

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council

Electoral review

March 2011

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0207 664 8534

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2011

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	9
Rural Rugby	9
Rugby Town	12
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	21
B Code of practice on written consultation	25
C Table C1: Draft recommendations for Rugby Borough Council	27

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Rugby Borough Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the borough.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
Council Size	20 July 2010	Submission of proposals for council size to the LGBCE
One	28 September 2010	Submission of proposals of warding arrangements to the LGBCE
Two	21 December 2010	LGBCE's analysis and deliberation
Three	29 March 2011	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	20 June 2011	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

The Commission received eleven representations during Stage One, including a borough-wide scheme from Rugby Borough Council. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

Rugby Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for May 2016, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2011. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% over this period. Although we had some concerns that this level of growth appeared somewhat high, the Council provided a robust methodology to support this increase. We are therefore content to accept the Council's electorate forecasts as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

Rugby Borough Council currently has a council size of 48 members. During the council size consultation, the Commission received proposals for a council size of 42 from the Council. The Council took an evidence-based approach in its consideration and detailed its governance structure in addition to providing information on the roles,

responsibilities and workload of its members. Given the evidence provided, we have decided to adopt a council size of 42 members as part of our draft recommendations as we consider that a council size of 42 will ensure that the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively and will provide a ward pattern that best reflects the community identities in Rugby.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during Stage One, we have developed proposals which are based broadly on those of the Council. The Council's proposals would provide good electoral equality and a clear warding pattern using man-made and natural boundaries. The Council's proposals were also supported by evidence of community identity. Where we have moved away from the Council's proposals, we have sought to use clearer ward boundaries that will result in good communication links across each ward.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council contained in the report. **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 these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **20 June 2011**. Any submissions received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Express your views by writing directly to us:

**Review Officer
Rugby Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
reviews@lgbce.org.uk**

The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk.

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Rugby Borough Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to Rugby Borough Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals first on the council size and then on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council in autumn 2011.

What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

Why are we conducting a review in Rugby?

6 We have decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, the existing Brownsover North Ward has 51% more electors than the borough average.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

How will the recommendations affect you?

7 Our recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also determine which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your ward name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 20 June 2011. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to be published in the autumn 2011. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 17 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

9 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Jane Earl
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed ward boundaries, ward names, and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Rugby is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

12 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

13 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Rugby Borough Council or the external boundaries or names of parish councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

15 Under the 2009 Act, where a council elects by thirds or halves (as opposed to the whole council being elected every four years), there is a presumption that the authority will have a uniform pattern of three-member and two-member wards respectively. We will only move away from this presumption where we receive

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

compelling evidence to do so and where it can be demonstrated that an alternative warding pattern will better reflect our statutory criteria.

Submissions received

16 Prior to the initial stage of the review, we visited Rugby Borough Council and met with members, officers and parish councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received eleven submissions during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

Electorate figures

17 As part of this review, Rugby Borough Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2016, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% over the six-year period from 2010–2016.

18 We had some concerns about whether the 8% growth would be realised. However, the Council provided a robust methodology to support this increase, citing planning forecasts, factoring in the expected level of void properties and having regard to inward and outward migration levels for the borough.

19 Noting the Council's supporting methodology, and the lack of evidence to contradict the electorate forecasts, we were content to accept the Council's forecasts as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

20 Rugby Borough Council currently has 48 councillors elected from 20 wards. During our initial consultation, we received seven comments in relation to council size. However, of these respondents, only the Council submitted a specific proposal.

21 The Council took an evidence-based approach in its consideration of council size and proposed a council size of 42, a reduction of six from the current number.

22 The Council's proposal outlined a Leader and Cabinet political management structure with a cabinet of six members which meets on average 10 times a year. In supporting its proposal for a council size of 42 members, the Council set out an allocation of members to committees under its political management structure and set out the frequency of meetings. In addition, the Council considered member commitments, as nominated by the Council to outside bodies.

23 We considered the Council's proposals provided a comprehensive rationale for a council size of 42. The Council detailed its governance structure in addition to providing commentary on the roles, responsibilities and workload of members within the context of its committee structure.

24 Based on the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the proposed council size of 42 members as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Electoral fairness

25 As discussed in the introduction to this report, the prime aim of an electoral review is to achieve electoral fairness within a local authority.

26 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (74,096 in December 2010 and 80,036 by December 2016) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 42 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 1,764 in 2010 and 1,906 by 2016.

28 Under the draft recommendations all of our proposed 16 wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the district by 2016. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our draft recommendations for Rugby.

General analysis

29 During Stage One, eleven submissions were received. The Council's submission was the only borough-wide proposal received.

30 The Council proposed a pattern of single- and multi-member wards and provided evidence of community identity. The Council's proposals would provide good electoral equality with no wards having an electoral variance of more than 10% from the borough average by 2016. We note from other submissions received during Stage One that some respondents had sight of the proposals.

31 As mentioned in paragraph 15, where a local authority elects by thirds, as in the case of Rugby, there is a presumption in favour of three-member wards. We considered the proposals put forward by the Council for three single-member wards and we are satisfied that the proposals would better meet our statutory criteria than a uniform pattern of three-member wards across the borough. Therefore, we are recommending a pattern of thirteen three-member wards and three single-member wards.

32 We had some concerns over the Council's proposals where a consequence of the warding arrangements would require the warding of two parishes, Clifton upon Dunsmore and Churchover, where significant development is going to take place by 2016. Currently, there are no electors in the proposed parish wards. Our policy is not to create parish wards that are electorally unviable. However, we consider that the evidence supplied by the Council provides strong justification to depart from this policy in the case of these two parished areas. The areas of development will be an extension of the urban area and in both cases will have strong connections with the urban area in terms of their identity, access roads and will share the same facilities. To

incorporate these areas in a rural ward would not, in our view, best reflect our statutory criteria.

33 We considered that, in the main, the Council's scheme provided clear ward boundaries using main roads, railways and waterways, and that its proposed wards provided a good reflection of communities in the borough. We have therefore broadly based our proposals on the Council's scheme, subject to a number of modifications which are outlined below.

34 The remainder of the submissions received during Stage One were localised or non-specific comments. The majority of these focused on wards in the rural area. The only submission received for a warding pattern in the urban area was received from the Council.

35 The Council's proposed Lawford & Revel ward included the villages of Willey, Withybrook, Pailton, Stretton under Fosse, Brinklow, Harborough Magna and Long Lawford. We received five submissions opposing the Council's proposal in this area. A submission from Councillor Watson suggested there is no road link from Long Lawford to the villages further north. This was confirmed when we toured the area in advance of preparing our recommendations, noting that the road north of Long Lawford has a deep ford which is inaccessible for any motor vehicle. In addition to accessibility issues, Councillor Gillias suggested that Long Lawford does not have any community interests with the villages further north; a group of villages known as The Revel.

36 We considered the evidence in the submissions, which suggested that there are stronger communication links with the villages to the west, including Wolston. The villages share a bus route along the A428, a community forum and the facilities of a church and primary school. Accordingly, as part of our draft recommendations we have decided to alter the Council's proposed Long Lawford & Revel ward and, as a consequence, also alter the Council's proposed Earl Craven ward.

37 We received two submissions regarding the village of Ryton-on-Dunsmore, one from the parish council and the other from a borough councillor. Both of these submissions opposed the Council's proposal to include the village in a ward with Stretton-on-Dunsmore and Dunchurch. They suggested that Ryton-on-Dunsmore has greater links with Wolston, which provides services and facilities such as doctor's surgery, sports facilities and library. Whilst we acknowledge the communities of interest that exist between Ryton-on-Dunsmore and Wolston, this proposal would have a detrimental effect on the electoral variances in the Council's proposed Dunsmore ward and therefore cannot be accommodated as part of our draft recommendations.

38 The Liberal Democrat Group's submission disagreed with the Council's proposed name of Overslade ward. They felt it was not distinctive and, as the ward is made up of electors from the existing Caldecott and Overslade wards, it should not take on either name but should have its own distinct name. They considered that using an existing ward name would cause 'community confusion rather than community cohesion'. There is a road in the proposed ward called Rocheberie Way and, as the name has historical significance, they felt it would be appropriate to use

this as the name of the ward. There were no other submissions received regarding ward names, other than that from the Council.

39 In view of the evidence we have received, our proposals are for a pattern of three single-member wards, and 13 three-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests.

40 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on page 27) and Map 1, Map 2 and Map 3.

41 During Stage Three we welcome comments on these draft recommendations.

Electoral arrangements

42 This section of the report details the warding recommendations for each area of Rugby in context of the submissions received. The following areas are considered in turn:

- Rural Rugby (page 9)
- Rugby Town (page 12)

43 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table C1 on page 27, and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Rural Rugby

44 Rural Rugby comprises the area of the borough surrounding the town and is entirely parished. The existing wards in this area are the single-member Leam Valley, Ryton-on-Dunsmore, and Wolvey wards; the two-member Avon & Swift, Fosse, Lawford & King's Newnham wards; and the three-member Dunchurch & Knightlow and Earl Craven & Wolston wards.

45 During Stage One, in addition to the Council's borough-wide proposal, we received seven submissions in relation to this area from district and parish councillors. As discussed in paragraph 33, we have developed proposals which are broadly based on the borough-wide scheme of the Council.

46 The Council's proposed wards in this area would provide good electoral equality. However, we have made modifications which, in our view, would better reflect community identities and provide good communication links across each ward.

Dunchurch and Leam Valley area

47 The existing wards in this area are the single-member Leam Valley and Ryton-on-Dunsmore wards and the three-member Dunchurch & Knightlow ward. Under the existing arrangements Leam Valley has 6% fewer electors per councillor, Ryton-on-Dunsmore has 12% fewer electors per councillor and Dunchurch & Knightlow has 1% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2016.

48 We have decided to adopt as part of our draft recommendations the Council's proposed three-member Dunsmore ward and single-member Leam Valley ward, with a small modification to Dunsmore ward.

49 Our draft recommendations for Dunsmore ward would comprise the parishes of Dunchurch, Thurlaston, Bourton & Draycote, Frankton, Princethorpe, Stretton-on-Dunsmore and Ryton-on-Dunsmore. The ward provides strong boundaries, using the River Leam to the south, the urban area of Rugby to the east and the borough boundary to the west. The villages are easily accessible by the A45 which runs east to west along the ward. We propose that Dunsmore ward includes the rural areas south of the town and the farms and houses along Ashlawn Road, as they would appear to have more community links with the rural area than with the town centre. Under our draft recommendations this ward would have a variance of 6% more electors than the average by 2016.

50 Our draft recommendations for Leam Valley ward would include the small villages to the south of Leam River and comprise the parishes of Wolfhampcote, Willoughby, Grandborough, Leamington Hastings, Birdingbury and Marton, providing good electoral equality with a variance of 4% more electors than the average by 2016.

51 The proposed ward has strong natural boundaries, with the borough boundary to the south, east and west, and the northern boundary provided by the River Leam and Rains Brook. The area is isolated from the northern part of the borough and we consider that the evidence received warrants the departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area.

Clifton upon Dunsmore, Newton and Churchover area

52 The existing ward in this area is the two-member Avon & Swift ward which, under the existing arrangements, has 30% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

53 We have decided to adopt as part our draft recommendations the Council's proposed one-member Clifton, Newton & Churchover ward without modification.

54 The proposed ward would include the villages to the east of Rugby town and would comprise the parish of Newton & Biggin and parts of Churchover and Clifton upon Dunsmore parishes. Good electoral equality would be achieved with a variance of 5% fewer electors than the borough average by 2016. The area is bounded by the borough boundary on the eastern edge, the urban area in the west and south and the River Swift to the north. The proposal achieves good electoral equality, reflects the strong community identity between the three villages and has good natural boundaries.

55 We consider that on the basis of the evidence received, relating to the statutory criteria, a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards is warranted in this area. We have therefore decided to adopt it in its entirety as part of our draft recommendations the Council's proposed Clifton, Newton and Churchover ward.

Wolvey area

56 Wolvey ward is currently a single-member ward which, under the existing arrangements, has 6% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

57 The proposed Wolvey & Shilton ward would include the villages at the northern tip of the borough and would have a variance of 7% more electors than the borough average by 2016. It would comprise the parishes of Stretton Baskerville, Burton Hastings, Wolvey, Copston Magna and Shilton. The proposal achieves good electoral equality, is supported by evidence of community identity and has strong natural boundaries.

58 We considered that the evidence received in relation to the statutory criteria warrants a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area. We have therefore decided to adopt it in its entirety as part of our draft recommendations the Council's proposed Wolvey & Shilton ward.

Central Rural area

59 The existing wards in this area are the two-member Fosse and Lawford & King's Newnham wards and the three-member Earl Craven & Wolston ward. Under the existing arrangements, Fosse has 9% fewer electors per councillor, Lawford & King's Newnham has 1% fewer electors per councillor and Earl Craven & Wolston has 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

60 As discussed in paragraph 35, we received evidence opposing the Council's proposal to link Long Lawford to the north as, it was argued, it had poor communication and community identity links.

61 We recommend two three-member wards for this area. We propose a three-member ward called Wolston & The Lawfords which would include the parishes of Wolston, Church Lawford, Long Lawford, Little Lawford, Brandon & Bretford and King's Newnham. The ward has good communication links along the A428 and evidence received during the Stage One consultation demonstrated that they also share community facilities such as a village hall, community forums and a church.

62 We also propose a three-member ward called Revel & Binley Woods, comprising the parishes of Ansty, Coombe Fields, Binley Woods, Brinklow, Stretton under Fosse, Withybrook, Monks Kirby, Wibtoft, Willey, Pailton, Easenhall and Harborough Magna. Evidence received demonstrated that there are community identity links between the group of villages known locally as The Revel, which incorporate the parishes of Brinklow, Stretton under Fosse, Withybrook, Monks Kirby, Wibtoft, Willey, Pailton, Easenhall and Harborough Magna. The villages in the west are easily accessible by the A46 which runs down the western boundary of the ward, with minor roads linking them with the remainder of the ward.

63 Overall, we consider our draft recommendations will ensure clearly identifiable ward boundaries that are coterminous with existing parish boundaries. Under our draft recommendations, the proposed three-member Revel & Binley Woods and Wolston & The Lawfords wards would have 4% more and 6% fewer electors than the borough average respectively by 2016.

64 Table C1 (on page 27) provides details of the electoral variances of the draft recommendations for wards in this area of the borough. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

Rugby Town

65 This area comprises the town of Rugby, with the immediately surrounding urban areas. The only parishes in the town area are Cawston parish to the west and Cosford parish to the north of the town centre. There are no parishes within the town itself.

66 During Stage One, in addition to the Council's borough-wide proposal, we received one submission in relation to this area from the Liberal Democrat Group, commenting on a ward name. As discussed in paragraph 33, we have developed proposals which are broadly based on the borough-wide scheme of the Council.

67 The Council's proposed wards in this area would provide good electoral equality. However, we have proposed modifications to provide clearer ward boundaries that will result in good communication links across each ward.

North

68 The existing three-member wards of Benn and Newbold and the two-member wards of Brownsover North and Brownsover South are located in the northern urban area, just south of the M6 motorway. Under the existing arrangements, Brownsover North ward has 41% more electors per councillor, Brownsover South has 17% more electors per councillor, Newbold has 1% more electors per councillor and Benn has 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

69 We have decided to adopt in its entirety as part of our draft recommendations the Council's proposed three-member Coton & Boughton ward. It uses the natural boundary of the M6 to the north and includes some of the Brownsover area and part of Churchover parish. New housing is due to be built in the Churchover parish. However, as this will be an extension of the urban area and link directly with the Brownsover area, we propose that this area of the parish is included in Coton & Boughton ward resulting in a variance of 3% fewer electors than the average by 2016. As a consequence of our draft recommendation there will need to be a change to the electoral arrangements of Churchover Parish Council.

70 Under the Council's proposed Brownsover Benn ward, the Murray Road area would have poor communication links with the majority of the ward and would be separated from it by the railway line. We considered it would be more appropriate for the area south of the railway line to be located in a ward, incorporating some of the town centre and using the railway line as the northern boundary of the ward. As the area is located in the town centre we propose the ward be called Central. It would have three-members and have a variance of 7% more electors than the average by 2016.

71 We propose a three-member ward which would comprise the areas north of the railway of Newbold and part of Brownsover. There are good links between the areas, namely the A426 and Brownsover Road and the railway line acts as a natural boundary to the south. We propose the ward be called Newbold & Brownsover,

which would provide for good electoral equality with a variance of 2% more electors than the average by 2016.

72 The Council's proposal included the parish of Cosford in a rural ward. Although we note that the small hamlet of Cosford is rural in nature and community identity is more closely linked with the rural areas, the only access to the hamlet is via Cosford Lane, through Swift Valley Industrial Estate into either the Brownsover or Newbold areas. For this reason we propose including the entire parish in Newbold & Brownsover ward.

South west

73 The existing three-member wards of Admirals, Bilton, Caldecott, New Bilton and Overslade are located in this area of the borough. Under the existing arrangements Admirals ward has 21% more electors per councillor, Bilton has 17% fewer electors per councillor, Caldecott has 16% fewer electors per councillor New Bilton has 7% more electors per councillor and Overslade has 10% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

74 The suburbs of New Bilton, Bilton, Overslade and the parish of Cawston are located in this area. We have decided to adopt the Council's proposals of four three-member wards-Admirals, New Bilton, Bilton and Overslade-as part of our draft recommendations. However, we propose minor modifications to the Council's proposed wards to provide more easily identifiable ward boundaries and a change to the name of the Overslade ward.

75 We propose that Overslade ward be named Rocheberie, as proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group. It would have a 0% variance from the average by 2016.

76 Our changes to the Council's proposed New Bilton ward provide for good electoral equality, strong boundaries and community identity in the ward which, under our draft recommendations, would have a variance of 9% fewer electors than the average by 2016.

77 In the remainder of this area, we have decided to adopt the Council's proposals for Admirals ward (which would include the parish of Cawston) and Bilton ward without modification. Both wards provide good electoral equality with a variance of 5% fewer and 5% more electors than the borough average respectively.

South east

78 The existing three-member wards of Eastlands and Hillmorton and two-member Paddox ward are located in this area of the borough. Under the existing arrangements, Eastlands ward has 2% fewer electors per councillor, Hillmorton has 7% fewer electors per councillor and Paddox ward has 14% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2016.

79 The Council proposed retaining the ward names of Eastlands, Paddox and Hillmorton. We considered the Council's proposals provided good electoral equality and have decided to adopt the proposals as part of our draft recommendations, albeit with some minor modifications to provide more easily identifiable boundaries.

80 The Council's proposed Eastlands ward includes areas in the town centre and also more rural areas in the southern part of the ward. As discussed in paragraph 49, we recommend the rural properties along Ashlawn Road are included in Dunsmore ward.

81 We propose a further modification to the boundary which runs along the top of Firs Drive and causes the entrance to the drive to be in Eastlands ward but the properties to be in New Bilton ward. We recommend that all of Firs Drive be included in Eastlands ward as access to the drive is via Russelsheim Way which is wholly located in Eastlands ward.

82 The Council's proposed Paddox ward includes Malvern Avenue and Catesby Road. However, we considered it could be improved by using the entrance to Catesby Road as a boundary. This would improve communication within the ward.

83 In the new development of Penny Lane, the Council's proposed boundary separates four properties in the cul-de-sac in Paddox ward and the other properties in Hillmorton ward. Access to the lane is via Ashlawn Road in the proposed Paddox ward and, as such, we recommend that the entire lane be included in Paddox ward.

84 In Hillmorton ward, the Council's proposed boundary intersects properties in Lower Hillmorton Road, placing Gibson Drive into Hillmorton ward. However, the access point to the drive is in Paddox ward. As part of our draft recommendations we propose the boundary follows Gibson Drive at this point, to include Gibson Drive in Paddox ward, which will strengthen the boundary and improve access to the ward. We have also made further modifications in the area of Bromwich Road, to provide a more identifiable boundary.

85 Our draft recommendation for Hillmorton ward includes the suburb of Hillmorton and part of Clifton upon Dunsmore Parish, which includes the Rugby Radio Station development site. As the development will be an extension of the urban area and link directly with the Hillmorton area, we propose that this area of the parish is included in Hillmorton ward. This would result in the variance being 2% fewer electors than the average by 2016. As a consequence of this recommendation there will need to be a change to the electoral arrangements of Clifton upon Dunsmore Parish Council.

86 In the remainder of the south-east area of the town, we have decided to adopt the Council's proposal without modification.

87 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed three-member wards of Eastlands, Paddox and Hillmorton would have 3% more, 5% fewer and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2016.

88 Table C1 (on page 27) provides details of the electoral variances of the draft recommendations for wards in this area of the borough. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1, Map 2 and Map 3 accompanying this report.

Conclusions

89 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2010 and 2016 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2010	2016
Number of councillors	42	42
Number of electoral wards	16	16
Average number of electors per councillor	1,764	1,906
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	8	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Draft recommendation
 Rugby Borough Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 16 wards, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

90 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

91 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Rugby Borough Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

92 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Churchover and Clifton upon Dunsmore.

93 We would particularly welcome comments on these proposals from the parish councils concerned and local residents during this consultation stage.

94 The parish of Churchover is currently unwarded, returning five members. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory

criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Churchover parish.

Draft recommendation

Churchover Parish Council should return five councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Churchover North (returning four members) and Churchover South (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3.

95 The parish of Clifton upon Dunsmore is currently unwarded, returning eight members. As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Clifton upon Dunsmore parish.

Draft recommendation

Clifton upon Dunsmore Parish Council should return eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Clifton upon Dunsmore (returning seven members) and Rugby Radio Station (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3.

3 What happens next?

96 There will now be a consultation period of twelve weeks, during which time everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Rugby Borough Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 20 June 2011. Any submissions received after this date may not be taken into account.

97 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Rugby and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during Stage Three. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

98 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer
Rugby Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG**

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, www.lgbce.org.uk or by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk.

99 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all Stage Three representations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of Rugby Borough Council and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

100 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

101 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and 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 the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

102 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Rugby Borough Council in 2012.

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for Rugby

103 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Rugby Borough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Rugby Borough Council.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2** illustrates the proposed wards in east of Rugby town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed wards in west of Rugby town.

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Boundary Committee's functions were assumed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections

Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents

Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'
Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Consultation* (2008) (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 November 2008, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

We comply with this requirement.

Appendix C

Table C1: Draft recommendations for Rugby Borough Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Admirals	3	4,802	1,601	-9%	5,420	1,807	-5%
2	Bilton	3	5,876	1,959	11%	6,018	2,006	5%
3	Central	3	5,711	1,904	8%	6,138	2,046	7%
4	Clifton, Newton & Churchover	1	1,512	1,512	-14%	1,806	1,806	-5%
5	Coton & Boughton	3	4,691	1,564	-11%	5,522	1,841	-3%
6	Dunsmore	3	5,921	1,974	12%	6,065	2,022	6%
7	Eastlands	3	5,576	1,859	5%	5,904	1,968	3%
8	Hillmorton	3	4,198	1,399	-21%	5,600	1,867	-2%
9	Leam Valley	1	1,952	1,952	11%	1,974	1,974	4%
10	New Bilton	3	5,190	1,730	-2%	5,223	1,741	-9%

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11	Newbold & Brownsover	3	5,004	1,668	-5%	5,832	1,944	2%
12	Paddox	3	5,418	1,806	2%	5,457	1,819	-5%
13	Revel & Binley Woods	3	5,879	1,960	11%	5,939	1,980	4%
14	Rocheberie	3	5,524	1,841	4%	5,707	1,902	0%
15	Wolston & The Lawfords	3	4,825	1,608	-9%	5,385	1,795	-6%
16	Wolvey & Shilton	1	2,017	2,017	14%	2,046	2,046	7%
Totals		42	74,096	-	-	80,036	-	-
Averages		-	-	1,764	-	-	1,906	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Rugby Borough Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each ward 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.