

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Portsmouth in Hampshire

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

July 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 167

CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>3</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>7</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>9</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>35</i>
APPENDIX	
A Draft Recommendations for Portsmouth (January 2000)	<i>37</i>

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



Local Government Commission for England

25 July 2000

Dear Secretary of State

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

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although modifications have been made to the boundaries of six wards. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Portsmouth.

We recommend that Portsmouth City Council should be served by 42 councillors representing 14 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to conduct elections by thirds.

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

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

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Malcolm Grant'.

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT
Chairman

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Portsmouth on 20 July 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 18 January 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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 city, 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 132-133) 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;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

These 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 forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 8 per cent from the average for the city in 2004.**

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

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

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1 Baffins	3	Copnor ward (part); Milton ward (part)
2 Central Southsea	3	Havelock ward (part)
3 Charles Dickens	3	Charles Dickens ward; Nelson 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 Drayton & Farlington	3	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part)
7 Eastney & Craneswater	3	Highland ward (part); St Jude ward (part – Craneswater parish ward of Southsea parish)
8 Fratton	3	Fratton ward (part)
9 Hilsea	3	Hilsea ward (part)
10 Milton	3	Highland ward (part); Milton ward (part)
11 Nelson	3	Hilsea ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
12 Paulsgrove	3	Paulsgrove ward (part)
13 St Jude	3	St Jude ward (part – Clarence and Kings parish wards of Southsea parish); St Thomas ward (part – Owens Garden parish ward of Southsea parish)
14 St Thomas	3	Havelock ward (part); St Thomas ward (part – including Croxton 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 Final 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	10,331	3,444	1	10,695	3,565	2
2 Central Southsea	3	10,957	3,652	7	10,735	3,578	2
3 Charles Dickens	3	10,482	3,494	2	10,435	3,478	-1
4 Copnor	3	10,021	3,340	-2	10,102	3,367	-4
5 Cosham	3	10,061	3,354	-2	10,237	3,412	-3
6 Drayton & Farlington	3	10,289	3,430	0	10,003	3,334	-5
7 Eastney & Craneswater	3	10,575	3,525	3	10,886	3,629	4
8 Fratton	3	10,668	3,556	4	11,007	3,669	5
9 Hilsea	3	10,194	3,398	-1	10,585	3,528	1
10 Milton	3	9,940	3,313	-3	10,139	3,380	-3
11 Nelson	3	10,410	3,470	2	11,100	3,700	6
12 Paulsgrove	3	9,843	3,281	-4	10,677	3,559	2
13 St Jude	3	9,685	3,228	-5	9,699	3,233	-8
14 St Thomas	3	10,009	3,336	-2	10,747	3,582	2
Totals	42	143,465	-	-	147,047	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,416	-	-	3,501	-

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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Portsmouth in Hampshire. We have now reviewed 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 was 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 have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained 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* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

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

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

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

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

10 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/00 PER programme, including the Hampshire districts and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils, that 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.

11 This review was in four stages. 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 Council, 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. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

12 Stage Three began on 18 January 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Portsmouth in Hampshire*, and ended on 13 March 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

13 Portsmouth city covers an area of 4,196 hectares and has a population of some 190,400, giving a density of around 45 persons per hectare. Portsea Island, the larger part of the city, is divided by the Port Creek from the mainland wards. Portsmouth is traditionally a major maritime centre, but key areas of economic activity now include high technology, manufacturing, distribution and communication, financial services, and leisure and tourism. The 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 St Jude ward and part of St Thomas ward, and accounts for 12 per cent of the city's total electorate.

14 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'.

15 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. Each of the wards is represented by three councillors. The Council is elected by thirds.

16 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, the electorate in Cosham ward has decreased notably, with 13 per cent fewer electors than 20 years.

17 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 20 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 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
Totals	39	143,465	-	-	146,981	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,679	-	-	3,769	-

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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

18 During Stage One we received five representations, including city-wide schemes from Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Constituency 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 submissions from Southsea Parish Council and a local resident. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Portsmouth in Hampshire*.

19 Our draft recommendations were based on the Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a pattern of three-member wards across the city. However, we moved away from the Conservatives' scheme in a number of areas, affecting Paulsgrove, Cosham, Drayton & Farlington, Baffins, Milton and Craneswater & Highland wards, using parts of the schemes submitted by Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party, together with some of our own proposals. Our main draft recommendations were that:

- Portsmouth City Council should be served by 42 councillors, compared with 39 at present, representing 14 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one ward.

Draft Recommendation

Portsmouth City Council should comprise 42 councillors, serving 14 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

20 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all of the 14 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the city average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

21 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, 71 representations and 240 uniformly produced letters were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of Portsmouth City Council and the Commission.

Portsmouth City Council

22 The City Council objected to the draft recommendations for Portsmouth, particularly in the south-east of the city. It considered that the proposed Baffins, Milton and Craneswater & Highland wards did not reflect community identities. Additionally, it requested a public hearing to allow further evidence so that “the Commission understands fully the complexities of such a close knit urban area”.

23 The City Council further stated that at Stage One it had understood that variances from the average of over 2-3 per cent would not be acceptable, given the urban nature of the city; however, the draft recommendations contained variances above this assumed limit. It queried whether this was because permissible tolerances had increased.

24 The City Council requested that a ward covering the North End area be reconsidered. It also requested that Southsea parish should be re-warded, as it considered that the existing parish wards had not been set up with due care and attention. The City Council submitted two minor boundary amendments which would affect the boundary between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards, and between Milton and Baffins wards. Additionally, it objected to five proposed ward names, instead proposing that the existing ward names of Charles Dickens, Nelson, St Jude and St Thomas be retained and Craneswater & Highland ward should be renamed Eastney & Craneswater.

Portsmouth Conservative Group

25 The Conservative Group generally supported the draft recommendations for Portsmouth. It objected to claims made by Portsmouth Labour Party at Stage One, as it considered that it is important to retain the city’s existing parish ward boundaries, and that main roads and railway lines constitute strong boundaries.

26 The Conservative Group proposed a modification to the Cosham and Drayton & Farlington ward boundary so that the community north of Portsdown Hill, adjacent to the boundary with Havant borough, would be transferred from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward. It considered that these electors “might feel greater affinity” with Cosham ward. Similarly to the City Council, the Conservative Group proposed that Mill House be transferred from Milton ward to Baffins ward. Additionally, the Conservative Group proposed that the existing ward names of St Jude and St Thomas be retained and that Craneswater & Highland, Landport, Buckland & Stamshaw wards should be renamed Craneswater & Eastney, Guildhall, North End & Stamshaw respectively.

Portsmouth Liberal Democrat Group

27 The Liberal Democrat Group objected to the draft recommendations for Portsmouth, particularly in the south-east of the city. It called for “a Review in Public ... so that members of the public can be given an opportunity to voice their opinions”. It expressed disappointment that its proposals, as submitted to the City Council’s Strategic Advisory Panel on Governance (Governance Panel), had not been considered by the Commission at Stage One.

28 The Liberal Democrat Group also proposed that a ward be created in the North End area, similarly to the City Council and to Portsmouth Labour Party’s Stage One proposal.

Portsmouth Labour Party

29 Portsmouth Labour Party objected to the draft recommendations for Portsmouth, as a whole, on community identity grounds. It too requested a public inquiry. Similarly to the City Council, it also queried the assumed maximum permitted variance from the average. The Labour Party also proposed that Southsea parish be re-warded, although alternative parish ward boundaries were not proposed.

Other Representations

30 A further 68 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from Portsmouth North Conservative Association, Portsmouth South Conservative Association, St Thomas Branch Labour Party, Eastney, Milton and Old Portsmouth neighbourhood forums, three city councillors, a parish councillor, a member of staff at Portsmouth University and 57 local residents. We also received 240 uniformly produced letters.

31 Portsmouth North Conservative Association supported the draft recommendations, subject to proposing a boundary amendment between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards. It also proposed that Nelson ward should retain its existing name. Portsmouth South Conservative Association made identical proposals to those proposed by the Conservative Group, supporting the draft recommendations, but proposing that an area of Drayton & Farlington ward should be transferred to Cosham ward. It also proposed five ward name changes to provide a better reflection of the areas covered.

32 St Thomas Branch Labour Party objected to the proposed Old Portsmouth ward name, arguing that Old Portsmouth is only one of the communities in the proposed ward, instead proposing that it should be called West Southsea.

33 Eastney Neighbourhood Forum supported our draft recommendation for 14 wards in the city, but objected to the proposed Craneswater & Highland ward on community identity grounds. It also objected to the name of the ward but did not propose any alternatives. Milton Neighbourhood Forum proposed the retention of the existing Milton ward, objecting to our draft recommendation to create a new Baffins ward which would include the north of Milton ward. Old Portsmouth Neighbourhood Forum supported the draft recommendations, but proposed that St Jude and St Thomas wards should retain their existing names.

34 We received representations from three city councillors and one parish councillor. Councillor Worley, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group and member for St Thomas ward, supported the draft recommendations but objected to our draft recommendation to name the ward Old Portsmouth, and instead proposed that its existing name be retained. Councillor Heaney, member for Cosham ward, proposed a similar modification to the boundary between Drayton & Farlington ward and Cosham ward to that put forward by the City Council. He also objected to the western boundary of Cosham ward in the Wymering area. Councillor Crabbe, member for Charles Dickens ward, objected to the proposal that the ward should be renamed Landport. Councillor The Reverend Butler, a Southsea parish councillor representing Kings parish ward, supported the city ward names proposed in the draft recommendations, except for Craneswater & Highland ward, which he proposed should be named Eastney & Craneswater.

35 Dr Burnett, a member of staff in the Department of Geography at Portsmouth University, considered that communities have been divided by some proposed wards, requesting a public hearing in order to put proposals to the Commission in person.

36 We also received 57 representations from local residents. Although the majority of respondents supported the draft recommendations, particularly in the Southsea area, boundaries in the south-east of Portsea Island and ward names proved contentious. Twelve submissions were received from residents objecting to the modified Milton ward and proposing that its northern boundary be extended to include the Moorings Way area. Eleven respondents proposed that the community north of Portsdown Hill, situated on the boundary with Havant borough, should be transferred from Drayton & Farlington to Cosham ward.

37 A number of proposals were also received regarding our draft recommendations for ward names. Alternative ward names were proposed for most wards on Portsea Island. Respondents generally argued in favour of retaining the existing “neutral” names, considering that geographical ward names did not always accurately reflect the communities within the wards.

38 We received uniformly produced letters from 240 local residents, which echoed the views expressed by the Conservative Group and Portsmouth South Conservative Association, expressing general support for the draft recommendations. In particular, it was proposed that the community north of Portsdown Hill be transferred from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward, and that the existing ward names of St Jude and St Thomas be retained and that Craneswater & Highland and Landport wards should be renamed Craneswater & Eastney (or East Southsea) and Guildhall respectively.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

39 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Portsmouth is, so far as is reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the 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”.

40 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 also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

41 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.

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

Electorate Forecasts

43 At Stage One 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 expected 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 estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, and the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

44 The City Council formulated its Stage One submission using small area population forecasts, whereas Portsmouth Conservatives submitted five-year forecasts based on the electorate register plus estimated new development, producing a slightly different total from the forecast electorate provided by the City Council. With the consent of Portsmouth Conservatives, officers from the

City Council revised Portsmouth Conservatives' five-year forecast data using small area forecasts for comparative purposes.

45 During Stage Four Portsmouth City Council revisited this revised five-year forecast data, upon which the draft recommendations were based, and found that there had been a data transfer error affecting 11 out of 14 wards. This would have a marginal affect on electoral variances for these wards, which we do not consider materially impacts on the proposals for wards contained in the draft recommendations. We accept that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the revisited forecast electorates, we are satisfied that they represent the best estimates that could reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

46 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 carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

47 Portsmouth City Council is at present served by 39 councillors. At Stage One 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, 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.

48 In our draft recommendations we noted that Portsmouth is divided by the Port Creek, which most respondents argued is a clear physical boundary. The majority of respondents, including parties on the City Council and Southsea Parish Council, considered that this natural boundary should not be crossed. Additionally, there was cross-party consensus for retaining the existing pattern of entirely three-member wards. We considered that, given the consensus over these two issues, retaining the existing council size of 39 would not be conducive to the achievement of good electoral equality, given that 13 three-member wards would not achieve the correct representation for the electorate either side of Port Creek.

49 We considered the two ward patterns proposed at Stage One; 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. We noted that the 14-ward option would more accurately reflect the population distribution between the mainland and Portsea Island, while providing for improved electoral equality. We also noted that the 14-ward option was supported by the City Council, the Labour Group, the Conservative associations and Southsea Parish. We concluded, therefore, given the evidence submitted to us and the degree of consensus behind the 14-ward option, that a council size of 42 would better facilitate convenient and effective local government in Portsmouth. Therefore, we considered that, given the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, a council of 42 members for Portsmouth should be adopted as part of our draft recommendations.

50 During Stage Three a resident of Cosham ward proposed a 28-member council, comprising 14 two-member wards, considering that 42 members would entail a surplus of councillors should new structures be implemented. A resident of St Jude ward preferred the existing council size. Given the representations received at Stage One, the general support for a council of 42 at Stage Three, and the achievement of improved electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria, we are confirming our draft recommendation for a council of 42 members as final.

Electoral Arrangements

51 As set out in our draft recommendations report, having proposed a council size of 42, we 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 considered 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 considered 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.

52 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. During Stage Two, 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.

53 We recognised the generally improved electoral equality achieved by the Conservatives' scheme, compared to the existing arrangements and we therefore adopted their proposals as the basis of our draft recommendations. However, in light of the revised forecast electorate and having regard to local community identities and interests, we moved away from the Conservatives' proposals in four areas.

54 Following publication of the draft recommendations a number of anomalies regarding electorate data were brought to our attention. First, almost 600 electors were incorrectly allocated in the Waverley Road area of Southsea parish under the Conservatives' Stage One proposals, both in 1999 and 2004. Second, the City Council found that there had been a data transfer error, affecting 11 out of 14 wards, under the revised five-year forecast data provided for the Conservatives. Third, in adopting the Conservatives' proposals we interpreted their mapping in a number of places where it was unclear, for the purposes of our draft recommendations. In these

areas we proposed that boundaries followed the centre of roads. However, at Stage Three, it was drawn to our attention that the electorate figures provided with the Conservatives' scheme for both 1999 and 2004 were based on the premise that a number of the boundaries would run along backs of houses or parts of streets.

55 Consequently, there would be a marginal affect on electoral variances in most wards, under both 1999 and 2004 electorate. The amended 2004 ward-by-ward breakdown, when combined with the correction to the Conservatives' data in the Southsea area and the revisions necessary to ensure that the figures reflected the mapping would have a marginal impact on most wards. However, in Southsea ward, these three problems combined would have an adverse affect on electoral variances in the ward. Southsea ward's electorate would be reduced by 681, resulting in the variance from the city average worsening from 1 per cent below the city average under the draft recommendations to 8 per cent below in 2004.

56 Given the revisions to the published data, we asked the City Council to examine the accuracy of these revised 1999 and 2004 figures. Portsmouth City Council's Chief Executive has stated "I am satisfied that they represent accurately the electorate for each ward. You have my assurance, therefore, that you can place confidence on them in reaching your final decisions". Based on this assurance, we have confidence in the revised data provided.

57 At Stage Three Portsmouth City Council, Portsmouth Labour Party, Portsmouth Liberal Democrat Group, Eastney Neighbourhood Forum, Milton Neighbourhood Forum and a local resident requested a public hearing. However, as stated in our *Guidance*, we generally only hold public meetings when we need to secure additional evidence on specific issues. In the case of Portsmouth, we did not believe that there were such issues on which we had not already received evidence, and therefore did not hold a public meeting.

58 We also received a number of proposals regarding our draft recommendations for ward names. In general it was considered that a number of the names included in our draft recommendations did not properly reflect the areas covered. Where there was a degree of consensus expressed at Stage Three we have moved away from our draft recommendations for ward names where appropriate. These are discussed in the relevant sections.

59 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. 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.

60 Details of our final 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

61 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, to correct the current over-representation. However, under a 42-member council, the mainland continues to merit nine councillors.

62 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 should be modified so that, instead of following Southampton Road westwards then following the M27 southwards to Port Creek, it should 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.

63 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the boundary between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards should 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 would 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”.

64 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 in 2004).

65 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.

66 Portsmouth Conservatives also proposed that an area north of Portsdown Hill Road should be transferred to Drayton & Farlington ward, similar to the City Council’s and Portsmouth Labour Party’s proposal. However, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that only Hilltop Crescent and

part of Portsdown Hill Road should be transferred. The Conservatives also proposed a transfer from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward, but proposed that a larger area should be transferred, to include the area east of Widley Road down to Havant Road. 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).

67 We carefully considered the representations from the City Council, Portsmouth Labour Party and Portsmouth Conservatives and adopted, in part, the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposals and, in part, Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations. The draft recommendations followed the City Council's and Portsmouth Labour Party's boundary between Paulsgrove ward and Cosham ward to place the Ports Down site in Paulsgrove ward, thus avoiding dividing the Ministry of Defence installations at Ports Down between two wards. We made a minor amendment in this area, aligning the boundary along Southwick Road, as under the City Council's and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal the boundary would not have been tied to any ground detail. Additionally, we adopted the City Council's and Portsmouth Labour Party's proposal to transfer the area bounded by Dellcrest Path from Cosham ward to Drayton & Farlington ward, thus keeping this small community together. These two minor modifications provided improved electoral equality and, we judged, more clearly identifiable boundaries. In the south of Paulsgrove ward, and in the west of Drayton & Farlington ward we adopted Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals as we considered they utilised strong boundaries and better reflected local communities in these areas.

68 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).

69 In their Stage Three response to our draft recommendations, Portsmouth Conservative Group, Portsmouth North Conservative Association, Portsmouth South Conservative Association and 11 residents proposed that those properties north of Portsdown Hill, adjacent to the Havant boundary, should be transferred from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward. The 240 standard letters also proposed this transfer.

70 Portsmouth City Council proposed that the Railway Cottages, six properties in the "Railway Triangle", currently in Cosham ward, should be transferred from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward. Councillor Heaney, member for Cosham, also proposed this transfer. A resident of Fratton ward objected to wards being named after districts or communities, preferring locally famous people. He proposed that Cosham, Drayton & Farlington and Paulsgrove be renamed after Graham Hurley, James Deverell and Alec Rose respectively.

71 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have found that there is a degree of support for our draft recommendations. In the case of the Portsdown Hill area, we consider that this amendment, proposed by the Conservatives, 11 residents and the 240 standard letters, would provide a significant worsening of electoral equality which would not be justified in terms of better meeting the statutory criteria.

72 However, having revisited the area, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations and modify the proposed boundary between Cosham and Drayton & Farlington wards to include the Railway Cottages in Cosham ward. We note that these properties have access to Cosham ward via a pedestrian bridge over the railway line but are relatively remote from the remainder of Drayton & Farlington ward. We also note that this proposed transfer would only affect 11 electors. Having considered the evidence we propose adopting the City Council's and Councillor Heaney's proposals as we consider it would provide for more convenient and effective local government than the draft recommendations. The adjacent industrial estate would remain united in Drayton & Farlington ward, as under our draft recommendations.

73 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the three mainland wards as final, with the exception of this amendment, as it would achieve reasonable electoral equality and has received some local support. As explained earlier, a data transfer error required adjustments to the forecast electorate data as shown in our draft recommendations. This has had only a marginal affect on ward variances in almost all wards. Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Cosham ward would be 2 per cent below the average (3 per cent in 2004), equal to the average in Drayton & Farlington ward (5 per cent below in 2004) and 4 per cent below in Paulsgrove ward (2 per cent above in 2004). The proposed new warding arrangements for Portsmouth mainland are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Portsea Island wards

Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards

74 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).

75 At Stage One the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that Copnor ward should 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.

76 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.

77 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).

78 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.

79 Under the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party’s Stage One 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).

80 At Stage One 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 should 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. 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.

81 Under Portsmouth Conservatives’ proposal the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below in Baffins ward (2 per cent in 2004), 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).

82 Southsea Parish Council proposed at Stage One that the boundaries of Copnor ward should 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.

83 Having visited the area, we adopted the Conservatives' proposals as part of our draft recommendations for these wards as we considered that they would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We noted that electors in the existing Fratton and Milton wards are separated by Kingston prison, the railway line and Kingston Cemetery. The City Council's proposed Kingston Manor ward would straddle these features, which we considered would combine distinct communities, currently divided by strong boundaries. We did 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. We proposed only minor amendments which would align the boundaries to ground detail and would not affect any electors. We proposed realigning the southern boundary of the proposed Baffins ward to run behind Andrew Close, Whitcombe Gardens and Livesay Gardens, and modifying the southern boundary of Milton ward to follow Bransbury Park, as proposed by the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party.

84 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below in Baffins ward (2 per cent in 2004), 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).

85 At Stage Three Portsmouth Conservative Group supported the proposed Baffins, Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards, stating that the boundaries of these wards are "considered acceptable as they follow readily identifiable and significant ground features", and that the communities are, to a large extent, drawn from the local Neighbourhood Forums. However, the Conservative Group proposed a minor change to the boundary between Baffins and Milton wards, so that Mill House Hostel is transferred to Baffins ward, creating more identifiable boundaries in this area. This was supported by Portsmouth South Conservative Association.

86 The City Council, the Liberal Democrat Group, Portsmouth Labour Party and Milton Neighbourhood Forum objected to our proposals for a new Baffins ward and a modified Milton ward. Portsmouth City Council stated its concern that "the new 'mix' of some areas will lead to a breaking up of what has become well established areas with their own 'community identity' ". It stated that the existing Milton ward has historic links based around St James' Church, that residents north of St James' Hospital "form part of a local community with close associations with the rest of southern Milton", and are separated from properties north of Eastern Road by Milton Common. It also noted that the new Miltoncross Secondary School, "intended to have ties with the Milton area" would be placed in Baffins ward under the draft recommendations. The City Council, similarly to the Conservative Group, also proposed that Mill House Hostel be transferred from Milton ward to Baffins ward.

87 Portsmouth Liberal Democrat Group stated that the draft recommendations “for the Baffins, Milton and Highland areas divide very well defined communities with a clear sense of identity” and that they “have produced considerable concern in Milton, Eastney and Southsea”.

88 Portsmouth Labour Party continued to support its Stage One proposed Kingston Manor ward, stating that the Baffins Community Association’s ‘area of benefit’ crosses the railway line (the proposed ward would have also crossed the railway line). It opposed the draft recommendations in the Milton area as it considered that they would not reflect local community identities.

89 Milton Neighbourhood Forum objected to the draft recommendations, stating “the number of Electors per Councillor is not a burning issue locally. We believe that different parts of the City have different needs”, arguing for a variable councillor:elector ratio across the city. It proposed that Milton ward’s existing boundaries should be retained, arguing that the historic Milton community, defined by the ecclesiastical parish boundary, would be split under the draft recommendations. It also added that the proposed arrangements would not provide for convenient and effective local government, as local issues, such as nuisance associated with Portsmouth FC, would be split between the new Baffins ward and the modified Milton ward. Additionally, it stated its concern that the new Miltoncross Secondary School, to be placed in Baffins ward under the draft recommendations, would see its catchment area redirected “away from Milton to the more northerly areas”.

90 A resident of Fratton ward objected to wards being named after districts or communities, preferring them to be named after famous people. He proposed that Copnor, Fratton and Milton wards be renamed after James Callaghan, Cosmo Lang and Arthur Conan Doyle respectively. He did not propose an alternative ward name for Baffins ward, but noted that Isambard Brunel and Rudyard Kipling were unallocated.

91 We also received representations regarding this area from two residents of Havelock ward, three residents of Highland ward and 16 residents of Milton ward. The Havelock ward residents supported the draft recommendations for Portsmouth and those for Milton in particular, considering that the proposed ward is “based on what many others and we call ‘Milton Village’”. A resident of Highland ward objected to the proposal to transfer the area in the north of the existing Highland ward to a modified Milton ward. A second Highland ward resident proposed that Milton ward be renamed, as it covers a far different area than the existing ward. No alternative ward name was proposed. A third resident of Highland ward and the residents of Milton ward generally proposed that Milton Common and the Moorings Way area be transferred from Baffins ward to Milton ward.

92 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received, including the proposals to transfer the Moorings Way from Baffins ward to Milton ward. However, we are unable to accommodate such large-scale modifications without substantially reconfiguring warding patterns in the remainder of the city or incurring significant worsening of electoral equality. We do not consider that the community identity arguments received in this area are strong enough to justify such a change. Additionally, as explained earlier, discrepancies were discovered between the Conservatives’ Stage One proposals and the mapping provided in our draft recommendations. We visited each of the boundaries affected and concluded in most cases that those shown in the mapping contained in our draft recommendations are the most clearly

identifiable. However, we propose making a minor amendment to the boundary between Baffins and Milton wards to better reflect the Conservatives' Stage One proposals, so that Heron Close and Samuel Lodge are placed in Baffins ward, rather than Milton ward as under our draft recommendations. Given that this revised boundary reflects the Conservatives' original proposal, there would be no change to the electoral variances. Subject to this amendment we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

93 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the average in Baffins ward (2 per cent in 2004), 2 per cent below in Copnor ward (4 per cent in 2004), 4 per cent above in Fratton ward (5 per cent in 2004) and 3 per cent below in Milton ward (unchanged in 2004). Our recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Havelock, Highland, St Jude and St Thomas wards

94 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).

95 At Stage One the City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that Havelock ward should be modified slightly so the new boundary between Havelock ward and St Thomas ward would follow Victoria Road, whilst the boundary with St Jude ward would follow Outram Road, Livingstone Road and Lorne Road. It did not propose any other changes to St Thomas ward. As a consequence of the City Council's and Portsmouth Labour Party's Stage One 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 should 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. 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.

96 The City Council and Portsmouth Labour Party proposed that the northern boundary of St Thomas ward should 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's and Portsmouth Labour Party's Stage One 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).

97 At Stage One Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that Highland ward should 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 should 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.

98 Finally, in this area, Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that Havelock ward should be renamed Central Southsea, and that it should remain unchanged except for the minor boundary change along its border with Old Portsmouth, as detailed above. Under Portsmouth Conservatives' Stage One 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).

99 Southsea Parish Council stated at Stage One 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".

100 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. 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. 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.

101 We considered all the evidence available and adopted the Conservatives' proposals for these four wards as part of our draft recommendations in their entirety. We noted that Southsea parish was created in April 1999, and considered 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 was proposed which would facilitate the retention of the current pattern of parish warding. We considered other options which would retain the parished area within two city wards, but concluded that alternative proposals would result in higher levels of electoral inequality in the area as a whole. We 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 and included them as part of our draft recommendations. However, we proposed one ward name modification in this area. We noted the lack of consensus over ward names in this area and, given the comments received during Stage One we renamed Portsmouth Conservatives' Craneswater & Eastney ward, Craneswater & Highland.

102 Under our draft recommendations, 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).

103 At Stage Three the City Council, the Liberal Democrat Group, the Labour Party and Eastney Neighbourhood Forum objected to the proposed Craneswater & Highland ward. In particular, the City Council noted that Eastney Community Centre would be located outside the boundary of the proposed new ward. Additionally, the City Council argued that the ward would be "some three miles in length and a half mile wide and is considered to be of a shape that would not provide the most effective or convenient local government". The City Council also objected to the use of whole parish wards as ward boundaries in the parished area and proposed that the parish be re-warded. However, it did not put forward an alternative.

104 Portsmouth Liberal Democrats and Portsmouth Labour Party each objected to the proposed Craneswater & Highland ward, considering that it would divide communities. Both groups also proposed that the parish of Southsea be re-warded, the Liberal Democrats stating that "the proposal to create ward boundaries that reflect Southsea Parish ward boundaries is illogical". Eastney Neighbourhood Forum supported the proposed increase in wards from 13 to 14. However, it objected to the proposed new Craneswater & Highland ward, considering the ward would not provide for convenient and effective local government due to the ward's shape. Eastney Neighbourhood Forum also objected to the modified Milton ward, arguing that "the proposals would cut the current Eastney Community approximately in half". A Highland ward resident opposed the draft recommendations for Southsea ward, considering that the ward's shape would not provide for convenient and effective local government. This resident instead proposed the ward be "more of a box shape".

105 Portsmouth Conservative Group and Portsmouth South Conservative Association supported the proposed Central Southsea, Craneswater & Highland, Old Portsmouth and Southsea wards. The Conservative Group and Conservative Association also questioned the validity of Eastney Neighbourhood Forum's claims, stating that when the review was discussed at the Neighbourhood Forum only ward names were discussed. A resident of Highland ward supported the comments made by the Conservatives. Old Portsmouth Neighbourhood Forum and Councillor Worley, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group and member for St Thomas ward, each supported the draft recommendations.

106 A resident of St Jude ward supported the draft recommendations but proposed that the boundary between Southsea and Craneswater & Highland wards follow the centre of Waverley Road and Bourgogne Road, rather than using whole parish wards. Another resident of St Jude ward supported the proposed increase in councillors from 39 to 42. Three residents of Havelock

ward, two residents of Highland ward, four residents of St Jude ward and two residents on the boundary between St Jude and St Thomas ward generally supported the draft recommendations.

107 The City Council proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward should be renamed Eastney & Craneswater, and that Old Portsmouth and Southsea wards should retain their existing names of St Thomas and St Jude. It stated that the Old Portsmouth ward name could lead to confusion, as the ward “would cover an extensive area outside of that which is historically known as ‘Old Portsmouth’ ”. It added that the existing St Jude ward name derives from St Jude’s Church, “a major landmark in the area”, whereas Southsea “is more properly associated with a much larger area”.

108 Portsmouth Conservative Group proposed that Craneswater & Highland, Old Portsmouth and Southsea wards should be renamed. It proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward should be renamed Craneswater & Eastney. It further proposed that Old Portsmouth should retain the name St Thomas, “after the name of the Cathedral, a significant building within the ward”. Finally, it proposed that Southsea ward should retain the name St Jude, “after the name of the Church ... that was designed to be the focus of this part of the city when Southsea was laid out”. These alternative ward names were supported by Portsmouth South Conservative Association. A resident of Highland ward, a resident of St Jude ward, a resident of St Thomas ward and the standard letter, submitted by 240 residents, supported these alternative ward names. These residents also proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed either Craneswater & Eastney or East Southsea.

109 The Liberal Democrat Group objected to ward names in the Southsea area, stating that they do not reflect community identities. Eastney Neighbourhood Forum objected to the ward name Craneswater & Highland, stating “electoral wards must have names which are not the geographic name of the area for fear of confusing the community identities”. It proposed either the retention of the existing name, Highland, or “a new electoral name to reflect the changed boundaries”. Old Portsmouth Neighbourhood Forum objected to the proposed Southsea and Old Portsmouth ward names and instead proposed the retention of the existing St Jude and St Thomas names. St Thomas Branch Labour Party objected to the proposal to rename St Thomas ward, Old Portsmouth. It stated that the Old Portsmouth area “covers less than a quarter” of the electorate in the proposed ward. It proposed instead that the ward be named West Southsea.

110 Councillor Worley, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group and member for St Thomas ward, proposed retaining the existing ward name of St Thomas. Councillor Worley stated that the Old Portsmouth name would not been understood by those who live in the ward’s other communities, such as Southsea. Councillor The Reverend Butler, parish councillor for Kings parish ward of Southsea parish, proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed Eastney & Craneswater. A resident of Fratton ward, objecting to wards being named after districts or communities, preferring instead locally famous people, proposed that Craneswater & Highland (described as Eastney), Old Portsmouth and Southsea wards be renamed after Betty Burton, John Pounds and Peter Sellers respectively. As with Baffins ward, he did not propose an alternative ward name for Central Southsea ward, but noted that Isambard Brunel and Rudyard Kipling were unallocated.

111 A Havelock ward resident, a resident of Paulsgrove ward, three residents of St Jude ward, and a resident of St Thomas ward objected to the proposed Southsea and Old Portsmouth ward names, proposing that the existing St Jude and St Thomas names be retained. A resident of Milton ward supported these proposals, and additionally proposed that Central Southsea be renamed Southsea Central. A resident of St Jude ward also supported these proposals, and additionally proposed that Havelock ward's name be retained.

112 Two residents of Highland ward proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed, one proposing East Southsea, the other proposed that the ward be given a "neutral" name such as Cumberland or Cockleshell. Seven residents of St Jude ward objected to Craneswater & Highland ward's name. Five of these residents proposed alternative names: Craneswater, Craneswater & East Southsea, Eastney, East Southsea or Eastney, Southsea East or Eastney & Southsea. Two residents of St Jude ward, three residents of St Thomas ward and a resident on the boundary between St Jude and St Thomas ward objected to Craneswater & Highland ward's name; three of these residents instead proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed East Southsea. A resident of St Thomas ward proposed that the "existing and traditional" naming of wards be retained and also proposed that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed East Southsea.

113 We have carefully considered the representations received in response to our draft recommendations. We note the arguments against our proposed Craneswater & Highland ward, but, as explained earlier, we are unable to consider any single area in isolation but must have regard to the impact which any modification would have upon the proposals for the whole area. We note that the amendments put forward by the City Council and others would have a detrimental impact upon electoral equality in the wider area. Consequently, we confirm our draft recommendations for wards in this area as final, as we judge that they continue to provide the most satisfactory balance of the need to improve electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, given the representations received.

114 However, we note the general opposition to the proposed ward names in this area. Having revisited the area, and having considered Stage Three submissions, we agree that Old Portsmouth is but one of the communities within the proposed ward. Conversely, we note that Southsea is generally considered to cover a larger area than the proposed Southsea ward. We therefore propose that Old Portsmouth ward and Southsea ward should be renamed St Thomas and St Jude respectively, thus returning to their present names. We consider, however, that there is little consensus among proposals regarding the renaming of the proposed Craneswater & Highland ward. However, we note that there is all-party support on the City Council for the name of Eastney & Craneswater and therefore propose that Craneswater & Highland ward be renamed Eastney & Craneswater.

115 As explained earlier, the amended 2004 electorate figures for our proposals, when combined with the correction to the Conservatives' data in the Southsea area together with the revisions necessary to ensure that the figures reflect the mapping, would have a marginal impact on ward variances in almost all wards. However, in Southsea ward (to be renamed St Jude), these three adjustments combined produce a more marked affect on electoral variances in the ward. Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the city average in Central Southsea ward (2 per cent in 2004), 3 per cent above the average in

Eastney & Craneswater ward (4 per cent in 2004), 5 per cent below in St Jude ward (8 per cent in 2004) and 2 per cent below the average in St Thomas ward (2 per cent above in 2004). Our final recommendations for the wards of Central Southsea, Eastney & Craneswater, St Jude and St Thomas are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Charles Dickens, Hilsea and Nelson wards

116 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).

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

118 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's 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).

119 At Stage One Portsmouth Conservatives proposed that the southern boundary of Charles Dickens ward should be retained, as detailed earlier, but that the ward should 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 that the ward be renamed Landport. Portsmouth Conservatives further proposed including parts of Nelson ward in Copnor ward and Landport ward. They, however, also proposed that this ward be extended northwards to include polling district J1, and that it be renamed Buckland & Stamshaw ward. 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).

120 As detailed earlier, Southsea Parish Council proposed at Stage One that most of the existing Charles Dickens ward should be joined with parts of the existing St Thomas ward to create a new Old Portsmouth & Guildhall ward and that Nelson ward should be extended southwards to include the remainder of St Thomas ward, which it proposed be renamed Harbourside. It further

proposed that London Road should be included in the proposed new North End ward and that the area north of Gruneison Road should be included in Hilsea ward. Finally, it proposed that the area east of, and including, London Road, currently in Hilsea ward, should be transferred to the proposed new North End ward. The Parish Council did not provide detailed proposals for Harbourside or Hilsea wards.

121 We noted that both city-wide submissions would provide for improved electoral equality in these wards. However, we considered 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, while having regard to local communities. Having considering the Parish Council's proposals we found that, in addition to not submitting detailed figures, we were not convinced, given the evidence received, that it would better meet the statutory criteria. Therefore, as part of our draft recommendations for these wards, we adopted Portsmouth Conservatives' proposals for the wards of Landport, Hilsea and Buckland & Stamshaw. 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).

122 At Stage Three the City Council objected to the warding patterns in the north of Portsea Island and reiterated its proposal for a North End ward. It also objected to proposed ward names in this area and proposed that Landport ward and Buckland & Stamshaw ward be renamed Charles Dickens and Nelson respectively, as at present. It added that a further alternative would be to rename the wards Guildhall and North End. The Liberal Democrat Group supported the City Council in proposing that a North End ward be reconsidered. Portsmouth Labour Party also requested that "the case for a North End ward" be reconsidered.

123 The Conservative Group also objected to the ward names of Landport and Buckland & Stamshaw and proposed instead that the wards should be respectively renamed Guildhall ward, after the civic building, and North End & Stamshaw ward, after two communities within the ward. This was supported by Portsmouth South Conservative Association. Portsmouth North Conservative Association objected to the name Buckland & Stamshaw and proposed that the existing ward name, Nelson, be retained.

124 Councillor Crabbe, member for Charles Dickens ward, stated he had received objections from local residents about the proposal to rename the ward, Landport, and proposed that it retain the existing ward name.

125 A resident of Nelson ward wrote on behalf of the local Neighbourhood Forum and as Chairman of the ward Conservative Group. He objected to the proposed Buckland & Stamshaw ward name, considering that the two communities did not wish to be associated with each other. A resident on the boundary between Nelson ward and Charles Dickens ward stated that the existing arrangements divided the Buckland housing estate along Sultan Road. He objected to the draft recommendations which, he stated, would "divide the estate into three", and would not reflect community identities in this area. A resident of Hilsea ward objected to the proposal to transfer an area in the south-west of Hilsea ward to the new Buckland & Stamshaw ward, proposing that the area in the north-east of the ward be instead transferred from Hilsea ward to

Copnor ward. A second Hilsea ward resident objected to being placed in a ward with the Stamshaw area. A further Hilsea ward resident supported the draft recommendations, but proposed that Buckland & Stamshaw ward be renamed Nelson. A resident of Drayton & Farlington ward supported the draft recommendations, but objected to the renaming of Nelson ward as Buckland & Stamshaw.

126 A resident of Fratton ward, objecting to wards being named after districts or communities, preferring famous people, proposed that Landport and Buckland & Stamshaw wards retain the existing names of Charles Dickens and Nelson respectively. He further proposed that Hilsea ward be named after Nevil Shute.

127 Two residents of St Thomas ward proposed that Landport ward be renamed Guildhall, one stating, “in the minds of many residents Landport does not cover the heart of the city”. A third resident of St Thomas ward objected to the proposed Guildhall and North End ward names. A Milton ward resident proposed that Landport ward be renamed St George’s, as it encompasses St George’s Church. The uniformly produced letters received from 240 residents, proposed that Landport ward be renamed Guildhall.

128 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period. We have examined the proposals that a North End ward be reconsidered. However, we note that the creation of an additional ward in the north of Portsea Island would require substantial boundary change in the remainder of the island and would require us to move away from our draft recommendations substantively. We were not persuaded of the case for such a ward at draft recommendations stage, given the resulting warding patterns across the island, and do not consider that new evidence has been submitted at Stage Three to persuade us otherwise. Further, we note that some respondents opposed certain aspects of our draft recommendations in these wards. However, in the absence of any proposals for alternative arrangements we remain content that our draft recommendations represent the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for the boundaries of these three wards as final.

129 However, we note the opposition which we have received to our draft recommendations for ward names in this area. There appears to be consensus for ward names which are not geographically based. We note that communities in Portsmouth are not of uniform sizes and consider, in this area, that it would be more inclusive to return to the more neutral historically named wards. We note the proposal from the Conservative Group, Portsmouth South Conservative Association, the two residents and the 240 uniformly produced letters to rename Landport ward as Guildhall. We consider, however, that the existing ward names better reflect the areas covered. We therefore propose adopting the City Council’s proposals to rename our proposed Landport and Buckland & Stamshaw wards, as Charles Dickens and Nelson. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the city average in Charles Dickens ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Hilsea ward (1 per cent above in 2004) and 2 per cent above in Nelson ward (6 per cent in 2004). Our proposals in this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

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

131 At Stage Three a resident of Cosham ward proposed a 28-member council, comprising 14 two-member wards, and biennial elections in light of the Government's modernising local government agenda. However, as there is no statutory provision for biennial elections we are unable to propose such a cycle. Noting the consensus among parties on the council for a system of elections by thirds, we confirm our draft recommendation as final.

Conclusions

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

- transferring all of Sterling Street and Washington Road from Charles Dickens ward to Nelson ward;
- transferring Heron Close and Samuel Lodge from Milton ward to Baffins ward;
- transferring Mill House Hostel from Milton ward to Baffins ward;
- transferring the Railway Cottages from Drayton & Farlington ward to Cosham ward;
- renaming five wards, so that four existing ward names, Charles Dickens, Nelson, St Jude and St Thomas, are retained and one proposed ward name, Craneswater & Highland is changed to Eastney & Craneswater.

133 We conclude that, in Portsmouth:

- there should be an increase in council size from 39 to 42;
- there should be 14 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

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

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	39	42	39	42
Number of wards	13	14	13	14
Average number of electors per councillor	3,679	3,416	3,769	3,501
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

135 As Figure 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from four to zero with all wards varying by no more than 7 per cent from the city average. This improved level of electoral equality would continue in 2004, with no wards varying by more than 8 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation
 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 on the large map at the back of the report. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Portsmouth

6 NEXT STEPS

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

137 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an order. Such an order will not be made before six weeks from the date of publication.

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

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

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Portsmouth

As explained earlier, the amended 2004 ward-by-ward breakdown, when combined with the correction to the Conservatives' data in the Southsea area and the revisions necessary to marry the figures with the mapping, would have a marginal impact on ward variances in almost all wards. Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ from those we put forward as draft recommendations in all wards, due to additional boundary changes and/or revisions in electorate figures, under both current electorate and five-year forecast data; our draft proposals are set out below. The only other change from draft to final recommendations, which is not included in Figures A1 and A2, is that we propose to rename Buckland & Stamshaw, Craneswater & Highland, Landport, Old Portsmouth and Southsea wards as Nelson, Eastney & Craneswater, Charles Dickens, St Thomas and St Jude respectively.

Figure A1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Baffins	Copnor ward (part); Milton ward (part)
Buckland & Stamshaw	Hilsea ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
Central Southsea	Havelock ward (part)
Copnor	Copnor ward (part); Fratton ward (part); Nelson ward (part)
Cosham	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part); Paulsgrove ward (part)
Craneswater & Highland	Highland ward (part); St Jude ward (part – Craneswater parish ward of Southsea parish)
Drayton & Farlington	Cosham ward (part); Drayton & Farlington ward (part)
Fratton	Fratton ward (part)
Hilsea	Hilsea ward (part)
Landport	Charles Dickens ward; Nelson ward (part)
Milton	Highland ward (part); Milton ward (part)
Old Portsmouth	Havelock ward (part); St Thomas ward (part – including Croxton parish ward of Southsea parish)
Paulsgrove	Paulsgrove ward (part)
Southsea	St Jude ward (part – Clarence and Kings parish wards of Southsea parish); St Thomas ward (part – Owens Garden parish ward of Southsea parish)

Figure A2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
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
Totals	42	143,465	-	-	146,984	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,416	-	-	3,500	-

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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.