in more urban areas, stating further that it regarded “the two-way communication between the Parish Council and the District Councillor to be an essential and vital component of local government” and that a councillor having to attend the meetings of five parish councils “spread over a distance of 13 kilometres, is to create immense difficulties in that two-way communication”. It stated further that road links between Farringdon and Wield were not ideal and that the two villages had little in common. It proposed that Farringdon remain linked to

Newton Valence, East Tisted and Chawton, adding that Beech could be added if it was necessary to enlarge the ward.

148 Beech Parish Council supported our proposals, stating that it preferred to be linked with rural parishes rather than the urban Alton South West ward. Bentworth Parish Council proposed that Bentworth and Wield remain linked with Shalden and Lasham and that Beech and Froyle should be added to form a new North Downland ward. A local resident objected to our proposed Farringdon ward, stating that Bentworth, Shalden and Lasham share common ties. Binsted Parish Council supported our proposals for Binsted & Bentley ward, as did Bentley Parish Council, who stated that they hoped we would “not be minded to change this recommendation.”

149 We have considered carefully all the evidence available and, in the light of the evidence put forward at Stage Three, we consider that the statutory criteria would best be met in Alton town by six single-member wards, and propose adopting the alternative scheme put forward by the District Council. We are content to endorse the ward names of Alton Amery, Alton Ashdell, Alton Eastbrooke, Alton Westbrooke, Alton Whitedown and Alton Wooteys. However, we propose a minor boundary amendment to the District Council’s proposals between Alton Ashdell and Alton Westbrooke wards, proposing that the area to the north of the railway, to the south of Butts Road and to the west of Borovere Road be included within Alton Whitedown ward, as this would improve electoral equality in both wards. We also propose that the Industrial Estate between Alton Ashdell and Holybourne & Froyle wards should be contained entirely within Alton Ashdell ward, as proposed by Alton Town Council.

150 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Alton Amery, Alton Ashdell, Alton Eastbrooke, Alton Westbrooke, Alton Whitedown and Alton Wooteys wards would vary by 1 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer initially (2 per cent fewer, 8 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 2 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 4 per cent fewer by 2004).

151 However, we have not been persuaded to move away from our draft recommendations in Holybourne & Froyle ward. We considered the proposal from Froyle Parish Council that Froyle, Lasham and Shalden be combined with Bentley, that Binsted be combined with the parishes to its south and that Holybourne be included within Alton but, as outlined in our draft recommendations report, this would result in Alton being notably under-represented overall. Our final recommendations would result in Holybourne & Froyle ward having 13 per cent more electors than the district average currently (13 per cent more in 2004).

152 Similarly, we have not been persuaded to change our proposed Farringdon ward. We cannot view any area in isolation and note that Farringdon Parish Council’s proposals would adversely affect the levels of electoral equality in neighbouring wards. Therefore, we consider that our proposed Farringdon ward would best reflect electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. Under our final recommendations Farringdon ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors than the district average initially (2 per cent more in 2004).

153 Given the support received for our proposed Binsted & Bentley ward, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations it would have 11 per cent more electors currently (11 per cent more in 2004).



## Electoral Cycle

154 At Stage One we received no proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the district. Accordingly, we made no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

155 At Stage Three no further comments were received to the contrary, and we confirm our draft recommendation to retain the present system of whole-council elections every four years, as final.

## Conclusions

156 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- there should be a minor boundary modification between Petersfield Rother and Petersfield St Marys ward;
- the existing Grayshott and Headley wards should be retained;
- Alton should comprise six single-member wards.

157 We conclude that, in East Hampshire:

- there should be an increase in council size from 42 to 44;
- there should be 38 wards, seven more than at present;
- the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

158 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 and 2004 electorate figures.

*Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	42	44	42	44
Number of wards	31	38	31	38

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Average number of electors per councillor	1,989	1,899	2,112	2,016
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	23	6	23	6
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	16	0	16	0

159 As Figure 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 23 to six with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. By 2004 only six wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

#### **Final Recommendation**

East Hampshire District Council should comprise 44 councillors, serving 38 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

### **Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

160 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable 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, in our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for Alton, Horndean, Liss, Petersfield, Rowlands Castle and Whitehill parishes to reflect the proposed district wards.

161 The parish of Alton is currently served by 11 councillors representing five parish wards: Alton Holybourne parish ward returning two councillors, Alton North East parish ward returning three councillors, Alton North West parish ward returning two councillors, Alton South East parish ward returning one parish councillor and Alton South West parish ward returning three parish councillors. As part of our draft recommendations, we proposed creating three district wards covering the main town. In order to facilitate this change, we proposed modifying the parish warding arrangements for the town. We proposed that a new Alton Amery & Whitedown parish ward should be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning four parish councillors; a new Alton West & Ashdell parish ward should be created, coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new

Alton Wooteys & Manor parish ward should be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors and that a new Alton Holybourne parish ward should be created comprising that part of the proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward in Alton parish, returning one councillor.

162 In response to our consultation report, Alton Town Council objected to our proposal that the Council be represented by 11 parish councillors. It argued that Alton was “already severely under- represented by parish councillors compared with other parishes”. It argued further that Alton should be represented by a minimum of 12 councillors, two per ward, based on a division of the town into six district wards, including Holybourne.

163 Having considered all the evidence received, and in the light of our final recommendations for six single-member district wards in Alton, we propose, in order to secure two councillors per parish ward in Alton, and one councillor for Holybourne parish ward, that Alton Town Council should be represented by 13 parish councillors, representing seven parish wards. We propose that a new Alton Amery parish ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors; a new Alton Ashdell Parish ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors; a new Alton Eastbrooke parish ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors; a new Alton Westbrooke ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors; a new Alton Whitedown ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors and a new Alton Wooteys ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning two parish councillors. Given our proposals for Alton at district level we propose that Holybourne parish ward, part of Holybourne & Froyle ward, be represented by one parish councillor.

<p><b>Final Recommendation</b></p> <p>Alton Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, two more than at present, representing seven parish wards: Alton Amery, Alton Ashdell, Alton Eastbrooke, Alton Westbrooke, Alton Whitedown and Alton Wooteys (all returning two parish councillors) and Holybourne (returning one parish councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.</p>
---

164 The parish of Horndean is currently served by 12 councillors representing four parish wards; Horndean Murray, Hordean Kings, Horndean Catherington and Horndean Hazleton, each returning three parish councillors.

165 After consulting with Horndean Parish Council, the District Council requested an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15, with three parish councillors representing each parish ward. We therefore proposed as part of our draft recommendations the following new parishing arrangements to facilitate the proposed district warding arrangements: a new Horndean Catherington & Lovedean parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, a new Horndean Downs parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, a new Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same

name, a new Horndean Kings parish ward be created coterminous with the district ward of the same name, and a new Horndean Murray parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, each returning three parish councillors.

166 At Stage Three we received no comments with regard to our proposals and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final.

**Final Recommendation**  
Horndean Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, three more than at present, representing five wards: Horndean Catherington & Lovedean parish ward (returning three councillors), Horndean Down parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Horndean Kings parish ward (returning three parish councillors) and Horndean Murray parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundaries between the five parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on Maps A3 and A4 in Appendix A.

167 The parish of Liss is represented by 13 parish councillors and is not warded at present. The District Council proposed that, in order to facilitate the proposals at district level, the parish be divided into two parish wards of Liss and Liss Forest. It proposed that Liss parish ward be represented by 10 parish councillors and Liss Forest parish ward be represented by three parish councillors. We adopted the District Council’s proposal for this area as part of our draft recommendations.

168 At Stage Three we received no comments with regard to our proposals and are therefore content to confirm our draft proposals as final.

**Final Recommendation**  
Liss Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Liss parish ward (returning 10 parish councillors) and Liss Forest parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

169 The parish of Petersfield is currently represented by 12 parish councillors representing three parish wards: Petersfield St Marys returning five parish councillors; Petersfield Heath returning three parish councillors; and Petersfield St Peters returning four parish councillors.

170 As part of our draft recommendations and given our proposals for district warding in the area, we proposed that Petersfield parish be divided into six new parish wards, each returning two parish councillors. We proposed that the new parish wards of Petersfield St Peters, Petersfield Bell Hill, Petersfield St Marys, Petersfield Rother, Petersfield Heath and Petersfield Causeway should be created, each coterminous with the district ward of the same name.

171 At Stage Three we received no comments with regard to our proposals and are therefore content to confirm our draft proposals as final.

**Final Recommendation**

Petersfield Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Petersfield Bell Hill parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield St Marys parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Rother parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Heath parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Causeway parish ward (returning two parish councillors) and Petersfield St Peters parish ward (returning two parish councillors). The boundaries between the six parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

172 Rowlands Castle Parish Council is currently represented by nine parish councillors and is not warded. The District Council proposed that the area of Rowlands Castle parish to be placed in a new district ward with the parish of Clanfield be named Idsworth & Finchdean parish ward, to be represented by one parish councillor. We therefore proposed creating two new parish wards, Rowlands Castle parish ward to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning eight parish councillors, and Finchdean & Idsworth parish ward to be coterminous with that part of Rowlands Castle parish in the proposed Clanfield district ward, returning one parish councillor.

173 At Stage Three we received no comments with regard to our proposals and are therefore content to confirm our draft proposals as final.

**Final Recommendation**

Rowlands Castle Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Rowlands Castle parish ward (returning eight parish councillors) and Finchdean & Idsworth parish ward (returning one parish councillor). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A5 in Appendix A.

174 Whitehill Parish Council is currently represented by 12 parish councillors representing two parish wards: Whitehill (Deadwater) returning six parish councillors and Whitehill (Whitehill) returning six parish councillors. As stated earlier, in our draft recommendations we proposed that the Whitehill area be divided into five district wards. In its Stage One submission, the District Council stated that Whitehill Parish Council had requested an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15, with each ward being represented by three parish councillors. Whitehill Town Council reiterated its preference for these arrangements at Stage Three.

175 In order to facilitate the proposed district warding arrangements we proposed an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15 representing five new parish wards. We proposed that a new Whitehill Chase parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, a revised Whitehill Deadwater parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, a new Whitehill Hogmoor parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, a new Whitehill Pinewood parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, and a new Whitehill Walldown parish ward coterminous with the district ward of the same name, each returning three parish councillors.

176 At Stage Three Whitehill Town Council supported our proposals for five parish wards each returning three parish councillors. As we have not received any other comments and given this local support we are content to endorse our draft proposals as final.

**Final Recommendation**

Whitehill Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, three more than at present, representing five wards: Whitehill Chase parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Deadwater ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Hogmoor parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Pinewood parish ward (returning three parish councillors) and Whitehill Walldown parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundaries between the five parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

177 In our draft recommendations report we proposed that there should be no change to the electoral cycle of parish councils in the district, and are confirming this as final.

**Final Recommendation**

For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the District Council.

*Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for East Hampshire*





## 6 NEXT STEPS

178 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in East Hampshire and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

179 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 4 September 2000.

180 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU



## APPENDIX A

### **Final Recommendations for East Hampshire: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the East Hampshire 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, A3, A4, A5 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Liss.

**Map A3** illustrates the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Horndean.

**Map A4** illustrates the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Horndean.

**Map A5** illustrates the proposed warding of Rowlands Castle parish.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the proposed warding arrangements for Alton, Petersfield and Whitehill.

*Map A1: Final Recommendations for East Hampshire: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed warding of Liss Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed Warding of Horndean Parish*

*Map A4: Proposed Warding of Horndean Parish*

*Map A5: Proposed Warding of Rowlands Castle Parish*



## APPENDIX B

### Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire

Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ from those we put forward as draft recommendations in respect of only six wards, where our draft proposals are set out below.

*Figure B1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
Alton Amery & Whitedown	Alton ward (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Alton West & Ashdell	Alton ward (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Alton Wooteys & Manor	Alton ward (part – Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish; (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Headley & Grayshott	Headley ward (the parish of Headley); Grayshott ward (the parish of Grayshott)
Petersfield St Marys	Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)
Petersfield Rother	Petersfield Heath ward (part – part of Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)

*Figure B2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Alton Amery & Whitedown	2	3,850	1,925	1	4,038	2,019	0
Alton West & Ashdell	2	3,705	1,853	-2	3,895	1,948	-3
Alton Wooteys & Manor	2	3,741	1,871	-1	3,926	1,963	-3
Headley & Grayshott	3	6,104	2,035	7	6,615	2,205	9

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Petersfield St Marys	1	1,560	1,560	-18	1,823	1,823	-10
Petersfield Rother	1	1,773	1,773	-7	1,940	1,940	-4

*Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Hampshire 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*