

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Tendring in Essex

June 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>33</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Tendring: Detailed Mapping	<i>35</i>
B Tendring District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>41</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>43</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Clacton-on-Sea and Frinton & Walton is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Tendring on 30 November 1999.

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

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

- **in 18 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 eight wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 this unequal representation 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 19 wards and by more than 20 per cent in ten wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 114-115) are that:

- **Tendring District Council should have 60 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 35 wards, instead of 32 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of three, and seven wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 34 of the proposed 35 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average both initially and in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Frinton and Harwich;**

- **an increase in the number of councillors serving Brightlingsea Town Council; and a reduction in the number of councillors serving Great Bentley Parish Council.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eleven weeks from 20 June 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 4 September 2000:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map Reference
1	Alresford	1	Alresford, Thorrington & Frating ward (part – Alresford parish)	Map 2
2	Alton Park	2	Bockings Elm ward (part); Rush Green ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
3	Ardleigh & Little Bromley	1	Ardleigh ward; Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley ward (part – Little Bromley parish)	Map 2
4	Beaumont & Thorpe	1	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
5	Bockings Elm	2	Bockings Elm ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
6	Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix	1	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
7	Brightlingsea	3	Brightlingsea East ward; Brightlingsea West ward	Map 2
8	Burrsville	1	St Bartholomews ward (part); St Johns ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
9	Frinton	2	Frinton ward (part); Walton ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
10	Golf Green	2	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2 & Large map
11	Great & Little Oakley	1	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
12	Great Bentley	1	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
13	Hamford	2	Frinton ward (part); Holland & Kirby ward (part); Walton ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
14	Harwich East	1	Harwich East ward (part)	Maps 2 & A2
15	Harwich East Central	2	Harwich East ward (part); Harwich East Central ward; Harwich West Central ward (part)	Maps 2, A2 & A3
16	Harwich West	2	Harwich West ward (part)	Maps 2, A2 & A3
17	Harwich West Central	2	Harwich West ward (part); Harwich West Central ward (part)	Maps 2, A2 & A3
18	Haven	1	Haven ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
19	Holland & Kirby	2	Frinton ward (part); Holland & Kirby ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map Reference
20	Homelands	1	Holland & Kirby ward (part); Walton ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
21	Lawford	2	Lawford & Manningtree ward (part – Lawford parish)	Map 2
22	Little Clacton & Weeley	2	Little Clacton ward; Tendring & Weeley ward (part – Weeley parish)	Map 2
23	Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring	2	Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley ward (part – Little Bentley parish); Lawford & Manningtree ward (part – Manningtree parish); Mistley ward; Tendring & Weeley ward (part – Tendring parish)	Map 2
24	Peter Bruff	2	Bockings Elm ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
25	Pier	2	Rush Green ward (part); St James ward (part); St Marys ward (part); Southcliff ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
26	Ramsey & Parkeston	1	Ramsey ward	Map 2
27	Rush Green	2	Bockings Elm ward (part); Rush Green ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
28	St Bartholomews	2	Haven ward (part); St Bartholomews ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
29	St James	2	Rush Green ward (part); St James ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
30	St Johns	2	St Johns ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
31	St Marys	2	Bockings Elm ward (part); St Johns ward (part); St Marys ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
32	St Osyth & Point Clear	2	St Osyth ward	Map 2
33	St Pauls	2	Southcliff ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map
34	Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley	2	Alresford, Thorrington & Frating ward (part – the parishes of Thorrington and Frating); Elmstead ward; Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley ward (part – Great Bromley parish)	Map 2
35	Walton	2	Walton ward (part)	Map 2 & Large map

Notes: 1 Clacton-on-Sea is the only unparished part of the district.

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Tendring

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 Alresford	1	1,688	1,688	-5	1,709	1,709	-6
2 Alton Park	2	3,523	1,762	0	3,527	1,764	-3
3 Ardleigh & Little Bromley	1	1,777	1,777	1	1,802	1,802	-1
4 Beaumont & Thorpe	1	1,819	1,819	3	1,844	1,844	1
5 Bockings Elm	2	3,409	1,705	-4	3,487	1,744	-4
6 Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix	1	1,733	1,733	-2	1,756	1,756	-4
7 Brightlingsea	3	6,217	2,072	17	6,319	2,106	16
8 Burrsville	1	1,770	1,770	0	1,799	1,799	-1
9 Frinton	2	3,424	1,712	-3	3,521	1,761	-3
10 Golf Green	2	3,831	1,916	8	3,997	1,999	10
11 Great & Little Oakley	1	1,639	1,639	-7	1,719	1,719	-6
12 Great Bentley	1	1,797	1,797	2	1,805	1,805	-1
13 Hamford	2	3,399	1,700	-4	3,420	1,710	-6
14 Harwich East	1	1,855	1,855	5	1,906	1,906	5
15 Harwich East Central	2	3,647	1,824	3	3,774	1,887	4
16 Harwich West	2	3,362	1,681	-5	3,815	1,908	5
17 Harwich West Central	2	3,647	1,824	3	3,769	1,885	4
18 Haven	1	1,783	1,783	1	1,785	1,785	-2
19 Holland & Kirby	2	3,501	1,751	-1	3,639	1,820	0
20 Homelands	1	1,713	1,713	-3	1,715	1,715	-6
21 Lawford	2	3,365	1,683	-5	3,438	1,719	-6
22 Little Clacton & Weeley	2	3,680	1,840	4	3,760	1,880	3

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 Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring	2	3,266	1,633	-8	3,464	1,732	-5
24 Peter Bruff	2	3,344	1,672	-5	3,502	1,751	-4
25 Pier	2	3,481	1,741	-2	3,713	1,857	2
26 Ramsey & Parkeston	1	1,774	1,774	0	1,827	1,827	0
27 Rush Green	2	3,469	1,735	-2	3,629	1,815	0
28 St Bartholomews	2	3,781	1,891	7	3,825	1,913	5
29 St James	2	3,263	1,632	-8	3,453	1,727	-5
30 St Johns	2	3,633	1,817	3	3,692	1,846	1
31 St Marys	2	3,585	1,793	1	3,593	1,797	-1
32 St Osyth & Point Clear	2	3,316	1,658	-6	3,398	1,699	-7
33 St Pauls	2	3,595	1,798	2	3,605	1,803	-1
34 Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead, & Great Bromley	2	3,646	1,823	3	3,736	1,868	3
35 Walton	2	3,329	1,665	-6	3,452	1,726	-5
Totals	60	106,061	–	–	109,195	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,768	–	–	1,820	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Tendring District Council.

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

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Tendring in Essex on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the twelve districts in Essex 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 Tendring. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1975 (Report No. 16). The electoral arrangements for Essex County Council were last reviewed in November 1980 (Report No. 401). We completed a directed electoral review of Thurrock in 1996 and a periodic electoral review of Southend-on-Sea in 1999. We expect to undertake a periodic electoral review of Thurrock in 2000 and a review of the County Councils electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to our statutory criteria. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward.

Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including the Essex 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. The proposals were taken forward in the Local Government Bill, published in December 1999, and are currently being considered by Parliament.

12 Stage One began on 30 November 1999, when we wrote to Tendring District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Essex County Council, Essex Police

Authority, the local authority associations, Essex Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district and the Members of the European Parliament for the South East Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 28 February 2000.

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

14 Stage Three began on 20 June 2000 and will end on 4 September 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The district of Tendring is situated in north-east Essex. It has a water frontage of some 38 miles stretching from the River Stour in the north to the River Colne in the south. The majority of the population (approximately 130,900) are situated along this coast-line in the main settlements of Clacton-on-Sea, Harwich, Frinton and Brightlingsea. The district covers some 33,650 hectares and has a population density of approximately 3.9 persons per hectare. Tendring district contains 27 parishes; Clacton-on-Sea town is itself unparished and comprises around 40 per cent of the district's total electorate.

17 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'.

18 The electorate of the district is 106,061 (February 1999). The Council presently has 60 members who are elected from 32 wards, 15 of which are relatively rural in profile. Seven of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 14 are each represented by two councillors and 11 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Tendring district, with around 24 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Bockings Elm and Frinton wards.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,768 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,820 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 18 of the 32 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, eight wards by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Bockings Elm ward, where the councillors represent 156 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Tendring

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alresford, Thorrington & Frating	2	2,985	1,493	-16	3,069	1,535	-16
2 Ardleigh	1	1,581	1,581	-11	1,596	1,596	-12
3 Beaumont & Thorpe	1	1,819	1,819	3	1,844	1,844	1
4 Bockings Elm	2	9,066	4,533	156	9,405	4,703	158
5 Bradfield Wrabness & Wix	1	1,733	1,733	-2	1,756	1,756	-4
6 Brightlingsea East	2	3,177	1,589	-10	3,232	1,616	-11
7 Brightlingsea West	2	3,040	1,520	-14	3,087	1,544	-15
8 Elmstead	1	1,488	1,488	-16	1,507	1,507	-17
9 Frinton	3	5,343	1,781	1	5,461	1,820	0
10 Golf Green	2	3,831	1,916	8	3,997	1,999	10
11 Great & Little Oakley	1	1,639	1,639	-7	1,719	1,719	-6
12 Great Bentley	1	1,797	1,797	2	1,805	1,805	-1
13 Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley	1	1,274	1,274	-28	1,294	1,294	-29
14 Harwich East	2	2,526	1,263	-29	2,599	1,300	-29
15 Harwich East Central	2	2,762	1,381	-22	2,867	1,434	-21
16 Harwich West	2	4,190	2,095	19	4,643	2,322	28
17 Harwich West Central	2	3,033	1,517	-14	3,155	1,578	-13
18 Haven	2	2,726	1,363	-23	2,728	1,364	-25
19 Holland & Kirby	2	4,518	2,259	28	4,656	2,328	28
20 Lawford & Manningtree	2	4,068	2,034	15	4,149	2,075	14
21 Little Clacton	1	2,293	2,293	30	2,352	2,352	29
22 Mistley	1	1,826	1,826	3	1,999	1,999	10

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 Ramsey	1	1,774	1,774	0	1,827	1,827	0
24 Rush Green	3	4,330	1,443	-18	4,421	1,474	-19
25 Southcliff	3	4,533	1,511	-15	4,765	1,588	-13
26 St Bartholomews	2	2,841	1,421	-20	2,885	1,443	-21
27 St James	3	5,416	1,805	2	5,586	1,862	2
28 St Johns	3	5,827	1,942	10	5,915	1,972	8
29 St Marys	3	3,897	1,299	-27	3,905	1,302	-28
30 St Osyth	2	3,316	1,658	-6	3,398	1,699	-7
31 Tendring & Weeley	1	1,907	1,907	8	1,943	1,943	7
32 Walton	3	5,505	1,835	4	5,630	1,877	3
Totals	60	106,061	–	–	109,195	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,768	–	–	1,820	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Tendring District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Harwich East ward were relatively over-represented by 29 per cent, while electors in Bockings Elm ward were substantially under-represented by 156 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received eight representations during Stage One, including district-wide schemes from the District Council and the Tendring District Council Labour Group, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission, by appointment.

Tendring District Council

23 Tendring District Council proposed a council of 60 members, as at present, serving 36 wards, compared to the existing 32. The Council proposed a mix of two- and single-member wards as they “had regard to the Government’s proposals relating to electoral arrangements contained in the Local Government Bill”.

24 After a local consultation exercise the District Council proposed new electoral arrangements for Brightlingsea, Clacton (the only unparished area in the district), Frinton and Harwich, as well as regrouping the parishes in the north-west of the district. It proposed that there should be 13 wards covering the Clacton town area, four more than at present, and five wards covering Frinton & Walton, two more than at present. The Council’s submission proposed an increase of one councillor, from 23 to 24, in the Clacton area; an increase of one in Frinton & Walton, from eight to nine; a decrease of one in Brightlingsea, from four to three; a decrease of one in Harwich, from eight to seven and 17 councillors representing the rural parishes, as at present. The District Council proposed no parish warding.

25 Under the District Council’s proposals two wards would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the district average by 2004. The Council’s proposal is summarised at Appendix B.

Tendring District Council Labour Group

26 Tendring District Council Labour Group proposed a council of 57 members, three fewer than at present. The Labour Group’s scheme was based on 57 single-member wards. It proposed major boundary realignment across the majority of the district as a result of submitting a scheme wholly based on single-member wards. The Labour Group’s submission was “based on the view that single-member wards will help to extend democracy” and will improve representation at a local level. The Labour Group proposed elections for the whole council in 2003 to be followed by elections by halves.

27 Under the Labour Group's proposals eight wards would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the district average. This would improve to four wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent by 2004.

Parish and Town Councils

28 We received representations from four parish and town councils. Brightlingsea Town Council stated its opposition to Tendring District Council's proposals for its area. It submitted a proposal for a single three-member ward or alternatively three single-member wards. It felt that these alternatives would provide better representation and would improve community identity whilst not affecting the electoral equality. Brightlingsea Town Council also recommended an increase in its number of councillors from 10 to 12.

29 Harwich Town Council put forward its own electoral arrangements which were based on Harwich retaining eight district councillors, including boundary modifications to improve on the existing levels of electoral equality. Tendring Parish Council stated its opposition to the District Council's proposals to place it in a ward with the parishes of Manningtree and Mistley. Great Bentley Parish Council put forward new parish warding arrangements.

30 As part of its Stage One submission the District Council outlined the observations it had received from 19 parish councils. We are therefore aware that a number of parishes did not wholly support the District Council's draft scheme. Therefore, as part of our Stage Three consultation exercise, we ask that these parishes make representations to the Commission directly and provide evidence and argumentation regarding the proposed warding arrangements in their areas, offering any alternatives that they believe provide equally good or better electoral equality and reflection of community identities as our draft recommendations, where possible.

Other Representations

31 We received a further two submissions, one from Councillor Cook, member for St Marys ward, who wrote on behalf of the Labour Group. He outlined the concerns the Labour Group had with the District Council's submission. He stated that he did not support the "gross under-representation of the electors in both wards in Brightlingsea", the proposals for Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward and Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley ward and the lack of community identity in urban areas under the District Council's scheme. He stated that all of these problems were caused by the District Council's decision to continue with a council size of 60. Councillor Cook made comments on 19 of the District Council's 36 proposed wards, but did not make specific alternative proposals.

32 We received a submission from Councillor Patrick, member for Brightlingsea East ward, which was supported by Councillor Bailey of Brightlingsea Town Council. They stated their "strong support for Tendring District Council's proposals for the warding of Brightlingsea" and their opposition to Brightlingsea Town Council's proposals for district ward electoral arrangements. They did support Brightlingsea Town Council's proposals for an increase in the number of town councillors from 10 to 12.

33 During Stage One Tendring District Council forwarded to us copies of representations it had received from individual councillors. Councillor Randall, member for Lawford & Manningtree, commented on the proposals for Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward and Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley ward, stating his opposition to both proposed groupings of parishes. Councillor Dixon, member for Brightlingsea West, outlined his support for Brightlingsea Town Council's proposal for a single three-member ward. Councillor Johnston, member for Weeley & Tendring, stated her opposition to the District Council's proposal to include Tendring parish in a ward with Manningtree and Mistley parishes.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

34 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Tendring is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor is as nearly as possible the same, as stated in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities.

35 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 next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

36 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.

37 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, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates.

Electorate Forecasts

38 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 3 per cent from 106,061 to 109,195 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in the wards of Bockings Elm and Harwich West. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

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

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 Tendring District Council presently has 60 members. The District Council proposed a council of 60 members which it decided upon after considering the effects of having a council size of 56, 57, 58, 59 or 60 members. It concluded that a council size of 60 would provide convenient and effective local government and would also facilitate a scheme with good electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria.

42 Tendring District Council Labour Group proposed a council size of 57 members as “this figure shows a best fit between the various towns and areas of the district”. The Labour Group also argued that its council size provided “a good fit in terms of the rural area and maintains the present constituency boundaries” while ensuring that “none of the major shopping areas [are] split by a ward boundary”.

43 We considered the arguments put forward both for a 57-member and a 60-member council. We were concerned that there was no argumentation as to what effect a council size of 57 members would have on the internal political management, the role of councillors and the implications for both the council and the residents of the proposed new council size. As already stated, we start from the assumption that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government; with this in mind and a lack of evidence outlining how a council of 57 members would operate, we have decided to adopt the council size put forward by Tendring District Council.

44 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 60 members.

Electoral Arrangements

45 We have considered carefully all the representations received, including the district-wide schemes from Tendring District Council and Tendring District Council Labour Group.

46 We were concerned that the Labour Group’s proposals have not been, to the best of our knowledge, made available for public inspection or the subject of local consultation, neither have they received cross-party support from members on the District Council. We also noted that the Labour Group’s proposals would involve a degree of parish warding. Under its proposals the communities of Great Bromley and Lawford would be split between separate district wards. We were particularly concerned with the Labour Groups proposal to include Bovills parish ward of Little Clacton parish in Bockings Elm ward which is an unparished part of Clacton-on-Sea town. This proposal would see the community of Little Clacton divided with 335 electors being transferred into Bockings Elm ward. It is our understanding that across the district, there is local opposition to dividing parishes between district wards.

47 In view of the degree of consensus behind elements of the Council’s proposals, the exercise of testing council sizes of 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60 that the council carried out, and our decision to propose a 60-member council, we have concluded that our draft recommendations should be based on the District Council’s scheme. We conclude that the scheme put forward by the Council

provides generally strong and clear boundaries whilst having regard for community identities and resulting in good electoral equality across the district.

48 We consider that the scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or the other scheme submitted at Stage One by the Labour Group. The number of councillors for each area proposed under the District Council's scheme also provides for the correct level of representation.

49 Having concluded that our draft recommendations should be based on the council's scheme, we have been unable to make detailed comparisons with the boundaries proposed under the Labour Group's 57-member scheme, as the different councillor:elector ratio means that the size and configuration of wards vary substantially. It is important to note that (based on the 1999 electorate) under a council size of 60 the number of electors per councillor would be 1,768, while under a council size of 57, the number of electors per councillor would be 1,861, a difference of nearly 100 electors per ward. In the text which follows, we have not therefore, made a detailed analysis of the Labour Group's scheme.

50 We are therefore basing our draft recommendations on the Council's scheme, however, we have decided to propose a three-member ward in our recommendations. We noted that Tendring District Council put forward a scheme based on single- and two-member wards. Having visited the town of Brightlingsea and considered all representations received we are proposing a three-member ward for the town (outlined later in the chapter). We conclude that due to its geographical position and subsequent separate community identity, convenient and effective local government in Brightlingsea would be best served by a single three-member ward.

51 We have also moved away from the boundaries put forward by the District Council in Frinton & Walton, in order to further improve electoral equality and to have regard to the statutory criteria. We have also made minor modifications to the District Council's proposals in Clacton-on-Sea. In the proposed St Pauls ward we are recommending realignment of its boundaries with the proposed Pier ward and St Johns ward. Where appropriate we have made comparisons between the proposed boundaries under each scheme, comparing them to those of the District Council, and have attempted to draw on the local knowledge that each submission provides. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

Clacton-on-Sea

- (a) Haven, St Bartholomews and Southcliff wards;
- (b) Golf Green, Rush Green and St James wards;
- (c) Bockings Elm, St Johns and St Marys ward.

Frinton & Walton

- (d) Frinton, Holland & Kirby and Walton wards.

Harwich

- (e) Harwich East, Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central wards.

Brightlingsea

- (f) Brightlingsea East and Brightlingsea West wards.

The rural area

- (g) Alresford, Thorrington & Frating, Ardleigh and Elmstead wards;
- (h) Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley, Lawford & Manningtree and Mistley wards;
- (i) Great Bentley, Little Clacton, St Osyth and Tendring & Weeley wards;
- (j) Beaumont & Thorpe, Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix, Great & Little Oakley and Ramsey wards.

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

Clacton-on-Sea

53 Clacton-on-Sea is the main settlement in Tendring. It is situated in the south of the district and is the only unparished area, comprising around 40 per cent of the district's total electorate.

Haven, St Bartholomews and Southcliff wards

54 These three wards are situated in the south of Clacton town. The two-member Haven and St Bartholomews wards are currently 23 per cent and 20 per cent over-represented (25 per cent and 21 per cent by 2004). The three-member Southcliff ward is 15 per cent over-represented (13 per cent by 2004).

55 Tendring District Council proposed new electoral arrangements for these three wards in order to improve electoral equality. It proposed that 943 electors of Haven ward should be transferred into a modified St Bartholomews ward with the remaining electors of the existing St Bartholomews ward and that a modified Haven ward should comprise the remaining electors of the existing Haven ward. It also proposed the creation of two new wards, Pier and St Pauls. It stated that the new Pier ward should comprise 2,443 electors from St James ward, 948 electors from Southcliff ward, 79 electors from Rush Green ward and 21 electors from St Marys ward. St Pauls ward should comprise the remaining electors of the existing Southcliff ward which would cease to exist. The District Council proposed that the ward of Haven should be represented by one councillor, while the wards of Pier, St Bartholomews and St Pauls should be represented by two councillors each.

56 Under the District Council's proposals Pier ward would have an electoral variance of 1 per cent below the district average (2 per cent above by 2004). Haven, St Bartholomews and St Pauls

wards would have electoral variances of 1 per cent, 7 per cent and 1 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent below, 5 per cent above and 1 per cent below by 2004 respectively).

57 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council's proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. However we propose slight modifications to the District Council's boundary between Pier ward and St Pauls ward. We propose transferring the 12 electors of the flats of 25 Church Road into St Pauls whilst transferring the two electors of 32-36 Holland Road into Pier ward. These modifications have no effect on electoral equality, but they provide a strong, clear boundary. We also propose one minor modification to the District Council's proposed boundary between St Pauls ward and St Johns ward. We are adopting the railway line as the boundary between these two wards, which we believe offers a strong, clearer boundary than the one put forward by the District Council. There are no electors in this area and consequently there is no effect on the electoral equality of St Pauls ward. We otherwise intend adopting the District Council's proposals, and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the Borough Council's proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Golf Green, Rush Green and St James ward

58 These three wards are situated in the west of Clacton town. The two-member Golf Green ward is 8 per cent under-represented (10 per cent by 2004) and the three-member wards of Rush Green and St James are 18 per cent over-represented and 2 per cent under-represented respectively (19 per cent and 2 per cent by 2004).

59 Tendring District Council proposed that there should be no change to the electoral arrangements of Golf Green ward, except for one minor modification which would see the Clinic and Community Hall on Golf Green Road transferred into Golf Green ward from St James ward. This modification does not affect any electors. It proposed modifications to the boundaries of Rush Green and St James wards. It proposed including 2,159 electors from Bockings Elm ward with 1,310 electors from the existing Rush Green ward in a revised Rush Green ward. The District Council proposed that 290 electors from Rush Green ward be included with the remaining electors from St James ward in a revised ward. It also proposed the creation of Alton Park ward, comprising 41 electors from Bockings Elm ward, 2,651 electors from Rush Green ward and 831 electors from St Marys ward. It proposed that each of these four wards should be represented by two councillors.

60 Under the District Council's proposals, the ward of Golf Green would have an electoral variance of 8 per cent above the district average (10 per cent by 2004) whilst the wards of Rush Green and St James would have electoral variances of 2 per cent and 8 per cent below the district average respectively (equal to the district average and 5 per cent below by 2004). The new ward of Alton Park would be equal to the district average (3 per cent below by 2004).

61 Councillor Cook stated that the District Council's proposals for Rush Green ward would involve "the unnatural split of Bluehouse Estate", it would also involve "splitting of the community to the south west of St Osyth Road, around Coopers Lane". He also stated that the

proposed Alton Park ward would “continue the existing arbitrary split of the community between Old Road and Wellesley Road”.

62 During Stage One we received 51 representations from residents of Golf Green stating their objection to any plans to create a Jaywick Parish Council. The Commission *does not* have the power to propose the creation of new parish councils as part of a periodical electoral review. We therefore recommend that any queries relating to this issue are addressed to the Secretary of State for the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions or to Tendring District Council.

63 We have noted the electoral variance of 10 per cent in the District Council’s proposed Golf Green ward (by 2004). Having visited the area we agree with the District Council that Golf Green ward “is a self-contained area which naturally forms a ward of its own”. We have considered alternative arrangements in the area, including the Labour Group’s proposals for two single-member wards. However we consider that the existing two-member ward best represents community identity. We conclude that including electors of Golf Green in a neighbouring ward would not provide convenient and effective local government as Golf Green ward is separated from the main area of Clacton-on-Sea by a golf course, air strip and open land. We are therefore not satisfied that the alternatives would provide improved electoral arrangements or facilitate convenient and effective local government.

64 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council’s proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore intend adopting the District Council’s proposals for these wards without modification and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the District Council’s proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Bockings Elm, St Johns and St Marys ward

65 These three wards are situated in the north of Clacton town. The two-member Bockings Elm ward is 156 per cent under-represented (158 per cent by 2004), the three-member St Johns ward is 10 per cent under-represented (8 per cent by 2004) and the three-member St Marys ward is 27 per cent over-represented (28 per cent by 2004).

66 Tendring District Council proposed alterations to the boundaries of all three wards to improve electoral equality. It proposed that St Marys ward should be modified to include 427 electors from the Castle Hill area of St Johns ward and the 482 electors from the Cann Hall area of Bockings Elm ward. It also proposed transferring 1,221 electors from St Marys ward to form part of the new Alton Park ward, Peter Bruff ward and Pier ward. The District Council proposed that St Johns ward should be made up of the remaining parts of the existing ward. It also put forward proposals for the creation of two new wards, Burrsville ward, comprising 1,767 electors of St Johns ward and three electors of St Bartholomews ward, and Peter Bruff ward comprising 2,975 electors and 369 electors currently included in Bockings Elm ward and St Marys ward respectively. It also proposed that the ward of Bockings Elm should have a significant reduction in the number of electors with 5,657 electors being transferred into the proposed wards of Alton Park, Peter Bruff, Rush Green, St Johns and St Marys, as outlined earlier. The District Council

proposed that Burrsville ward should be represented by one councillor while Bockings Elm, Peter Bruff, St Johns and St Marys wards should each be represented by two councillors.

67 Under the District Council's proposals the wards of St Johns and St Marys would have electoral variances of 3 per cent and 1 per cent above the district average respectively (1 per cent above and 1 per cent below respectively by 2004). Bockings Elm and Peter Bruff wards would have an electoral variances of 4 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively (both wards would be 4 per cent below by 2004). Burrsville ward would have an electoral variance equal to the district average (1 per cent below by 2004).

68 Councillor Cook stated his opposition to the District Council's proposed Bockings Elm ward as it "splits the community of the Bluehouse estate in a completely unnatural way". He also stated that Thomas Road and Melbourne Road, which the District Council has proposed transferring into Peter Bruff ward, "have very little affinity with the areas with which they are now joined". Councillor Cook stated that the "community between Thorpe Road and Burrs Road to the north of Pickers Ditch and the Cemetery" will be split between Burrsville ward and St Johns ward. He also objected to the District Council's proposed St Marys ward as it included "four separate communities with little common identity". However, Councillor Cook did not propose alternative arrangements.

69 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council's proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. However, we propose one minor modification to the District Council's proposed boundary between St Pauls ward and St Johns ward. We propose adopting the railway line as the boundary between these two wards, which we believe offers a strong, clearer boundary than the one put forward by the District Council. There are no electors in this area and consequently there is no effect on the electoral equality of St Johns ward. We otherwise intend adopting the District Council's proposals and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the District Council's proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Frinton & Walton

Frinton, Holland & Kirby and Walton wards

70 The three-member wards of Frinton and Walton and the two-member Holland & Kirby ward cover Frinton & Walton parish. The number of electors per councillor in Frinton ward is currently 1 per cent above the average (equal to the average by 2004), 4 per cent above the average in Walton ward (3 per cent by 2004) and 28 per cent above the average in Holland & Kirby ward, both initially and by 2004.

71 Tendring District Council proposed that the representation of Frinton & Walton should be increased by one district councillor, from eight to nine. It put forward suggestions for significant boundary realignment for Frinton & Walton with the creation of two new wards, Hamford and Homelands. It proposed that Hamford ward should comprise 2,142 electors currently in Frinton ward, 1,045 electors currently in Holland & Kirby ward and 145 electors currently in Walton ward. Homelands ward should comprise 1,843 electors currently in Walton ward and 25 electors

currently in Frinton ward. A revised Frinton ward should comprise the remainder of the existing ward and 13 electors currently in Walton ward. Holland & Kirby ward and Walton ward should comprise the remainder of the existing wards of the same names. The District Council proposed that the wards of Frinton, Hamford, Holland & Kirby and Walton should each be represented by two councillors, with Homelands ward returning one councillor.

72 Under the District Council's proposals the wards of Frinton, Hamford, Holland & Kirby and Walton would have electoral variances below the district average by 10 per cent, 6 per cent, 2 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (10 per cent, 8 per cent, 1 per cent and equal with the district average by 2004 respectively). Homelands ward would have an electoral variance of 6 per cent above the district average (3 per cent by 2004).

73 During Stage One Tendring District Council forwarded to us copies of correspondence between the Town Council of Frinton & Walton and themselves. The Town Council opposed the District Council's proposed boundary between Holland & Kirby ward and the new Hamford ward. It proposed that electors to the north side of Frinton Road should be transferred into Hamford ward instead of the electors of Laburnum Crescent and Sycamore Way, as proposed by the District Council. It stated that transferring the necessary number of electors from the north side of Frinton Road into Hamford ward would improve community identity as these electors have more in common with the electors in the proposed Hamford ward than the electors of Laburnum Crescent and Sycamore Way. The Town Council of Frinton & Walton also put forward proposals for its parishing arrangements which are outlined later in the chapter.

74 Councillor Cook agreed with the Town Council of Frinton & Walton's comments on the District Council's proposed boundary between Hamford ward and Holland & Kirby ward. He also stated that the south-west and south-east corners of the Homelands estate had been excluded from Homelands ward and included in Hamford ward and Walton ward, which would create unnatural boundaries.

75 We have considered carefully all representations received. We endorse the District Council's proposal that this area be represented by four two-member wards and one single-member ward. We considered the opposing proposals of Tendring District Council and the Town Council of Frinton & Walton for a transfer of electors from Holland & Kirby ward into Hamford ward, which are outlined in the previous paragraphs. Having visited the area we noted that the access into Hamford ward is particularly good from the eastern entrance of Laburnum Crescent whereas the area to the north of Frinton Road would not have good access into the proposed Hamford ward. We also concluded that there was very little difference between the housing to the north and south of Frinton Road and therefore we decided to adopt the District Council's proposal as it provided better access and consequently more convenient and effective local government. In Frinton & Walton we have proposed modifications to the District Council's proposed boundaries in order to improve electoral equality and provide clear, identifiable boundaries. We propose including the 235 electors of Easton Way, Rainham Way and Warley Way in Frinton ward as opposed to Walton ward. We propose transferring the 95 electors of Elm Tree Avenue, Garden Road and Homelands Court into Hamford ward, included in Homelands ward under the District Council's proposals. We propose transferring into Holland & Kirby ward the 28 electors of Turpins Lane, included in Hamford ward under the District Council's proposals. Finally, we

propose transferring into Walton ward 60 electors from Kirby Road, included in Homelands ward under the District Council's proposals.

76 Under our proposals Frinton, Hamford, Holland & Kirby, Homelands and Walton wards would all have electoral variances below the district average by 3 per cent, 4 per cent, 1 per cent, 3 per cent and 6 per cent respectively (3 per cent, 6 per cent, equal to the district average, 6 per cent and 5 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Harwich

Harwich East, Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central

77 These four two-member wards cover Harwich town, which is situated in the far north-east corner of the district. Harwich East ward is 29 per cent over-represented, both initially and by 2004. Harwich East Central ward is currently 22 per cent over-represented (21 per cent by 2004), Harwich West ward is currently 19 per cent under-represented (28 per cent by 2004) and Harwich West Central ward is currently 14 per cent over-represented (13 per cent by 2004).

78 Tendring District Council proposed a reduction in the number of district councillors representing Harwich, from eight to seven. It also proposed modifications to the existing ward boundaries to improve electoral equality. It proposed transferring 885 electors into Harwich East Central ward from part of Harwich old town, currently in Harwich East ward, and part of the Pound Farm area, currently in Harwich West Central ward. It also proposed transferring 811 electors from part of the All Saints area, currently in Harwich West ward, into Harwich West Central ward. Harwich East ward and Harwich West ward would comprise the remainder of the existing wards. The District Council proposed that the wards of Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central should each be represented by two councillors while Harwich East ward should return one councillor.

79 Under the District Council's proposals the wards of Harwich East, Harwich East Central and Harwich West Central would have electoral variances of 5 per cent, 3 per cent and 3 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent, 4 per cent and 4 per cent by 2004). Harwich West ward would have an electoral variance of 5 per cent below the district average (5 per cent above by 2004).

80 Harwich Town Council proposed the retention of eight district councillors to represent Harwich. It proposed new ward boundaries for Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central wards which would improve electoral equality across the town as a whole.

81 Councillor Cook stated that the District Council's proposals for Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central wards would involve splitting estates and consequently communities, but made no alternative proposals.

82 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council's proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We noted that the electorate of Harwich town (based on 1999 and 2004 figures)

would be entitled to seven members under a 60-member council and cannot therefore recommend Harwich Town Council's scheme. We therefore intend adopting the District Council's proposals without modification and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the District Council's proposals. Our proposals are illustrated in Appendix A on Maps A2 and A3.

Brightlingsea

Brightlingsea East and Brightlingsea West wards

83 The two-member wards of Brightlingsea East and Brightlingsea West cover the town of Brightlingsea. Brightlingsea East ward is currently 10 per cent over-represented (11 per cent by 2004) and Brightlingsea West ward is currently 14 per cent over-represented (15 per cent by 2004).

84 Tendring District Council proposed a single-member Brightlingsea South ward and a two-member Brightlingsea North ward. It stated that Brightlingsea North ward would cover "most of the newer part of the town" while Brightlingsea South ward would "include the old part of the town". The District Council noted that these proposals would result in both wards having electoral variances of over 10 per cent. It stated that Brightlingsea was surrounded by water on three sides and that the "community identity of this urban area is very different from the adjoining parishes". It also stated that "the separation of Brightlingsea is further enhanced by the fact that only one road connects Brightlingsea to the remainder of the district".

85 Under the District Council's proposals the wards of Brightlingsea North and Brightlingsea South would both have electoral variances of 17 per cent above the district average (16 per cent in both wards by 2004).

86 Brightlingsea Town Council stated its opposition to the proposals put forward by Tendring District Council. It proposed a single three-member ward or, alternatively, three single-member wards. The Town Council felt that a single and two-member ward "could lead to feelings of being hard done by in the under-represented minority". It also stated that "a single-member ward for Brightlingsea would not coincide with a distinct area of the town". Brightlingsea Town Council also proposed an increase in the number of town councillors from 10 to 12, which is discussed later in the chapter.

87 Councillor Patrick and Councillor Bailey stated their "strong support for Tendring District Council's proposals for the warding of Brightlingsea". They stated their support for the "retention of Brightlingsea as a separate urban unit". They stated that the boundaries between the two wards, put forward by the District Council, "are easily identifiable on the ground and logical as far as the local electorate is concerned". Councillor Patrick and Councillor Bailey supported Brightlingsea Town Council's proposals for an increase in the number of town councillors.

88 Councillor Cook proposed that Thorrington parish should be included with Brightlingsea in order to create two two-member wards, which would greatly improve electoral equality. He argued that "the properties in Clacton Road, Thorrington are very similar to those in Church Road, Brightlingsea". Councillor Cook also stated that the District Council's proposed boundary

between Brightlingsea North ward and Brightlingsea South ward involved “an unnatural split in the community”, with a modern estate being included with the older pre-war part of the town.

89 We have considered carefully all the representations received and have decided to adopt the Town Council’s proposal for a single three-member ward, covering the whole of Brightlingsea. Having visited the area we agreed with Tendring District Council, Brightlingsea Town Council and Councillors Patrick and Bailey, that Brightlingsea should not be included in a ward with the neighbouring parish of Thorrington. The two areas are clearly very separate communities with a considerable area of open land separating them. Also, we could not identify an area of Brightlingsea that could be included in a ward with Thorrington while providing convenient and effective local government. Having decided that Brightlingsea should remain separate from neighbouring parishes we considered the arguments for three single-member wards, a single member and a two-member ward and a single three-member ward. After visiting the area we agreed with Brightlingsea Town Council that although there is an older and newer part of Brightlingsea the boundary put forward by Tendring District Council “would not coincide with a distinct area of the town”. We considered the boundaries put forward by Tendring District Council Labour Group for three single-member wards, however under a council size of 60, these proposals did not provide better electoral equality or clearer boundaries than those put forward by Tendring District Council.

90 We have noted the electoral variance of 17 per cent in Brightlingsea Town Council’s proposal, but having considered the geographical position of Brightlingsea in relation to the rest of the district we conclude that it is a separate and cohesive community. We therefore conclude that a three-member ward would provide a strong, clear boundary while reflecting community identity and providing convenient and effective local government. We propose that the ward should be called Brightlingsea. Under our proposals Brightlingsea ward would have an electoral variance of 17 per cent above the district average (16 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

The rural area

Alresford, Thorrington & Frating, Ardleigh and Elmstead wards

91 These three wards are situated on the western border of the district. The two-member ward of Alresford, Thorrington & Frating comprises the parishes of the same name and is 16 per cent over-represented, both initially and by 2004. The single-member wards of Ardleigh and Elmstead are coterminous with the parishes of the same name and are currently 11 per cent and 16 per cent over-represented respectively (12 per cent and 17 per cent by 2004).

92 Tendring District Council proposed new groupings of parishes in order to improve electoral equality. It proposed that the parish of Alresford, should form a single-member ward. It also proposed that Ardleigh parish should be included in a new ward with the parish of Little Bromley, currently in a ward with the parishes of Great Bromley and Little Bentley. This new single-member ward should be named Ardleigh & Little Bromley. The District Council proposed that the parishes of Frating and Thorrington should be included in a district ward with the parishes of Elmstead, currently in a ward that is coterminous with the parish, and Great Bromley, which is currently in a district ward with the parishes of Little Bentley and Little Bromley. It proposed that

this new ward should be named Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley and should return two councillors. The proposals for Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley ward were supported by Thorrington Parish Council. Ardleigh Parish Council stated that Ardleigh parish “should continue as one unit preferably with its own representative”.

93 Under the District Council’s proposals Alresford ward would have an electoral variance of 5 per cent below the district average (6 per cent by 2004). Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley ward and Ardleigh & Little Bromley ward would have an electoral variance above the district average by 3 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (3 per cent and 1 per cent below respectively by 2004).

94 Councillor Cook stated that Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead & Great Bromley ward was a “very ungainly ward that seems to have little support anywhere”, but did not propose an alternative.

95 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council’s proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore intend adopting the District Council’s proposals without modification and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the District Council’s proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley, Lawford & Manningtree and Mistley wards

96 These three wards are situated in the north of the district. The single-member Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley ward comprises the parishes of the same name and is currently 28 per cent over-represented (29 per cent by 2004). The two-member Lawford & Manningtree ward comprises the parishes of the same name and is currently 15 per cent under-represented (14 per cent by 2004). The single-member Mistley ward comprises the parish of the same name and is currently 3 per cent under-represented (10 per cent by 2004).

97 Tendring District Council proposed new groupings of parishes in order to improve electoral equality. It proposed that the parish of Lawford, should form a two-member ward. It proposed that the parishes of Little Bentley, Manningtree and Mistley should be included in a district ward with Tendring parish, to be named Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward. The parishes of Great Bromley and Little Bromley, currently in Great Bromley, Little Bromley & Little Bentley ward, should be included in new district wards, as outlined earlier in the chapter. It proposed that Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward should be represented by two councillors.

98 Under the District Council’s proposals, Lawford ward and Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward would have electoral variances 5 per cent and 8 per cent below the district average respectively (6 per cent and 5 per cent by 2004).

99 During Stage One Tendring District Council forwarded to us copies of correspondence it had received from the parishes of Little Bentley, Manningtree and Mistley; all three stated their opposition to the proposed grouping of parishes. All three parishes stated that Manningtree and

Mistley parishes have different concerns to those of Little Bentley and Tendring parishes. Little Bentley Parish Council stated that it favoured the existing warding arrangements, Manningtree parish stated it should be grouped with part of Lawford parish or part of Mistley parish and Mistley parish stated that it should retain the existing arrangements.

100 Councillor Cook stated that the District Council's proposals for Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward is "a truly bad choice of villages to link together into a two-member ward. He stated that Manningtree parish should be included in a ward with Lawford parish and that Mistley parish "warrants a single-member in its own right". However he did not provide electorate figures or suggested boundaries for these proposals.

101 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council's proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We looked at alternatives to the District Council's proposals for the proposed Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring ward, such as those put forward by Councillor Cook, however we could not identify a better alternative without splitting parishes between district wards, which we concluded was undesirable in this area. We would welcome further comments, and suggested alternatives, on this issue during Stage Three. We therefore intend adopting the District Council's proposals without modification and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as those proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Great Bentley, Little Clacton, St Osyth and Tendring & Weeley wards

102 Situated in the centre of the district, the wards of Great Bentley, Little Clacton and Tendring & Weeley are each represented by a single member, while St Osyth ward is represented by two members. Each ward is coterminous with the parishes of the same names. The number of electors per councillor in Great Bentley ward is currently 2 per cent above the district average (1 per cent below by 2004), 30 per cent above the average in Little Clacton ward (29 per cent by 2004), 6 per cent below the average in St Osyth ward (7 per cent by 2004) and 8 per cent above the average in Tendring & Weeley ward (7 per cent by 2004).

103 Tendring District Council stated that there should be no change to the electoral arrangements of Great Bentley ward and St Osyth ward. It proposed that the parish of Little Clacton should be included in a new ward with the parish of Weeley, currently in the ward of Tendring & Weeley, proposing that this new ward should be named Little Clacton & Weeley. The District Council also proposed that Tendring parish should be included in a new ward with the parishes of Little Bentley, Manningtree and Mistley, proposing that this new ward should be named Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley & Tendring (detailed earlier in the chapter).

104 Under the District Council's proposals, the wards of Great Bentley and Little Clacton & Weeley would have electoral variances of 2 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (1 per cent below and 3 per cent above by 2004). The ward of St Osyth would have an electoral variance of 6 per cent below the district average (7 per cent below by 2004).

105 The parish council of St Osyth supported the District Council's proposal for no change to the boundaries of St Osyth ward, however it put forward a new ward name of St Osyth & Point

Clear as it felt that this ward name better reflected the area within the ward boundaries. Great Bentley Parish Council put forward recommendations for new parish electoral arrangements, outlined later in the chapter. Tendring Parish Council stated that it should not be grouped in a district ward with the parishes of Manningtree and Mistley.

106 Councillor Cook made comments on the proposal to include Little Clacton and Weeley parishes together in a district ward stating that “the linking of these two parishes into a two-member ward crosses the boundary between constituencies, which will cause some elector confusion”. However, we are unable to take parliamentary constituency boundaries into account as they will be the subject of future review by the Parliamentary Boundary Commission.

107 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council’s proposals for these wards provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore intend adopting the District Council’s proposals with one modification, that St Osyth ward should be renamed St Osyth & Point Clear. Consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the District Council’s proposals. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Beaumont & Thorpe, Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix, Great & Little Oakley and Ramsey wards

108 These four wards are situated in the north-east of the district and are each represented by a single member. Beaumont & Thorpe ward comprises the parishes of Beaumont-cum-Moze and Thorpe-le-Soken and is currently 3 per cent under-represented (1 per cent by 2004). Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix wards is currently 2 per cent over-represented (4 per cent by 2004) and comprises the parishes of Bradfield, Wrabness and Wix. Great & Little Oakley ward is currently 7 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2004) and comprises the parishes of Great Oakley and Little Oakley. Ramsey ward is coterminous with the parish of Ramsey & Parkeston; the number of electors per councillor in Ramsey ward is equal to the district average, both initially and by 2004.

109 Tendring District Council proposed that there should be no change to the electoral arrangements of Beaumont & Thorpe, Bradfield, Wrabness & Wix and Great & Little Oakley wards. It proposed that the ward of Ramsey should retain its existing boundaries and number of councillors, however it put forward the new ward name of Ramsey & Parkeston, which it felt better reflected the area within the ward boundaries. The parishes of Beaumont-cum-Moze, Bradfield, Great Oakley, Ramsey & Parkeston and Wrabness all supported Tendring District Council’s proposals for the retention of the existing arrangements in this area.

110 We have considered carefully all the representations received and conclude that the District Council’s proposals for the retention of these wards will provide the best electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore intend adopting the District Council’s proposals without modification and consequently our recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the existing arrangements. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

111 We received one representation regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. Tendring District Council Labour Group submitted "that the whole council should be elected in May 2003" and that following this, elections should take place by halves.

112 In undertaking electoral reviews the Commission can only make recommendations that are consistent with existing legislation. On electoral cycles, the existing legislation provides for either whole-council elections or elections by thirds for shire district councils, consequently a system of elections by halves would require changes to the legislation.

113 We received no further submissions regarding the electoral cycle and accordingly we make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

Conclusions

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

- (a) a council of 60 members should be retained;
- (b) there should be 35 wards;
- (c) the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of three wards;
- (d) elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

115 Our draft recommendations are based on the proposals put forward by Tendring District Council and would involve modifications to 25 of the existing wards in Tendring district, as summarised below:

- (a) we propose adopting Tendring District Council's proposals in full in the rural parishes and Harwich;
- (b) we propose adopting Tendring District Council's proposals in Clacton-on-Sea except for minor modifications to the boundaries of Pier ward, St Johns ward and St Pauls ward;
- (c) we propose adopting Brightlingsea Town Council's proposal for a single three-member ward in Brightlingsea;
- (d) we propose modifications to the District Council's proposals in Frinton & Walton.

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

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	60	60	60	60
Number of wards	32	35	32	35
Average number of electors per councillor	1,768	1,768	1,820	1,820
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	18	1	19	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	8	0	10	0

117 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Tendring District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 18 to one. By 2004 only one ward is forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

Draft Recommendation

Tendring District Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 35 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

118 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Frinton & Walton & Harwich to reflect the proposed district wards.

119 The parish of Frinton & Walton is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards, Frinton ward and Walton ward each returning six parish councillors, Holland ward returning one parish councillor and Kirby ward returning three parish councillors. The Town

Council of Frinton & Walton stated that it wished to retain 16 councillors representing five wards, reflecting the proposed district ward boundaries. It proposed that the parish wards of Frinton, Holland & Kirby and Walton should return four parish councillors each, with Hamford ward and Homelands ward returning two councillors each.

Draft Recommendation
The Town Council of Frinton & Walton should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Frinton (returning four councillors), Hamford (returning two councillors), Holland & Kirby (returning four councillors), Homelands (returning two councillors) and Walton (returning four councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries as illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

120 The town of Harwich is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards. The parish wards of Harwich East, Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central each return four town councillors. As a consequence of our draft recommendations we propose modifying the town wards of Harwich Town Council to reflect the proposed district wards.

Draft Recommendation
Harwich Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, the same as at present, representing four wards, Harwich East, Harwich East Central, Harwich West and Harwich West Central wards each of which should return four town councillors. The town ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries as illustrated in Appendix A on Map A2 and A3.

121 The town of Brightlingsea is currently served by 10 councillors representing two wards, Brightlingsea East and Brightlingsea West, each returning five town councillors. Brightlingsea Town Council requested an increase in the number of town councillors to 12. This proposal was supported by Councillor Patrick of Brightlingsea Town and Tendring District Council and Councillor Bailey of Brightlingsea Town Council, who argued that “if the number is increased to 12 then the Town Council will have greater opportunity to consult the local community through smaller groups of councillors”.

Draft Recommendation
Brightlingsea Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, two more than at present, representing two wards: Brightlingsea East (returning six councillors) and Brightlingsea West (returning six councillors). The town ward boundaries should remain unaltered.

122 The parish of Great Bentley is currently served by 11 councillors and is not warded. Great Bentley Parish Council proposed a reduction in the number of parish councillors by two to nine councillors. The Parish Council “believes that it is more realistic for a community of this size to have no more than nine councillors”.

Draft Recommendation
Great Bentley Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, two fewer than at present, representing the whole parish.

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

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

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

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Tendering

5 NEXT STEPS

125 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 4 September 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the District Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

126 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

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

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Tendring: Detailed Mapping

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

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Harwich town.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed warding of Harwich town.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Clacton-on-Sea and Frinton & Walton.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Tendring: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Harwich Town

Map A3: Proposed Warding of Harwich Town

APPENDIX B

Tendring District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

Figure B1: Tendring District Council's Proposals: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Brightlingsea North	Brightlingsea East ward; Brightlingsea West ward (part – part of Brightlingsea West parish ward of Brightlingsea parish)
Brightlingsea South	Brightlingsea West ward (part – part of Brightlingsea West parish ward of Brightlingsea parish)
Frinton	Frinton ward (part); Walton ward (part)
Hamford	Frinton ward (part); Holland & Kirby ward (part); Walton ward (part)
Holland & Kirby	Frinton ward (part); Holland & Kirby ward (part)
Homelands	Holland & Kirby ward (part); Walton ward (part)
Pier	Rush Green ward (part); St James ward (part); St Marys ward (part); Southcliff ward (part)
St Pauls	Southcliff ward (part)
Walton	Walton ward (part)

Figure B2: Tendring District Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Brightlingsea North	2	4,149	2,075	17	4,208	2,104	16
Brightlingsea South	1	2,068	2,068	17	2,111	2,111	16
Frinton	2	3,189	1,595	-10	3,286	1,643	-10
Hamford	2	3,332	1,666	-6	3,353	1,677	-8
Holland & Kirby	2	3,473	1,737	-2	3,611	1,806	-1
Homelands	1	1,868	1,868	6	1,870	1,870	3
Pier	2	3,491	1,746	-1	3,723	1,862	2
St Pauls	2	3,585	1,793	1	3,595	1,798	-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 %
Walton	2	3,504	1,752	-1	3,627	1,814	0

Source: Electorate figures are based on Tendring District Council's submission.

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

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

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

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

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

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

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish

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

or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

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

(f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

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

(h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

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

