

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Winchester in Hampshire

*February 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 CBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Peter Brokenshire  
Kru Desai  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Winchester 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<br>ARRANGEMENTS  | <i>5</i>  |
| 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED   | <i>9</i>  |
| 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT<br>RECOMMENDATIONS  | <i>13</i> |
| 5 NEXT STEPS   | <i>39</i> |
| <br>   |           |
| APPENDICES   |           |
| A Draft Recommendations for Winchester:<br>Detailed Mapping  | <i>41</i> |
| B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from:<br>– Winchester City Council<br>– Winchester Conservative Association and the Conservative Group on<br>Winchester City Council | <i>45</i> |
| C The Statutory Provisions   | <i>53</i> |

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Winchester city is inserted inside the back cover of this report



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Winchester 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 Winchester:

- **in 21 of the 32 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district, and 13 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 25 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 11 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 117-118) are that:

- **Winchester City Council should have 57 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 26 wards, instead of 32 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, and seven wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **The number of electors per councillor in eight of the proposed wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average, and in three wards by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **These levels of electoral equality are expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in only three wards forecast to vary by 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 re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Soberton and Wickham;**
- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Bishops Waltham and Swanmore parish councils.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 22 February 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 17 April 2000:

**Review Manager  
Winchester 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  | Bishops Waltham                      | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Bishops Waltham parish)  | Map 2                |
| 2  | Boarhunt & Southwick                 | 1                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Boarhunt and Southwick & Widley parishes)  | Map 2                |
| 3  | Cheriton & Bishops Sutton            | 1                            | Bishops Sutton ward (part – Bishops Sutton parish); Cheriton ward (Beauworth, Bramdean, Cheriton, Kilmiston and Tichborne parishes)        | Map 2                |
| 4  | Colden Common & Twyford              | 3                            | Owslebury & Colden Common ward (part – Colden Common parish); Twyford ward (Twyford parish)  | Map 2                |
| 5  | Compton & Otterbourne                | 2                            | Compton ward (Compton & Shawford parish); Otterbourne & Hursley ward (Hursley and Otterbourne parishes)                                    | Map 2                |
| 6  | Curdrige                             | 2                            | Curdrige ward (Curdrige parish); Durley & Upham ward (Durley and Upham parishes); Owslebury & Colden Common ward (part – Owslebury parish) | Map 2                |
| 7  | Denmead                              | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Denmead parish)  | Map 2                |
| 8  | Droxford, Soberton & Hambleton       | 1                            | Droxford, Soberton & Hambleton ward (part – Droxford parish, Hambleton parish and Soberton ward of Soberton parish as proposed)            | Maps 2 and A2        |
| 9  | Itchen Valley                        | 1                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley parishes)  | Map 2                |
| 10 | Kings Worthy                         | 2                            | The Worthys ward (part – Kings Worthy parish)  | Map 2                |
| 11 | Littleton & Harestock                | 2                            | <i>Unchanged</i> Littleton ward (Littleton & Harestock parish)   | Map 2                |
| 12 | Olivers Battery & Badger Farm        | 2                            | Badger Farm ward (Badger Farm parish); Olivers Battery ward (Olivers Battery parish)   | Map 2                |
| 13 | St Barnabas (in Winchester)          | 3                            | St Barnabas ward (part); St Paul ward (part)   | Large map            |
| 14 | St Bartholomew (in Winchester)       | 3                            | St Barnabas ward (part); St Bartholomew ward (part)  | Large map            |
| 15 | St John & All Saints (in Winchester) | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i>   | Large map            |
| 16 | St Luke (in Winchester)              | 3                            | St Luke ward (part)  | Large map            |
| 17 | St Michael (in Winchester)           | 3                            | St Luke ward (part); St Michael ward (part)  | Large map            |

|    | <b>Ward name</b>           | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>  | <b>Map reference</b> |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 18 | St Paul<br>(in Winchester) | 3                            | St Bartholomew ward (part); St Luke ward (part);<br>St Paul ward (part)   | Large map            |
| 19 | Shedfield                  | 2                            | Shedfield ward (Shedfield ward of Shedfield<br>parish); Waltham Chase ward (Waltham Chase<br>ward of Shedfield parish)                              | Map 2                |
| 20 | Sparsholt                  | 1                            | Sparsholt ward (Crawley and Sparsholt parishes);<br>The Worthys ward (part – Headbourne Worthy<br>parish)   | Map 2                |
| 21 | Swanmore &<br>Newtown      | 2                            | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part –<br>Soberton Heath & Newtown ward of Soberton<br>parish as proposed); Swanmore ward (Swanmore<br>parish) | Maps 2 and<br>A2     |
| 22 | The Alresfords             | 3                            | Bishops Sutton ward (part – Bighton and Old<br>Alresford parishes); New Alresford ward (New<br>Alresford parish)                                    | Map 2                |
| 23 | Upper Meon<br>Valley       | 1                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton,<br>Warnford and West Meon parishes)  | Map 2                |
| 24 | Whiteley                   | 2                            | Wickham ward (part – Whiteley & Curbridge<br>ward of Wickham parish (part))   | Maps 2 and<br>A3     |
| 25 | Wickham                    | 2                            | Wickham ward (part – Whiteley & Curbridge<br>ward of Wickham parish (part); Wickham ward of<br>Wickham parish)                                      | Maps 2 and<br>A3     |
| 26 | Wonston &<br>Micheldever   | 3                            | Micheldever ward (Micheldever and Northington<br>parishes); Wonston ward (South Wonston and<br>Wonston parishes)                                    | Map 2                |

*Notes: 1 Winchester city is the only unparished part of the district and comprises the six wards indicated above.  
2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map in the back of the report, illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Winchester

|    | <b>Ward name</b>                     | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (1999)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2004)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|----|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1  | Bishops Waltham                      | 3                            | 5,069                    | 1,690                                    | 17                             | 5,193                    | 1,731                                    | 13                             |
| 2  | Boarhunt & Southwick                 | 1                            | 959                      | 959                                      | -34                            | 1,353                    | 1,353                                    | -12                            |
| 3  | Cheriton & Bishops Sutton            | 1                            | 1,679                    | 1,679                                    | 16                             | 1,711                    | 1,711                                    | 11                             |
| 4  | Colden Common & Twyford              | 3                            | 4,132                    | 1,377                                    | -5                             | 4,226                    | 1,409                                    | -8                             |
| 5  | Compton & Otterbourne                | 2                            | 3,084                    | 1,542                                    | 6                              | 3,194                    | 1,597                                    | 4                              |
| 6  | Curdrige                             | 2                            | 2,872                    | 1,436                                    | -1                             | 3,056                    | 1,528                                    | -1                             |
| 7  | Denmead                              | 3                            | 4,756                    | 1,585                                    | 9                              | 5,003                    | 1,668                                    | 9                              |
| 8  | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon       | 1                            | 1,631                    | 1,631                                    | 13                             | 1,685                    | 1,685                                    | 10                             |
| 9  | Itchen Valley                        | 1                            | 1,325                    | 1,325                                    | -9                             | 1,415                    | 1,415                                    | -8                             |
| 10 | Kings Worthy                         | 2                            | 3,196                    | 1,598                                    | 10                             | 3,233                    | 1,617                                    | 5                              |
| 11 | Littleton & Harestock                | 2                            | 2,773                    | 1,387                                    | -4                             | 2,798                    | 1,399                                    | -9                             |
| 12 | Olivers Battery & Badger Farm        | 2                            | 3,282                    | 1,641                                    | 13                             | 3,152                    | 1,576                                    | 3                              |
| 13 | St Barnabas (in Winchester)          | 3                            | 4,520                    | 1,507                                    | 4                              | 4,281                    | 1,427                                    | -7                             |
| 14 | St Bartholomew (in Winchester)       | 3                            | 4,216                    | 1,405                                    | -3                             | 4,387                    | 1,462                                    | -5                             |
| 15 | St John & All Saints (in Winchester) | 3                            | 4,673                    | 1,558                                    | 7                              | 4,935                    | 1,645                                    | 7                              |
| 16 | St Luke (in Winchester)              | 3                            | 4,233                    | 1,411                                    | -3                             | 4,349                    | 1,450                                    | -6                             |
| 17 | St Michael (in Winchester)           | 3                            | 4,493                    | 1,498                                    | 3                              | 4,584                    | 1,528                                    | -1                             |
| 18 | St Paul (in Winchester)              | 3                            | 4,147                    | 1,382                                    | -5                             | 4,228                    | 1,409                                    | -8                             |
| 19 | Shedfield                            | 2                            | 3,022                    | 1,511                                    | 4                              | 3,092                    | 1,546                                    | 1                              |
| 20 | Sparsholt                            | 1                            | 1,598                    | 1,598                                    | 10                             | 1,642                    | 1,642                                    | 7                              |

|    | <b>Ward name</b>      | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (1999)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2004)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|----|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 21 | Swanmore & Newtown    | 2                            | 3,091                    | 1,546                                    | 7                              | 3,198                    | 1,599                                    | 4                              |
| 22 | The Alresfords        | 3                            | 4,949                    | 1,650                                    | 14                             | 4,903                    | 1,634                                    | 6                              |
| 23 | Upper Meon Valley     | 1                            | 1,478                    | 1,478                                    | 2                              | 1,530                    | 1,530                                    | 0                              |
| 24 | Whiteley              | 2                            | 1,140                    | 570                                      | -61                            | 2,929                    | 1,465                                    | -5                             |
| 25 | Wickham               | 2                            | 2,105                    | 1,053                                    | -27                            | 3,065                    | 1,533                                    | 0                              |
| 26 | Wonston & Micheldever | 3                            | 4,172                    | 1,391                                    | -4                             | 4,428                    | 1,476                                    | 4                              |
|    | <b>Totals</b>         | <b>57</b>                    | <b>82,595</b>            | <b>-</b>                                 | <b>-</b>                       | <b>87,570</b>            | <b>-</b>                                 | <b>-</b>                       |
|    | <b>Averages</b>       | <b>-</b>                     | <b>-</b>                 | <b>1,449</b>                             | <b>-</b>                       | <b>-</b>                 | <b>1,536</b>                             | <b>-</b>                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Winchester City Council's submission.

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

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Winchester in Hampshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing 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 is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Winchester. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1975 (Report No. 106). The electoral arrangements of Hampshire County Council were last reviewed in October 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, 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* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

| 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 district council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 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 March 1998 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

12 Stage One began on 20 July 1999 when we wrote to Winchester City 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, 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 City 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 22 February 2000 and will end on 17 April 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 district of Winchester extends over some 66,000 hectares in central Hampshire, and centres on Winchester city itself, the historic former capital of England. A large part of the district is rural in character, although it also includes the larger settlements of Bishops Waltham, New Alresford and Wickham. The M3 motorway and the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line link Winchester to London and the South. Winchester remains an important administrative centre for the armed forces, and there is a major naval establishment in the south of the district at Southwick. During the 1980s, major residential development occurred in Winchester, at Badger Farm on the edge of Winchester city, and at Denmead in the south of the district. Further development is expected to take place at Whiteley in the south-west of the district.

17 The district contains 46 parishes, ranging in size from an electorate of 82 in Beauworth to 5,069 in Bishops Waltham, although Winchester city itself is unparished. Winchester city comprises 32 per cent of the district'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 district average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

19 The electorate of the district is 82,595 (February 1999). The Council currently has 55 members who are elected from 32 wards, six of which cover the city of Winchester with the remainder being predominantly rural. Eight of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven represented by two councillors and 17 are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds. Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Winchester district, with around 30 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,502 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 1,592 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 21 of the 32 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, in 13 wards by more than 20 per cent and in six wards by more than 30 per cent. At present, the worst imbalances are in Denmead ward, where the two councillors each represent 58 per cent more electors than the district average, and in Boarhunt & Southwick ward where the councillor represents 36 per cent fewer electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Winchester*

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 Badger Farm                           | 1                     | 1,983             | 1,983                             | 32                      | 1,910             | 1,910                             | 20                      |
| 2 Bishops Sutton                        | 1                     | 1,041             | 1,041                             | -31                     | 1,127             | 1,127                             | -29                     |
| 3 Bishops Waltham                       | 3                     | 5,069             | 1,690                             | 13                      | 5,193             | 1,731                             | 9                       |
| 4 Boarhunt & Southwick                  | 1                     | 959               | 959                               | -36                     | 1,353             | 1,353                             | -15                     |
| 5 Cheriton                              | 1                     | 1,334             | 1,334                             | -11                     | 1,341             | 1,341                             | -16                     |
| 6 Compton                               | 1                     | 1,232             | 1,232                             | -18                     | 1,252             | 1,252                             | -21                     |
| 7 Curdridge                             | 1                     | 998               | 998                               | -34                     | 1,053             | 1,053                             | -34                     |
| 8 Denmead                               | 2                     | 4,756             | 2,378                             | 58                      | 5,003             | 2,502                             | 57                      |
| 9 Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon        | 2                     | 2,543             | 1,272                             | -15                     | 2,640             | 1,320                             | -17                     |
| 10 Durley & Upham                       | 1                     | 1,189             | 1,189                             | -21                     | 1,332             | 1,332                             | -16                     |
| 11 Itchen Valley                        | 1                     | 1,325             | 1,325                             | -12                     | 1,414             | 1,414                             | -11                     |
| 12 Littleton                            | 2                     | 2,773             | 1,387                             | -8                      | 2,798             | 1,399                             | -12                     |
| 13 Micheldever                          | 1                     | 1,157             | 1,157                             | -23                     | 1,215             | 1,215                             | -24                     |
| 14 New Alresford                        | 3                     | 4,253             | 1,418                             | -6                      | 4,146             | 1,382                             | -13                     |
| 15 Olivers Battery                      | 1                     | 1,299             | 1,299                             | -13                     | 1,242             | 1,242                             | -22                     |
| 16 Otterbourne & Hursley                | 1                     | 1,852             | 1,852                             | 23                      | 1,942             | 1,942                             | 22                      |
| 17 Owslebury & Colden Common            | 2                     | 3,652             | 1,826                             | 22                      | 3,777             | 1,889                             | 19                      |
| 18 St Barnabas (in Winchester)          | 3                     | 4,106             | 1,369                             | -9                      | 3,938             | 1,313                             | -18                     |
| 19 St Bartholomew (in Winchester)       | 3                     | 4,314             | 1,438                             | -4                      | 4,485             | 1,495                             | -6                      |
| 20 St John & All Saints (in Winchester) | 3                     | 4,673             | 1,558                             | 4                       | 4,935             | 1,645                             | 3                       |
| 21 St Luke (in Winchester)              | 3                     | 4,663             | 1,554                             | 4                       | 4,834             | 1,611                             | 1                       |
| 22 St Michael (in Winchester)           | 3                     | 4,063             | 1,354                             | -10                     | 4,099             | 1,366                             | -14                     |

| 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 % |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 23 St Paul (in Winchester) | 3                     | 4,463             | 1,488                             | -1                      | 4,474             | 1,491                             | -6                      |
| 24 Shedfield               | 1                     | 1,186             | 1,186                             | -21                     | 1,204             | 1,204                             | -24                     |
| 25 Sparsholt               | 1                     | 1,204             | 1,204                             | -20                     | 1,270             | 1,270                             | -20                     |
| 26 Swanmore                | 1                     | 2,179             | 2,179                             | 45                      | 2,243             | 2,243                             | 41                      |
| 27 The Worthys             | 2                     | 3,590             | 1,795                             | 20                      | 3,605             | 1,803                             | 13                      |
| 28 Twyford                 | 1                     | 1,165             | 1,165                             | -22                     | 1,120             | 1,120                             | -30                     |
| 29 Upper Meon Valley       | 1                     | 1,478             | 1,478                             | -2                      | 1,530             | 1,530                             | -4                      |
| 30 Waltham Chase           | 1                     | 1,836             | 1,836                             | 22                      | 1,888             | 1,888                             | 19                      |
| 31 Wickham                 | 2                     | 3,245             | 1,623                             | 8                       | 5,994             | 2,997                             | 88                      |
| 32 Wonston                 | 2                     | 3,015             | 1,508                             | 0                       | 3,213             | 1,607                             | 1                       |
| <b>Totals</b>              | <b>55</b>             | <b>82,595</b>     | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                | <b>87,570</b>     | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                |
| <b>Averages</b>            | <b>-</b>              | <b>-</b>          | <b>1,502</b>                      | <b>-</b>                | <b>-</b>          | <b>1,592</b>                      | <b>-</b>                |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Winchester City 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 Boarhunt & Southwick ward were relatively over-represented by 36 per cent, while electors in Denmead ward were relatively under-represented by 58 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 Winchester City 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 City Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 33 representations during Stage One, including two district-wide schemes, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission.

#### **Winchester City Council**

23 The City Council proposed a council of 57 members, two more than at present, serving 26 wards compared to the existing 32. Its proposal provided for a predominance of three-member wards in Winchester and the larger settlements, and for a mixture of one- and two-member wards in the more sparsely populated rural areas of the district. As part of the review process, the Council stated that it had invited views and representations from individuals, local political organisations and parish and town councils in the district, and had consulted locally on initial proposals.

24 The City Council's scheme would provide additional representation for the Whiteley area, currently in Wickham ward, and would modify the composition of several wards in the rural areas to reflect more accurately the levels of representation to which they are entitled. The Council proposed retaining separate wards for Winchester city, although it proposed modifying ward boundaries within the town to improve electoral equality and reflect community identities and interests.

25 Under the City Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in eight wards would initially vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district, and three wards would vary by more than 20 per cent. Electoral equality is expected to improve further by 2004, with only four wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average, none by more than 17 per cent. The Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

#### **Winchester Conservative Association**

26 Winchester Conservative Association and the Conservative Group on Winchester City Council ('the Conservatives') also submitted a district-wide scheme. The Conservatives proposed reducing the size of the council to 44, representing 24 wards, and retaining a mixed pattern of one-, two- and three-member wards in the district. Under their proposals, Littleton & Harestock parish in the north, and Olivers Battery and Badger Farm parishes in the south would be combined with parts of Winchester city. The composition of only one ward would remain unchanged as a result of the Conservatives' proposals.

27 The Conservatives' scheme would also improve levels of electoral equality. Under their proposals, the number of electors per councillor in three wards would vary from the average for the district by more than 10 per cent currently, and in one ward by more than 20 per cent. By 2004, no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 11 per cent.

28 The Conservatives also proposed an alternative scheme for 49 members "in case it is felt [by the Commission] that a reduction to 44 members is too radical". The Conservatives' proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

## **Members of the European Parliament**

29 We received a submission from Mr Roy Perry MEP, a Conservative representative for the South East region, supporting the Conservatives' proposals for Winchester.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

30 We received representations from eight parish and town councils in Winchester. Two submissions commented on the issue of council size. Itchen Valley Parish Council supported a slight reduction in council size, while New Alresford Town Council argued that a debate on the most appropriate council size for Winchester would have been constructive at this stage.

31 Other representations from parish and town councils commented on warding arrangements. Littleton & Harestock Parish Council requested no change to the existing Littleton ward and objected to the Conservatives' proposal, which would divide the parish. Bramdean Parish Council stated that, while it was not opposed to the composition of the Conservatives' proposed Alresford Villages ward, it objected to the ward name. Itchen Valley Parish Council stated that it would have no objection to including either Northington and Old Alresford or Tichborne parishes in the current Itchen Valley ward, although it did not wish to see the parish divided between district wards. New Alresford Town Council stated that it was content to have two district councillors instead of three, but was opposed to including Bighton and Old Alresford parishes in the ward. Both Soberton and Swanmore parish councils objected to the City Council's proposal to combine part of Soberton parish with Swanmore ward, and Swanmore Parish Council also stated that it was opposed to a larger multi-member ward for the area. Wickham Parish Council proposed dividing the parish and creating a new district ward for the expanding population of Whiteley. Wonston Parish Council supported retaining the Stoke Charity area in the current Wonston ward.

## **Other Representations**

32 We received a further 21 representations from local councillors and residents of the district. The leader of Winchester City Council's Conservative group, Councillor Allgood of Denmead ward, wrote on behalf of the 12 Conservative councillors supporting the Conservatives' 44-member scheme for Winchester. Councillors Coleman and Hutton, who represent The Worthys ward, opposed the Council's proposals for the area, which would divide the current ward and include Headbourne Worthy parish in a revised Sparsholt ward, and proposed an alternative configuration of parishes for the area. Councillor Empson, who represents Droxford, Soberton

& Hambledon ward, objected to the Council's proposal to divide Soberton parish and combine part with Swanmore ward, and suggested that Droxford parish might instead be included in a revised Upper Meon Valley ward. Eleven local residents supported a smaller council size, and two specifically supported the Conservatives' proposed reduction to 44 members. Nine residents objected to the Council's proposal to combine part of Soberton parish with Swanmore ward. One local resident supported the creation of a new South Wonston ward, and the incorporation of the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery areas within the city area, while another suggested a minor amendment to the City Council's proposed Whiteley ward.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

33 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Winchester 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 convenient and effective 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”.

34 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.

35 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.

36 Our *Guidance* states that 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 a 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**

37 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in Winchester’s electorate of some 6 per cent from 82,595 to 87,748 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. The Council stated that its electorate forecasts were based on population and household projections supplied by Hampshire County Council, and noted that this had been the common approach to electorate forecasts within the group of Hampshire authorities currently involved in the electoral review process. It expected most of the growth to be in Wickham ward, as a result of developments forecast to take place in the Whiteley area, although a significant amount was also expected in the more rural Boarhunt & Southwick ward.

38 In their submission the Conservatives questioned the accuracy of the City Council’s electorate forecasts in several areas. They argued that in Southwick & Widley parish the Council had assumed that a significant number of service personnel stationed at the HMS Dryad training

facility would be on the electoral register in 2004 and that, given the historic rate of under-registration among service personnel in Winchester, the Council's forecast electorate for the parish was exaggerated. Similarly, the Conservatives argued that the Council had erroneously included a significant number of servicemen stationed at Sir John Moore's Barracks in its forecast for Littleton & Harestock ward.

39 In the light of these arguments, we wrote to the City Council and sought further clarification regarding its forecasts for the Southwick & Widley and Littleton & Harestock areas. Having reconsidered its forecasts, the Council provided revised projections for these areas. It accepted that in its original forecasts there had been some over-estimation of the number of service personnel on electoral registers by 2004, and revised the figures accordingly. In relation to Southwick & Widley parish, the Council included 120 dwellings that it forecast would be completed by 2004 in the major development area west of Waterlooville, which had been omitted from the County Council's projections. These revised projections forecast a total electorate of 87,570 by 2004.

40 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the City Council's revised figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

## **Council Size**

41 Winchester City Council currently has 55 members. During Stage One, we received district-wide schemes based on different council sizes from two respondents. The City Council proposed increasing council size by two members to 57, while the Conservatives proposed a radical reduction of 11 members, to 44 under its preferred option, and by six to 49 under its alternative option.

42 As previously explained, the Commission's starting point in its PER work is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government. We will not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size, but as our *Guidance* makes clear we will be prepared to consider the case for change where there are both persuasive arguments and supporting evidence, and proof of a degree of local consensus in favour of change.

43 The City Council stated that it had established an informal working group, comprising both officers and members of the council, to evaluate options for Winchester and produce a recommended proposal for consideration. The Council noted that the group's starting point was "to seek to produce a Council size as close as possible to the existing membership of 55", which would allow members "reasonable time to fulfill his/her role, both in the Ward and in the Council Chamber". The working group concluded that a change in council size was necessary in order to improve levels of electoral equality in the district, but recommended that any change should be kept to a minimum. It produced an initial proposal comprising 57 members, and copies of this initial proposal were distributed to all parish councils and meetings in the district for further comment. Under the Council's proposals, the rural area of the district would experience an

increase in representation of two councillors, and electoral equality in Winchester would improve, with only four of the proposed wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average number of electors per councillor for the district by 2004.

44 The Conservatives argued that a significant reduction in council size would provide a number of benefits for the electorate of Winchester, including higher quality candidates at district elections and lower costs, and asserted that the district could continue to be run effectively with a reduced council size. They also noted that, relative to the size of its electorate, Winchester City Council currently has a larger number of councillors than its neighbouring Hampshire authorities. Their proposed scheme would reduce the size of Winchester City Council by 11 to 44 members, and their alternative scheme by six to 49 members. Copies of their proposals were distributed to all parish councils and meetings in the district for further comment. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood, leader of the Conservative group on the Council, both supported the Conservatives' proposals. Under the Conservatives' proposals, electoral equality would also improve, with only one of its proposed wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average number of electors per councillor for the district by 2004.

45 We received a further 13 representations, from parish and town councils and residents of the district, concerning council size. Itchen Valley Parish Council stated that it would favour a small reduction in the number of councillors for the district in order to reduce costs, while New Alresford Town Council argued that a wider discussion of council size would be appropriate. Eleven local residents wrote in support of a smaller council size, on the grounds of reduced costs and increased efficiency.

46 We have carefully considered the representations received, and have noted the lack of consensus regarding the appropriate council size for Winchester. Notwithstanding the reasonable levels of electoral equality achieved by the Conservatives' scheme, we are not persuaded that their proposed reduction in council size has been justified by sufficient evidence. In particular, it is difficult to ascertain whether, as a result of such a reduction, council structures would be adversely affected and that community ties would be reflected as well as under the current council size. We note that the Conservatives' submission draws comparisons between the size of Winchester City Council relative to its population, and the levels of representation which exist in neighbouring Hampshire authorities at present. However, as our *Guidance* makes clear, these are not factors which we take into account. Furthermore, we have received no evidence to suggest that there is significant support for such a radical change in council size for the district. We consider that the City Council's proposals would achieve reasonable electoral equality, and moreover would have the advantage of building on a principle of least change. Through the establishment of a cross-party working group and an extensive consultation exercise, we are persuaded that the Council has sought to canvas opinion on its proposals throughout the district, and build on a degree of local consensus. The small increase proposed is due to the need to reflect changes in electorate projected for the Whiteley area.

47 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 57 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

48 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the district-wide schemes from the City Council and the Conservatives. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have informed our draft recommendations. As outlined above, our proposals for Winchester are based on a council size of 57, which we consider to be the most appropriate council size for the district, having regard to the evidence submitted and to the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area. Given this preliminary conclusion on the most appropriate council size, we are unable to adopt completely either of the Conservatives' district-wide schemes. We are not persuaded that the slight improvement in electoral equality provided by the Conservatives' proposals for Winchester would justify their potential impact on community identities in the district, and consider that by building on existing ward structures the City Council's proposals would better reflect existing community ties.

49 Our draft recommendations are based primarily on the City Council's proposals, although we have sought to build on those proposals in several areas in order to improve electoral equality further and reflect community identities and interests in the district. The Council's proposals and the Conservatives' preferred option are discussed in detail below, while the Conservatives' alternative scheme is summarised in Appendix B. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Micheldever and Wonston wards;
- (b) Littleton, Sparsholt and The Worthy wards;
- (c) Compton, Otterbourne & Hursley and Twyford wards;
- (d) Curdrige, Durley & Upham and Owslebury & Colden Common wards;
- (e) Bishops Waltham, Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards;
- (f) Boarhunt & Southwick, Denmead and Wickham wards;
- (g) Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon, Swanmore and Upper Meon Valley wards;
- (h) Bishops Sutton, Cheriton, Itchen Valley and New Alresford wards;
- (i) Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards;
- (j) St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards;
- (k) St John & All Saints and St Michael wards;
- (l) St Luke and St Paul wards.

50 Details of our draft 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.

### **Micheldever and Wonston wards**

51 Micheldever and Wonston wards in the north of the district are currently represented by one and two councillors respectively. Micheldever ward comprises the parishes of Micheldever and Northington, and has 23 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. Wonston ward comprises the parishes of Wonston and South Wonston, and currently has equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the district. Electoral equality is expected to remain relatively stable in these wards over the next five years, with Micheldever ward having 24 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2004, and Wonston ward 1 per cent more.

52 The City Council proposed minimal change in this area, combining the current Micheldever and Wonston wards in a new three-member Wonston & Micheldever ward. It noted that both Micheldever and Wonston parishes had expressed opposition to initial proposals which would transfer the Stoke Charity area of Wonston parish to Micheldever ward, and argued that its revised proposal “achieves both electoral equality and satisfies the concerns of the Parish Councils about the severing of community links”. Under a council size of 57, the proposed ward would contain 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years’ time.

53 The Conservatives proposed combining Micheldever and Wonston parishes in a new single-member Micheldever & Wonston ward, and including Northington parish in a revised Itchen Valley ward. They also proposed creating a new single-member South Wonston ward comprising South Wonston parish. Under their proposals, Micheldever & Wonston and South Wonston wards would have 1 per cent and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively, based on a council size of 44 (4 per cent and 9 per cent more). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

54 We received three further representations concerning this area. Wonston Parish Council argued that the interests of Wonston and South Wonston parishes are closely linked, and objected to the City Council’s initial proposal to transfer electors from the Stoke Charity area of Wonston parish to a Micheldever ward. Councillors Coleman and Hutton, members for The Worthys ward, proposed alternative warding arrangements for The Worthys ward, which would combine Micheldever and The Worthys wards in a new three member ward, as discussed later. A resident of Winchester supported the creation of a new South Wonston ward and the combination of Micheldever and Wonston parishes in a single ward.

55 While the current arrangements for this area reflect community ties well, it is necessary to address the significant levels of electoral inequality which exist in these two wards. We are not persuaded that the Conservatives’ proposal to divide the current Wonston ward is appropriate, given the close association of interests between Wonston and South Wonston parishes. We consider that the City Council’s proposal to combine the two existing wards would best reflect the levels of representation to which the area is entitled under a council size of 57, without any adverse effect on community identities and interests in the area. We therefore propose putting forward its proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposed three-member Wonston & Micheldever ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years’ time.

### **Littleton, Sparsholt and The Worthys wards**

56 Littleton, Sparsholt and The Worthys wards lie to the north and west of Winchester city, and are currently represented by two, one and two councillors respectively. Littleton ward comprises the parish of Littleton & Harestock, and has 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. Sparsholt ward comprises the parishes of Crawley and Sparsholt, and currently has 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than average, while The Worthys ward, which is coterminous with Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy parishes, has 20 per cent more electors per councillor than average. Again, electoral equality is not expected to improve significantly

over the next five years, when Littleton, Sparsholt and The Worthys wards are forecast to have 12 per cent fewer, 20 per cent fewer and 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the average respectively.

57 The City Council proposed retaining three wards for this area. Under its proposals, Headbourne Worthy parish would be included in a revised single-member Sparsholt ward, while a new two-member Kings Worthy ward would be created, coterminous with Kings Worthy parish. The electoral arrangements of the two-member Littleton ward would be unchanged, but it would be renamed Littleton & Harestock ward. The Council recognised that including Headbourne Worthy parish in its proposed Sparsholt ward would create a geographically irregular ward, but argued that its inclusion was necessary in order to achieve electoral equality and avoid significant consequential effects on electoral equality elsewhere in the district. The Council added that it was reluctant to divide Littleton & Harestock parish, given that “considerable efforts had been made since the union of Littleton and Harestock 30 years ago, to forge many social links between the areas”. The Council’s proposed Kings Worthy and Sparsholt wards would each contain 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent and 7 per cent more by 2004), while Littleton & Harestock ward would have 4 per cent fewer than the average (9 per cent fewer by 2004).

58 The Conservatives proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements of The Worthys ward, and combining the Littleton area of Littleton & Harestock parish with the current Sparsholt ward in a revised single-member Littleton ward. The Harestock area of Littleton & Harestock parish would be combined with part of St Barnabas ward, as discussed later. The Conservatives argued that, although The Worthys ward comprises two individual parishes, it forms a single community which should not be separated. They also contended that “geographically at least, Harestock is part of Winchester City”, and that the area should be included in a city ward. Under a council size of 44, the two-member The Worthys ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (9 per cent fewer by 2004), and Littleton ward would have 10 per cent more than the average (6 per cent more by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

59 We received several further representations regarding this area at Stage One. Littleton & Harestock Parish Council requested no change to the existing arrangements for Littleton ward, and stated that it opposed the Conservatives’ proposals, which would divide the parish. Councillors Coleman and Hutton, members for The Worthys ward, objected to the Council’s proposal to divide the present ward and include Headbourne Worthy in a revised Sparsholt ward. They proposed alternative warding arrangements for the area, including Micheldever and Northington parishes with Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy parishes in a three-member ward, and combining Littleton and Sparsholt wards in a new three-member ward. Under a council size of 57, their proposed Wonston and The Worthys & Micheldever wards would contain 4 per cent and 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent and 5 per cent more by 2004), and their new Littleton & Sparsholt ward would have 9 per cent fewer than the average (12 per cent fewer by 2004). A resident of Winchester argued that, if Littleton & Harestock parish were to be divided between district wards, the Littleton area should be combined with Sparsholt ward and that a single-member Harestock ward should be created. Finally, another resident opposed the division of The Worthys ward and the inclusion of Headbourne Worthy in a revised Sparsholt ward.

60 We recognise that, given the size and nature of the communities involved, achieving electoral equality in this area presents us with a number of problems. Under the two district-wide schemes submitted, either Littleton & Harestock parish or The Worthys ward would be divided. While the proposed warding arrangements put forward by Councillors Coleman and Hutton would avoid dividing either community, and achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality, we are not persuaded that they would better reflect community ties, and they do not appear to have been subject to wide consultation. Although the City Council and the Conservatives' proposals achieve similar levels of electoral equality, we are reluctant to divide the parish of Littleton & Harestock between district wards, especially given the parish council's opposition to such a proposal.

61 We recognise that dividing Headbourne Worthy from Kings Worthy may be less than ideal, but have been unable to find a more suitable alternative which would provide reasonable electoral equality under a council size of 57. Consequently, we are content to adopt the City Council's proposal for this area. Our proposed Kings Worthy, Littleton & Harestock and Sparsholt wards would have 10 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer and 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more, 9 per cent fewer and 7 per cent more by 2004). We welcome further comments on these proposals at Stage Three of the review.

### **Compton, Otterbourne & Hursley and Twyford wards**

62 Compton, Otterbourne & Hursley and Twyford wards lie to the south and west of Winchester, and are each represented by one councillor. Compton ward, which is coterminous with the parish of Compton & Shawford, has 18 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. Otterbourne & Hursley ward, comprising Hursley and Otterbourne parishes, has 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, and Twyford ward, containing the parish of Twyford, has 22 per cent fewer than the average. Electoral equality is expected to deteriorate further over the next five years, with Compton, Otterbourne & Hursley and Twyford wards forecast to contain 21 per cent fewer, 22 per cent more and 30 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2004.

63 The City Council proposed combining Compton and Otterbourne & Hursley wards to form a new two-member Compton & Otterbourne ward, and including the parish of Colden Common, currently part of Owslebury & Colden Common ward, in a new three-member Colden Common & Twyford ward. The Council noted that Colden Common and Twyford are linked by the B3335 trunk road, and argued that significant community ties exist between the two settlements. Under its proposals, Compton & Otterbourne ward would have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (4 per cent more by 2004), and Colden Common & Twyford ward would have 5 per cent fewer than the average (8 per cent fewer by 2004).

64 The Conservatives proposed including Hursley parish in a new single-member Compton, Shawford & Hursley ward, and combining Otterbourne parish with Colden Common parish in a new two-member Colden Common ward. Under their proposals, Twyford ward would be combined with Owslebury parish of the current Owslebury & Colden Common ward, as discussed later. Based on a council size of 44, their proposed Compton, Shawford & Hursley ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent fewer by 2004), while Colden Common ward would have 10 per cent more than the average (9 per cent more by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

65 In view of the high levels of electoral inequality which exist in these wards, maintaining the existing electoral arrangements cannot be considered a practical solution. Both the City Council and the Conservatives' proposals would achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality in these wards. However, our proposed council size of 57 limits the extent to which we are able to consider the Conservatives' proposals for this area, which were based on a council size of 44. The Council's proposals would also have the advantage of building on existing ward structures, and we are therefore content to put forward its Colden Common & Twyford and Compton & Otterbourne wards as part of our draft recommendations. Under our proposed warding arrangements Colden Common & Twyford ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (8 per cent fewer by 2004) while Compton & Otterbourne ward would have 6 per cent more than the average (4 per cent more by 2004).

### **Curdrige, Durley & Upham and Owslebury & Colden Common wards**

66 Curdrige, Durley & Upham and Owslebury & Colden Common wards lie in the south-west of the district and mark the boundary with Eastleigh borough. The single-member Curdrige ward is coterminous with Curdrige parish, while Durley & Upham ward comprises the parishes of Durley and Upham and is also represented by one councillor. The two-member Owslebury & Colden Common ward contains the parishes of Colden Common and Owslebury. Curdrige and Durley & Upham wards currently have 34 per cent and 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively, while Owslebury & Colden Common ward has 22 per cent more than the average. These levels of electoral equality are not expected to improve significantly over the next five years, with Curdrige and Durley & Upham wards having 34 per cent and 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2004, and Owslebury & Colden Common ward 19 per cent more than the average.

67 As discussed previously, the City Council proposed including Colden Common parish in a new Colden Common & Twyford ward. It proposed combining Curdrige and Durley & Upham wards and Owslebury parish in a new two-member Curdrige ward. The Council argued that, while its proposed Curdrige ward would be geographically elongated, it would comprise a number of similar villages with small, scattered populations which share many interests. The Council also stated that, as part of its own consultation exercise, Curdrige Parish Council had requested that it be joined with other similar rural parishes and had accepted the Council's proposed Curdrige ward. Its proposed Curdrige ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years' time.

68 The Conservatives proposed combining Owslebury parish, currently part of Owslebury & Colden Common ward, with the existing Twyford ward in a new single member Twyford & Owslebury ward. They also proposed including Upham parish in a revised three-member Bishops Waltham ward, as discussed later, and combining Durley parish with Curdrige ward in a new single-member Curdrige & Durley ward. Under their proposals for a 44-member council, Twyford & Owslebury ward would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent fewer by 2004), while Curdrige & Durley ward would have 10 per cent fewer electors than the average, improving to 7 per cent fewer by 2004. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

69 We received one further representation regarding this area, from a local resident who opposed the Council's proposals for Curdridge ward, arguing that they would "combine unrelated parishes over an extended distance".

70 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we are not persuaded that the Conservatives' proposal to combine Owslebury and Twyford parishes in a new Twyford & Owslebury ward would adequately reflect community identities and interests in this area. We consider that the largely rural community in Upham parish is distinct from the largely urban Bishops Waltham area, and that combining them in one ward would not best reflect community ties. We concur with the City Council's view that the parishes of Owslebury, Upham, Durley and Curdridge are similar in nature and should be combined in a single ward, and propose adopting the Council's revised Curdridge ward as part of our draft recommendations. Under our proposals, the new two-member Curdridge ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years' time.

### **Bishops Waltham, Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards**

71 Bishops Waltham, Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards in the south of the district encompass the large settlement of Bishops Waltham, and the two smaller communities of Shedfield and Waltham Chase. Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards are coterminous with Shedfield and Waltham Chase parish wards of Shedfield parish. The three-member Bishops Waltham ward currently has 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average. Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards, each represented by one councillor, currently have 21 per cent fewer and 22 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively. Electoral equality is not expected to improve notably over the next five years, with Bishops Waltham and Waltham Chase wards forecast to have 9 per cent and 19 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2004, and Shedfield ward forecast to have 24 per cent fewer than the average.

72 The City Council proposed minimal change in this area, retaining the current Bishops Waltham ward, and combining Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards in a new two-member Shedfield ward, thereby uniting all of Shedfield parish in one ward. The Council noted that Bishops Waltham is a large, relatively self-contained settlement, and that the two parish wards of Shedfield parish have maintained many well-established community links. Under their proposals, Bishops Waltham and Shedfield wards would have 17 per cent and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively, improving to 13 per cent and 1 per cent more by 2004.

73 The Conservatives' proposals in this area would involve a greater degree of change. As previously discussed, they proposed including Upham parish in a revised three-member Bishops Waltham ward. They also proposed combining the current Shedfield, Swanmore and Waltham Chase wards in a new three-member Shedfield & Swanmore ward. Based on a council size of 44, the Conservatives' proposed Bishops Waltham ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (4 per cent fewer by 2004), and Shedfield & Swanmore ward would have 8 per cent fewer (11 per cent fewer by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

74 We received only one further representation concerning this area at Stage One from Swanmore Parish Council, which stated that it did not wish to see the parish divided for district warding purposes, and opposed combining the parish with other parishes in a multi-member ward.

75 As previously discussed, we are not persuaded that the Conservatives' proposal to combine Bishops Waltham and Upham parishes in a single ward would adequately reflect community ties in the area, and we consider that the City Council's proposals for this area would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. While we recognise that levels of electoral inequality in Bishops Waltham would be relatively high under the Council's proposals, improving electoral equality in these areas is constrained by parish boundaries, and we are content to put forward the Council's proposed Bishops Waltham ward as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations, Bishops Waltham ward would have 17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 13 per cent more by 2004.

76 We consider that the Council's proposal to unite the Shedfield and Waltham Chase parish wards of Shedfield parish in a single ward has considerable merit, as the two communities share a parish council and are linked by the B2177 Winchester Road. We note the concerns of Swanmore Parish Council that it would be at a disadvantage under proposals to combine it with other parishes in a large multi-member ward, and are not persuaded that the parish should be combined with Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards. Our proposed two-member Shedfield ward would be coterminous with the parish of Shedfield, and would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 1 per cent more by 2004.

### **Boarhunt & Southwick, Denmead and Wickham wards**

77 Boarhunt & Southwick, Denmead and Wickham wards lie in the south of the district bordering Fareham district, Portsmouth city and Havant borough. The single-member Boarhunt & Southwick ward currently comprises the parishes of Boarhunt and Southwick & Widley. Denmead ward, coterminous with Denmead parish, and Wickham ward, coterminous with Wickham parish, are currently represented by two councillors each. At present, Boarhunt & Southwick ward has 36 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, while Denmead and Wickham wards have 58 per cent and 8 per cent more than the average respectively. Electoral equality is forecast to improve marginally in Boarhunt & Southwick ward over the next five years, primarily as a result of housing developments in Southwick & Widley parish, and the ward is projected to have 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2004. Denmead ward is forecast to have 57 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2004. The Council expects that substantial housing developments will take place in Wickham ward over the next five years, and consequently the ward is forecast to have 88 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2004.

78 The City Council proposed no change to the composition of Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards, but proposed increasing the number of councillors representing Denmead ward to three. It noted that Denmead has recently experienced a considerable growth in population, primarily as a result of housing developments which took place during the 1980s, and argued that "the increase in population has justified an additional member". Under its proposed council size

of 57, Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards would have 34 per cent fewer and 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (12 per cent fewer and 9 per cent more by 2004). In order to address the issue of electoral inequality in Wickham ward as a result of the major development at Whiteley over the next five years, the Council proposed dividing the parish of Wickham to create a new two-member Whiteley ward encompassing the new development area, and a revised two-member Wickham ward, incorporating Curbridge and Knowle areas. The boundary between the Council's proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards would run southwards along the Eastleigh to Portsmouth railway line, Titchfield Lane and the public footpath to Lee Ground Farm. The boundary would then follow Springles Lane westwards, crossing the M27 motorway to the east of Whiteley Lane. The Council's proposed Whiteley ward would have 61 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently, improving to 5 per cent fewer by 2004. Its proposed two-member Wickham ward would have 27 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average currently, and equal to the average for the district by 2004.

79 The Conservatives also proposed dividing the current Wickham ward, creating a new two-member Whiteley & Knowle ward and combining the remainder of Wickham ward with part of Soberton parish in a new single-member Wickham ward. They argued that the proposed development at Knowle on the site of a former hospital would share more community links with the new development at Whiteley, and that the existing community of Wickham should be represented separately from the new developments. The Conservatives also proposed including part of the current Soberton parish, encompassing the Hundred Acres and Kingsmead areas, in their Wickham ward, arguing that the two communities are "very much part of Wickham, both physically, in terms of interest and even postal address". Their proposed Whiteley & Knowle ward would have 65 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 2 per cent more by 2004. In the east of the area, the Conservatives proposed combining the current Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards in a new three-member Denmead ward. Their proposed Denmead and Wickham wards would have 1 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent and 2 per cent more by 2004), based on a council size of 44. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

80 We received 13 further representations regarding this area. Wickham Parish Council favoured creating a separate district ward for the Whiteley area, and a two-member ward for the Wickham and Curbridge areas. A local resident also supported the City Council's proposed new Whiteley ward but suggested an alternative boundary for the new ward, and objected to the Conservatives' proposal to include the development at Knowle in Whitley ward. As discussed later, Soberton Parish Council objected to any proposals to divide the parish, and Councillor Empson (Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward) and nine local residents also objected to the City Council's proposal to divide Soberton parish between district wards.

81 We consider that there is some merit in Wickham Parish Council's proposal to create a new Whiteley ward and, in the light of the extensive development which is forecast to continue in the area, we are persuaded that additional and separate representation for Whiteley is necessary. We note that both the district-wide schemes submitted to us propose additional representation for the Whiteley area, and we consider that under a council size of 57, an increase of two members is

appropriate. We are not persuaded that the proposed development site at Knowle should be included in the new Whiteley ward. While we accept that the new development will share many characteristics with the development at Whiteley, Knowle remains geographically isolated from Whiteley and has good communication links with Wickham. We concur with the City Council's proposal to include the Curbridge area in Wickham ward, although we are not persuaded that the Hundred Acres and Kingsmead areas share sufficient links with Wickham to merit their inclusion in a Wickham ward as proposed by the Conservatives. We are therefore content to put forward the City Council's proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards as part of our draft recommendations without amendment. Our proposed Whiteley ward would have 61 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 5 per cent fewer by 2004, and Wickham ward would have 27 per cent fewer than the average, equal to the average by 2004. The proposed boundary between Whiteley and Wickham wards is illustrated on Maps 2 and A3 in Appendix A.

82 We have noted the Conservatives' proposal to combine Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards in a new three-member Denmead ward. We are not persuaded, however, that the rural Boarhunt and Southwick areas in the south of the district share significant community ties with the larger village of Denmead, and consider that the two areas should remain separately represented on the City Council. While we recognise that the City Council's proposed Boarhunt & Southwick ward would have 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2004, improving electoral equality in this area is constrained by existing parish boundaries. The Council stated that it had considered transferring part of Denmead parish to Boarhunt & Southwick ward to improve electoral equality, but was reluctant to ward the parish in such a small area, and we concur with this view. We are content, therefore, to put forward the City Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. Under a council size of 57, our proposed single-member Boarhunt & Southwick ward would have 34 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 12 per cent fewer by 2004, and the three-member Denmead ward would have 9 per cent more than the average, both now and in 2004.

### **Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon, Swanmore and Upper Meon Valley wards**

83 The predominantly rural Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon, Swanmore and Upper Meon Valley wards lie in the south-east of the district. At present the two-member Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward comprises the parishes of Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon, while the single-member Swanmore ward is coterminous with the parish of Swanmore. Upper Meon Valley ward comprises Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton, Warnford and West Meon parishes, and is currently represented by one councillor. Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Upper Meon Valley wards are currently over-represented, with 15 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively, while Swanmore ward has 45 per cent more than the average. Over the next five years electoral equality is expected to deteriorate in these three wards, with 17 per cent and 4 per cent fewer, and 41 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2004.

84 The City Council proposed including the southern part of Soberton parish, incorporating the settlements of Soberton Heath and Newtown, in a new two-member Swanmore & Newtown ward, and retaining the rest of Soberton parish in a single-member Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward. The Council stated that it had considered combining the current Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore wards to form a three-member ward in order to improve electoral equality in this area, but was reluctant to create such a geographically large ward. The Council also proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements of Upper Meon Valley ward. Under its proposals, Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon, Swanmore & Newtown and Upper Meon Valley wards would have 20 per cent, 3 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively, improving to 17 per cent more, equal to and equal to the average by 2004.

85 The Conservatives proposed more extensive change in this area. As discussed previously, they proposed combining Swanmore, Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards in a new Shedfield & Swanmore ward, and including part of Soberton parish in a revised Wickham ward. They also proposed combining Droxford parish, currently in Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward, with Upper Meon Valley ward to form a new single-member Meon Valley ward. Under their proposals, Hambledon parish would be combined with the remaining part of Soberton parish in a new single-member Soberton & Hambledon ward. Based on a council size of 44, the Conservatives' proposed Meon Valley and Soberton & Hambledon wards would each have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 4 per cent more and equal to the average respectively by 2004. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

86 We received several further comments concerning this area. As discussed previously, Swanmore Parish Council objected to any proposals either to divide the parish or combine it with other areas in a larger multi-member ward, and Soberton Parish Council stated that it did not wish to see the parish divided for district warding purposes. Councillor Empson and nine local residents also stated their opposition to the City Council's proposals which would divide the parish.

87 We recognise that under our proposed council size of 57, the existing Swanmore ward would have unacceptably high levels of electoral inequality. In order to achieve more reasonable levels of electoral equality in this area we consider that it is necessary to amend the current Swanmore ward, by either including part of another parish or transferring part of Swanmore parish to an adjacent ward. As previously discussed, we are not persuaded that Swanmore should be combined with Shedfield and Waltham Chase, as proposed by the Conservatives. We concur with the Council's view that creating a geographically large three-member ward encompassing Droxford, Soberton, Hambledon and Swanmore parishes may not best facilitate convenient and effective local government in the area.

88 We note concerns expressed by Soberton Parish Council, and supported by Councillor Empson and residents of Soberton, that the Council's proposals would "diminish, if not destroy the community spirit and links built up over so many years". However, the levels of electoral inequality in both Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore wards are such that they must be addressed as part of this review. We propose, therefore, to base our draft

recommendations for this area on the warding arrangements submitted by the City Council, which would combine Swanmore parish with the southern part of Soberton parish in a two-member Swanmore & Newtown ward. However, we propose amending the Council's scheme to improve electoral equality further in the proposed Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward. We propose that the boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards should run westwards along the centre of Cams Hill, Hambledon Lane and Peststead Lane to the boundary between Soberton and Droxford parishes. We also propose retaining the existing Upper Meon Valley ward.

89 Our proposed Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward would have 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 10 per cent more by 2004, while Swanmore & Newtown ward would have 7 per cent more than the average (4 per cent more by 2004). Under our proposals, Upper Meon Valley ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently, equal to the average by 2004. The proposed boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards is illustrated on Maps 2 and A2 in Appendix A. We note the lack of consensus regarding the most suitable warding arrangements for this area, and therefore welcome further comments on these proposals at Stage Three.

### **Bishops Sutton, Cheriton, Itchen Valley and New Alresford wards**

90 Bishops Sutton, Cheriton, Itchen Valley and New Alresford wards currently cover the area to the east of Winchester city, extending as far as the district boundary with East Hampshire district. The predominantly rural Bishops Sutton, Cheriton and Itchen Valley wards are each represented by a single councillor, while the more urban New Alresford ward is coterminous with the New Alresford Town Council area, and is currently represented by three councillors. Bishops Sutton ward comprises Bighton, Bishops Sutton and Old Alresford parishes; Cheriton ward comprises Beauworth, Bramdean, Cheriton, Kilmiston and Tichborne parishes; and Itchen Valley ward comprises the parishes of Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley. All four wards are currently over-represented and electoral equality is expected to deteriorate further over the next five years. Bishops Sutton, Cheriton, Itchen Valley and New Alresford wards currently have 31 per cent, 11 per cent, 12 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (29 per cent, 16 per cent, 11 per cent and 13 per cent fewer by 2004).

91 The City Council proposed reducing the number of wards covering this area from four to three, combining Bishops Sutton parish with the current Cheriton ward in a new single-member Cheriton & Bishops Sutton ward, and creating a new three-member ward encompassing the New Alresford town council area and the parishes of Bighton and Old Alresford, to be named The Alresfords ward. The Council argued that the addition of Bighton and Old Alresford parishes would improve electoral equality in The Alresfords ward, and that the areas have "historical and community links, with the two smaller rural parishes looking to New Alresford for most daily needs". The Council proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements of the single-member Itchen Valley ward. Under its proposals, Cheriton & Bishops Sutton and The Alresfords wards would have 16 per cent and 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (11 per cent and 6 per cent more by 2004), and Itchen Valley ward would have 9 per cent fewer than the average (8 per cent fewer by 2004).

92 The Conservatives also proposed creating three wards in this area. Their revised single-member Itchen Valley ward would combine the existing ward with Northington parish, currently in Micheldever ward, and Old Alresford parish. New Alresford ward would remain coterminous with New Alresford Town Council area, but would be represented by two councillors under the Conservatives' proposals, rather than three as at present. The parishes of Bighton and Bishops Sutton would be combined with the current Cheriton ward in a new single-member The Alresford Villages ward. Under the Conservatives' proposed council size of 44, Itchen Valley ward would have equal to the district average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent more by 2004), while New Alresford and The Alresfords wards would have 13 per cent and 3 per cent more than the average respectively (4 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

93 We received a further three representations regarding this area at Stage One, from Bramdean Parish Council, Itchen Valley Parish Council and New Alresford Town Council. Bramdean Parish Council stated that it wished to see Bramdean and Tichborne parishes remain part of Cheriton ward, and that the ward should also include Bishops Sutton and Bighton parishes. It also argued that any Alresford ward should include New Alresford town council area only. Itchen Valley Parish Council stated that while it would not object to including either Northington and Old Alresford or Tichborne parishes in the Itchen Valley district ward, it did not wish to see the parish divided between district wards. New Alresford Town Council stated that it would not wish to see New Alresford combined with Bighton and Old Alresford parishes in a single ward, arguing that "the varying and many issues relating to the small town of Alresford would overwhelm the problems of great importance to the two small villages", and requested that New Alresford ward be represented by two councillors rather than the present three.

94 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we consider that the City Council's proposals represent the most reasonable balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. While the Conservatives' proposals also achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality, our proposed council size of 57 limits the extent to which we are able to consider their proposals. We consider that the Council's proposals better reflect the identities and interests of communities in the New Alresford area, and concur with its view that Old Alresford and Bighton maintain strong communication links with New Alresford and look primarily to the town for their services. We consider that Bishops Sutton parish shares a commonality of interests with the rural parishes of the current Cheriton ward, and are content to adopt the Council's proposed Cheriton & Bishops Sutton ward as part of our draft recommendations. We are also content to put forward the Council's proposal to retain the existing Itchen Valley ward. Under our proposals, Cheriton & Bishops Sutton and The Alresfords wards would contain 16 per cent and 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (11 per cent and 6 per cent more by 2004), while Itchen Valley ward would have 9 per cent fewer than the average, improving slightly to 8 per cent fewer by 2004.

### **Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards**

95 The single-member Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards lie to the south of Winchester city, and are coterminous with the parish council areas of Badger Farm and Olivers Battery respectively. The area is predominantly residential: Olivers Battery parish experienced a great

deal of growth during the 1960s, while the majority of development in Badger Farm occurred during the 1980s. At present, Badger Farm ward is under-represented, with 32 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, while Olivers Battery ward is over-represented, with 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average. Electoral equality is not expected to improve significantly by 2004, when Badger Farm ward is forecast to have 20 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, and Olivers Battery ward 22 per cent fewer than average.

96 The City Council proposed combining Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards in a new two-member Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward, which would have 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently, improving to 3 per cent more by 2004. It argued that the two areas share many common interests and that its proposal “simply reinforces existing community links”.

97 The Conservatives also proposed combining Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards, and including part of the Stanmore estate area of St Luke ward to the south of Kilham Lane, Thurmond Crescent, The Valley and Octavia Hill in a new three-member Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore ward. They argued that the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery area is “essentially an area of urban overspill”, and that it shares common interests with other city wards. Under the Conservatives’ proposals, the ward would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently, falling to 1 per cent fewer by 2004. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

98 We received one further submission concerning this area at Stage One, from a local resident who supported proposals incorporating Badger Farm and Olivers Battery into Winchester, but wished to see each parish continue to be represented separately on the City Council.

99 We concur with the view expressed by both the City Council and the Conservatives that Badger Farm and Olivers Battery share a degree of common interest and should be combined in a single ward. The parishes share a community association and have common road access from the A3090 Badger Farm Road. However, we are not persuaded that they should be combined with part of the unparished city area as proposed by the Conservatives. The Stanmore estate is a separate community with distinct identities and interests, and it is not easily accessible from the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery areas. We are content to adopt the Council’s proposals for a two-member Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward which, under our draft recommendations, would have 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently, improving to 3 per cent more by 2004.

### **St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards**

100 St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards cover the northern part of the unparished area of Winchester city, and are each represented by three councillors. St Barnabas ward includes the Fulflood and Weeke areas of the city, west of the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line, and is bounded to the south by the B3049 Stockbridge Road. St Bartholomew ward includes the Abbots Barton and Hyde areas east of the railway line, as well as the commercial centre of the city, and is bounded in the east by the River Itchen and in the south by the High Street. Both St

Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards are currently over-represented, with 9 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively. Electoral equality is expected to deteriorate in both wards by 2004, with St Barnabas ward having 18 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, and St Bartholomew ward 6 per cent fewer.

101 The City Council proposed several changes in this area in order to improve electoral equality in both wards. It proposed including part of the Teg Down residential area of St Paul ward, incorporating Dean Lane, Downside Road, Mornington Drive, Old Hillside Road and Hillside Close, in a revised three-member St Barnabas ward. The Council noted that the Teg Down area is clearly divided between the compact development of the 1960s and the larger, earlier properties, and argued that its proposal “reflects the existing situation ... of two communities who have always regarded themselves as separate”. Its proposed St Barnabas ward would also include properties on the southern side of the B3049 Stockbridge Road, currently in St Pauls ward, and have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (4 per cent fewer by 2004). The Council proposed including the Dykes Farm and Erasmus Park areas to the west of Water Lane, Wales Street and Easton Lane (currently in St John & All Saints ward), in a revised three-member St Barnabas ward. It argued that in these areas “by its nature the electorate is very transient ... and they are already on the periphery of their existing ward”. To improve electoral equality further, the Council also proposed transferring part of the current St Bartholomew ward to the south of City Road and west of Sussex Street to its proposed St Paul ward, and part of St Bartholomew ward to the south of Tower Street and west of Jewry Street to its proposed St Michael ward, as discussed later. It also proposed uniting both sides of the High Street within the new St Michael ward, as discussed later. The Council’s proposed St Bartholomew ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent fewer by 2004).

102 The Conservatives proposed more extensive change in this area. As previously discussed, they proposed combining the Harestock area of Littleton & Harestock parish with part of St Barnabas ward, to form a new Harestock & Weeke ward. This new two-member ward would also include part of St Barnabas ward to the north of Stoney Lane, and have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 2 per cent more by 2004. The Conservatives also proposed enlarging the current St Bartholomew ward to include part of St Barnabas ward to the south of Stoney Lane, and part of St Paul ward to the east of Cheriton Road, thereby creating a new three-member Fulflood & Hyde ward. They also proposed transferring part of the current St Bartholomew ward to the south of North Walls and east of Jewry Street to a new Winnall & Highcliffe ward, as discussed later. The Conservatives’ proposed Fulflood & Hyde ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent more by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

103 As discussed previously, we are reluctant to divide the parish of Littleton & Harestock and are not persuaded that the Conservatives’ proposed Harestock & Weeke ward provides a satisfactory balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. However, we consider that the City Council’s proposals for this area also have a number of shortcomings, and while we are content to adopt its proposals as the basis for our draft recommendations, we propose departing from them in several areas. We are not persuaded that the two Teg Down areas are

sufficiently distinct to justify dividing them between district wards, and propose including the entire area in a revised St Barnabas ward. To improve electoral equality in our amended St Barnabas ward, we propose transferring the part of the current St Barnabas ward to the south of the B3041 Bereweke Road to a revised St Paul ward, and part of the ward to the east of the B3420 Andover Road to a revised St Bartholomew ward. We are content that these areas share some common interests and have reasonable communication links. Our proposed three-member St Barnabas ward would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (7 per cent fewer by 2004).

104 We are not persuaded that either of the district-wide proposals submitted to us at this stage provide appropriate ward boundaries in the city centre, and we consider that the existing boundary between St Bartholomew and St Michael wards which follows the High Street is clearly identifiable and divides the city centre between north and south. Furthermore, we consider that the River Itchen forms a suitable boundary which effectively defines communities in the east of the city, and are not persuaded that the City Council's proposed St Bartholomew ward would adequately reflect community interests in this area. We are content to retain the existing eastern boundary of the ward, although we propose amending the western boundary of St Bartholomew ward to follow Andover Road and continue along Sussex Street as far as the High Street in the south, as discussed previously. The Sussex Street area, including Station Hill, Gladstone Street, Newburgh Street and Upper High Street, would form part of our proposed St Paul ward, as discussed later. Under our proposals, the three-member St Bartholomew ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent fewer by 2004). Our proposals for these areas are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

## **St John & All Saints and St Michael wards**

105 St John & All Saints and St Michael wards cover the eastern areas of Winchester city and are each represented by three councillors. St John & All Saints ward, to the east of the River Itchen, Chesil Street and the B3330 Bar End Road, includes the Winnall and Highcliffe areas of the city. St Michael ward currently contains the cathedral area to the south of the High Street, and the B3335 St Cross Road area to the east of the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line. It also includes the Stuart Crescent area of the Stanmore estate to the west of the railway line. St John & All Saints ward has 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent more by 2004), while St Michael ward has 10 per cent fewer than the average (14 per cent fewer by 2004).

106 The City Council proposed minimal change in this area, transferring the Dykes Farm and Erasmus Park areas of St John & All Saints ward to its revised St Bartholomew ward, and including the Tower Street and High Street areas of St Bartholomew ward in its revised St Michael ward, as previously discussed. The Council proposed transferring the Stuart Crescent area of the Stanmore estate from St Michael ward to its revised St Luke ward, as discussed later, and including the Sleepers' Hill area bounded by the B3040 Romsey Road, Sleeper's Hill Road and Airlie Road in its revised St Michael ward. It argued that the Sleepers' Hill area is "of a different residential character and has no particular affinity with St Luke". St John & All Saints and St Michael wards would continue to be represented by three councillors each. Under the Council's proposals St John & All Saints ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years' time, while St Michael ward would have 9 per cent fewer (equal to the average by 2004).

107 The Conservatives proposed more extensive change in this area, combining St John & All Saints ward with part of the current St Bartholomew ward bounded by North Walls, Jewry Street and the High Street in a new three-member Winnall & Highcliffe ward. They also proposed creating a new two-member Cathedral & St Cross ward which would retain the boundaries of the current St Michael ward. Under the Conservatives' proposed council size of 44, both Winnall & Highcliffe and Cathedral & St Cross wards would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (equal to and 3 per cent more respectively by 2004). Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

108 We consider that the existing St John & All Saints ward has clearly identifiable boundaries and is forecast to continue to enjoy reasonable levels of electoral equality, and we are therefore content to retain the existing electoral arrangements for the ward. We are not persuaded that either the City Council's or the Conservatives' proposed amendments to St John & All Saints ward would best reflect the identities and interests of residents of the area. In addition, our proposed council size of 57 limits the extent to which we are able to consider the warding arrangements proposed by the Conservatives for this area, which were based on a council size of 44. Our proposed three-member St John & All Saints ward would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in five years' time.

109 We concur with the City Council's view that the Stuart Crescent area shares a closer affinity with the Stanmore Estate than with the remainder of the current St Michael ward, and are content to transfer the area to our proposed St Luke ward, as discussed later. We note that, to provide reasonable electoral equality under a council size of 57, it is necessary for at least one ward to breach the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line boundary. We consider that the Sleepers' Hill area has some community ties with areas to its east, and are therefore content to combine the area with St Michael ward. However, we propose amending the Council's proposals to include Dawn Gardens, Sleepers Hill Gardens and Wuthering Heights in St Michael ward, thereby uniting both sides of Sleeper's Hill Road in one ward. Under our draft recommendations, the three-member St Michael ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent fewer by 2004). Our proposals for these areas are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

### **St Luke and St Paul wards**

110 The three-member St Luke and St Paul wards cover the southern part of Winchester to the west of the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line. St Luke ward contains the Sleepers' Hill and Stanmore areas, and currently has 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent more by 2004). St Paul ward includes the Teg Down area to the south of the B3049 Stockbridge Road, and has 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer by 2004).

111 The City Council proposed transferring the Stuart Crescent area from the current St Michael ward to a revised St Luke ward, to include the entire Stanmore estate within a single ward, arguing that "most community links are directed towards the remainder of Stanmore". To improve electoral equality in both wards, the Council proposed transferring the Sleepers' Hill area (currently in St Luke ward) to a revised St Michael ward, as previously discussed. The

Council also proposed including the Sarum Road area, currently part of St Luke ward, in its revised St Paul ward, arguing that this would “reflect patterns of movement by the residents, who use Romsey Road and Chilbolton Avenue as routes to other parts of the town”. Additionally, the Council proposed transferring the Dean Lane area of Teg Down from St Paul ward to its revised St Barnabas ward, as previously discussed. Under its proposals, St Luke ward would have 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently, improving to 8 per cent fewer by 2004, while St Paul ward would have 4 per cent more than the average (2 per cent fewer by 2004).

112 The Conservatives proposed significant change in this area, combining Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards with the Stanmore area of St Luke ward in a new three-member Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore ward, as previously discussed. The remaining area of the current St Luke ward, to the north of Kilham Lane, Thurmond Crescent, The Valley and Cromwell Road, would be combined with the current St Paul ward, less the area to the east of Cheriton Road, as discussed previously. This new Sleepers’ Hill & Teg Down ward would be represented by three councillors. Under the Conservatives’ proposals, Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore and Sleepers’ Hill & Teg Down wards would each have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently, improving to 1 per cent and 5 per cent fewer respectively by 2004. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

113 As discussed previously, we are reluctant to combine Badger Farm and Olivers Battery parishes with unparished areas of Winchester city. These areas share few direct communication links and we are not persuaded that the Conservatives’ proposed Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore and Sleepers’ Hill & Teg Down wards would best reflect the identities and interests of communities in either of the parishes or the Stanmore area. We consider that the City Council’s proposals for St Luke and St Paul wards have some merit, and are content to base our draft recommendations for these wards on their proposals. We concur with the Council’s view that the Stanmore estate should be united within a single ward, and are content to transfer the Stuart Crescent area to our revised St Luke ward, and the Sleepers’ Hill area from St Luke ward to St Michael ward, as discussed previously. Under our proposals, our revised St Luke ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer by 2004).

114 We propose amending the City Council’s revised St Paul ward in a number of areas. We propose including the Sarum Road area (incorporating Sarum View, Sarum Close and Chilbolton Court), and the area bounded by Berewecke Road, Andover Road and Stockbridge Road in our revised St Paul ward, and transferring the Teg Down area from St Paul ward to a revised St Barnabas ward, as discussed previously. In order to improve electoral equality further, we propose including the Andover Road and Sussex Street areas in our revised St Paul ward, also discussed previously. We note that these areas share strong communication links with St Paul ward, and are content that our proposals reflect community identities well in this area. Our revised St Paul ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (8 per cent fewer by 2004). Our proposals for these areas are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

115 We received two representations regarding the City Council's electoral cycle. The City Council itself requested that the present cycle of elections by thirds be retained, and noted that there was all-party support for maintaining the present electoral cycle. The Conservatives' concurred with this view.

116 We have carefully considered the representations received. At present, there appears to be no demand for a change to the present electoral cycle, and we are therefore proposing no change to the current cycle of elections by thirds for the district.

## **Conclusions**

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

- there should be an increase in council size from 55 to 57;
- there should be 26 wards, 6 fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

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

- we propose that the boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and the proposed Swanmore & Newtown wards should be amended in order to improve electoral equality in Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward;
- in Winchester city we have put forward our own proposals, based on the City Council's proposals.

119 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with 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  | 55                   | 57                    | 55                       | 57                    |
| Number of wards  | 32                   | 26                    | 32                       | 26                    |
| Average number of electors per councillor                              | 1,502                | 1,449                 | 1,592                    | 1,536                 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 21                   | 8                     | 25                       | 3                     |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 13                   | 3                     | 11                       | 0                     |

120 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Winchester City Council would reduce the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 21 to eight. By 2004 only three wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Winchester City Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 26 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**

121 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, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Soberton and Wickham to reflect the proposed district wards.

122 The parish of Soberton is currently served by 11 parish councillors and is not warded. We propose dividing Soberton into two parish wards to allow it to be divided between the revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon district ward and the new Swanmore & Newtown district ward. The northern area of the parish, the new Soberton parish ward, would return three parish councillors and form part of the revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward. The southern area, the new Soberton Heath & Newtown parish ward, would return eight parish councillors and form part of the new Swanmore & Newtown ward. Soberton Parish Council objected to the proposed division of the parish, and did not comment on the allocation of councillors between the two parish wards.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Soberton Parish Council should comprise 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards. Soberton parish ward should return three councillors, and Soberton Heath & Newtown parish ward should return eight 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.

123 The parish of Wickham is currently served by 16 councillors representing two parish wards, Whiteley & Curbridge and Wickham. Whiteley & Curbridge parish ward currently returns nine parish councillors, and Wickham parish ward returns seven parish councillors. To facilitate the creation of a new Whiteley ward, we propose amending the boundary between Whiteley & Curbridge and Wickham parish wards to reflect the proposed boundary between Whiteley and Wickham district wards. Whiteley & Curbridge parish ward would be renamed Whiteley parish ward, and Wickham parish ward renamed Wickham & Curbridge parish ward. Wickham Parish Council supported the proposal to create a new district ward for the Whiteley area.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Wickham Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two parish wards, Whiteley and Wickham & Curbridge, each returning eight councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A3 in Appendix A.

124 The parish of Bishops Waltham is currently unwarded, and returns 12 parish councillors. The City Council noted that, as part of its own consultation exercise, Bishops Waltham Parish Council had requested that it should be served by two additional councillors, thereby increasing the total number to 14. Our proposed district warding arrangements would not result in change to this area and we are content to put forward the Parish Council’s proposal for consultation.

**Draft Recommendation**

Bishops Waltham Parish Council should comprise 14 parish councillors, instead of the current 12.

125 The parish of Swanmore is currently unwarded, and returns nine parish councillors. In agreement with the City Council, Swanmore Parish Council proposed that it should be served by one additional councillor, thereby increasing the total number of councillors to 10. Our proposed district warding arrangements would not result in change to this area and we are content to put forward the Parish Council's proposal for consultation.

**Draft Recommendation**

Swanmore Parish Council should comprise 10 parish councillors, instead of the current nine.

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

**Draft Recommendation**

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

**127 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Winchester and welcome comments from the City 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 Winchester*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

128 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Winchester. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 17 April 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 City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

129 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Winchester 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)

130 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 Winchester: Detailed Mapping**

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

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on Maps A2 and A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambleton and Swanmore & Newtown wards.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed boundary between Whiteley and Wickham wards.

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

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

*Map A2: Proposed Boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards*

*Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Whiteley and Wickham wards*

## APPENDIX B

### Winchester City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

*Figure B1: Winchester City Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| <b>Ward name</b>                        | <b>Constituent areas</b>   |
|---|--|
| Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon          | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part – Droxford parish, Hambledon parish and Soberton ward of Soberton parish as proposed)            |
| St Barnabas<br>(in Winchester)          | St Barnabas ward; St Paul ward (part)  |
| St Bartholomew<br>(in Winchester)       | St Bartholomew ward (part); St John & All Saints ward (part)   |
| St John & All Saints<br>(in Winchester) | St John & All Saints ward (part)   |
| St Luke<br>(in Winchester)              | St Luke ward (part); St Michael ward (part)  |
| St Michael<br>(in Winchester)           | St Bartholomew ward (part); St Luke ward (part); St Michael ward (part)  |
| St Paul<br>(in Winchester)              | St Bartholomew ward (part); St Luke ward (part); St Paul ward (part)   |
| Swanmore & Newtown                      | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part – Soberton Heath & Newtown ward of Soberton parish as proposed); Swanmore ward (Swanmore parish) |

Figure B2: Winchester City 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 % |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon       | 1                     | 1,742             | 1,742                             | 20                      | 1,796             | 1,796                             | 17                      |
| St Barnabas (in Winchester)          | 3                     | 4,592             | 1,531                             | 6                       | 4,424             | 1,475                             | -4                      |
| St Bartholomew (in Winchester)       | 3                     | 4,321             | 1,440                             | -1                      | 4,492             | 1,497                             | -3                      |
| St John & All Saints (in Winchester) | 3                     | 4,202             | 1,401                             | -3                      | 4,463             | 1,488                             | -3                      |
| St Luke (in Winchester)              | 3                     | 3,912             | 1,304                             | -10                     | 4,247             | 1,416                             | -8                      |
| St Michael (in Winchester)           | 3                     | 4,731             | 1,577                             | 9                       | 4,603             | 1,534                             | 0                       |
| St Paul (in Winchester)              | 3                     | 4,524             | 1,508                             | 4                       | 4,535             | 1,512                             | -2                      |
| Swanmore & Newtown                   | 2                     | 2,980             | 1,490                             | 3                       | 3,087             | 1,544                             | 0                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Winchester City Council's submission.

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

## Winchester Conservative Association's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3: Winchester Conservative Association's Proposal: 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 % |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore (in Winchester) | 3                     | 5,905             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 5,938             | 1,979                             | -1                      |
| 2 Bishops Waltham   | 3                     | 5,563             | 1,854                             | -1                      | 5,736             | 1,912                             | -4                      |
| 3 Cathedral & St Cross (in Winchester)                    | 2                     | 3,937             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 4,095             | 2,048                             | 3                       |
| 4 Colden Common   | 2                     | 4,137             | 2,069                             | 10                      | 4,359             | 2,180                             | 9                       |
| 5 Compton, Shawford & Hursley                             | 1                     | 1,914             | 1,914                             | 2                       | 1,941             | 1,941                             | -3                      |
| 6 Curdridge & Durley                                      | 1                     | 1,693             | 1,693                             | -10                     | 1,842             | 1,842                             | -7                      |
| 7 Denmead   | 3                     | 5,715             | 1,905                             | 1                       | 6,356             | 2,119                             | 6                       |
| 8 Fulflood & Hyde (in Winchester)                         | 3                     | 5,905             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 6,133             | 2,044                             | 3                       |
| 9 Harestock & Weeke (in Winchester)                       | 2                     | 3,937             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 4,073             | 2,037                             | 2                       |
| 10 Itchen Valley  | 1                     | 1,877             | 1,877                             | 0                       | 2,015             | 2,015                             | 1                       |
| 11 Littleton  | 1                     | 2,058             | 2,058                             | 10                      | 2,112             | 2,112                             | 6                       |
| 12 Meon Valley  | 1                     | 2,008             | 2,008                             | 7                       | 2,077             | 2,077                             | 4                       |
| 13 Micheldever & Wonston                                  | 1                     | 1,890             | 1,890                             | 1                       | 2,068             | 2,068                             | 4                       |
| 14 New Alresford  | 2                     | 4,253             | 2,127                             | 13                      | 4,146             | 2,073                             | 4                       |
| 15 Shedfield & Swanmore                                   | 3                     | 5,201             | 1,734                             | -8                      | 5,335             | 1,778                             | -11                     |
| 16 Sleepers' Hill & Teg Down (in Winchester)              | 3                     | 5,905             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 5,686             | 1,895                             | -5                      |
| 17 Soberton & Hambledon                                   | 1                     | 2,013             | 2,013                             | 7                       | 1,986             | 1,986                             | 0                       |
| 18 South Wonston  | 1                     | 2,076             | 2,076                             | 11                      | 2,167             | 2,167                             | 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 % |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 19 The Alresford Villages              | 1                     | 1,929             | 1,929                             | 3                       | 1,961             | 1,961                             | -2                      |
| 20 The Worthys                         | 2                     | 3,590             | 1,795                             | -4                      | 3,605             | 1,803                             | -9                      |
| 21 Twyford & Owslebury                 | 1                     | 1,951             | 1,951                             | 4                       | 1,890             | 1,890                             | -5                      |
| 22 Whiteley & Knowle                   | 2                     | 1,305             | 653                               | -65                     | 4,054             | 2,027                             | 2                       |
| 23 Wickham                             | 1                     | 1,940             | 1,940                             | 3                       | 2,040             | 2,040                             | 2                       |
| 24 Winnal & Highcliffe (in Winchester) | 3                     | 5,905             | 1,968                             | 5                       | 5,994             | 1,998                             | 0                       |
| <b>Totals</b>                          | <b>44</b>             | <b>82,605</b>     | –                                 | –                       | <b>87,609</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>                        | –                     | –                 | <b>1,877</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,991</b>                      | –                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Winchester Conservative Association's submission.

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

2 There are a number of small anomalies in the electorate figures supplied, and as a result this table and other tables do not exactly tally. Small changes to ward electorates may arise as a result of further analysis at Stage Three.

## Winchester Conservative Association's Alternative Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B4: Winchester Conservative Association's Alternative Proposal: Constituent areas

|    | Ward name  | Number of councillors | Constituent areas  |
|----|--|-----------------------|--|
| 1  | Barton, Hyde & Brooks<br>(in Winchester)               | 2                     | St Bartholomew ward (part)   |
| 2  | Bereweke & Fullood<br>(in Winchester)                  | 2                     | St Barnabas ward (part); St Paul ward (part)   |
| 3  | Bishops Waltham & Upham                                | 3                     | Bishops Waltham ward (Bishops Waltham parish);<br>Durley & Upham ward (part – Upham parish)  |
| 4  | Cathedral & St Cross<br>(in Winchester)                | 2                     | St Bartholomew ward (part); St Michael ward (part)   |
| 5  | Curdridge & Durley                                     | 1                     | Curdridge ward; Durley & Upham ward (part – Durley parish)   |
| 6  | Denmead, Southwick & Widley                            | 3                     | Boarhunt & Southwick ward (part – Southwick & Widley parish); Denmead ward   |
| 7  | Droxford & Soberton                                    | 1                     | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part – Droxford parish and Soberton parish (part))  |
| 8  | Hambledon, Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton & Warnford    | 1                     | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part – Hambledon parish); Upper Meon Valley ward (part – Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton and Warnford parishes)                           |
| 9  | Harestock & Weeke<br>(in Winchester)                   | 2                     | Littleton ward (part – Littleton & Harestock parish (part)); St Barnabas ward (part)   |
| 10 | Itchen Valley, Northington & East Stratton             | 1                     | Itchen Valley ward (Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley parishes); Micheldever ward (part – Micheldever parish (part) and Northington parish)                |
| 11 | New Alresford, Old Alresford, Bighton & Bishops Sutton | 3                     | Bishops Sutton ward (Bighton, Bishops Sutton and OldeAlresford parishes); New Alresford ward (New Alresford town)  |
| 12 | Shawford, South Down, Colden Common & Otterbourne      | 3                     | Compton ward (part – Compton & Shawford parish (part)); Otterbourne & Hursley ward (part – Otterbourne parish); Owslebury & Colden Common ward (part – Colden Common parish) |
| 13 | Shedfield, Waltham Chase & Swanmore                    | 3                     | Shedfield ward (Shedfield ward of Shedfield parish); Swanmore ward (Swanmore parish); Waltham Chase ward (Waltham Chase ward of Shedfield parish)                            |

|    | <b>Ward name</b>  | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>  |
|----|---|------------------------------|---|
| 14 | South Winchester<br>(in Winchester)                             | 2                            | Badger Farm ward (Badger Farm parish); Olivers Battery ward (Olivers Battery parish); St Luke ward (part)   |
| 15 | Sparsholt, Crawley, Littleton, Compton & Hursley                | 2                            | Compton ward (part – Compton parish (part)); Littleton ward (part – Littleton & Harestock parish (part)); Otterbourne & Hursley ward (part – Hursley parish); Sparsholt ward (Crawley and Sparsholt parishes) |
| 16 | Stanmore & Westhill<br>(in Winchester)                          | 3                            | St Luke ward (part); St Michael ward (part)   |
| 17 | Teg Down & Greenhill<br>(in Winchester)                         | 2                            | St Luke ward (part); St Paul ward (part)  |
| 18 | The Worthys   | 2                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (The Worthys ward)   |
| 19 | Tichborne, Cheriton, Beauworth, Kilmeston, Bramdean & West Meon | 1                            | Cheriton ward (Beauworth, Bramdean, Cheriton, Kilmeston and Tichborne parishes); Upper Meon Valley ward (part – West Meon parish)   |
| 20 | Twyford & Owslebury   | 1                            | Owslebury & Colden Common ward (part – Owslebury parish); Twyford ward (Twyford parish)   |
| 21 | Whiteley  | 2                            | Wickham ward (part – Whiteley & Curbridge ward of Wickham parish and Wickham ward of Wickham parish (part))   |
| 22 | Wickham & Boarhunt  | 2                            | Boarhunt & Southwick ward (part – Boarhunt parish); Wickham ward (part – Wickham ward of Wickham parish (part))   |
| 23 | Winnall, Highcliffe & St Giles<br>(in Winchester)               | 3                            | St Bartholomew ward (part); St John & All Saints ward; St Michael ward (part)   |
| 24 | Wonston & Micheldever   | 2                            | Micheldever ward (part – Micheldever parish (part)); Wonston ward (South Wonston and Wonston parishes)  |

*Figure B5: Winchester Conservative Association's Alternative Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

| <b>Ward name</b>   | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (2004)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 Barton, Hyde & Brooks (in Winchester)                            | 2                            | 3,549                    | 1,775                                    | -1                             |
| 2 Berewecke & Fulflood (in Winchester)                             | 2                            | 3,425                    | 1,713                                    | -4                             |
| 3 Bishops Waltham & Upham  | 3                            | 5,736                    | 1,912                                    | 7                              |
| 4 Cathedral & St Cross (in Winchester)                             | 2                            | 3,673                    | 1,837                                    | 3                              |
| 5 Curdridge & Durley   | 1                            | 1,842                    | 1,842                                    | 3                              |
| 6 Denmead, Southwick & Widley                                      | 3                            | 5,883                    | 1,961                                    | 10                             |
| 7 Droxford & Soberton  | 1                            | 1,695                    | 1,695                                    | -5                             |
| 8 Hambledon, Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton & Warnford              | 1                            | 1,693                    | 1,693                                    | -5                             |
| 9 Harestock & Weeke (in Winchester)                                | 2                            | 3,630                    | 1,815                                    | 1                              |
| 10 Itchen Valley, Northington & East Stratton                      | 1                            | 1,872                    | 1,872                                    | 5                              |
| 11 New Alresford, Old Alresford, Bighton & Bishops Sutton          | 3                            | 5,273                    | 1,758                                    | -2                             |
| 12 Shawford, South Down, Colden Common & Otterbourne               | 3                            | 5,054                    | 1,685                                    | -6                             |
| 13 Shedfield, Waltham Chase & Swanmore                             | 3                            | 5,335                    | 1,778                                    | -1                             |
| 14 South Winchester (in Winchester)                                | 2                            | 3,530                    | 1,765                                    | -1                             |
| 15 Sparsholt, Crawley, Littleton, Compton & Hursley                | 2                            | 3,502                    | 1,751                                    | -2                             |
| 16 Stanmore & Westhill (in Winchester)                             | 3                            | 5,205                    | 1,735                                    | -3                             |
| 17 Teg Down & Greenhill (in Winchester)                            | 2                            | 3,423                    | 1,712                                    | -4                             |
| 18 The Worthys   | 2                            | 3,605                    | 1,803                                    | 1                              |
| 19 Tichborne, Cheriton, Beauworth, Kilmeston, Bramdean & West Meon | 1                            | 1,964                    | 1,964                                    | 10                             |

| Ward name   | Number of councillors | Electorate (2004) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 20 Twyford & Owslebury                            | 1                     | 1,791             | 1,791                             | 0                       |
| 21 Whiteley                                       | 2                     | 3,246             | 1,623                             | -9                      |
| 22 Wickham & Boarhunt                             | 2                     | 3,355             | 1,678                             | -6                      |
| 23 Winnall, Highcliffe & St Giles (in Winchester) | 3                     | 5,484             | 1,828                             | 2                       |
| 24 Wonston & Micheldever                          | 2                     | 3,970             | 1,985                             | 11                      |
| <b>Totals</b>                                     | <b>49</b>             | <b>87,735</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>                                   | –                     | –                 | <b>1,791</b>                      | –                       |

*Source: Electorate figures are based on Winchester Conservative Association's submission. Electorate figures for 1999 were not provided.*

*Notes: 1 The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.  
2 There are a number of small anomalies in the electorate figures supplied, and as a result this table and other tables do not exactly tally. Small changes to ward electorates may arise as a result of further analysis at Stage Three.*

## 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:

- (a) the number of councillors;
- (b) the need for parish wards;
- (c) the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- (d) the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- (e) 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.