

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Portsmouth in Hampshire

*January 2000*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

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

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Portsmouth Conservatives' Proposed Electoral Arrangements Portsmouth City Council & Portsmouth Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>27</i>
B The Statutory Provisions	<i>31</i>

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



## SUMMARY

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

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

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

- **in four of the 13 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district, although no ward varies by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in four wards and by more than 20 per cent in one ward.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 89-90) are that:

- **Portsmouth City Council should have 42 councillors, three more than at present;**
- **there should be 14 wards, instead of 13 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In all of the proposed 14 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 4 per cent from the average for the city in 2004.**

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

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

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

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

*Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1 Baffins	3	Copnor ward (part); Milton ward (part)
2 Buckland & Stamshaw	3	Hilsea ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
3 Central Southsea	3	Havelock ward (part)
4 Copnor	3	Copnor ward (part); Fratton ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
5 Cosham	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part); Paulsgrove ward (part)
6 Craneswater & Highland	3	Highland ward (part); St Jude ward (part – Craneswater parish ward of Southsea parish)
7 Drayton & Farlington	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part)
8 Fratton	3	Fratton ward (part)
9 Hilsea	3	Hilsea ward (part)
10 Landport	3	Charles Dickens ward; Nelson ward (part)
11 Milton	3	Highland ward (part); Milton ward (part)
12 Old Portsmouth	3	Havelock ward (part); St Thomas ward (part – including Croxton parish ward of Southsea parish )
13 Paulsgrove	3	Paulsgrove ward (part)
14 Southsea	3	St Jude ward (part – Clarence and Kings parish wards of Southsea parish); St Thomas ward (part – Owens Garden parish ward of Southsea parish)

*Notes: 1 Southsea Parish covers the existing ward of St Jude and part of the existing St Thomas ward.  
2 Map 2 and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Portsmouth

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 Baffins	3	9,936	3,312	-3	10,308	3,436	-2
2 Buckland & Stamshaw	3	10,356	3,452	1	10,661	3,554	2
3 Central Southsea	3	10,727	3,576	5	10,402	3,467	-1
4 Copnor	3	10,279	3,426	0	10,531	3,510	0
5 Cosham	3	9,820	3,273	-4	10,113	3,371	-4
6 Craneswater & Highland	3	10,195	3,398	-1	10,495	3,498	0
7 Drayton & Farlington	3	10,651	3,550	4	10,251	3,417	-2
8 Fratton	3	10,352	3,451	1	10,629	3,543	1
9 Hilsea	3	10,425	3,475	2	10,875	3,625	4
10 Landport	3	10,542	3,514	3	10,633	3,544	1
11 Milton	3	10,199	3,400	0	10,500	3,500	0
12 Old Portsmouth	3	10,016	3,339	-2	10,668	3,556	2
13 Paulsgrove	3	9,722	3,241	-5	10,538	3,513	0
14 Southsea	3	10,245	3,415	0	10,380	3,460	-1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>143,465</b>	–	–	<b>146,984</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>3,416</b>	–	–	<b>3,500</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Portsmouth City Council.

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

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the City of Portsmouth in Hampshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 11 districts in Hampshire and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Portsmouth. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1979 (Report No. 338). Since undertaking that review the City of Portsmouth has become a unitary authority (1 April 1997).

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 B).

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

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

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

7 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Hampshire districts and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in our *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

12 Stage One began on 20 July 1999, when we wrote to Portsmouth City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Hampshire Local Councils Association, Southsea parish, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city and the Members of the European Parliament for the South East Region, and the headquarters of

the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999.

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

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

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The city of Portsmouth is a major maritime centre. Portsea Island, the larger part of the city, is divided by the Port Creek from the mainland wards. Portsmouth City has one parish, Southsea, situated in the far south of Portsea Island. The remainder of the city is unparished. The parished area covers the existing ward of St Jude and part of the existing St Thomas ward, and accounts for 12 per cent of the city'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 city 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 city is 143,465 (February 1999). The Council presently has 39 members who are elected from 13 wards, three of which cover the mainland with the remainder being on Portsea Island. All of the wards are represented by three councillors. The Council is elected by thirds.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Portsmouth City, with around 3 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in St Jude and St Thomas wards, with approximately 15 per cent and 14 per cent more electors respectively than 20 years ago. However, Cosham ward has decreased notably, with 13 per cent fewer electors.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,679 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 3,769 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 four of the 13 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the city average; no wards vary by more than 19 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Thomas ward where the councillor represents 19 per cent more electors than the city average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Portsmouth*

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 Charles Dickens	3	9,646	3,215	-13	9,542	3,181	-16
2 Copnor	3	11,829	3,943	7	11,784	3,928	4
3 Cosham	3	9,310	3,103	-16	9,407	3,136	-17
4 Drayton & Farlington	3	10,476	3,492	-5	10,166	3,389	-10
5 Fratton	3	10,943	3,648	-1	11,338	3,779	0
6 Havelock	3	11,139	3,713	1	10,926	3,642	-3
7 Highland	3	11,439	3,813	4	12,071	4,024	7
8 Hilsea	3	12,312	4,104	12	12,822	4,274	13
9 Milton	3	10,482	3,494	-5	10,805	3,602	-4
10 Nelson	3	11,069	3,690	0	11,705	3,902	4
11 Paulsgrove	3	10,407	3,469	-6	11,344	3,781	0
12 St Jude	3	11,313	3,771	3	11,192	3,731	-1
13 St Thomas	3	13,100	4,367	19	13,879	4,626	23
<b>Totals</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>143,465</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>146,981</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>3,679</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>3,769</b>	<b>–</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Portsmouth City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Cosham ward were relatively over-represented by 16 per cent, while electors in St Thomas ward were relatively under-represented by 19 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 Portsmouth City Council and its constituent parish council.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the City Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. At Stage One we received five representations, including city-wide schemes from the City Council, Portsmouth Labour Party, and two schemes from Portsmouth South Conservative Association, Portsmouth North Conservative Association and the Conservative Group on Portsmouth City Council (who made a joint submission). We also received representations from Southsea Parish Council and a local resident, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission.

#### **Portsmouth City Council**

23 During Stage One Portsmouth City Council undertook a consultation exercise in which it invited readers of a special edition of the City Council's magazine, *Flagship*, to indicate with which communities they identified, and to give their views on a proposal to divide the area into 14 wards. In its submission, the City Council proposed a council of 42 members, three more than at present, serving 14 wards compared to the existing 13, with changes proposed to all of the existing wards. It proposed retaining the existing pattern of entirely three-member wards with elections by thirds.

24 The Council proposed that there be three wards on the mainland, as at present, and 11 wards on Portsea Island, one more than at present. The additional ward would be located in the north of the island, in the North End area of the city. The City Council also proposed that the parished area be divided between three proposed wards for city election purposes, necessitating re-warding of Southsea Parish. It would provide improved levels of electoral equality with no ward varying by more than 7 per cent in 1999, improving to 2 per cent by 2004. The Council adopted the Labour Group Working Party's scheme, described in more detail below.

25 The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

#### **Portsmouth Labour Party**

26 Portsmouth Labour Party put forward identical proposals to those of the City Council. The Labour Party considered that features such as railway lines and major roads, "have never been relevant in constructing wards in this city" due to the density of population. It also did not consider the existing neighbourhood fora to be appropriate community markers as "the City Council has decided to replace them with new Area Committees" as part of its modernising agenda. It stated that it had consulted local members on its scheme, and that it had also had regard to the City Council's consultation, although it considered that the survey results were "statistically insignificant and therefore inconclusive". Additionally, it stated that it had considered the future

boundaries for the wards in Portsea Island based on the City Council's pre-1983 ward structure. All its proposed island wards, except for Copnor, North End and Havelock wards were based on these historic boundaries.

## **Portsmouth Conservatives**

27 Portsmouth South Conservative Association submitted two schemes on behalf of Portsmouth South Conservative Association, Portsmouth North Conservative Association, and the Conservative Group on the Council (referred to as Portsmouth Conservatives). It stated that both the Conservative Group and the associations objected to the City Council's submission.

28 The Association proposed two city-wide schemes, one based on a pattern of 10 wards, the other based on a pattern of 14 wards. It stated that the Conservative Group on the Council preferred the 10-ward option, whereas the Conservative associations accepted that the Council's consultation exercise had demonstrated the popularity of a council of 42 members, and therefore supported the 14-ward option. Both options would provide improved levels of electoral equality with no ward varying by more than 5 per cent under the 14-ward scheme, while under the 10-ward scheme no ward would vary by more than 7 per cent.

29 Portsmouth Conservatives' 14-ward scheme proposed a similar distribution of wards to the City Council, with three wards on the mainland, as at present, and 11 wards on Portsea Island, one more than at present. However, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that the additional ward be located in the east of the island, in the Baffins area of the city. Portsmouth Conservatives also proposed that the parish of Southsea be divided between three city wards, using existing parish wards as building blocks. It stated that boundaries had, where possible, been drawn "to reflect local communities as evidenced by the City Council's own Neighbourhood Forums". It also stated that change had been limited "to preserve continuity within the community".

## **Southsea Parish Council**

30 We received a scheme from Southsea Parish Council for the Portsea Island part of the city only. It accepted that any proposals to cover the parish would impact upon neighbouring areas, and therefore submitted proposals for the whole of the island. Southsea Parish Council's scheme did not include 1999 electorate data, nor did it provide complete five-year forecast electorate data.

## **Other Representations**

31 We received a further representation from a local resident objecting to any proposed increase in councillors.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

36 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 2 per cent from 143,465 to 146,981 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Paulsgrove ward, although a notable amount is also expected in Highland, Nelson and St Thomas wards. 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 City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

37 Portsmouth Labour Party formulated its submission using small area population forecasts, whereas Portsmouth Conservatives submitted five-year forecasts for their 10- and 14-ward submissions based on the electorate register plus estimated new development. The method used by Portsmouth Conservatives produced a slightly different total from the forecast electorate

provided by the City Council. We have consulted the City Council on the alternative methodologies used; officers do not consider that the method used by Portsmouth Conservatives is significantly inferior to that used by the Labour Party. However, with the consent of Portsmouth Conservatives, officers have revised their five-year forecast data using small area forecasts for comparative purposes.

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

## **Council Size**

39 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

40 Portsmouth City Council presently has 39 members. The City Council proposed a council size of 42, an increase of three. This council size was supported by Portsmouth Labour Party, the Conservative associations, acknowledging the strength of public feeling demonstrated by the consultation results, Southsea Parish Council and 70 per cent of the 1,053 respondents to the City Council's consultation document. The Conservative Group's preferred scheme was based on a council of 30, a reduction of nine. This council size was supported by a local resident.

41 The Commission will not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but will be prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. Portsmouth City is divided by the Port Creek, which most respondents argue is a clear physical boundary. The majority of respondents, including parties on the Council and Southsea Parish Council considered that this natural boundary should not be crossed. Portsmouth Labour Party considered that the creek "clearly separates the distinctive communities of the Island and the Mainland". Additionally, there was cross-party consensus for retaining the existing pattern of entirely three-member wards.

42 It is accepted that, given the general consensus that Port Creek be retained as a boundary and that three-member wards be retained throughout the city, retaining the existing council size of 39 would not be conducive to the achievement of good electoral equality, while reflecting the statutory criteria. Having accepted the consensus on these two issues, two ward patterns present themselves; a 10-ward, 30-member pattern, involving a reduction of three wards and nine members with two wards on the mainland and eight on Portsea Island, or a 14-ward, 42-member pattern, involving an increase of one ward and three members on Portsea Island. Both schemes would give improved representation between the mainland and Portsea Island, although the 14-ward option would more accurately reflect the population distribution between the mainland and Portsea Island. These two patterns would both provide for improved electoral equality. The 10-ward scheme was supported by the Conservative Group on the Council while the 14-ward option was supported by the City Council, the Labour Group, the Conservative associations and Southsea Parish. The Conservative Group did not provide an analysis of how the Council and its committees would function with a council of 30, and, given the lack of support both amongst political parties on the Council and the local people, we do not propose such a decrease in members as we are not persuaded it would facilitate more convenient and effective local government in Portsmouth.

43 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 42 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

44 Having proposed a council size of 42, we have carefully considered both 14-ward city-wide options proposed at Stage One, and the 11-ward scheme for Portsea Island provided by Southsea Parish Council. Both city-wide proposals would significantly improve electoral equality and have regard to communities (as identified in the City Council's consultation exercise). However, we consider that Portsmouth Conservatives' scheme would generally utilise clearer boundaries and better provide for convenient and effective local government in Portsmouth. This is particularly so in two areas. First, in the parished area the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's scheme would require re-warding the parish, whereas Portsmouth Conservatives' proposal used whole parish wards in this area. Second, the City Council's proposed Kingston Manor ward would join together communities separated by Kingston prison, the railway line and Kingston Cemetery. We consider that, in this area, Portsmouth Conservatives' proposal would provide for better boundaries and have more regard to communities, while providing for improved levels of electoral equality.

45 Portsmouth Conservatives' forecast electorate figures were based on existing electorate, adjusted for new developments, as indicated earlier. As a different methodology was used, Portsmouth Conservatives' total forecast electorate differed by 325 electors from the City Council's estimated forecast. We therefore asked the City Council's officers to adjust the Conservatives' data, to provide comparable calculations. This revision had a negligible impact on most of the Conservatives' proposals, however in the proposed wards of Central Southsea and Drayton & Farlington the revised electorate differed by 4 per cent (400 electors) from Portsmouth Conservatives' original calculations. This had an adverse effect on electoral variances in the wards concerned. Therefore, in light of the revised forecast electorate and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Conservatives' proposals in four areas. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Cosham, Drayton & Farlington and Paulsgrove wards;
- (b) Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards;
- (c) Havelock, Highland, St Jude and St Thomas wards;
- (d) Charles Dickens, Hilsea and Nelson wards.

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

## **Mainland wards**

### **Cosham, Drayton & Farlington and Paulsgrove wards**

47 Separated from the remainder of the city by the Port Creek, the wards of Cosham, Drayton & Farlington and Paulsgrove are each represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 16 per cent below the city average in Cosham ward (17 per cent below in 2004), 5 per cent below the average in Drayton & Farlington ward (10 per cent below in 2004) and 6 per cent below the average in Paulsgrove ward (equal to the average in 2004). Had the current council size been maintained, these imbalances would have necessitated a ward straddling Port Creek. However, under a 42-member council, the mainland continues to merit nine councillors.

48 At Stage One we received three representations relating to these wards. Both the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the ward boundary between Paulsgrove and Cosham wards should be modified so that it would run from the existing boundary at Southampton Road northwards along Washbrook Road, then eastwards along Lowestoft Road, between Norwich and Harwich roads, then north along Wymering Lane and continuing in a northerly direction to the city boundary. The Labour Party stated that it proposed transferring this part of Wymering to Cosham ward “because of long held community association and ties to Cosham, but also [because it] helps achieve the requisite ward tolerance”. The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party also proposed that the southern boundary of Paulsgrove ward be modified so that, instead of following Southampton Road westwards then following the M27 southwards to Port Creek, it would run southwards from the Johnson & Johnson roundabout to include the new development at Port Solent in Paulsgrove ward. This boundary would not be tied to an identifiable ground feature in the marina area.

49 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the boundary between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards be amended so that the area bounded by Dellcrest Path and Portsdown Hill Road would be transferred to Drayton & Farlington ward, and the area bounded by St Matthews Road westwards be transferred from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward. Portsmouth Labour Party commented that the Widley area “has always had strong links to the Drayton & Farlington area”.

50 Under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party’s proposals the number of electors per councillor in Cosham ward would be 5 per cent below the average (2 per cent below in 2004), 3 per cent above the average in Drayton & Farlington ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 7 per cent below in Paulsgrove ward (2 per cent below the average in 2004).

51 Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that the existing boundary between Paulsgrove ward and Cosham ward should be retained except for the area bounded by Braintree Road, Washbrook Road and Southampton Road, which would be transferred from Paulsgrove ward to Cosham ward.

52 Portsmouth Conservatives also proposed that an area north of Portsdown Hill Road be transferred to Drayton & Farlington ward, similar to the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party’s proposal. However, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that only Hilltop Crescent and part of Portsdown Hill Road be transferred. The Conservatives also proposed a transfer from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham, but proposed that a larger area be transferred, to include the area east of Widley Road down to Havant Road.

53 Under Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals the number of electors per councillor in Cosham ward would be equal to the average (unchanged in 2004), equal to the average in Drayton & Farlington ward (6 per cent below in 2004) and 5 per cent below in Paulsgrove ward (equal to the average in 2004).

54 We have carefully considered representations from the City Council, Portsmouth Labour Party and Portsmouth Conservatives and propose adopting, in part, the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposals and, in part, Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals for these wards. We propose following the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's boundary between Paulsgrove ward and Cosham ward to place the Ports Down site in Paulsgrove ward. This would avoid dividing the Ministry of Defence installations at Ports Down between two wards. We do, however, propose making a minor amendment in this area, aligning the boundary along Southwick Road, as under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal the boundary would not be tied to any ground detail. Additionally, we propose adopting the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal to transfer the area bounded by Dellcrest Path from Cosham ward to Drayton & Farlington ward. This would keep this small border community together. These two minor modifications would provide improved electoral equality and better boundaries. However, in the south of Paulsgrove ward, and in the west of Drayton & Farlington ward we propose adopting Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals as we consider they utilise strong boundaries and better reflect local communities in these areas. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Cosham ward would be 4 per cent below the average (unchanged in 2004), 4 per cent above the average in Drayton & Farlington ward (2 per cent below in 2004) and 5 per cent below in Paulsgrove ward (equal to the average in 2004). The proposed new warding arrangements for Portsmouth mainland are illustrated in the large map at the back of the report.

## **Portsea Island wards**

### **Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards**

55 Copnor ward is situated in the north-east of the island and is bounded by Fratton and Milton wards to the south. All three wards are each served by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 7 per cent above the city average in Copnor ward (4 per cent above in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Fratton ward (equal to the average in 2004) and 5 per cent below the average in Milton ward (4 per cent below in 2004).

56 At Stage One the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that Copnor ward be extended to include that part of Hilsea ward east of London Road. It proposed that the boundary then run eastwards along Amberley Road, southwards along Copnor Road to Laburnum Grove, then south again along Kensington Grove to Powerscourt Road, placing all properties west of these roads in a proposed new North End ward. The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed retaining Copnor ward's existing southern boundary.

57 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed creating a new North End ward comprising parts of the existing Fratton, Nelson, Hilsea and Copnor wards. The southern boundary of this new ward would follow Powerscourt Road, then follow London Road northwards, taking in the area surrounded by Gladys Avenue and London Avenue, then north, along Amberley Road. Portsmouth Labour Party stated that "this particular ward was instantly recognisable and acceptable" during consultation with party members.

58 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposed ward of Kingston Manor would comprise the remainder of the existing Fratton ward, and part of the existing Milton ward north of and including St Mary's Hospital, the new Miltoncross Secondary School, then following the Eastern Road to its junction with Tangier Road. The remainder of the existing Fratton ward, the area between Powerscourt Road and George Street, would form part of a proposed new Buckland ward (detailed later).

59 The modified Milton ward, to be renamed Milton Manor, would comprise the area south of the proposed Kingston Manor ward, extending southwards to Goldsmith Avenue, including part of the existing Highland ward generally north of Maxwell Landguard Road and Bransbury Park to the Henderson Park Caravan Site. Portsmouth Labour Party stated that this ward was based on a pre-1983 ward named Milton Manor.

60 Under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the city average in Copnor ward (unchanged in 2004), 5 per cent above the average in Kingston Manor ward (1 per cent above in 2004), 1 per cent above in North End ward (equal to the average in 2004) and 1 per cent below the average in Milton Manor ward (2 per cent above in 2004).

61 Portsmouth Conservatives proposed retaining the existing boundary between Copnor and Hilsea wards but proposed including polling district H1, part of the existing Nelson ward, in Copnor ward. They also proposed creating a new Baffins ward, which would include that part of the existing Copnor ward south of Burrfields Road, and that part of the existing Milton ward north of St James Hospital, Warren Avenue and Milton Cemetery. The boundary would then run eastwards through St Marys Hospital, although this section of the boundary would not be tied to ground detail. Portsmouth Conservatives further proposed that the existing ward of Fratton be retained, with a minor boundary modification to include the area from the northern part of Queens Road, east of Carnarvon Road in Copnor ward.

62 Finally, in this area Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that the northern boundary of Milton ward should be modified to create a new Baffins ward. The proposed Milton ward would include that part of the existing Highland ward north of Highland Road, then would continue due eastwards through Bransbury Park to the coast, again not following ground detail.

63 Under Portsmouth Conservatives' proposal the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the average in Copnor ward (unchanged in 2004), 1 per cent above the average in Fratton ward (unchanged in 2004) and equal to the average in Milton ward (unchanged in 2004).

64 Southsea Parish Council proposed that the boundaries of Copnor ward be generally retained, with minor amendments in the west and south of the ward. The Parish Council proposed the creation of a new North End ward, comprising parts of the existing Hilsea, Copnor, Nelson and Fratton wards. This ward would be bounded by London Road to the west, Amberley Road to the north, Wesbourne and Kensington Roads to the east, and Queens Road to the south. Fratton ward would also remain relatively unchanged, the only boundary modification being the transfer of that part of Fratton ward generally north of Queens Road to a new North End ward. Southsea Parish Council also proposed generally retaining the existing Milton ward, but proposed transferring the area generally north of Hayling Avenue to Copnor ward. The Parish Council did not provide detailed proposals for Copnor or North End wards.

65 Having visited the area we propose adopting the Conservatives' proposals as part of our draft recommendations for these wards as we consider that they would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Electors in the existing Fratton and Milton wards are separated by Kingston prison, the railway line and Kingston Cemetery. The City Council's Kingston Manor ward would straddle these features, which we consider would bring together distinct communities, currently divided by strong boundaries. We do not believe it would best reflect community identities to combine these areas. Portsmouth Conservatives' proposal would generally provide for better boundaries and have more regard to communities, while providing for improved levels of electoral equality.

66 However, we propose realigning the southern boundary of the proposed Baffins ward to run behind Andrew Close, Whitcombe Gardens and Livesay Gardens, and propose modifying the southern boundary of Milton ward to follow Bransbury Park, as proposed by the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party. These amendments would align the boundaries to ground detail and would not affect any electors. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the average in Copnor ward (unchanged in 2004), 1 per cent above the average in Fratton ward (unchanged in 2004) and equal to the average in Milton ward (unchanged in 2004). Our proposed Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Havelock, Highland, St Jude and St Thomas wards**

67 These four three-member wards are situated in the south of Portsea Island. Portsmouth's only parish, Southsea, is covered by the existing St Jude ward, and part of St Thomas ward. The number of electors per councillor is 1 per cent above the city average in Havelock ward (3 per cent below in 2004), 4 per cent above the average in Highland ward (7 per cent above in 2004), 3 per cent above the average in St Jude ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 19 per cent above the average in St Thomas ward (23 per cent above in 2004).

68 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that Havelock ward be modified slightly so the new boundary between Havelock ward and St Thomas ward follow Victoria Road, whilst the boundary with St Jude ward follow Outram Road, Livingstone Road and Lorne Road. It did not propose any other changes to St Thomas ward.

69 As a consequence of the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal for a new Milton Manor ward, the northern boundary of Highland ward would be modified, as described above. Additionally, the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the western boundary of Highland ward be extended to include part of Craneswater parish ward of Southsea parish, currently in St Jude ward. This would require the re-warding of Southsea Parish.

70 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party further proposed extending the northern boundary of St Jude ward to include part of Havelock ward, as described above, and part of Owens Garden parish ward currently in St Thomas ward. The boundary would then run northwards along Grove Road South and Elm Grove through St Andrews Road rejoining the current boundary with Havelock ward at Margate Road.

71 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the northern boundary of St Thomas ward be modified so that the area bounded by Middle Street, Brougham Road and Somers Road be included in Charles Dickens ward, which would be renamed Portsmouth Central ward. Under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent above the city average in Havelock ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Highland ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 2 per cent below in St Jude ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 2 per cent above the average in St Thomas ward (equal to the average in 2004).

72 Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that Highland ward be renamed Craneswater & Eastney ward, and in addition to the boundary change in the north of the ward, detailed above, proposed that Craneswater parish ward of Southsea parish be included in this ward. The remainder of Southsea parish would be located in the proposed Southsea ward (based on the existing St Jude ward), except for Croxton parish ward which would remain in St Thomas ward, to be renamed Old Portsmouth. Portsmouth Conservatives also proposed that the eastern boundary of Old Portsmouth ward be extended to include all of the western side of Victoria Road North.

73 Finally, in this area, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that Havelock ward be re-named Central Southsea, and that it remain unchanged except for the minor boundary change along its border with Old Portsmouth, as detailed above. Under Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent above the city average in Central Southsea ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Craneswater & Eastney ward (equal to the average in 2004), equal to the average in Southsea ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 2 per cent below the average in Old Portsmouth ward (2 per cent above in 2004).

74 Southsea Parish Council stated that "the distribution of the Parish between a number of City wards should be avoided", and had therefore "sought to keep the central commercial area of Southsea within one City ward". Southsea Parish Council did not provide 1999 electorate figures, and the forecast figures it provided were "best estimates". We have, therefore, not been able to provide electoral variances to illustrate its proposals.

75 The Parish Council proposed that a new Central Southsea ward be created using the parish wards of Croxton, Kings, Owens Garden and part of Clarence parish ward. It also proposed creating a new East Southsea ward containing the remainder of Clarence parish ward, Craneswater parish ward and that part of the current Havelock ward south of and including Fawcett Road, Delamere Road and Pretoria Road and that part of the current Highland ward generally west of Kimberley Road and polling district D8.

76 The Parish Council proposed that the northern boundary of the existing Highland ward be retained, and that it be renamed Eastney-Highland ward. It also proposed creating a new North Southsea ward, comprising the remainder of Havelock ward, plus that part of the existing St Thomas ward east of, but not including, Green Road and Grosvenor Street.

77 Finally in this area, the Parish Council proposed creating a new Old Portsmouth & Guildhall ward comprising that part of the existing St Thomas ward west of Pier Road, Jubilee Terrace, north of Kings Road and west of Green Road and Grosvenor Street. This ward would also include that part of Charles Dickens ward bounded by Fitzherbert Street, Staunton Street and Arundel Street, including the dockyard.

78 Having considered all the evidence available we propose adopting the Conservatives' proposals for these four wards as part of our draft recommendations in their entirety. We note that Southsea parish was created in April 1999, and consider it would not be in the interests of convenient and effective local government to propose modifications to the internal parish warding at this early date given that a scheme has been proposed which would facilitate the retention of the current pattern of parish warding. We have considered other options which would retain the parished area within two city wards, but have concluded that alternative proposals would result in higher levels of electoral inequality in the area as a whole. We have therefore concluded that Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals for this area, using whole parish wards, would provide the best levels of electoral equality whilst having regard to the statutory criteria.

79 However, we propose one ward name modification in this area. We note the lack of consensus over ward names in this area and, given the comments received during Stage One we propose renaming Portsmouth Conservatives' Craneswater & Eastney ward, Craneswater & Highland. We would welcome comments on this and other ward names during Stage Three. Under our proposals, the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent above the city average in Central Southsea ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Craneswater & Highland ward (equal to the average in 2004), equal to the average in Southsea ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 2 per cent below the average in Old Portsmouth ward (2 per cent above in 2004). Our draft recommendations for the wards of Central Southsea, Craneswater & Highland and Southsea are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Charles Dickens, Hilsea and Nelson wards**

80 The three-member wards of Charles Dickens, Hilsea and Nelson are situated in the west of Portsea Island. The number of electors per councillor is 13 per cent below the city average in Charles Dickens ward (16 per cent below in 2004), 12 per cent above the average in Hilsea ward (13 per cent above in 2004) and equal to the average in Nelson ward (4 per cent above in 2004).

81 During Stage One the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that Charles Dickens ward be re-named Central Portsmouth and that its southern boundary with St Thomas ward be amended, as described earlier. It proposed that the eastern boundary of the ward continue to follow Fratton ward, but proposed that the area bounded by Flathouse Road, Fitzherbert Street and Wingerfield Street be included in Nelson ward. The southern boundary of the modified Nelson ward would follow this boundary, then continue eastwards along Sultan Road to George Street and New Road East, then northwards along Copnor Road, westwards along Powerscourt Road following the existing Fratton ward boundary, northwards to Kingston Road, then westwards along Angerstein Road to Ranelagh Road. The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party also proposed Nelson ward be re-named Buckland.

82 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party further proposed a number of transfers from Hilsea ward to both Copnor ward and the proposed new North End ward, as detailed earlier. Under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the city average in Central Portsmouth ward (2 per cent above in 2004), equal to the average in Hilsea ward (1 per cent above in 2004) and 1 per cent below in Buckland ward (1 per cent above in 2004).

83 Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that the southern boundary of Charles Dickens ward be retained, as detailed earlier, but that the ward be extended northwards to include Washington Road and the area to the south of, and including, Malins Road, currently in the existing Nelson ward. They also proposed the ward be re-named Landport.

84 Portsmouth Conservatives further proposed including parts of Nelson ward in Copnor ward and Landport ward. It, however, also proposed that this ward be extended northwards to include polling district J1, and that it be re-named Buckland & Stamshaw ward.

85 Finally in this area, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed realigning the boundary between Hilsea ward and the proposed Buckland & Stamshaw ward as detailed above. Under Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the city average in Landport ward (1 per cent above in 2004), 2 per cent above the average in Hilsea ward (4 per cent above in 2004) and 1 per cent above in Buckland & Stamshaw ward (2 per cent above in 2004).

86 As detailed earlier, Southsea Parish Council proposed that most of the existing Charles Dickens ward be joined with parts of the existing St Thomas ward to create a new Old Portsmouth & Guildhall ward and that Nelson ward be extended southwards to include the remainder of St Thomas ward, which it proposed be re-named Harbourside. It further proposed that London Road be included in the proposed new North End ward and that the area north of Gruneison Road be included in Hilsea ward. Finally, it proposed that the area east of, and including, London Road, currently in Hilsea ward, be transferred to the proposed new North End ward. The Parish Council did not provide detailed proposals for Harbourside or Hilsea wards.

87 Both city-wide submissions would provide for improved electoral equality in these wards. However, we consider that, in the areas covered by the existing wards of Charles Dickens, Hilsea and Nelson, Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals would secure good electoral equality and use clear boundaries, often retaining existing boundaries, whilst having regard to local communities. Therefore, as part of our draft recommendations for these wards, we propose adopting Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals for the wards of Landport, Hilsea and Buckland & Stamshaw. Our proposals in this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the city average in Landport ward (1 per cent above in 2004), 2 per cent above the average in Hilsea ward (4 per cent above in 2004) and 1 per cent above in Buckland & Stamshaw ward (2 per cent above in 2004).

## **Electoral Cycle**

88 At Stage One the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party stated that there was consensus on retaining a system of elections by thirds. All city-wide schemes submitted provided for three-member wards throughout the city. Accordingly, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of elections by thirds.

## **Conclusions**

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

- (a) there should be an increase in council size from 39 to 42;
- (b) there should be 14 wards, one more than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one ward;
- (d) elections should continue to be held by thirds.

90 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- (a) we propose creating a new boundary between the wards of Paulsgrove and Cosham to better reflect community identity;
- (b) we propose adopting the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal for the northerly boundary between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards to include all electors in this area in one ward;
- (c) we propose amending the proposed boundary between Baffins and Milton wards to follow ground detail;
- (d) we propose amending the proposed boundary between Milton and Craneswater & Highland wards to follow ground detail.

91 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	39	42	39	42
Number of wards	13	14	13	14
Average number of electors per councillor	3,679	3,416	3,769	3,500
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	4	0	4	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	0	0	1	0

92 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Portsmouth City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the city average from four to none. By 2004 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 4 per cent from the average for the city.

**Draft Recommendation**

Portsmouth City Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 14 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

**93 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Portsmouth and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish 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 Portsmouth*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

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

95 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 0171 404 6142

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

96 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

## Portsmouth Conservatives' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ substantively from those put forward by Portsmouth Conservatives only in two wards, where the Conservatives proposals were as follows:

*Figure A1: Portsmouth Conservatives' Proposals: Constituent Areas*

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Cosham	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part); Paulsgrove ward (part)
2	Drayton & Farlington	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part)

## Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

*Figure A2: Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's Proposals: Constituent Areas*

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Buckland	3	Charles Dickens ward (part); Fratton ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
2	Central Portsmouth	3	Charles Dickens ward (part); St Thomas ward (part)
3	Copnor	3	Copnor ward (part); Hilsea ward (part)
4	Cosham	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part); Paulsgrove ward (part)
5	Drayton & Farlington	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part)
6	Havelock	3	Havelock ward (part)
7	Highland	3	Highland ward (part); St Jude ward (part – Craneswater parish ward (part) of Southsea parish)
8	Hilsea	3	Hilsea ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
9	Kingston Manor	3	Fratton ward (part); Milton ward (part)
10	Milton Manor	3	Highland ward (part); Milton ward (part)

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
11	North End	3	Copnor ward (part); Hilsea ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
12	Paulsgrove	3	Cosham ward (part); Paulsgrove ward (part)
13	St Jude	3	Havelock ward (part); St Jude ward (part – Clarence and King parish wards, and Craneswater parish ward (part) of Southsea parish); St Thomas ward (part – Owens Garden parish ward (part) of Southsea parish ward)
14	St Thomas	3	St Thomas ward (part) (including Croxton parish ward and Owens Garden parish ward (part) of Southsea parish)

Figure A3: Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party'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 %
1 Buckland	3	10,177	3,392	-1	10,634	3,545	1
2 Central Portsmouth	3	10,192	3,397	-1	10,697	3,566	2
3 Copnor	3	10,469	3,490	2	10,701	3,567	2
4 Cosham	3	9,780	3,260	-5	10,290	3,430	-2
5 Drayton & Farlington	3	10,599	3,533	3	10,342	3,447	-1
6 Havelock	3	10,670	3,557	4	10,391	3,464	-1
7 Highland	3	10,159	3,386	-1	10,433	3,478	-1
8 Hilsea	3	10,205	3,402	0	10,560	3,520	1
9 Kingston Manor	3	10,714	3,571	5	10,591	3,530	1
10 Milton Manor	3	10,156	3,385	-1	10,702	3,567	2
11 North End	3	10,322	3,441	1	10,457	3,486	-0
12 Paulsgrove	3	9,567	3,189	-7	10,288	3,429	-2
13 St Jude	3	10,006	3,335	-2	10,386	3,462	-1
14 St Thomas	3	10,448	3,483	2	10,512	3,504	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>143,464</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>146,984</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>3,416</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>–</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party.

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 city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



# APPENDIX B

## The Statutory Provisions

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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