

Draft Recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Eastleigh in Hampshire

*January 2000*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Eastleigh in Hampshire.

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Eastleigh: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>
B Eastleigh Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>37</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>39</i>

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



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Eastleigh on 20 July 1999.

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

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

- **in 12 of the 17 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, and nine 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 14 wards and by more than 20 per cent in eight wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 66 - 67) are that:

- **Eastleigh Borough Council should have 44 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 19 wards, instead of 17 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of two, with only one ward retaining its existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In all of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all 19 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath, Hound, Hedge End and West End.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 18 January 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 13 March 2000:

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142**

**E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map Reference</b>
1	Bishopstoke East	2	Bishopstoke ward (part - part Bishopstoke parish); Fair Oak ward (part - part Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish)	Maps 2 and A2
2	Bishopstoke West	2	Bishopstoke ward (part - part Bishopstoke parish)	Maps 2 and A2
3	Botley	2	<i>Unchanged</i> (Botley parish)	Map 2
4	Bursledon & Old Netley	3	Bursledon ward (Bursledon parish); Hound ward (part - the proposed Old Netley parish ward); West End South ward (part - the proposed West End South parish ward of West End parish)	Map 2 and A5
5	Chandler's Ford East	2	Chandler's Ford ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
6	Chandler's Ford West	2	Chandler's Ford ward (part); Eastleigh West ward (part); Hiltingbury West ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
7	Eastleigh Central	3	Eastleigh Central ward; Eastleigh North ward (part); Eastleigh South ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
8	Eastleigh North	3	Eastleigh North ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
9	Eastleigh South	3	Eastleigh South ward (part); Eastleigh West ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
10	Fair Oak & Horton Heath	3	Fair Oak ward (part - the proposed Fair Oak & Horton Heath East parish ward of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish)	Maps 2 and A2
11	Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath	2	Hamble ward (Hamble-le-Rice parish); Hound ward (part - the proposed Butlocks Heath parish ward of Hound parish)	Maps 2 and A8
12	Hedge End St John's	3	Hedge End St John's ward (part - the proposed St Helen's and St John's parish wards of Hedge End parish); Hedge End Wildern ward (part - the proposed Freegrounds parish ward of Hedge End parish)	Maps 2 and A7
13	Hedge End Grange Park	2	Hedge End Wildern ward (part - the proposed Grange Park parish ward of Hedge End parish)	Maps 2 and A6
14	Hedge End Wildern	2	Hedge End Wildern ward (part - the proposed Wildern parish ward); Hedge End St John's ward (part - part the proposed Wildern parish ward of Hedge End parish)	Maps 2 and A7

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map Reference</b>
15	Hiltingbury East	2	Hiltingbury East ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
16	Hiltingbury West	2	Hiltingbury West ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
17	Netley Abbey	2	Hound ward (part - the proposed Ingleside and Netley Abbey parish wards of Hound parish)	Maps 2 and A9
18	West End North	2	West End North ward (part - the proposed West End North parish ward of West End parish)	Maps 2 and A4
19	West End South	2	West End South ward (part - the proposed West End South parish ward of West End parish)	Maps 2, A4 and A5

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Eastleigh

	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	Bishopstoke East	2	4,085	2,043	1	4,348	2,174	4
2	Bishopstoke West	2	4,264	2,132	6	4,345	2,173	4
3	Botley	2	3,999	2,000	0	3,883	1,942	-6
4	Burlesdon & Old Netley	3	5,423	1,808	-10	5,897	1,966	-6
5	Chandler's Ford East	2	3,870	1,935	-4	3,926	1,963	-6
6	Chandler's Ford West	2	4,225	2,113	4	4,217	2,109	1
7	Eastleigh Central	3	6,185	2,062	2	6,537	2,179	5
8	Eastleigh North	3	6,105	2,035	1	5,946	1,982	-5
9	Eastleigh South	3	6,002	2,001	-1	6,234	2,078	0
10	Fair Oak & Horton Heath	3	6,312	2,104	4	6,747	2,249	8
11	Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath	2	3,790	1,895	-6	4,385	2,193	5
12	Hedge End St John's	3	5,979	1,993	-1	5,796	1,932	-7
13	Hedge End Grange Park	2	3,886	1,943	0	4,115	2,058	-7
14	Hedge End Wildern	2	4,018	2,009	-4	3,895	1,948	-1
15	Hiltingbury East	2	4,187	2,094	4	4,046	2,023	-3
16	Hiltingbury West	2	4,077	2,039	1	4,207	2,114	1
17	Netley Abbey	2	4,168	2,084	3	4,049	2,025	-3
18	West End North	2	3,709	1,855	-9	4,531	2,266	8
19	West End South	2	4,457	2,229	10	4,591	2,296	10
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>88,741</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>91,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,017</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,084</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Eastleigh Borough Council's submission.

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



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Eastleigh in Hampshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the eight districts in Hampshire, including the city councils of Portsmouth and Southampton, as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Eastleigh. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1975 (Report No. 69). The electoral arrangements of Hampshire County Council were last reviewed in 1980 (Report No. 397). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. 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* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough 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 borough.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties*. This sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

7 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. For example, 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 Third, 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 borough’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Hampshire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the *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.

12 Stage One began on 20 July 1999, when we wrote to Eastleigh Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Members of Parliament 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 Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 18 January 2000 and will end on 13 March 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Eastleigh lies on the banks of Southampton Water in southern Hampshire. It incorporates historic villages such as Hamble-le-Rice, Bursledon and Botley, and also developing areas such as Hedge End, West End and Fair Oak. Its administrative and commercial centre is the town of Eastleigh. With a population of 106,000 covering an area of 7,967 hectares, the borough has witnessed a rapid expansion in residential, commercial and industrial development over recent years. The M27 and M3 motorways run through the borough, and Southampton International Airport is located within it. Eastleigh is served by rail services to London, Southampton, Portsmouth and the South Coast.

17 The borough contains eight parishes, but Eastleigh town and Chandler's Ford are unparished. The unparished area comprises approximately 40 per cent of the borough's total electorate.

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

19 The electorate of the borough is 88,741 (February 1999). The Council presently has 44 members who are elected from 17 wards. Ten of the wards are each represented by three councillors and seven are two-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Eastleigh borough, with around 40 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,017 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,084 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 12 of the 17 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and in nine wards by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Hedge End Wildern ward where the councillor represents 105 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Eastleigh*

Figure 4: 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 Bishopstoke	3	7,495	2,498	-24	7,849	2,616	26
2 Botley	2	4,000	2,000	-1	3,884	1,942	-7
3 Bursledon	2	4,323	2,162	7	4,791	2,396	15
4 Chandler's Ford	3	4,989	1,663	-18	5,077	1,692	-19
5 Eastleigh Central	3	4,430	1,477	-27	4,638	1,546	-26
6 Eastleigh North	3	6,885	2,295	14	6,726	2,252	8
7 Eastleigh South	3	3,777	1,259	-38	4,008	1,336	-36
8 Eastleigh West	3	5,756	1,919	-5	5,847	1,949	-6
9 Fair Oak	3	7,166	2,389	18	7,601	2,534	22
10 Hamble	2	3,034	1,517	-25	3,434	1,717	-18
11 Hedge End St John's	2	5,068	2,534	26	4,952	2,476	19
12 Hedge End Wildern	2	8,283	4,142	105	8,310	4,155	99
13 Hiltingbury East	3	4,380	1,460	-28	4,223	1,408	-32
14 Hiltingbury West	3	4,434	1,478	-27	4,593	1,531	-27
15 Hound	3	5,470	1,823	-10	5,552	1,851	-11
16 West End North	2	3,884	1,942	-4	4,718	2,359	13
17 West End South	2	5,367	2,684	33	5,491	2,746	32
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>88,741</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>91,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,017</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,084</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Eastleigh Borough 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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Eastleigh South ward were relatively over-represented by 38 per cent, while electors in Hedge End Wildern ward were relatively under-represented by 105 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received two representations during Stage One, including a borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council, both of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

#### **Eastleigh Borough Council**

23 The Borough Council proposed a council of 44 members, the same as at present, serving 19 wards, compared to the existing 17 wards. The Council's proposals would retain the existing mix of multi-member wards. In order to achieve improvements in electoral equality, the Borough Council proposed a reconfiguration of all the existing wards which would require consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath, Hedge End, West End and Hound. The Borough Council had undertaken a consultation exercise with parish and town councils and local political parties within the borough before submitting its proposals to the Commission.

24 The Council noted that its submission was a joint submission supported by the following groups: Eastleigh Constituency Labour Party, Eastleigh Liberal Democrats, Romsey County Liberal Democrats, Romsey Conservative Association, Romsey Constituency Labour Party, Bishopstoke Parish Council, Botley Parish Council, Fair Oak & Horton Heath Parish Council, Burlesdon Parish Council, Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council, Hedge End Town Council, Hound Parish Council and West End Parish Council. The scheme was also supported by Eastleigh Conservative Association, although the Conservative Association proposed an alternative warding pattern in the north-east of the borough. These groups' joint proposals will be referred to as the Borough Council's submission throughout the following report.

#### **Eastleigh Conservative Association**

25 Eastleigh Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposals "with the exception of the Fair Oak & Horton Heath versus Bishopstoke boundaries". The Association proposed an alternative configuration of three wards in this area.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

26 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Eastleigh is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities 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”.

27 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 must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

28 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.

29 Our *Guidance* states that although we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

30 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 3 per cent from 88,741 to 91,694 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects much of the growth to be in the existing ward of West End North, although significant growth is also expected in Fair Oak ward. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

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

## **Council Size**

32 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government. Eastleigh Borough Council presently has 44 members. The Borough Council proposed retaining the existing council size. Eastleigh Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposed council size.

33 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 44 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

34 In view of the agreement behind the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have concluded that we should base our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's scheme, although we note the Conservative's alternatives for three wards which are considered later in the chapter. We consider that the Council's scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements.

35 We also noted that the Borough Council had undertaken a parish review before submitting its proposals to the Commission and based its borough warding pattern on its proposed new parish boundaries. At present, the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions has indicated it will not have the opportunity to give effect to the Borough Council's parishing modifications before the end of the Periodic Electoral Review. We can therefore only base our draft recommendations on existing parish boundaries. We have, however, managed to accommodate the majority of the proposals in the areas affected through utilising existing or proposed parish wards, discussed in detail in the following sections. Additionally, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Borough Council's proposals in two areas. For borough warding purposes the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Hiltingbury East and Hiltingbury West;
- (b) Chandler's Ford;
- (c) Eastleigh Central, Eastleigh North, Eastleigh South and Eastleigh West;
- (d) Bishopstoke and Fair Oak;
- (e) Botley, West End North and West End South;
- (f) Hedge End St John's and Hedge End Wildern;
- (g) Bursledon, Hound and Hamble.

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

### **Hiltingbury East and Hiltingbury West wards**

37 These two wards lie in the north of the borough, and each returns three members. Both wards are significantly over-represented under current arrangements, with Hiltingbury East ward and Hiltingbury West ward having electoral variances of 28 per cent and 27 per cent respectively (32 per cent and 27 per cent in 2004).

38 The Borough Council proposed retaining much of the existing Hiltingbury East and Hiltingbury West wards, transferring only an area south of Merdon Avenue and west of Winchester Road from Hiltingbury East ward into a new Chandler's Ford West ward, together with an area of the existing Hiltingbury West ward broadly south of Valley Road/Merdon Avenue. The Council stated that, in formulating its proposals for this area it was "keen to maintain existing boundaries as much as possible as Members felt this preserved the identity of the existing wards". Under the Borough Council's proposals, the revised Hiltingbury East and Hiltingbury West wards would have electoral variances of 3 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (4 per cent and 2 per cent in 2004). We received no further comments on this area.

39 We carefully examined the Borough Council's proposals for these wards, which we noted would achieve good electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. However, we are not proposing to adopt the Council's proposals in their entirety as we consider a boundary modification to the Borough Council's proposed Chandler's Ford West ward (detailed later) would better reflect the settlement pattern in the area. Therefore, we are retaining the existing southern ward boundary in Hiltingbury East ward and we propose modifying the western ward boundary, transferring electors from an area around Gordon Road and Hiltingbury Close into Hiltingbury West ward. We also propose transferring an additional area of Hiltingbury West ward around Common Road and Heathlands Road from Hiltingbury West to Chandler's Ford West ward as part of our draft recommendations.

40 Under our draft recommendations for Hiltingbury East and Hiltingbury West wards, the electoral variance would be 4 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (3 per cent and 1 per cent in 2004). The proposals are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Chandler's Ford ward**

41 The three-member Chandler's Ford ward, located in the north-east of the borough, is currently over-represented by 18 per cent. This inequality is anticipated to worsen marginally to 19 per cent in 2004.

42 The Borough Council proposed creating two two-member wards in this area. Chandler's Ford East ward would contain much of the current Chandler's Ford ward, encompassing the Oakmount area, together with the area west of Winchester Road and Park Road. The proposed Chandler's Ford West ward would comprise part of Hiltingbury East ward (south of Merdon Avenue and west of Winchester Avenue), part of Hiltingbury West ward (south of Valley Road/Merdon

Avenue), part of Chandler's Ford ward (north of the Eastleigh to Romsey railway line) and part of Eastleigh West ward (north of Leigh Road and west of the M3 motorway). Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Chandler's Ford East would be 4 per cent below the average (6 per cent below in 2004) and in Chandler's Ford West ward it would be 4 per cent above (1 per cent in 2004). We received no further representations regarding this area.

43 We have carefully considered the Borough Council's proposals for this area. We are satisfied that the Council's proposal for Chandler's Ford East ward achieve a good degree of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and we are therefore adopting this proposal as part of our draft recommendations. However, we were not persuaded that the Council's proposals for Chandler's Ford West ward satisfactorily reflected the settlement pattern in the area. In particular, we were concerned that the proposed ward boundaries might not secure convenient and effective local government in the area. Therefore, in order to achieve a more satisfactory warding pattern, we are modifying the ward's northern boundary to follow Lakewood Road, then west along Merdon Avenue and Valley Road before turning north to Common Road and the existing boundary.

44 Under our draft recommendations for Chandler's Ford East and Chandler's Ford West wards the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the average and 5 per cent above the average respectively (6 per cent below and 1 per cent above in 2004). The proposals are illustrated on the large map in the back of the report.

### **Eastleigh Central, Eastleigh North, Eastleigh South and Eastleigh West wards**

45 These four wards cover the town of Eastleigh. Each ward currently returns three councillors. Eastleigh Central, Eastleigh South and Eastleigh West wards are all over-represented by 27 per cent, 38 per cent and 5 per cent respectively (26 per cent, 36 per cent and 6 per cent in 2004). Eastleigh North ward is under-represented, with 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (8 per cent in 2004).

46 In order to address the over-representation in Eastleigh as a whole, the Borough Council proposed three three-member wards for the area, with a large area of the existing Eastleigh West ward forming part of a new Chandler's Ford West ward. Under the Council's proposals Eastleigh North ward would retain its existing northern, eastern and western ward boundaries, although the present southern boundary would be modified to follow a line north of the railway line along Shakespeare Road, thereby transferring properties around The Quadrangle into a modified Eastleigh Central ward. The southern boundary of Eastleigh Central ward would also be modified to follow the length of Derby Road to the junction with Southampton Road. The Council proposed that Eastleigh South ward should comprise all of the existing ward apart from an area north of Derby Road, together with an area of the existing Eastleigh West ward broadly south of Leigh Road and east of Bournemouth Road.

47 Under the Council's proposals, the electoral variances in the revised Eastleigh North, Eastleigh Central and Eastleigh South wards would be 1 per cent, 2 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (5 per cent, 5 per cent and equal to the average in 2004). We received no further comments on this area, and after carefully considering the Council's proposals we consider that

they achieve good electoral equality while utilising clearly identifiable ward boundaries and we are adopting them without modification as part of our draft recommendations. The proposals are illustrated on the large map in the back of the report.

### **Bishopstoke and Fair Oak wards**

48 Bishopstoke and Fair Oak wards are located at the far north-eastern end of the borough and are both under-represented, with 24 per cent and 18 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (26 per cent and 22 per cent in 2004).

49 The Borough Council proposed three new wards for this area in order to address the current under-representation. A two-member Bishopstoke West ward would comprise the western part of the existing ward, with its eastern boundary located to the east of Underwood Road, following part of Fair Oak Road and continuing south across open land to the west of West Horton Farm. The Council's proposed two-member Bishopstoke East ward would comprise the remainder of the existing Bishopstoke ward along with an area of the adjoining parish of Fair Oak & Horton Heath (broadly south of Athena Close/Pilchards Avenue, west of Sandy Lane/Allington Lane and north of Quobleigh Pond). The Council's proposed three-member Fair Oak & Horton Heath ward would comprise the whole of the existing Fair Oak ward, apart from the area transferred to the new Bishopstoke East ward. The Council considered its proposals for the Bishopstoke area "best represented the communities of 'older' and 'newer' Bishopstoke". Under the Council's proposal the electoral variance in Bishopstoke West, Bishopstoke East and Fair Oak & Horton Heath wards would be 6 per cent, 1 per cent and 4 per cent respectively (4 per cent, 4 per cent and 8 per cent in 2004).

50 Eastleigh Conservative Association, while supporting the majority of the Borough Council's submission, proposed an alternative warding pattern in this area. They considered their proposals for the area "would relocate less voters" than the Borough Council's alternative configuration and would utilise "simply defined boundaries". The Conservative Association proposed a three-member Bishopstoke ward which would retain its existing boundaries apart from its eastern boundary which would move west to follow Abbotsbury Road and Alan Drayton Road, turning south to the west of Stokewood Close before rejoining the existing boundary. The Association proposed two two-member wards of Fair Oak West and Fair Oak East & Horton Heath. Fair Oak West ward would comprise that part of the Bishopstoke parish not located in Bishopstoke ward under their proposals, along with an area of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish broadly west of Winchester Road and North of Fair Oak Road/Alan Drayton Way (although including an area around Brookfield Farm). The proposed ward of Fair Oak East & Horton Heath would comprise the remainder of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish. Under the Conservative Association's proposal the electoral variances in Bishopstoke, Fair Oak West and Fair Oak East & Horton Heath wards would be 4 per cent, 7 per cent and 3 per cent respectively (7 per cent, 1 per cent and 11 per cent in 2004).

51 We have carefully considered the two alternative proposals for this area. We concluded that, due to the electoral imbalance between the existing two wards of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak, significant boundary modifications between the two were inevitable. We noted that in order to facilitate this improvement in electoral equality the Borough Council (supported by Bishopstoke

and Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish councils) proposed transferring an area of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish into a modified Bishopstoke ward, whereas the Conservative Association proposed transferring an area of the existing Bishopstoke ward into a modified Fair Oak ward for the same purpose. We consider that both approaches would significantly improve electoral equality in the area and utilised clear ward boundaries. We also noted the similar levels of electoral equality achieved in both sets of proposals. However, we judge that the Borough Council's scheme achieves marginally better electoral equality and provides a better reflection of community identity in the area. Therefore, on balance, we consider that our draft recommendations should reflect the Council's proposals in their entirety. The Council's proposals would also involve consequential warding to both the parishes of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak & Horton Heath, detailed later. In consultation with Ordnance Survey, we are recommending a the boundary a small number of boundary modifications in the area in order to closely match ground features, affecting no electors. The proposals are illustrated on Maps A2 and A3 in Appendix A.

### **Botley, West End North and West End South wards**

52 The three wards of Botley, West End North and West End South are located in the centre of the borough and have electoral variances of 1 per cent, 4 per cent and 33 per cent respectively (7 per cent, 13 per cent and 32 per cent in 2004). Each of the three wards returns two councillors.

53 The Borough Council proposed retaining the existing Botley ward unaltered, apart from transferring a small area (24 electors) of West End North ward into Botley ward. This modification reflected the Council's proposed parish ward boundary modifications submitted recently to the Secretary of State, on which no order has been made (at the time of this report publication). Therefore, in conducting our statutory duties, we must have regard to the existing parish boundaries in the area and therefore to adopt the Borough Council's proposals unaltered would require creating of a parish ward of West End Parish containing 24 electors. We do not judge that this would provide convenient and effective local government in the area and therefore we are not recommending modifications to the warding of West End parish to facilitate the proposed borough warding between the existing Botley and West End North wards. We propose retaining the existing Botley ward as part of our draft recommendations, which would continue to provide a good level of electoral equality.

54 The Borough Council proposed a modified West End North ward, including transferring 24 electors from the ward into Botley parish, as noted above. The Council further proposed modifying the ward's southern boundary with West End South ward, transferring an area of the Townhill Farm development from West End South ward. West End North ward's eastern boundary would also be modified, transferring broadly the area of the Peppercorn estate (549 electors) into a modified Hedge End Grange Park ward. West End South ward would comprise the majority of the existing ward with the exception of the Townhill Farm area, and an area in the far south of the ward, comprising a corridor to the west of the A27 to the borough boundary with Southampton city, which the Council proposed should form part of a modified Bursledon ward. We received no further proposals in this area.

55 Under the Council's proposed West End North and West End South wards, the number of electors per councillor would initially be 9 per cent below and 10 per cent above the average respectively (8 per cent and 10 per cent above respectively in 2004, due to significant growth in the area).

56 We have carefully examined the Borough Council's proposals and consider that they achieve significantly improved electoral equality in the area and provide a good reflection of the existing settlement pattern. We therefore propose adopting the Council's proposed West End North ward (subject to retaining 24 electors in Botley ward as described above) and West End South ward as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations, the resulting electoral variances in West End North and West End South wards would be 8 per cent and 10 per cent respectively (9 per cent and 10 per cent in 2004). The consequential parishing arrangements are detailed later in this chapter. Our proposals are illustrated on Maps A4, A5 and A6 in Appendix A.

### **Hedge End St John's and Hedge End Wildern wards**

57 The two, two-member wards of Hedge End St John's and Hedge End Wildern are located in the centre of the borough, bordered to the west by West End parish and the east by Botley parish. Hedge End St John's ward has an electoral variance of 26 per cent (19 per cent in 2004). Hedge End Wildern has the worst electoral variance in the borough, with each councillor representing 105 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (99 per cent in 2004).

58 The Borough Council proposed addressing the severe under-representation in the Hedge End area through the creation of two two-member wards for the area broadly covered by the existing Hedge End Wildern ward. It proposed a Hedge End Grange Park ward comprising the majority of the Grange Park development, along with the Peppercorn estate area of West End parish. It also proposed a new two-member Hedge End Wildern ward, with the southern boundary between the two wards following a line north of Herald Road, Charterhouse Way and Radley Close to the junction with Old Shamblehurst Lane, where the boundary would turn south to follow the centre of this road and finally east along Drummond Road then south along Maunsell Way before turning east along Grange Road to the parish boundary. The eastern and western boundaries would be formed by the parish boundaries, with a revised southern boundary following Upper Norton Road (B3036) from the existing western parish boundary to its eastern boundary.

59 The Council also proposed a modified Hedge End St John's ward, comprising that part of the existing ward apart from an area north of Upper Norton Road and broadly west of Wildern Lane which would form part of the Council's proposed Hedge End Wildern ward. That part of the existing Hedge End Wildern ward south of Upper Norton Road would also form part of the Council's revised Hedge End St John's ward.

60 We received no further proposals for this area. Under the Council's proposals the electoral variances in Hedge End Grange Park, Hedge End Wildern and Hedge End St John's wards would be 4 per cent below, equal to and 1 per cent below the average respectively (1 per cent below, 7 per cent below and 7 per cent below in 2004).

61 Having carefully considered the Borough Council’s proposals for the Hedge End area, we noted that due to the substantial electoral imbalances under the present arrangements, significant change in this area is inevitable if electoral equality is to be improved. We judge that the Borough Council’s proposals, supported by Hedge End Town Council, would achieve significant improvements in electoral equality, while reflecting local settlement patterns and utilising, where possible, clearly identifiable ward boundaries. We are therefore adopting them unaltered as part of our draft recommendations. The proposals are illustrated on Maps A6 and A7 in Appendix A. Proposals for consequential changes to the parishing arrangements in Hedge End are detailed at the end of this chapter.

### **Bursledon, Hound and Hamble wards**

62 The two two-member wards of Bursledon and Hound and the three-member ward of Hamble occupy the southern part of the borough. Bursledon ward is under-represented, with an electoral variance of 7 per cent (15 per cent in 2004). Hound and Hamble wards are each over-represented, with electoral variances of 10 per cent and 25 per cent respectively (11 per cent and 18 per cent in 2004).

63 The Borough Council proposed a modified three-member Bursledon ward, to be called Bursledon & Old Netley, which would comprise the whole of the existing ward along with the northern part of Hound parish and the extreme southern part of West End parish. The Council also proposed that the far south-western part of Hound parish, incorporating the majority of Netley village and the Ingleside estate, north of the railway line, should form a new two-member Netley Abbey ward. The remaining part of Hound parish, including Butlocks Heath, together with the entire parish of Hamble-le-Rice, would form a modified two-member Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath ward. We received no further representations on this area. The Council considered that its proposals for this area had sought to “retain all of the parish of Hamble-le-Rice within a multi-member ward”.

64 Under the Borough Council’s proposals, Bursledon & Old Netley, Netley Abbey and Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath wards would have electoral variances of 10 per cent, 3 per cent and 6 per cent respectively (6 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent in 2004). In looking at the Borough Council’s proposals, we concluded that these three wards would achieve a significant improvement in electoral equality in the area while closely reflecting the pattern of the three settlements of Bursledon, Netley and Hamble-le-Rice. The Council also indicated that, in response to its consultation, the proposed warding pattern had been supported by the three parish councils of Bursledon, Netley and Hamble-le-Rice. We are therefore adopting the Borough Council’s proposals for these three wards in their entirety as part of our draft recommendations. The proposals are illustrated on Maps A8 and A9 in Appendix A. We have made recommendations for consequential changes to the parish electoral arrangements for these three parishes, which are detailed at the end of this chapter.

## **Electoral Cycle**

65 The Borough Council commented that it wished to continue the present cycle of elections by thirds. We received no further comments on the electoral cycle for Eastleigh and we are therefore proposing to retain the existing cycle in our draft recommendations.

## **Conclusions**

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

- (a) a council of 44 members should be retained;
- (b) there should be 19 wards, two more than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of two wards;
- (d) elections should continue to be held by thirds.

67 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

- (a) we propose transferring 215 electors (south of Merdon Avenue) from the Council's proposed Chandler's Ford West ward into its proposed Hiltingbury East ward;
- (b) we are transferring 193 electors around Gordon Road from the Council's proposed Hiltingbury East ward into its proposed Hiltingbury West ward;
- (c) we are transferring 228 electors around Heathlands Road from the Council's proposed Hiltingbury West ward into its proposed Chandler's Ford West ward;
- (d) we are not adopting the Borough Council's proposal to transfer an area of West End North ward into Botley ward, affecting 24 electors.

68 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	44	44	44	44
Number of wards	17	19	17	19
Average number of electors per councillor	2,017	2,017	2,084	2,084
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	12	0	14	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	9	0	8	0

69 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Eastleigh Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 12 to none. By 2004 this improvement in electoral equality is anticipated to continue.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Eastleigh Borough Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

70 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 Local Government Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, there are a number of areas where the Borough Council has made recommendations based upon its proposed new parish boundaries, which we have in the main accommodated. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath, West End, Hedge End, Bursledon and Hound to reflect the proposed borough wards.

71 The parish of Bishopstoke is served by 14 councillors and is not currently warded. In its submission the Borough Council, supported by Bishopstoke Parish Council, proposed a borough warding pattern in Bishopstoke which would require warding the parish. The Borough Council’s

submission stated: “The Parish Council do not wish to submit any proposals for warding at this stage.” However, as stated, we must make recommendations for warding the parish of Bishopstoke in order to facilitate our warding at borough level.

72 Consequently, in the absence of any proposals from the borough or parish councils, we recommend that Bishopstoke parish should comprise two parish wards, Bishopstoke West and Bishopstoke East, which would be coterminous with our proposed borough wards as they fall within the parish. We do not propose any change to the current parish council size, with each of the two wards returning seven councillors. Our proposals are shown on Maps A2 and A3 in Appendix A.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Bishopstoke Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bishopstoke West (returning seven councillors) and Bishopstoke East (returning seven councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Maps A2 and A3 in Appendix A.

73 The parish of Fair Oak & Horton Heath is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. The Borough Council, supported by Fair Oak & Horton Heath Parish Council, proposed modified borough warding in the area which would require consequential parish warding. However, neither the Borough nor the Parish Council submitted proposals for revised parishing arrangements, and therefore we are formulating our own draft recommendations.

74 We recommend that the parish of Fair Oak & Horton Heath should comprise two parish wards, Fair Oak & Horton Heath West ward (comprising that part of the parish within the borough ward of Bishopstoke East) and Fair Oak & Horton Heath East ward (coterminous with the proposed borough ward of Fair Oak & Horton Heath). Although there is no legislative requirement for electoral equality at parish level, in the absence of alternative proposals we are proposing that Fair Oak & Horton Heath West parish ward should return two parish councillors, based upon its proportion of the whole parish electorate, and Fair Oak & Horton Heath East parish ward should return 13 councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Fair Oak & Horton Heath Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Fair Oak & Horton Heath West parish ward (returning two councillors) and Fair Oak & Horton Heath East ward (returning 13 councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on Maps A2 and A3 in Appendix A.

75 The parish of West End comprises 15 councillors and is currently divided into two parish wards which are coterminous with the existing borough wards of West End North and West End South. West End North parish ward currently returns six councillors and West End South parish ward returns nine councillors. The Borough Council’s proposed borough warding pattern for West End parish would involve re-warding the parish of West End to create four new parish wards. The Borough Council in its submission, supported by West End Parish Council, stated that “no proposals have been submitted by the Parish Council in respect of the name or level of representation for any new ward”.

76 As we have based our borough warding pattern in West End parish on the Borough Council’s proposals, we are also making consequential recommendations for modifications to West End parish. We propose creating a new ward, West End East, which would comprise that part of the parish which, for borough warding purposes, would form part of Hedge End Grange Park ward. We propose that this ward should return one councillor. We also propose new West End North and West End South wards which would be coterminous with our proposed borough wards of the same names. We propose that these two parish wards should return six and seven parish councillors respectively.

77 For the area of West End parish west of the A27, which would form part of our proposed Bursledon & Old Netley ward, we propose creating a parish ward, named West End Peninsula, returning one councillor. Our proposed parish warding pattern for West End parish is illustrated on Maps A4, A5 and A6 in Appendix A.

**Draft Recommendation**  
West End Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: West End East (returning one councillor), West End North (six), West End South (seven) and West End Peninsula (one). Our proposals are illustrated on Maps A4, A5 and A6 in Appendix A.

78 The parish of Hedge End currently returns 20 councillors and is formed of six wards: St John’s (four councillors), St Helen’s (three), Wildern (three), Freegrounds (three), Grange Park South (three) and Grange Park North (four). The Borough Council, supported by Hedge End Town Council, proposed re-warding this parish in order to reflect its proposed borough warding pattern in the area. It also proposed increasing the number of town councillors from 20 to 21 and increasing the number of parish wards from six to seven. Each parish ward would return three councillors. It also proposed that three parish wards should cover the area of the proposed borough ward of Hedge End St John’s: St John’s, St Helen’s and Freegrounds. For the proposed borough ward of Hedge End Grange Park, it proposed two parish wards: Grange Park East and Grange Park West. The proposed borough ward of Hedge End Wildern would also comprise two parish wards: Wildern and Shamblehurst.

79 Having adopted the Borough Council’s proposed warding pattern for Hedge End, we are adopting its proposals for parish re-warding unaltered as part of our draft recommendations. The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated on Maps A6 and A7 in Appendix A.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Hedge End Town Council should comprise 21 parish councillors, one more than at present, representing seven wards: St John’s, St Helen’s, Freegrounds, Grange Park East, Grange Park West, Wildern and Shamblehurst. Each ward should return three town councillors. Our proposals are illustrated on Maps A6 and A7 in Appendix A.

80 The parish of Hound currently has 15 councillors returned from three parish wards: Butlocks Heath & Ingleside (five councillors), Netley Abbey (eight) and Old Netley (two). In its submission, the Borough Council, supported by Hound Parish Council, proposed re-warding the parish in order to reflect its proposed borough warding pattern in the area. It proposed four new parish wards: Old Netley parish ward would be coterminous with the proposed borough ward of Bursledon & Old Netley, and Butlocks Heath parish ward would be coterminous with that part of Hound parish within its proposed borough ward of Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath. For the borough ward of Netley Abbey it proposed two parish wards: Netley Abbey (returning nine councillors) and Ingleside (two councillors).

81 Having adopted the Borough Council’s proposed borough warding pattern in this area, we are adopting its proposed parish warding unaltered as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposals are shown on Maps A8 to A9 in Appendix A.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Hound Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Old Netley (returning two councillors), Butlocks Heath (two), Ingleside (two) and Netley Abbey (nine). Our proposals are illustrated on Maps A8 and A9 in Appendix A.

82 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the borough.

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

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

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



## 5 NEXT STEPS

84 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Eastleigh. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 13 March 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

85 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

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



# APPENDIX A

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

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

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 to A9 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed boundary between Bishopstoke East and Fair Oak & Horton Heath wards and the proposed Fair Oak & Horton Heath West, Fair Oak & Horton Heath East parish wards of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed boundary between Bishopstoke East and Bishopstoke West wards and the proposed parish wards of Bishopstoke East and Bishopstoke West of Bishopstoke parish.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed boundary between West End North and West End South wards and the proposed parish wards of West End North and West End South of West End parish.

**Map A5** illustrates the proposed boundary between West End South and Bursledon & Old Netley wards and the proposed West End Peninsula parish ward of West End parish.

**Map A6** illustrates the proposed boundary between Hedge End Grange Park and Hedge End Wildern wards and the proposed parish wards of West End East, Grange Park West, Grange Park East, Shamlehurst and Wildern of West End and Hedge End parishes.

**Map A7** illustrates the proposed boundary between Hedge End Wildern and Hedge End St John's wards and the proposed parish wards of Freegrounds, St John's and St Helen's of Hedge End parish.

**Map A8** illustrates the proposed boundaries between Bursledon & Old Netley and Hamble-Le-Rice & Butlocks Heath wards and the parish ward boundaries of Old Netley and Butlocks Heath of Hound parish.

**Map A9** illustrates the proposed boundary between Netley Abbey and Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath ward and the proposed parish wards of Ingleside and Netley Abbey of Hound parish.

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

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

*Map A2: Proposed Boundary between Bishopstoke East and Fair Oak & Horton Heath Wards and the Proposed Fair Oak & Horton Heath West, Fair Oak & Horton Heath East Parish Wards of Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish.*

*Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Bishopstoke East and Bishopstoke West Wards and the Proposed Bishopstoke East and Bishopstoke West Parish Wards of Bishopstoke parish.*

*Map A4: Proposed Boundary between West End North and West End South Wards and the Proposed West End North and West End South Parish Wards of West End parish.*

*Map A5: Proposed Boundary between West End South and Bursledon & Old Netley Ward and the Proposed West End Peninsula parish ward of West End parish.*

*Map A6: Proposed Boundary between Hedge End Grange Park and Hedge End Wildern Wards and the Proposed West End East, Grange Park West, Grange Park East, Shamblehurst and Wildern Parish Wards of West End and Hedge End parishes.*

*Map A7: Proposed Boundary between Hedge End Wildern and Hedge End St John's Wards and the Proposed Freegrounds, St John's and St Helen's Parish Wards of Hedge End parish.*

*Map A8: Proposed Boundary between Bursledon & Old Netley and Hamble-Le-Rice & Butlocks Heath Wards and Old Netley and Butlocks Heath Parish Wards of Hound parish.*

*Map A9: Proposed Boundary between Netley Abbey and Hamble-le-Rice & Butlocks Heath wards and the Proposed Ingleside and Netley Abbey Parish Wards of Hound parish.*

## APPENDIX B

### Eastleigh Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

*Figure B1: Eastleigh Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
Botley	Botley ward (Botley parish), West End North ward (part - West End North parish ward)
Chandler's Ford West	Eastleigh West ward (part), Chandler's Ford ward (part), Hiltingbury West ward (part) and Hiltingbury East ward (part)
Hiltingbury East	Hiltingbury East ward (part)
Hiltingbury West	Hiltingbury West ward (part)
West End North	West End North ward (part) and West End South (part)

*Figure B2: Eastleigh Borough Council's Proposals: 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 %
Botley	2	4,023	2,012	0	3,907	1,954	-6
Chandler's Ford West	2	4,212	2,106	4	4,190	2,095	1
Hiltingbury East	2	4,165	2,083	3	4,009	2,005	-4
Hiltingbury West	2	4,112	2,056	2	4,271	2,136	2
West End North	2	4,457	1,843	-9	4,591	2,254	8

*Source:* Electorate figures are based on Eastleigh Borough Council's submission.

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



## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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