

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Winchester in Hampshire

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

*July 2000*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper. ♻

Report no: 174

# CONTENTS

|   | page       |
|---|------------|
| LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE                            | <i>v</i>   |
| SUMMARY   | <i>vii</i> |
| 1 INTRODUCTION  | <i>1</i>   |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS                            | <i>3</i>   |
| 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS                                     | <i>7</i>   |
| 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION                                 | <i>9</i>   |
| 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS                        | <i>13</i>  |
| 6 NEXT STEPS  | <i>41</i>  |
| <br>  |            |
| APPENDICES  |            |
| A Final Recommendations for Winchester:<br>Detailed Mapping | <i>43</i>  |
| B Draft Recommendations for Winchester (February 2000)      | <i>47</i>  |

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





## Local Government Commission for England

25 July 2000

Dear Secretary of State

On 20 July 1999 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Winchester under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in February 2000 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraph 130) in light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Winchester.

We recommend that Winchester City Council should be served by 57 councillors representing 26 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

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

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

Yours sincerely

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT  
Chairman



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Winchester on 20 July 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 22 February 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 130-131) 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 26 of the existing wards should be modified and six wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **The number of electors per councillor in only eight of the proposed wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average, and in only 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:

- **new warding arrangements for the parishes of Soberton and Wickham;**
- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Bishops Waltham, Swanmore and Wickham parish councils.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 5 September 2000:

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

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

|    | <b>Ward name</b>                     | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>   | <b>Map reference</b> |
|----|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| 1  | 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, Kilmeston 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  | Denmead                              | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Denmead parish)  | Map 2                |
| 7  | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon       | 1                            | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part – Droxford parish, Hambledon parish and Soberton ward of Soberton parish as proposed)            | Maps 2 and A2        |
| 8  | Itchen Valley                        | 1                            | Itchen Valley ward (Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley parishes); Micheldever ward (part – Northington parish)            | Map 2                |
| 9  | Kings Worthy                         | 2                            | The Worthys ward (part – Kings Worthy parish)  | Map 2                |
| 10 | Littleton & Harestock                | 2                            | <i>Unchanged</i> Littleton ward (Littleton & Harestock parish)   | Map 2                |
| 11 | Olivers Battery & Badger Farm        | 2                            | Badger Farm ward (Badger Farm parish); Olivers Battery ward (Olivers Battery parish)   | Map 2                |
| 12 | Owslebury & Curdrige                 | 2                            | Curdrige ward (Curdrige parish); Durley & Upham ward (Durley and Upham parishes); Owslebury & Colden Common ward (part – Owslebury 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            |

|    | <b>Ward name</b>              | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>  | <b>Map reference</b> |
|----|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 17 | St Michael<br>(in Winchester) | 3                            | St Luke ward (part); St Michael ward (part)   | Large map            |
| 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 parish); Waltham Chase ward (Waltham Chase ward of Shedfield parish)                              | Map 2                |
| 20 | Sparsholt                     | 1                            | Sparsholt ward (Crawley and Sparsholt parishes);<br>The Worthys ward (part – Headbourne Worthy parish)  | Map 2                |
| 21 | Swanmore &<br>Newtown         | 2                            | Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward (part –<br>Soberton Heath & Newtown ward of Soberton parish as proposed); Swanmore ward (Swanmore parish) | Maps 2 and A2        |
| 22 | The Alresfords                | 3                            | Bishops Sutton ward (part – Bighton and Old Alresford parishes); New Alresford ward (New Alresford parish)                                    | Map 2                |
| 23 | Upper Meon Valley             | 1                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Corhampton & Meonstoke, Exton, Warnford and West Meon parishes)   | Map 2                |
| 24 | Whiteley                      | 2                            | Wickham ward (part – Whiteley & Curbridge ward of Wickham parish (part))  | Maps 2 and A3        |
| 25 | Wickham                       | 2                            | Wickham ward (part – Whiteley & Curbridge ward of Wickham parish (part)); Wickham ward of Wickham parish)                                     | Maps 2 and A3        |
| 26 | Wonston &<br>Micheldever      | 3                            | Micheldever ward (part – Micheldever parish);<br>Wonston ward (South Wonston and 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 inserted inside the back cover of the report, illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Winchester

| 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 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 Denmead                               | 3                     | 4,756             | 1,585                             | 9                       | 5,003             | 1,668                             | 9                       |
| 7 Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon        | 1                     | 1,631             | 1,631                             | 13                      | 1,685             | 1,685                             | 10                      |
| 8 Itchen Valley                         | 1                     | 1,531             | 1,531                             | 6                       | 1,608             | 1,608                             | 5                       |
| 9 Kings Worthy                          | 2                     | 3,196             | 1,598                             | 10                      | 3,233             | 1,617                             | 5                       |
| 10 Littleton & Harestock                | 2                     | 2,773             | 1,387                             | -4                      | 2,798             | 1,399                             | -9                      |
| 11 Olivers Battery & Badger Farm        | 2                     | 3,282             | 1,641                             | 13                      | 3,152             | 1,576                             | 3                       |
| 12 Owslebury & Curdrige                 | 2                     | 2,872             | 1,436                             | -1                      | 3,056             | 1,528                             | -1                      |
| 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                       |

| 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 % |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 20 Sparsholt             | 1                     | 1,598             | 1,598                             | 10                      | 1,642             | 1,642                             | 7                       |
| 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                     | 3,966             | 1,322                             | -9                      | 4,235             | 1,412                             | -8                      |
| <b>Totals</b>            | <b>57</b>             | <b>82,595</b>     | –                                 | –                       | <b>87,570</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>          | –                     | –                 | <b>1,449</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,536</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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Winchester in Hampshire. 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 intend reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified; in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a district's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, or that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the district council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals were taken forward in a Local Government Bill, published in December 1999, and are currently being considered by Parliament.

10 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/00 PER programme, including the Hampshire districts, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State's intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

11 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 20 July 1999, when we wrote to 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, 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 Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

12 Stage Three began on 22 February 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Winchester in Hampshire*, and ended on 17 April 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

13 The district of 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, and it also includes the 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.

14 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.

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

16 The electorate of the district is 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 are each 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.

17 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| Ward name                               | Number of councillors | Electorate (1999) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2004) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 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>87,570</b>     | –                                 | –                       |
| <b>Averages</b>            | –                     | –                 | <b>1,502</b>                      | –                       | –                 | <b>1,592</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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

18 During Stage One we received 33 representations, including district-wide schemes from Winchester City Council and Winchester Conservative Association, and submissions from Mr Roy Perry MEP (for the South East Region), eight parish and town councils and 21 local councillors and residents. In light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Winchester in Hampshire*.

19 Our draft recommendations were largely based on the City Council's proposals, which achieved improved electoral equality, and provided a pattern of three-member wards in Winchester itself, and a mix of one-, two- and three-member wards in the rest of the district. However, we moved away from the Council's scheme in Winchester city itself, where we proposed our own warding arrangements, and in the south of the district, where we proposed amending the boundary between Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newton wards. We proposed that:

- Winchester City Council should be served by 57 councillors, compared with the current 55, representing 26 wards, six fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, while seven wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Soberton and Wickham, and an increase in the number of councillors serving Bishops Waltham and Swanmore parishes.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Winchester City Council should comprise 57 councillors, serving 26 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

20 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 18 of the 26 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only three wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

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

### **Winchester City Council**

22 The City Council stated that “on the basis that the Local Government Commission wishes to provide numerical equality, they be informed that the City Council accepts the three principal draft recommendations contained in its report”. However, it proposed some minor amendments in light of representations which it had received as part of its own consultation process. The Council proposed transferring Northington parish from the proposed Wonston & Micheldever ward to Itchen Valley ward, and also proposed that Curdrige ward be renamed Owslebury & Curdrige ward in order to more accurately reflect the geography of the area. The Council also stated that it supported Wickham Parish Council’s request to increase representation for the parish.

### **Winchester Conservative Association**

23 Winchester Conservative Association (‘the Conservatives’) stated that they were “extremely disappointed” with to our draft recommendations, and reiterated their support for a reduced council size of 44 members. The Conservatives argued that, in terms of electoral equality and community identity, their original proposal for a council size of 44 would more accurately reflect the needs of the district than our draft recommendations. In particular, they objected to our proposal to include Headbourne Worthy parish in Sparsholt ward, and to our proposal to divide Soberton parish between a revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward and a new Swanmore & Newtown ward. The Conservatives also objected to our proposal to combine Micheldever and Wonston wards in a new Wonston & Micheldever ward.

24 Winchester City Council Conservative Group reiterated its support for a reduction in council size and objected to our draft recommendations, in particular expressing opposition to our proposed Curdrige, Sparsholt and Wonston & Micheldever wards.

### **Hampshire County Council**

25 Hampshire County Council objected to our proposed Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards. In particular, it argued that this proposal would divide Soberton, and combine part of it with Swanmore which is “quite different in character”. It stated that it was concerned that the Commission’s proposals would disrupt established and close-knit communities in order to achieve better electoral equality. It made no comment in relation to any other area of our draft recommendations.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

26 We received further comments at Stage Three from 13 parish and town councils and parish meetings in Winchester. Both Droxford and Soberton parish councils objected to our proposal to divide Soberton parish between a revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward and a new Swanmore & Newtown ward. Droxford Parish Council also noted that the parish shared some community links with the parishes of Upper Meon Valley ward, and proposed combining the current Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Upper Meon Valley wards. Exton Parish Meeting argued that it has stronger ties with Droxford than with West Meon, and was therefore “strongly attracted” to Droxford Parish Council’s proposal. As a second preference, it would strongly recommend no change to Upper Meon Valley ward.

27 Headbourne Worthy Parish Council objected to our proposed Sparsholt ward, and expressed support for the alternative warding arrangements proposed by Councillors Coleman and Hutton (The Worthys ward) at Stage One. Kings Worthy Parish Council also objected to our proposal to include Headbourne Worthy parish in a revised Sparsholt ward. Micheldever Parish Council objected to our proposal to combine the current Micheldever and Wonston wards, while New Alresford Town Council objected to our proposed The Alresford Villages ward, and argued that New Alresford itself should form a separate ward and that its surrounding villages should also be grouped in a separate ward. Shedfield Parish Council objected to our proposed Shedfield ward, arguing that its two parish wards, which are currently represented by separate district wards, have different needs, and requested that the existing arrangements be retained.

28 Littleton & Harestock Parish Council supported our proposed two-member Littleton & Harestock ward, Southwick & Widley Parish Council supported our proposed single-member Boarhunt & Southwick ward, Tichborne Parish Council supported our proposed single-member Cheriton & Bishops Sutton ward, while Swanmore Parish Council expressed support for our draft recommendations for Winchester. Wickham Parish Council supported our proposal to divide the parish into two new wards, but proposed an increase in parish councillors. A parish councillor for Wickham argued that the present number of parish councillors for Wickham should be increased.

## **Other Representations**

29 A further 45 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations, from local political groups, local organisations, councillors and residents.

30 We received submissions from seven Winchester city councillors and one Hampshire county councillor. Councillor Archard (Waltham Chase ward) objected to our proposal to combine Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards to form a single Shedfield ward, arguing that the two areas share very little in terms of community identity and interests. Councillors Coleman and Hutton (The Worthys ward) objected to our proposal to include Headbourne Worthy parish in a revised Sparsholt ward, and suggested alternative warding arrangements which would combine Micheldever and The Worthys wards to form a new three-member ward, and also combine Littleton and Sparsholt wards to form a new three-member ward. Councillors Dinenage and

Empson (Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward) and County Councillor Hindson (Meon Valley division) objected to our proposal to transfer part of Soberton parish to Swanmore & Newtown ward. Councillor Newton (Micheldever ward) supported the proposal to transfer Northington parish from Wonston & Micheldever ward to Itchen Valley ward, but argued that the residents of Micheldever would prefer to retain separate representation on the Council in a single-member Micheldever ward. Councillor Evans (Wickham ward) requested an increase in parish councillors for Wickham parish.

31 We received further submissions from 37 local residents, 33 of whom objected to our proposal to transfer part of Soberton parish to Swanmore & Newtown ward. Concern was expressed that the proposal would divide the parish, and it was argued that the area has no affinity with Swanmore. One local resident proposed transferring Owslebury parish from Curdrige ward to Colden Common & Twyford ward, while another resident expressed support for our proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards. A further two residents objected to the proposed increase in council size.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

36 At Stage One 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 substantial growth to take place 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.

37 In their Stage One 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 service personnel stationed at Sir John Moore's Barracks in its forecast for Littleton & Harestock ward.

38 In 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.

39 In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the electorate forecasts, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates presently available. We received no comments in relation to the Council's electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates presently available.

## **Council Size**

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

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

42 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 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 fulfil his/her role, both in the Ward and in the Council Chamber", and while concluding that a change in council size was necessary in order to improve levels of electoral equality in the district, it recommended that any change should be kept to a minimum. The working group produced an initial proposal to increase the size of the council to 57 members, which would provide for improved levels of electoral equality and a net increase in representation of two councillors for the rural areas of the district.

43 In their Stage One submission 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 proposed reducing the council

size to 44 (or 49 under their alternative scheme). They asserted that the district could continue to be run effectively with a reduced council size, and noted that, relative to the size of its electorate, Winchester City Council currently has a larger number of councillors than its neighbouring Hampshire authorities. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals, while two parish councils and 11 local residents also supported reducing the size of the council.

44 In our draft recommendations report we considered all the evidence received, and 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 were not persuaded that their proposed reduction in council size was supported by sufficient evidence. In particular, we were not persuaded that, as a result of such a reduction, council structures would not be adversely affected and that community ties would continue to be reflected as well as under the current council size. Furthermore, we noted that the Commission would not take into account comparisons between neighbouring authorities in reaching conclusions on the most appropriate council size for Winchester. We considered that the City Council's proposals achieved reasonable electoral equality, had been established by a cross-party working group and had been subject to extensive consultation. We concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that there was significant support for a radical change in council size for the district, and were content that the City Council's proposals would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria under a council size of 57.

45 At Stage Three we received several representations in relation to council size. The City Council accepted our draft recommendation to increase the size of the council by two, to 57 members. The Conservatives confirmed their opposition to the proposed increase in council size, and reiterated their earlier assertion that the size of Winchester City Council could be significantly reduced, arguing that "the experience of neighbouring authorities suggests that the council size proposed by the WCA [Winchester Conservative Association] can and does lead to 'convenient and effective' local government". They also contended that the workload of councillors would not be prohibitively heavy under a council size of 44, noting that currently Hampshire county councillors each represent approximately 13,000 electors, compared to a ratio of 2,000 electors per district councillor under their proposals. In addition, the Conservatives noted that the council has recently announced plans to move to a cabinet style of government, and argued that an increased council size would be unnecessary under these new proposals.

46 We received four further comments in relation to council size at Stage Three. The Conservative Group on the City Council and County Councillor Hindson expressed opposition to the proposed increase in council size, expressing similar comments to those made by the Conservatives, and two local residents objected to the proposed increase in council size.

47 Having considered all the evidence received, we are content to confirm our draft recommendation for a council size of 57 as final. While we recognise that there has been some opposition to the proposed increase in council size, we have not been persuaded that there is significant support within Winchester for alternative warding arrangements based on a reduced council size. We consider that, from the evidence submitted to us, there remains a greater degree of local support for warding arrangements based around a small increase in council size than for

a significant reduction. We remain of the view that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would be best met by a council size of 57.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

48 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the district-wide schemes from the City Council and the Conservatives. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations. As outlined above, our proposals for Winchester were based on a council size of 57, which we considered 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 were unable to adopt completely either of the Conservatives' district-wide schemes. We considered that by building on existing ward structures the Council's proposals would reflect existing community ties better than alternative warding arrangements put forward at Stage One. While our draft recommendations were based primarily on the Council's proposals, we 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.

49 At Stage Three our draft recommendations received a degree of local support and we propose that they should be substantially endorsed, subject to a number of minor modifications. While we recognise that there has been some localised opposition to our proposals, we note that opposition has been confined to a limited number of wards. Furthermore, we have not been persuaded that any alternative warding arrangements would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In light of the further evidence we have received at Stage Three, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations in several areas in order to better reflect community identities and interests and create more clearly identifiable boundaries. 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 Worthys 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 final recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

## **Micheldever and Wonston wards**

51 Micheldever and Wonston wards lie to the north of Winchester city, and are currently represented by one and two councillors respectively. Micheldever ward, containing the parishes of Micheldever and Northington, has 23 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, while Wonston ward, which comprises the parishes of Wonston and South Wonston, has equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the district as a whole. Electoral equality is not expected to improve over the next five years, with Micheldever ward forecast to have 24 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2004, and Wonston ward forecast to have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the average.

52 At Stage One the City Council proposed limited change in this area, combining the current Micheldever and Wonston wards to form 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”. The Conservatives proposed combining Micheldever and Wonston parishes to form a new single-member Micheldever & Wonston ward, and creating a new single-member South Wonston ward comprising South Wonston parish. Under their proposals, Northington parish would be included in a revised Itchen Valley ward.

53 We received five further representations in relation to this area at Stage One. Wonston Parish Council objected to the City Council’s initial proposal to transfer Stoke Charity to Micheldever ward, and also argued that the interests of Wonston and South Wonston parishes are closely linked. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards, and a resident of Winchester also supported the creation of a new South Wonston ward and the combination of Micheldever and Wonston parishes to form a new ward. Councillors Coleman and Hutton (The Worthys ward) proposed alternative warding arrangements in this area, under which Micheldever and the Worthys wards would be combined to form a new three-member ward.

54 In our draft recommendations report we proposed adopting the City Council’s proposals for this area without amendment. While we were content that the current arrangements for this area reflect community ties well, we considered that it was necessary to address the significant levels of electoral inequality in Micheldever ward. We were not persuaded that the Conservatives’ proposal to divide the current Wonston ward was appropriate, given the close association of interests between Wonston and South Wonston parishes. We considered that the 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, and would not have an adverse effect on community identities and interests in the area.

55 At Stage Three we received a number of representations in relation to this area. The City Council noted that, as part of its own consultation process, Northington Parish Council had requested that the parish be included in a revised Itchen Valley ward, and that Itchen Valley Parish Council had no objection to this proposal. In view of this request, the Council accepted

our proposed Wonston & Micheldever ward, subject to transferring Northington parish to the proposed Itchen Valley ward. The Conservatives objected to our proposal to combine Wonston and South Wonston parishes within a new Wonston & Micheldever ward, asserting that the two parishes regard themselves as separate communities. The Conservative Group on the City Council also objected to our proposed Wonston & Micheldever ward, arguing that it would encompass “a massive area of mixed urban and rural communities”.

56 We received three further representations in relation to this area. Micheldever Parish Council objected to our proposal to combine Micheldever and Wonston wards, arguing that Micheldever is a “distinct rural entity”, which has little in common with the parishes of Wonston and South Wonston. Councillor Newton (Micheldever ward) supported the proposal to include Northington parish in a revised Itchen Valley ward, although he requested that Micheldever parish be retained in a separate single-member Micheldever ward. Councillor Newton also suggested that, should the proposed Wonston & Micheldever ward be adopted as part of our final recommendations, it should be renamed Dever Valley ward. As discussed later, Councillors Coleman and Hutton objected to our proposals for this area, and proposed alternative warding arrangements for the northern area of Winchester, under which Micheldever ward would be combined with The Worthys ward to form a new three-member ward.

57 Having considered all the evidence received, we are content to broadly confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. While we recognise that there is some local opposition to the proposed Wonston & Micheldever ward, we note that the current poor level of electoral equality in Micheldever ward would not improve under the proposal to retain two separate wards (under a council size of 57 Micheldever ward would have 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently, and 21 per cent fewer than the average by 2004). We have not been persuaded that Micheldever parish is sufficiently separate and distinct from the parishes of Wonston and South Wonston to justify retaining a separate Micheldever ward with such a high level of electoral inequality. Furthermore, while we accept that South Wonston is a more substantial settlement than Wonston or Micheldever, we are not persuaded by the Conservatives’ proposal that Wonston and South Wonston parishes should be represented separately. As discussed later, we have not been persuaded that there is significant local support for Councillors Coleman and Hutton’s alternative warding arrangements, under which Micheldever ward would be combined with The Worthys ward. Similarly, we note Councillor Newton’s proposal to rename Wonston & Micheldever ward as Dever Valley ward, but are not persuaded that his proposal has significant local support.

58 We do, however, consider that there is some merit in Northington Parish Council’s request that the parish be included in a revised Itchen Valley ward, and propose amending our draft recommendations to reflect this proposal. We recognise that Northington parish shares some community ties with the parishes of Itchen Valley ward, and note that both the City Council and Itchen Valley Parish Council support the request. Under our final recommendations, the single-member Itchen Valley and three-member Wonston & Micheldever wards would have 6 per cent more and 9 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

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

59 Littleton, Sparsholt and The Worthys wards lie to the north and west of Winchester city. The two-member Littleton ward comprises the parish of Littleton & Harestock, while Sparsholt ward contains Crawley and Sparsholt parishes and is represented by one councillor. The two-member The Worthys ward is coterminous with Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy parishes. Littleton and Sparsholt wards have 8 per cent and 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (12 per cent and 20 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004), while The Worthys ward has 20 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (13 per cent more electors than the average by 2004).

60 At Stage One the City Council proposed transferring Headbourne Worthy parish to a revised single-member Sparsholt ward, and creating a new two-member Kings Worthy ward, coterminous with Kings Worthy parish. Under its proposals the two-member Littleton ward would be renamed Littleton & Harestock ward, and would remain coterminous with Littleton & Harestock parish. 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”.

61 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 to form a revised single-member Littleton ward. Under their proposals, the Harestock area of Littleton & Harestock parish would be combined with part of St Barnabas ward in Winchester city, as detailed below. The Conservatives argued that while The Worthys ward comprises two individual parishes, it forms a single community which should not be separated, and contended that “geographically at least, Harestock is part of Winchester City”.

62 We received four further representations in relation to this area at Stage One. Littleton & Harestock Parish Council objected to the Conservatives’ proposals, which would divide the parish, and requested no change to the existing Littleton ward. Councillors Coleman and Hutton (The Worthys ward) objected to the Council’s proposal to divide The Worthys ward and include Headbourne Worthy in a revised Sparsholt ward. They proposed alternative warding arrangements for the area, which would combine Micheldever and The Worthys wards to form a new three-member ward, and combine Littleton and Sparsholt wards to form a new three-member ward. 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 a single-member Harestock ward should be created, while another resident objected to the proposed division of The Worthys ward and the inclusion of Headbourne Worthy in a revised Sparsholt ward.

63 In our draft recommendations report we noted that, 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 were not persuaded that they had been subject to wide consultation or received a significant degree of local support. While the City Council's and the Conservatives' proposals would achieve similar levels of electoral equality, we were reluctant to divide the parish of Littleton & Harestock between district wards, especially given the parish council's opposition to such a proposal. We therefore proposed adopting the Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations.

64 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our proposed Kings Worthy, Littleton & Harestock and Sparsholt wards. The Council also noted that, as part of its own consultation process, Crawley Parish Council had expressed support for our proposed Sparsholt ward. The Conservatives objected to our draft recommendations for this area and restated their preference for the alternative warding arrangements which they had proposed at Stage One. While the Conservatives accepted that either Littleton or The Worthys wards must be divided in order to provide improved levels of electoral equality in this area, they argued that the Harestock area of Littleton ward shares some community ties with the unparished Winchester city area and proposed including Harestock in a Winchester city ward. The Conservative Group on the City Council also objected to our draft recommendations, arguing that "there is no feeling of community between Sparsholt and Crawley and with Headbourne Worthy".

65 We received four further representations in relation to our draft recommendations at Stage Three. Councillors Coleman and Hutton objected to our proposal to divide The Worthys ward, and confirmed their preference for the alternative warding arrangements which they had proposed at Stage One. They also suggested a further alternative proposal, under which The Worthys ward would be combined with Itchen Valley ward to form a new three-member ward, and Littleton and Sparsholt wards would be combined to form a new three-member ward. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council also objected to our draft recommendations in relation to the Worthys area, and expressed support for the alternative warding arrangements put forward by Councillors Coleman and Hutton which would combine Micheldever and The Worthys wards. Kings Worthy Parish Council also objected to our proposals in relation to the current The Worthys ward, arguing that "Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy are intertwined" and that "Headbourne Worthy looks towards Kings Worthy for most of its amenities". Littleton & Harestock Parish Council expressed support for our proposed Littleton & Harestock ward.

66 Having considered all the evidence received, we are content that our draft recommendations provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in relation to this area, and propose confirming them as final. While we recognise that the alternative warding arrangements put forward by Councillors Coleman and Hutton would provide reasonable levels of electoral equality in this area, we have not been persuaded that there is significant local support for their proposals. In particular, we note that of those parishes which would experience change under Councillors Coleman and Hutton's proposals, only Headbourne Worthy parish has expressed support for the alternative warding arrangements, while both Crawley and Littleton & Harestock parish councils have expressed support for our draft recommendations in this area. Similarly, we have not been persuaded to put forward the Conservatives' proposal to include the Harestock area of Littleton ward in a Winchester city ward, and are content to confirm our proposed Littleton & Harestock ward as final.

67 Under our final recommendations, Kings Worthy and Littleton & Harestock wards, each represented by two councillors, would have 10 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more and 9 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004), while the single-member Sparsholt ward would have 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (7 per cent more than the average by 2004).

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

68 Compton, Otterbourne & Hursley and Twyford wards lie to the south of Winchester, and are each represented by one councillor. Compton ward is coterminous with the parish of Compton & Shawford, Otterbourne & Hursley ward comprises the parishes of Hursley and Otterbourne, while Twyford ward comprises the parish of Twyford. Compton and Twyford wards have 18 per cent and 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (21 per cent and 30 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004), and Otterbourne & Hursley ward has 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (22 per cent more than the average by 2004).

69 At Stage One the City Council proposed combining Compton and Otterbourne & Hursley wards to form a new two-member Compton & Otterbourne ward, and combining Colden Common and Twyford parishes to form 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 the Council's proposals, Owslebury parish would form part of a new Curdridge ward, as detailed below. The Conservatives proposed combining Compton ward and Hursley parish to form a new single-member Compton, Shawford & Hursley ward, and combining Otterbourne and Colden Common parishes to form a new two-member Colden Common ward. Under their proposals Twyford ward would be combined with Owslebury parish to form a new single-member Twyford & Owslebury ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

70 In our draft recommendations report we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area without amendment. While we recognised that the Conservatives' proposals would provide reasonable levels of electoral equality based on a council size of 44, we considered that electoral inequality would be unreasonably high under our proposed council size of 57. We considered that the Council's proposals would have the advantage of building on existing ward structures, and would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area.

71 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations in relation to this area, and noted that, as part of its own consultation process, Colden Common and Compton & Shawford parish councils had expressed support for our proposed warding arrangements. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One scheme, but made no specific comment in relation to this area. A local resident proposed including Owslebury parish in Colden Common & Twyford ward, arguing that Colden Common and Owslebury parishes have had "strong community ties for many years".

72 Having considered all the evidence received, we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. We have considered the proposal to include Owslebury parish in Colden Common & Twyford ward, but note that such an arrangement would lead to an unreasonably high level of electoral inequality in this area, with a revised Colden Common & Twyford and Curdridge wards having 21 per cent fewer and 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively. Under our final recommendations, the three-member Colden Common & Twyford and two-member Compton & Otterbourne wards would have 5 per cent fewer and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent fewer and 4 per cent more than the average respectively by 2004).

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

73 Curdridge, Durley & Upham and Owslebury & Colden Common wards lie in the south-west of the district adjacent to the boundary with Eastleigh borough. The single-member Curdridge ward is coterminous with Curdridge 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 comprises the parishes of Colden Common and Owslebury. Curdridge and Durley & Upham wards have 34 per cent and 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (34 per cent and 16 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004), while Owslebury & Colden Common ward has 22 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (19 per cent more than the average by 2004).

74 At Stage One the City Council proposed transferring Colden Common parish to a new Colden Common & Twyford ward, as detailed above, and combining Curdridge and Durley & Upham wards and Owslebury parish to form a new two-member Curdridge ward. The Council argued that while the proposed Curdridge ward would be geographically elongated, it would comprise a number of similar villages with small, scattered populations which share many interests. The Council also noted that, as part of its own consultation exercise, Curdridge Parish Council had requested that it be joined with other similar rural parishes and had accepted the proposed Curdridge ward. Under the Conservatives' proposals Durley parish would be combined with Curdridge ward to form a new single-member Curdridge & Durley ward, and Owslebury parish would be combined with Twyford ward to form a new Twyford & Owslebury ward, as detailed above. They also proposed including Upham parish in a revised three-member Bishops Waltham ward, as detailed below.

75 In our draft recommendations report we concurred with the Council's view that the parishes of Curdridge, Durley, Owslebury and Upham are similar in nature and should be combined in a single ward, and adopted its proposals for this area without amendment. While we recognised that the Conservatives' proposals would provide improved levels of electoral equality in this area, we were not persuaded that they would appropriately reflect community identities and interests. In particular, we considered that the largely rural Upham parish is distinct from the largely urban Bishops Waltham area, and we were not persuaded that the interests of residents of Upham would be reflected appropriately under the Conservatives' proposals.

76 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our proposed Curdridge ward, but proposed that it be renamed Owslebury & Curdridge ward, in order to “better describe the geographical area”. The Conservatives reiterated their initial representation, but did not comment in detail on our proposals for this area. The Conservative Group on the City Council argued that the proposed Curdridge ward would form “a strange dogleg covering a large number of communities over a huge distance”. We received only one further representation in relation to this area, from a local resident who proposed including Owslebury parish in Colden Common & Twyford ward, as detailed above.

77 Having considered all the evidence received, we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. As discussed previously, the proposal to include Owslebury parish in Colden Common & Twyford ward would provide significantly poorer levels of electoral equality in this area, and we are not persuaded that such high levels of electoral inequality would be justified. Furthermore, we have not been persuaded by the evidence received that the geographical size of the proposed Curdridge ward would have adverse implications for the conduct of convenient and effective local government in this area, and are content that our proposals would best reflect the identities and interests of Curdridge, Durley, Owslebury and Upham parishes. In light of the City Council’s comments, however, we propose renaming Curdridge ward as Owslebury & Curdridge ward. Under our final recommendations the two-member Owslebury & 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**

78 The three-member Bishops Waltham ward and the single-member Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards lie in the south of the district. Bishops Waltham ward is coterminous with the parish of Bishops Waltham, while Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards are coterminous with Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards of Shedfield parish respectively. While Bishops Waltham and Waltham Chase wards have 13 per cent and 22 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 19 per cent more than the average respectively by 2004), Shedfield ward has 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (24 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

79 At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the current Bishops Waltham ward, and combining Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards to form a new two-member Shedfield ward, thereby uniting all of Shedfield parish within a single ward. The Council argued 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. The Conservatives proposed including Upham parish in a revised three-member Bishops Waltham ward, and combining the current Shedfield, Swanmore and Waltham Chase wards to form a new three-member Shedfield & Swanmore ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards. We received one further representation in relation to 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 that it would oppose combining the parish with other parishes in a multi-member ward.

80 In our draft recommendations report we considered that the City Council’s proposals for this area would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the alternative proposals put forward at Stage One, and adopted the proposed Bishops Waltham and Shedfield wards without amendment. We noted Swanmore Parish Council’s opposition to proposals to combine it with other parishes in a large multi-member ward, and we were not persuaded that the Conservatives’ proposed Bishops Waltham and Shedfield & Swanmore wards would adequately reflect community ties in the area. While we recognised that, under the Council’s proposals, levels of electoral inequality in Bishops Waltham ward would be relatively high (17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 13 per cent more than the average by 2004), we considered that opportunities for improving electoral equality in this area were constrained by existing parish boundaries. We also considered that the Council’s proposal to unite the Shedfield and Waltham Chase parish wards of Shedfield parish within a single ward had some merit, as the two communities share a parish council and are linked by the B2177 Winchester Road.

81 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for these wards, while the Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals but made no specific comments in relation to warding arrangements in this area. Shedfield Parish Council objected to our proposed Shedfield ward, arguing that the two areas of the parish are different in character, and that “the needs of the two wards differ accordingly”. Councillor Archard (Waltham Chase ward) also objected to the proposed Shedfield ward, arguing that while Shedfield and Waltham Chase are neighbouring communities which share a parish church “there is very little else that is shared”, and that “the needs of the two communities are therefore very different”. He also argued that, while residents of Waltham Chase look towards Bishop’s Waltham for their services, Shedfield and Shirrel Heath residents are more inclined to look towards Wickham.

82 Having considered all the evidence received, we are content to confirm our proposed Bishops Waltham and Shedfield wards as final. We note the concerns raised by Shedfield Parish Council and Councillor Archard regarding community ties in this area. However, we remain persuaded that the significant level of electoral inequality in the current Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards should be addressed. We also note that the communities of Shedfield and Waltham Chase share a parish council, and have not been persuaded that our proposals would have an adverse effect on community identities and interests in this area. Under our final recommendations the three-member Bishops Waltham and two-member 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 than the average respectively by 2004.

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

83 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 comprises the parishes of Boarhunt and Southwick & Widley, while Denmead ward, which is coterminous with Denmead parish, is represented by two councillors. Wickham ward, which is coterminous with Wickham parish, is also represented by two councillors. Boarhunt & Southwick ward has 36 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district

average (15 per cent fewer than the average by 2004), while Denmead ward has 58 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (57 per cent more than the average by 2004). While Wickham ward has 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average at present, it is projected to have 88 per cent more than the average by 2004 as a result of extensive housing development forecast to take place in the area over the next five years.

84 At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the existing boundaries of both 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”. In order to address the issue of electoral inequality in Wickham ward which is forecast to develop as a result of the major housing 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 Wickham and the Curbridge and Knowle areas.

85 The Conservatives proposed dividing the current Wickham ward in order to create a new two-member Whiteley & Knowle ward. They proposed combining the remaining part of Wickham ward with part of Soberton parish incorporating the Hundred Acres and Kingsmead areas to form a revised single-member Wickham ward, arguing that the area is “very much part of Wickham, both physically, in terms of interest and even postal address”. 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. In the east of the area, the Conservatives proposed combining the current Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards to form a new three-member Denmead ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives’ proposals for these wards.

86 We received 13 further representations in relation to this area at Stage One. Wickham Parish Council favoured creating a separate district ward for the Whiteley area, and retaining a two-member ward for the Wickham and Curbridge areas. A local resident also supported the City Council’s proposed Whiteley ward, but suggested an alternative boundary for the new ward, and expressed opposition to the Conservatives’ proposal to include the development at Knowle in Whiteley ward. As detailed below, Soberton Parish Council objected to any proposals to divide the parish, and Councillor Empson (Droxford, Soberton & Hambleton ward) and nine local residents also objected to proposals which would divide Soberton parish between district wards.

87 In our draft recommendations report we adopted the City Council’s proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards without amendment. We considered that, in light of the extensive development which is forecast to continue in the area, there was some merit in the proposal to create a new two-member Whiteley ward. While we accepted that the proposed development site at Knowle would share many characteristics with the development at Whiteley, we considered that the area remains geographically isolated from Whiteley, and we were not persuaded that Knowle should be included in the new Whiteley ward. We concurred with the Council’s proposal to include the Curbridge area in Wickham ward, although we were 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.

88 In relation to the Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead areas of Winchester district, we were not persuaded that the rural Boarhunt and Southwick areas in the south of the district share significant community ties with the larger village of Denmead, and concurred with the City Council's proposal to retain the existing electoral arrangements in this area.

89 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for warding arrangements in this area, and noted that, as part of its own consultation exercise, it had received representations expressing support for our proposals from Boarhunt, Southwick & Widley and Wickham parish councils. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals, but made no specific comment in relation to this area. We received two further representations at Stage Three. Southwick & Widley Parish Council supported our proposed Boarhunt & Southwick ward, while Wickham Parish Council supported our proposed Wickham and Whiteley wards.

90 Having considered all the evidence received we remain content that our proposed warding arrangements for this area would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. We note that our proposed Boarhunt & Southwick and Denmead wards have achieved a degree of local support, and under our final recommendations the single-member Boarhunt & Southwick and three-member 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 than the average respectively by 2004). Similarly, we note that there is a degree of local support for our proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards, in particular from Wickham Parish Council itself, and are content that our proposal to divide the current Wickham ward would reflect community identities and interests well. Initially, Wickham and Whiteley wards, each to be represented by two councillors, would have 61 per cent and 27 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively. However, these levels of electoral inequality are expected to improve significantly by 2004, so that the proposed Whiteley ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, and Wickham ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor. The boundary between the proposed Whiteley and Wickham wards is illustrated on Map 2 and Map A3 in Appendix A.

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

91 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 have 15 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (17 per cent and 4 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004), while Swanmore ward has 45 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (41 per cent more than the average by 2004).

92 At Stage One the City Council proposed combining Swanmore parish with the settlements of Soberton Heath and Newtown from Soberton parish to form a new two-member Swanmore & Newtown ward. It also proposed combining the remaining part of Soberton parish with Droxford and Hambledon parishes to form a single-member Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward. The Council stated that, in order to improve electoral equality in this area, it had considered combining the current Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore wards to form a three-member ward. However, it was reluctant to create such a geographically large ward. Under the Council's proposals, the existing electoral arrangements of Upper Meon Valley ward would be retained.

93 The Conservatives proposed more extensive change in this area, combining Shedfield, Swanmore and Waltham Chase wards to form a new three-member Shedfield & Swanmore ward, and transferring part of Soberton parish to a revised Wickham ward, as detailed above. Under their proposals, Droxford parish would be combined with Upper Meon Valley ward to form a new single-member Meon Valley ward, and Hambledon parish would be combined with the remaining part of Soberton parish to form a new single-member Soberton & Hambledon ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

94 We received several further comments in relation to this area at Stage One. Swanmore Parish Council objected to any proposals either to divide the parish or to combine it with other areas in a larger multi-member ward, while 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 to divide the parish.

95 In our draft recommendations report we largely adopted the City Council's scheme as the basis for our proposals in this area. In order to achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality in this area we considered that it would be necessary to amend the current Swanmore ward, either by combining Swanmore parish with part of another parish, or by transferring part of Swanmore parish to an adjacent ward. We were not persuaded that creating a geographically large three-member ward encompassing Droxford, Soberton, Hambledon and Swanmore parishes would best facilitate convenient and effective local government in the area and, as discussed previously, we did not consider that Swanmore parish should be combined with Shedfield and Waltham Chase wards, as proposed by the Conservatives.

96 While we noted the concerns of Soberton Parish Council, Councillor Empson and residents of Soberton that the City Council's proposals would "diminish, if not destroy the community spirit and links built up over so many years", we considered that the high levels of electoral inequality in both Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore wards must be addressed, and that the Council's proposals would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In order to further improve electoral equality in the revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward, however, we proposed transferring the part of Soberton parish to the south of Cams Hill, Hambledon Lane and Peststead Lane to the new Swanmore & Newtown ward. We also proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements of the single-member Upper Meon Valley ward.

97 At Stage Three we received a number of representations expressing opposition to our draft recommendation to include part of Soberton parish in Swanmore & Newtown ward. Soberton Parish Council objected to our proposal, arguing that “there is no affinity whatsoever between Newtown and Swanmore”, and that the ward would “be separated by the A32 road and the River Meon”. Droxford Parish Council objected to our proposals, and suggested alternative warding arrangements which would combine Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Upper Meon Valley wards, and Exton Parish Meeting expressed support for this proposal. Hampshire County Council, the Conservatives, the Conservative Group on the City Council, Councillors Dinenage and Empson (Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon ward) and County Councillor Hindson (Meon Valley division) and 33 local residents also expressed opposition to our proposals in relation to Soberton parish. The City Council accepted our proposed Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards, and Swanmore Parish Council expressed support for our draft recommendations.

98 Having considered all the evidence received, we propose confirming our draft recommendations for this area as final. While we recognise that there has been some local opposition to our proposed warding arrangements in this area, we have not been persuaded that there is significant support for any alternative warding arrangements which would, in particular, address the level of electoral inequality in Swanmore. In addition, we note that while the Conservatives opposed our draft recommendations and reiterated their Stage one proposal, they too would divide Soberton parish between district wards. Under Droxford Parish Council’s proposals for alternative warding arrangements, a three-member ward comprising the current Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Upper Meon Valley wards would have 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average based on a council size of 57 (10 per cent fewer than the average by 2004). However, Swanmore ward would continue to have 50 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (46 per cent more by 2004).

99 We consider that the level of electoral inequality in the existing Swanmore ward should be addressed, and we remain content that our draft recommendations would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. While our proposals would mean that Soberton parish would be divided between district wards, we consider that the effect on community ties should not be overstated. Our proposals do not affect parish boundaries, and should not prevent the community playing an active part in parish affairs. Under our final recommendations, the single-member Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Upper Meon Valley wards would have 13 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10 per cent more than and equal to the average respectively by 2004), while the two-member Swanmore & Newtown ward would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (4 per cent more than the average by 2004). The boundary between the proposed Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown wards is illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

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

100 Bishops Sutton, Cheriton, Itchen Valley and New Alresford wards cover the area to the east of Winchester city, extending as far as the boundary with East Hampshire district. Bishops Sutton

ward comprises Bighton, Bishops Sutton and Old Alresford parishes; Cheriton ward comprises Beauworth, Bramdean, Cheriton, Kilmeston and Tichborne parishes; and Itchen Valley ward comprises the parishes of Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley. New Alresford ward is coterminous with the New Alresford Town Council area. The single-member Bishops Sutton, Cheriton and Itchen Valley wards have 31 per cent, 11 per cent and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (29 per cent, 16 per cent and 11 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004). The three-member New Alresford ward has 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (13 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

101 At Stage One the City Council proposed reducing the number of wards covering this area from four to three. It proposed combining Cheriton ward with Bishops Sutton parish to form a new single-member Cheriton & Bishops Sutton ward, and combining New Alresford ward with the parishes of Bighton and Old Alresford to form a new three-member The Alresfords ward. Under the Council's proposals the existing single-member Itchen Valley ward would be retained. The Conservatives also proposed creating three wards in this area. Under their proposals a revised Itchen Valley ward would include Northington and Old Alresford parishes, while Cheriton ward would be combined with Bighton and Bishops Sutton parishes to form a new The Alresford Villages ward. The boundaries of New Alresford ward would remain unchanged, but the area would be represented by two councillors, rather than three as at present. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

102 We received three further representations in relation to this area at Stage One. 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, and requested that New Alresford ward be represented by two councillors rather than the present three.

103 In view of the evidence received at Stage One we considered that the City Council's scheme would provide the most reasonable balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area, and adopted its proposals as part of our draft recommendations. While we recognised that the Conservatives' proposals would also provide reasonable levels of electoral equality based on a council size of 44, we considered that electoral inequality would be unreasonably high under our proposed council size of 57. We were content that Bishops Sutton parish shares some community interests with the rural parishes of the current Cheriton ward, and were also content to put forward the Council's proposal to retain the existing Itchen Valley ward. While we recognised the concerns expressed by New Alresford Town Council regarding the inclusion of Bighton and Old Alresford parishes in The Alresfords ward, we were content that the parishes maintain strong communication links with New Alresford and look primarily to the town for their services.

104 At Stage Three the City Council broadly accepted our draft recommendations for this area. As detailed above, the Council proposed transferring Northington parish from Wonston & Micheldever ward to Itchen Valley ward in light of local representations. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals but made no comment in relation to this area. New Alresford Town Council objected to our proposed The Alresfords ward, arguing that the ward should include either all of the surrounding villages or none at all. The Town Council reiterated its original proposal to retain a separate New Alresford ward, to be represented by two councillors, one fewer than at present. Tichborne Parish Council expressed support for our proposed Cheriton & Bishops Sutton ward.

105 Having considered all the evidence received we are content to broadly confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. While we remain content that our draft recommendations would generally provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area, we propose transferring Northington parish from Wonston & Micheldever ward to Itchen Valley ward, as discussed previously. We note New Alresford Town Council's objection to our proposals, and recognise its concerns regarding the inclusion of more rural parishes in The Alresfords ward. However, under a council size of 57 a two-member New Alresford ward would have 47 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (35 per cent more than the average by 2004), and we have not been persuaded that the town is sufficiently separate and distinct from Bighton and Old Alresford parishes to justify such high levels of electoral inequality. Under our final recommendations the single-member Cheriton & Bishops Sutton and Itchen Valley wards would have 16 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (11 per cent and 5 per cent more than the average respectively by 2004), while the three-member The Alresfords ward would have 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent more than the average by 2004).

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

106 The single-member Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards lie to the south of Winchester city, and are coterminous with Badger Farm and Olivers Battery parish councils 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. Badger Farm ward has 32 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, while Olivers Battery ward has 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (20 per cent more and 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively by 2004).

107 At Stage One the City Council proposed combining Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards to form a new two-member Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward, arguing that the two areas share many common interests and that its proposal "simply reinforces existing community links". The Conservatives proposed combining Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards with the part of the Stanmore estate area of St Luke ward to the south of Kilham Lane, Thurmond Crescent, The Valley and Octavia Hill to form 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. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards. 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 the Winchester city area, but wished to see each parish continue to be represented separately on the City Council.

108 In our draft recommendations report we concurred with the view expressed by both the City Council and the Conservatives that the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery areas share a degree of common interest, and proposed combining them to form a new two-member Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward. We noted that, while the parishes share a community association and have common road access from the A3090 Badger Farm Road, the Stanmore estate is a separate community with a distinct identity and interests which is not easily accessible from the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery areas, and we were not persuaded that they should be combined with part of the unparished city area, as proposed by the Conservatives.

109 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for the proposed Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals, but made no specific comments in relation to this area. We received no further comments in relation to this area.

110 In light of the evidence received at Stage Three, we remain content that our draft recommendations would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area, and confirm them as final. Under our final recommendations, the two-member Olivers Battery & Badger Farm ward would have 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 3 per cent more than the average by 2004.

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

111 St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards cover the northern part of the unparished Winchester city area, and are each represented by three councillors. St Barnabas ward includes the Fulflood and Weeke areas of the city to the 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 Abbotts Barton and Hyde areas to the 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. St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards have 9 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (18 per cent and 6 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

112 At Stage One the City Council proposed several changes to warding arrangements in this area in order to improve electoral equality in both wards. The Council proposed enlarging the current St Barnabas ward to include the part of St Paul ward to the north of Dean Lane, Downside Road, Mornington Drive, Old Hillside Road and Hillside Close. It also proposed transferring properties on the southern side of the B3049 Stockbridge Road, currently in St Pauls ward, to the revised St Barnabas ward. Under the Council's proposals St Bartholomew ward would include the part of St John ward to the west of Water Lane, Wales Street and Easton Lane, while the part of St Bartholomew ward to the south of Tower Street, Jewry Street and St George's Street would be transferred to the proposed St Michael ward. In order to improve electoral equality further, the Council also proposed transferring the part of St Bartholomew ward to the south of City Road and west of Sussex Street to its proposed St Paul ward.

113 The Conservatives proposed more extensive change in this area. As detailed above, they proposed combining the Harestock area of Littleton & Harestock parish with the part of St Barnabas ward to the north of Stoney Lane to form a new Harestock & Weeke ward. Under the Conservatives' proposals the remaining part of St Barnabas ward would be combined with St Bartholomew ward less the area to the south of North Walls and east of Jewry Street, and part of St Pauls ward to the east of Cheriton Road, to form a new Fulflood & Hyde ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

114 In our draft recommendations report we put forward our own warding arrangements for this area, which were based in part on the City Council's scheme. While we were reluctant to combine part of Littleton & Harestock parish with areas of the city, as proposed by the Conservatives, we were not persuaded that the Council's proposals would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. We proposed transferring the Teg Down area from St Paul ward to a revised St Barnabas ward and, in order to improve electoral equality, proposed transferring the part of St Barnabas ward to the south of the B3041 Bereweke Road to a revised St Paul ward. Under our proposals the part of St Barnabas ward to the east of the B3420 Andover Road would be transferred to the proposed St Bartholomew ward, while the part of St Bartholomew ward to the west of Andover Road and Sussex Street would be transferred to St Paul ward. We were content that the existing southern and eastern boundaries of St Bartholomew ward provide recognisable and clearly identifiable boundaries which delineate the local communities well, and proposed retaining them as part of our draft recommendations.

115 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals, but made no specific comments in relation to this area. We received no further comments in relation to this area.

116 In light of the evidence received at Stage Three we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. Under our final recommendations St Barnabas and St Bartholomew wards, each to be represented by three- councillors, would have 4 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent and 5 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

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

117 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, while St Michael ward comprises the cathedral area to the south of the High Street, and the 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 than the average by 2004), while St Michael ward has 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (14 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

118 At Stage One the City Council proposed minimal change to warding arrangements in this area. As detailed above, it proposed transferring the part of St John & All Saints ward to the west of Water Lane, Wales Street and Easton Lane to a revised St Bartholomew ward, and including the part of St Bartholomew ward to the south of Tower Street, Jewry Street and St George's Street in a revised St Michael ward. Under the Council's proposals St Michael ward would include the part of St Luke ward to the south of the B3040 Romsey Road and north of Sleeper's Hill Road and Airlie Road, while the Stuart Crescent area of the Stanmore estate would be transferred from St Michael ward to the proposed St Luke ward. The Conservatives proposed combining St John & All Saints ward with the part of St Bartholomew ward to the south of North Walls and east of Jewry Street to form a new Winnall & Highcliffe ward, and creating a new Cathedral & St Cross ward which would retain the boundaries of the current St Michael ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

119 In our draft recommendations report we proposed retaining the existing St John & All Saints ward and making minor amendments to St Michael ward. We were content that St John & All Saints ward has clearly identifiable and easily recognisable boundaries and that it would have reasonable levels of electoral equality under a council size of 57, and we were not persuaded that either the City Council's or the Conservatives' proposals would better reflect the identities and interests of residents of the area. We concurred with the 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 proposed transferring the area to the revised St Luke ward. While we were reluctant to put forward warding arrangements which would combine areas either side of the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line, we noted that the Sleeper's Hill area shares some community ties with areas to its east, and proposed transferring the part of St Luke ward to the south of Romsey Road and north of Sleeper's Hill Road and Airlie Road to St Michael ward.

120 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for St John & All Saints and St Michael wards. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals, but made no specific comments in relation to this area. We received no further comments in relation to this area.

121 In light of the evidence received at Stage Three we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. Under our final recommendations St John & All Saints and St Michael wards, each represented by three councillors, would have 7 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

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

122 St Luke and St Paul wards cover the southern part of Winchester to the west of the Winchester to London Waterloo railway line, and are each represented by three councillors. St Luke ward contains the Sleeper's Hill and Stanmore areas, and St Paul ward includes the Teg Down area to the south of the B3049 Stockbridge Road. St Luke ward has 4 per cent more

electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent more than the average by 2004), and St Paul ward has 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer than the average by 2004).

123 As detailed above, at Stage One the City Council proposed transferring the Sleeper's Hill area from St Luke ward to a revised St Michael ward, and including the Stuart Crescent area in a revised St Luke ward, thereby uniting the entire Stanmore estate within a single ward. The Council also proposed transferring the Sarum Road area, incorporating Chilbolton Court, Sarum Close and Sarum View, to a 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". Under the Council's proposals St Paul ward would also include the Sussex Street area, currently part of St Bartholomew ward, as detailed above.

124 The Conservatives proposed more significant change in this area, combining the part of St Luke ward to the south of Kilham Lane, Thurmond Crescent, The Valley and Cromwell Road with Badger Farm and Olivers Battery wards to form a new Badger Farm, Olivers Battery & Stanmore ward, as detailed above. The remaining part of St Luke ward would be combined with the proposed St Paul ward, less the area to the east of Cheriton Road as detailed above, to form a new Sleeper's Hill & Teg Down ward. Mr Roy Perry MEP and Councillor Allgood supported the Conservatives' proposals for these wards.

125 As discussed previously, we were reluctant to combine Badger Farm and Olivers Battery parishes with unparished areas of Winchester city, and we were not persuaded that the Conservatives' proposals would best reflect the identities and interests of communities in either of the parishes or the Stanmore area. We considered that the City Council's proposals for St Luke and St Paul wards had some merit, and based our draft recommendations for these wards on their proposals. We proposed transferring the Stuart Crescent area to a revised St Luke ward, and including the Sleeper's Hill area in our proposed St Michael ward, as detailed above. Under our proposals Sarum Close and Chilbolton Court would be transferred to the proposed St Paul ward, which would also include the Sussex Street area from St Bartholomew ward, and the part of St Barnabas ward to the south of the B3041 Bereweeke Road, as detailed above.

126 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our draft recommendations for St Luke and St Paul wards. The Conservatives reiterated their Stage One proposals, but made no specific comments in relation to this area. We received no further comments in relation to this area.

127 In light of the evidence received at Stage Three we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final. Under our final recommendations St Luke and St Paul wards, each represented by three councillors, would have 3 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent and 8 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2004).

## **Electoral Cycle**

128 At Stage One we received two representations in relation to the City Council's electoral cycle. The 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. Accordingly, we made no recommendation for change to the current cycle of elections by thirds for the district.

129 At Stage Three the City Council accepted our recommendation that elections should continue to take place by thirds. No other representations in relation to the electoral cycle were received, and we confirm our draft recommendation as final.

## **Conclusions**

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

- We propose transferring Northington parish from Wonston & Micheldever ward to Itchen Valley ward.
- We propose renaming Curdridge ward as Owslebury & Curdridge ward.

131 We conclude that, in Winchester:

- there should be a increase in council size from 55 to 57;
- there should be 26 wards, six fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

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

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

|  | 1999 electorate      |                       | 2004 forecast electorate |                       |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | Current arrangements | Final recommendations | Current arrangements     | Final recommendations |
| Number of councillors  | 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                     |

133 As Figure 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 21 to eight, with only three wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality is expected to have improved further in 2004, with no ward varying by more than 13 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

**Final 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. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

134 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, in our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Soberton and Wickham to reflect the proposed district wards.

135 The parish of Soberton is currently served by 11 parish councillors and is not warded. In our draft recommendations report we proposed dividing Soberton into two parish wards to allow it to be divided between the revised Droxford, Soberton & Hambledon and Swanmore & Newtown district wards. 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.

136 In response to our draft recommendations report we received significant opposition to our proposal to transfer part of Soberton parish to a new Swanmore & Newtown ward, as discussed previously. In particular, Soberton Parish Council objected to our proposal to ward the parish, and requested that the existing district and parish electoral arrangements be retained. Having considered all the evidence received, we are confirming our draft recommendations for district warding arrangements in this area as final. Consequently we propose to confirm our draft recommendations for warding arrangements for Soberton parish as final.

**Final 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.

137 The parish of Wickham is currently served by 16 councillors representing two parish wards, Whiteley & Curbridge and Wickham. Whiteley & Curbridge parish ward currently returns seven parish councillors, and Wickham parish ward returns nine parish councillors. In our draft recommendations report we proposed creating a new Whiteley district ward, and consequently we proposed amending the boundary between Whiteley & Curbridge and Wickham parish wards to reflect the proposed boundary between the new Whiteley and revised Wickham district wards. Whiteley & Curbridge parish ward would be renamed Whiteley parish ward, and Wickham parish ward would be renamed Wickham & Curbridge parish ward. Wickham Parish Council supported the proposal to create a new district ward for the Whiteley area.

138 In response to our draft recommendations report Wickham Parish Council accepted our draft recommendation to create separate Whiteley and Wickham & Curbridge parish wards. However, it proposed that Whiteley and Wickham & Curbridge parish wards should each be served by 11 councillors, arguing that increased representation would reflect the growth in electorate predicted for the parish, and noting that “Whiteley will, in the foreseeable future, petition for a separate parish council”. The City Council supported this request. We received two further representations in relation to this area, from a Wickham parish councillor who also proposed increasing the number of councillors for Wickham parish ward to 11, and from a

resident of Whiteley who proposed increasing the number of parish councillors for Whiteley parish ward to 12.

139 Having considered all the evidence received, we note the City Council’s support for Wickham Parish Council’s proposal to increase the number of parish councillors for Wickham, and are content to put forward its proposal as part of our final recommendations. We are content to increase the number of councillors serving Wickham parish, and consider that Whiteley and Wickham & Curbridge parish wards should be served by 11 councillors each.

**Final Recommendation**  
Wickham Parish Council should comprise 22 councillors, six more than at present, representing two parish wards, Whiteley and Wickham & Curbridge, each returning 11 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.

140 The parish of Bishops Waltham is currently unwarded, and returns 12 parish councillors. At Stage One 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 have resulted in change to this area and we were content to put forward the Parish Council’s proposal for consultation.

141 We received no further comments in relation to this area at Stage Three, and are therefore content to confirm our draft recommendation as final.

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

142 The parish of Swanmore is currently unwarded, and returns nine parish councillors. At Stage One, 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 have resulted in change to this area and we were content to put forward the Parish Council’s proposal for consultation.

143 In response to our consultation report Swanmore Parish Council expressed support for our draft recommendations. We received no further comments in relation to this area at Stage Three, and are therefore content to confirm them as final.

**Final Recommendation**

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

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

**Final Recommendation**

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

*Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Winchester*

## 6 NEXT STEPS

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

146 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an order. Such an order will not be made before 5 September 2000.

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

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Final Recommendations for 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 inserted inside the back of the report.

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

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

The **large map** inserted inside the back cover of the report illustrates the 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

### Draft Recommendations for Winchester

Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ from those we put forward as draft recommendations in respect of only two wards, where our draft proposals are set out below. The only other change from draft to final recommendations, which is not included in Figures B1 and B2, is that we propose to rename Curdridge ward as Owslebury & Curdridge ward.

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

| Ward name             | Constituent areas  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Itchen Valley         | <i>Unchanged</i> (Chilcomb, Itchen Stoke & Ovington and Itchen Valley parishes)                            |
| Wonston & Micheldever | Micheldever ward (Micheldever and Northington parishes); Wonston ward (South Wonston and Wonston parishes) |

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

| Ward name             | Number of councillors | Electorate (1999) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2004) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Itchen Valley         | 1                     | 1,325             | 1,325                             | -9                      | 1,415             | 1,415                             | -8                      |
| Wonston & Micheldever | 3                     | 4,172             | 1,391                             | -4                      | 4,428             | 1,476                             | 4                       |

*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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

