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Summary

Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

2 Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority’s electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why West Berkshire?

4 We are conducting a review of West Berkshire Council as a result of a request from the authority in order that the number of councillors elected to the authority could be examined.

Our proposals for West Berkshire

- West Berkshire should be represented by 43 councillors, nine fewer than there are now.
- West Berkshire should have 20 wards, 10 fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of one ward will stay the same.

Have your say

5 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 29 August 2017 to 6 November 2017. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to contribute to the design of the new wards – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the views we received.

6 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

You have until 6 November 2017 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 31 for how to send us your response.
What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

8 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Peter Knight CBE, DL
- Alison Lowton
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Sir Tony Redmond

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

9 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in West Berkshire are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the district.

What is an electoral review?

10 Our three main considerations are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

11 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

12 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for West Berkshire. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the district. During that consultation, we received a number of submissions challenging the electorate forecasts used. We therefore asked the Council to provide revised figures, which they did, and we undertook a second period of consultation. The submissions received during both consultation periods have informed our draft recommendations.

13 This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2017</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2017</td>
<td>Start of first consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2017</td>
<td>Close of first consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Second consultation seeking views on new wards with revised figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 2017</td>
<td>End of second consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August 2017</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of third consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

14 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation\(^2\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^3\) there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

16 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

17 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of West Berkshire</td>
<td>121,480</td>
<td>130,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. All of our proposed wards for West Berkshire will have good levels of electoral equality by 2023.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the district or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

20 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

21 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2023, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2018. During the first consultation, we received significant concern from respondents who considered that these forecasts were not accurate. We therefore asked the Council to provide revised forecast figures on the basis of likely developments. These revised forecasts

---


\(^3\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 7% by 2023.

22 We considered the updated electorate forecasts provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time although recognise the difficulty in projecting figures for this period. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

**Number of councillors**

23 West Berkshire Council currently has 52 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by the Council and concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by 10 would make sure the Council could carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

24 We therefore invited proposals for a new pattern of wards that would be represented by 42 councillors – for example, 42 one-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

25 We received nine submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. Four submissions were broadly supportive of a reduction in the size of the Council. Three submissions objected to the proposed reduction of councillors; Cold Ash Parish Council, a local resident and the Volunteer Centre opposed such a large decrease as they considered it would have a negative impact on a councillor’s ability to effectively carry out their work and reduce their accountability. We received a submission from an individual who considered that 43 members would facilitate a better warding pattern.

26 A local resident requested that West Berkshire adopt a 42 single-member warding pattern, as they believed it would better reflect the community identity of West Berkshire.

27 We note the opposition to the reduction in council size but do not consider that there were specific alternatives that were proposed that would be better and therefore consider that a reduction of around 10 is still desirable. However, during the development of our draft recommendations, we could not identify a warding pattern for 42 councillors that had good electoral equality and which would reflect the community evidence we received across the authority. We agree with the individual who proposed a 43-councillor warding pattern which we consider would better reflect community identities and interests, particularly in Newbury. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a 43-member council. This approach is consistent with our guidance where we state it may be necessary to increase or decrease the council size by one or two members to ensure better boundaries or the better reflection of community identity.

**Ward boundaries consultation**

28 We received 52 submissions to our original consultation on ward boundaries. A number of respondents challenged the electoral forecasts as they believed they did not adequately reflect the electorate of West Berkshire. The Commission went to
West Berkshire Council with these concerns and as a result a new set of electorate forecasts were produced by the Council. We then conducted a further consultation on warding arrangements based on the new electoral forecasts. We note that respondents were broadly supportive of these new figures.

29 In total, across both stages of consultation on warding arrangements we received 76 submissions. Fourteen of these submissions commented on issues that are outside the scope of this review, notably the desire to move the area of Calcot, Purley and Tilehurst into the administrative area of Reading Borough.

30 We received three district-wide schemes in total. The district-wide schemes we received from West Berkshire Council (the Council) and the Newbury and West Berkshire Liberal Democrats (the Liberal Democrats) provided for a mixed pattern of one-, two- and three-councillor wards for West Berkshire. The Liberal Democrats’ submission was similar to the Council’s submission. Both schemes were based on 42 councillors. Most of the wards proposed by the Council and Liberal Democrats have good levels of electoral equality. We also considered that they generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. We received a submission from an individual, whose district-wide scheme is roughly based on the Council’s proposal. They do propose that if West Berkshire were to be represented by 43 councillors, this would improve the electoral equality in the Council’s proposed wards of Tilehurst and Theale. While this proposal does provide a scheme for each ward, it does not provide enough clarity of the boundaries used and provides for poor levels of electoral equality, therefore we are unable to use this proposal.

31 We also received a submission from the West Berkshire UNISON branch which requested that the ward boundaries reflect the administrative workings of the council throughout West Berkshire. The statutory criteria to which we must have regard does not include reflecting the administrative workings of a council, which are subject to change in any case and we have therefore not used this as the basis of our wards.

32 We received a partial submission from a district councillor who opposed the proposals made by the Council for wards in the northern and eastern areas of West Berkshire. All of the alternative wards facilitated good levels of electoral equality but provided little evidence of community evidence and therefore we are unable to adopt this proposal.

33 Our draft recommendations are based on a combination of the Council’s and Liberal Democrats’ proposals. In some areas of the district we have also incorporated the views of parish councils and local residents where they have provided evidence of community links and strong and identifiable boundaries. In some areas, we considered that the proposals received did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries. We also visited the area in order to look at the various different proposals on the ground. This tour of West Berkshire helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.
34 The Commission seek to avoid splitting up areas which share the same community identity. In the rural areas of West Berkshire, we received a lot of submissions that provided strong evidence of overlapping community interests, whereby some parish councils considered they shared a community of interest with other parishes but other parish councils gave contrasting views. Accordingly, in some areas, we were not able to identify a warding pattern that reflected all the locally proposed schemes and we took the decision to create larger two- and three-member wards that combined parishes together as requested but also included other parishes. We note that while this results in large wards it does not divide communities but links a number of parishes that may not have shared common interests.

35 Our draft recommendations are for seven three-councillor wards, nine two-councillor wards and four one-councillor wards. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

36 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on page 27 and on the large map accompanying this report.

37 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

Draft recommendations

38 The tables and maps on pages 10 - 26 detail our draft recommendations for each area of the West Berkshire. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

---

Newbury, Thatcham and surrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chieveley &amp; Cold Ash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury &amp; Speen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcham Central &amp; Crookham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcham North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcham West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Common</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chieveley & Cold Ash

39 The proposals made by the Council and the Liberal Democrats for this area provided for good levels of electoral equality. We also received a submission from a district councillor, who based their proposed Castle ward on the Council’s proposal, amending it slightly so that Yattendon parish was excluded. This ward would provide good levels of electoral equality. However, we received alternative submissions which provided stronger evidence of community identities in this area.

40 Cold Ash Parish Council would like Cold Ash parish in its entirety to be in a ward on its own. A number of other respondents supported this view. We received a submission from a local resident, also requesting that Florence Gardens be included in a Cold Ash ward. He noted that if these houses were in a Thatcham ward the district councillor would have an increased workload as he would need to attend the Cold Ash Parish Council meetings.

41 The Commission acknowledge that a Cold Ash ward based on the whole of Cold Ash parish would have as good levels of electoral equality as a one-member ward; however, on our tour of the area we noted that a few areas on the edge of the parish, including Florence Gardens, are likely to share more in common with the neighbouring wards to the south as they appear to be overspill from Thatcham and Newbury.

42 A local resident also requested that houses on Florence Gardens remain within Cold Ash parish. Alterations to parish boundaries fall outside the scope of this review, and we are therefore not making any proposals to change the parish boundary.

43 Chieveley Parish Council requested that their parish be in a ward on its own, but did note that to help improve electoral equality Hermitage and Winterbourne parishes could be included. We also received a submission from Winterbourne Parish Council that requested being in a ward with parishes similar to their semi-rural village, noting that they look more towards Chieveley parish than Speen.

44 We note the proposals to link Chieveley with Hermitage and Winterbourne but consider that linking these parishes alone would not have enough electors to provide a satisfactory level of electoral equality and we are therefore proposing not to adopt them.

45 We were not persuaded by Cold Ash Parish Council’s and the local resident’s view on our tour of this area regarding the south of Cold Ash parish. We consider these areas would be better served with Newbury and Thatcham as they appear to be areas of overspill from the two towns and link directly into the respective areas. We are recommending that Clay Hill should be included in Clay Hill ward in Newbury; Florence Gardens should be included in Thatcham West ward; and Little Copse should be included in Thatcham North East ward.

46 The exclusion of these areas from the proposed ward from Cold Ash Parish Council, would result in a ward with a poor level of electoral equality which we do not consider is justified. However, we note that including this part of Cold Ash parish based on the original village with the other parishes to the north of Newbury would
result in a ward comprising broadly similar rural parishes. We note that this links more parishes than proposed locally but we consider that this proposal is preferable to dividing parishes between wards which we would be required to do if we did not take this approach.

47 We are therefore proposing a two-member Chieveley & Cold Ash ward with good levels of electoral equality and comprising the following parishes: Cold Ash, Chieveley, Hermitage and Winterbourne.

*Thatcham Central & Crookham, Thatcham North East and Thatcham West*

48 The five submissions we received for Thatcham proposed different boundaries from each other. None of the submissions created wards that would provide good levels of electoral equality and they lacked sufficient evidence to justify adopting wards with such poor imbalances.

49 Our proposed Thatcham wards are broadly based on the submission provided by the Liberal Democrats. On our tour of the area we considered that the majority of the boundaries they proposed would reflect community identities and used strong and clearly identifiable boundaries. We are recommending that the Thatcham West ward proposed by the Liberal Democrats is adopted. This includes the properties located along Florence Gardens in Cold Ash parish; having toured the area we are satisfied that these properties have strong links with the rest of Thatcham town.

50 Our Thatcham North East ward is based on the Liberal Democrats’ proposed Thatcham North ward, with the addition of properties to the north within the Little Copse area of Cold Ash parish. Having toured the area we believe these properties would be better served by being included in a Thatcham ward.

51 The Liberal Democrats’ proposed Thatcham South & Crookham ward would have a variance of -15%, which the Commission does not consider is justified by community identity evidence. We are therefore recommending combining this ward with its proposed Thatcham Central ward. We are satisfied that our proposed Thatcham Central & Crookham ward will reflect community identity and uses clear strong boundaries, following the A4 along its northern boundary.

*Newbury Town*

52 Under a council size of 42, the town of Newbury would be entitled to 11 councillors and, despite receiving two submissions that covered the whole area, we could not identify a warding pattern for Newbury that would allow for good levels of electoral equality. We are therefore recommending that the total number of councillors for West Berkshire Council be increased by one, and that the additional councillor is allocated to the town of Newbury as this allows for the wards in this area to have better levels of electoral equality and use strong boundaries. Our proposed wards for Newbury will include the parishes of Speen, Shaw-cum-Donnington, Greenham and parts of Cold Ash Parish as we consider they have strong links to the town and help improve the levels of electoral equality.

53 The warding arrangements proposed by the Council and the Liberal Democrats for the Newbury area provided for poor levels of electoral equality and, with little evidence to justify such poor variances, we are not persuaded to adopt the majority
of their proposed wards in this area. We have identified our own warding patterns which we consider broadly use strong boundaries and reflect, where possible, the locally generated schemes.

54 Due to the lack of community evidence received for this area, we welcome views on our proposed warding arrangements for this area in particular.

Newbury & Speen and Newbury Central
55 We received a submission from a local resident requesting that properties to the east of the A34 within Speen parish should be included with a Newbury ward.

56 Our proposed Newbury & Speen ward comprises Speen parish, Shaw-cum-Donnington parish and the northern area of Newbury. Our proposed Newbury Central ward is a two-member ward that provides for good levels of electoral equality.

Clay Hill
57 The Council’s proposed Clay Hill ward includes the Clay Hill area from Cold Ash parish. Having toured the area we are satisfied that this better reflects the urban characteristics of Newbury and should therefore be included in a Newbury ward. The northern boundary of this ward follows the Newbury parish boundary until it goes south along the A339 and then east towards Thatcham, until it aligns with the Newbury parish boundary again.

58 The Liberal Democrats’ proposed ward is similar; it includes the properties along Church Road in its Clay Hill ward. However, this would create an unviable parish ward in Shaw-cum-Donnington parish and we were therefore not persuaded to adopt it.

59 We are recommending that the Council’s proposed Clay Hill ward is adopted as it provides for good levels of electoral equality and uses clear boundaries.

Greenham
60 The Council proposed a two-member ward in this area, with a good level of electoral equality. It extended west across the A339 to include the new Sandleford development. However, we received submissions from two local residents requesting that the Sandleford development should not be included in the Greenham ward.

61 The Liberal Democrats’ proposed Greenham ward provides good levels of electoral equality. However, it does not appear to use strong or clear boundaries along the outside of the town centre.

62 We have largely chosen to base our proposed ward boundaries on a combination of the Liberal Democrats’ proposed Greenham and St John wards, as this allows for sufficient access for the new developments north of the racecourse. We have slightly amended the boundaries so that they run along the A343 and down the centre of the Bartholomew Street and Newtown Road, as we believe this provides a stronger ward boundary.
The Liberal Democrats’ proposed Wash Common ward would provide for good levels of electoral equality; however, they proposed the western boundary as the A34, which we note would divide the parish of Enborne between two wards. We consider that the parish boundary between Newbury and Enborne is a better boundary in this area and do not consider using the A34 justifies the need to create a parish ward in Enborne.

We received five submissions from local residents, requesting that a Wash Common ward be created that follows the boundaries of the ecclesiastical parish of St George. This proposed ward includes properties along Monks Lane and North Essex Street, while using the A339 as a clear boundary to the east, and the A34 as a boundary to the west. This ward would include the new Sandleford development, which will be located to the west of the A339. They noted that their proposed ward would better reflect the community interests of those living in the south of Newbury. This proposal would create a two-member ward with a variance of -18%, and there is insufficient evidence to support this variance.

However, we note that the majority of the proposed access to the Sandleford development will be from the Wash Common area and we propose to include these areas in the same ward. We are also recommending that this ward extends north towards the town centre. Our proposed three-member Wash Common ward will have an electoral variance of 4% by 2023.
## Eastern area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermaston &amp; Bucklebury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burghfield &amp; Mortimer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theale

66 We received five submissions requesting that the existing Theale ward comprising only the parish of Theale be maintained as it reflects the character of the parish and has strong natural boundaries. We received no other submissions.

67 This ward would have a good level of electoral equality and is based on a whole parish which we consider reflects the community so we have decided to base our Theale ward on the existing ward boundaries.

Burghfield & Mortimer

68 We received conflicting proposals in this area, with respondents linking different parishes into different wards.

69 The Liberal Democrats proposed two wards in this area; its Mortimer ward follows the existing Mortimer ward but removes the Aldermaston Wharf area. We noted that this proposal creates a two-member ward with a -24% variance. Its Burghfield ward comprises Burghfield, Sulhamstead and Englefield parish with a -1% variance.

70 The Council proposed a Mortimer ward that comprised only Mortimer parish. Its proposed Burghfield ward included Beech Hill, Wokefield, Burghfield and Sulhamstead parishes. The submission we received from a district councillor reflected the wards proposed by the Council, with the slight amendment, that only the southern area of Sulhamstead parish be included. Both these wards would have good levels of electoral equality, but little community identity evidence was received in support of the proposals.

71 We also received submissions from Beech Hill Parish Council, Burghfield Parish Council, a district councillor and a local resident requesting that Beech Hill parish be included in a ward with Stratfield Mortimer parish as they use Mortimer village for their shopping, doctor’s surgery, library, transport and social activities. Beech Hill Parish Council suggested that, if necessary, Wokefield parish could be added to help improve electoral equality.

72 A ward comprising just Stratfield Mortimer parish and Beech Hill parish would create a one-member ward with a variance of +20%. Despite the strong evidence of community identity provided, the Commission is not persuaded to recommend a ward with such poor variances and, therefore, are not persuaded to adopt this proposed ward.

73 We received a submission from a local resident who noted that the south of Sulhamstead parish, the area of Burghfield Common near Hollybush Lane, is part of Burghfield village and should be included in the same ward as Burghfield parish, where the majority of the village is. Sulhamstead Parish Council requested that their parish wards be removed and that the whole parish is included in one ward.

74 We note the evidence received in this area and view that Beech Hill parish has more in common with Stratfield Mortimer parish. However, in order to provide an acceptable level of electoral equality the Commission has had to choose between dividing parishes between wards or linking parishes that do not share a strong
community of interest. The Commission has considered the evidence and looked at options in this area. We consider that it is better to include more parishes in a larger ward than arbitrarily dividing parishes between wards to provide good electoral equality. We are therefore proposing that Beech Hill, Stratfield Mortimer, Wokefield and Burghfield parishes and the southern part of Sulhamstead parish be combined to create a three-member Burghfield & Mortimer ward. While we have sought to avoid dividing parishes between wards we have done so in Sulhamstead by including the southern part of the parish in the Burghfield & Mortimer ward because this area contains part of Burghfield village and we consider that including the whole of Burghfield village in the same ward is more likely to reflect community identities. We recognise the view of Sulhamstead Parish Council but note that its view is not supported by evidence of community identity and consider that Burghfield village would be better reflected if united in one ward.

Our proposed Burghfield & Mortimer ward provides an acceptable level of electoral equality and avoids splitting up the community links between the parishes of Beech Hill and Stratfield Mortimer.

Aldermaston & Bucklebury

The village of Aldermaston Wharf sits within three parishes (Padworth, Aldermaston and Beenham). We received a submission from a local resident, requesting that the parish boundaries be altered to locate Aldermaston Wharf within one parish. However, alterations to parish boundaries fall outside of the scope of this review, and we are therefore unable to make parish boundary alterations here. West Berkshire Council can undertake a Community Governance Review to amend parish boundaries.

The submissions we received from the Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed warding arrangements which would allow all of Aldermaston Wharf to be included in one ward. However, the reminder of their proposed wards for this area provided for poor levels of electoral equality which we are not persuaded to adopt.

We received a submission from a district councillor who proposed that this area be split into three wards. While all three wards did provide for good levels of electoral equality, we received submissions with strong evidence of community identity which did not support these proposals. We have therefore chosen not to adopt the Liberal Democrats’ proposal in this area.

Bucklebury Parish Council requested that Bucklebury, Stanford Dingley, Woolhampton and Midgham parishes be linked together as they share strong community interests and all have similar rural characteristics. This would create a one-member ward with a variance of -25% and the Commission does not consider there is evidence to justify a ward with such a poor level of electoral equality.

Aldermaston Parish Council and Beenham Parish Council provided a joint submission that reflected their view that Aldermaston Wharf should be included in one ward. They also acknowledged the strong links that Bucklebury parish has with Midgham and Woolhampton parishes. They proposed a one-member Aldermaston ward with a variance of 4% comprising Beenham, Padworth, Brimpton, Wasing and Aldermaston parishes. They also proposed a two-member Bucklebury ward with a
variance of 1% comprising Hermitage, Frilsham, Bucklebury, Stanford Dingley, Bradfield, Midgham and Woolhampton parishes.

81 While their proposals do provide for wards with good levels of electoral equality and there is evidence that they reflect community identities, they do not consider Englefield, Sulhamstead and Ufton Nervet parishes. We have not been able to identify a warding pattern in the area that accommodates these three parishes if we were to adopt the wards proposed by Aldermaston and Beenham parish councils. A combination of Englefield, Sulhamstead and Ufton Nervet parishes into a single-member ward produces a poor variance of -76%. We also note that combining these parishes in our proposed Theale ward or Mortimer & Bucklebury ward would also provide poor levels of electoral equality.

82 We considered amending their proposal by including Englefield parish into their proposed Bucklebury ward and including Ufton Nervet parish and the northern part of Sulhamstead parish into their proposed Aldermaston ward, but this would create wards with variances of 4% and 21% respectively, which we do not consider are justified.

83 We are therefore proposing an Aldermaston & Bucklebury ward which combines the existing Aldermaston and Bucklebury wards, with the addition of the Beenham, Padworth, Ufton Nervet and Englefield parishes and the northern part of Sulhamstead. This creates a three-member ward with good levels of electoral equality and we consider it avoids splitting up communities in this area. We note that this is a relatively large ward and we welcome views on it during our consultation.
### Northern areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basildon &amp; Compton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangbourne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilehurst &amp; Purley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilehurst Birch Copse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilehurst South &amp; Holybrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Basildon & Compton**

84 The Council proposed three wards in this area. The Ridgeway ward would comprise the following parishes: East Ilsley, West Ilsley, Compton, Aldworth and Streatley. The Bradfield ward would comprise the following parishes: Basildon, Bradfield and Ashampstead. The Chieveley ward would comprise Chieveley, Beedon and Hampstead Norreys.

85 The Liberal Democrats proposed two wards in this area. Its proposed Ridgeway ward is an expansion of the existing Compton ward, including the parishes of Aldworth, East Ilsley and West Ilsley, creating a ward with good levels of electoral equality. Its proposed Pangbourne ward combines the following parishes: Sulham, Tidmarsh, Pangbourne, Bradfield, Basildon and Streatley.

86 We received a submission from a local resident that provided good evidence of community links between the parishes located within Pang Valley, based on the collective knowledge base of the parishes when it comes to dealing with flooding issues. Hampstead Norreys Parish Council also acknowledged the strong community interests that are shared between parishes within Pang Valley. They suggested a merger of the existing wards of Basildon and Compton.

87 A local resident noted that Streatley parish is better linked with Basildon and would not like it to be in a ward with Pangbourne or Purley on Thames as it shares very little in common with these parishes.

88 We received a submission from a district councillor who noted the strong community identity that is shared between the parishes of Basildon, Streatley and Aldworth. They do not want to see this existing ward divided and therefore are proposing that the parish of Ashampstead be combined into the existing ward for the purpose of improving electoral equality.

89 We received submissions from Compton Parish Council and a local resident, acknowledging the strong community links between the parishes of Ashampstead and Aldworth. However, Compton Parish Council proposed both parishes be included with the existing Compton ward, while the local resident argued that these parishes should be included within the existing Basildon ward.

90 Where possible we try not to separate communities, and most of the submissions we received for this area provided strong evidence of overlapping community interests across the area. We could not identify a warding pattern that reflected all the locally proposed schemes and were not persuaded that any single proposal was better than any of the others. We recognise that while a Pang Valley ward would have a good level of electoral equality, it would not facilitate a warding pattern for the north-east of the district. It would leave some parishes not able to reasonably form a ward with acceptable electoral equality that reflects community identities. The Pang Valley ward also did not reflect the other responses from parish councils, who considered they should be included in alternative wards to the south.

91 We recognised that the proposals from the Council and the Liberal Democrats provided for wards with good levels of electoral equality; however, we were persuaded by alternative proposals which we considered provided better evidence of
community identity. We propose combining the wards proposed by Compton Parish Council and the local resident described above. These submissions provided conflicting views over which ward Ashampstead parish should be included in. By combining these proposed wards, which are the same as the existing Compton and Basildon wards, with the addition of West Ilsley and East Ilsley parishes and the removal of Pangbourne parish in the south, we are able to create a two-member ward with good levels of electoral equality. This avoids splitting up the community links between Aldworth and Ashampstead.

**Pangbourne**

92 The Council proposed a large Pangbourne & Purley ward, comprising the parishes of Purley on Thames, Tidmarsh, Sulham and Pangbourne. A district councillor proposed a ward comprising just Purley and Pangbourne parishes. We also received submissions from two local residents and a district councillor, stating that while Sulham, Tidmarsh and Pangbourne parishes should be in the same ward, they have little in common with Purley parish. We agree with this view and are including Purley with the northern part of Tilehurst parish. Our proposed one-member Pangbourne ward therefore includes Pangbourne, Tidmarsh and Sulham parishes.

**Tilehurst & Purley, Tilehurst Birch Copse and Tilehurst South & Holybrook**

93 We received a submission from Tilehurst Parish Council which proposed three Tilehurst wards that were all contained within the Tilehurst parish boundary. These wards would provide for poor levels of electoral equality and, with little evidence to justify such poor variances, we are not persuaded to adopt these wards.

94 The Council and the Liberal Democrats provided identical submissions for this area, creating three wards with good levels of electoral equality. We have based our Tilehurst South & Holybrook ward on their proposals. On our tour of this area we noted that the properties to the west of the Calcot golf course did appear to have stronger links with the area known as Birch Copse. However, the woods around the golf course limit access between properties to the north of Calcot and the southern area of Holybrook. We are therefore satisfied to use these boundaries for this ward.

95 We have made amendments to the locally proposed schemes in this area. The Council and Liberal Democrats proposed dividing the northern area using a boundary which we considered arbitrarily ran through the middle of an area of similar housing, which we consider is likely to share a community of interest. With no evidence of community identity to support this boundary we believe that Sulham Hill provides a much clearer boundary in this area. This creates a Tilehurst Birch Copse ward in the centre of Tilehurst parish, with its northern boundary running along Sulham Hill.

96 The remainder of Tilehurst parish is too small to be in a ward on its own, as it would create a two-member ward with a variance of -14%. By including the parish of Purley on Thames with this northern area of Tilehurst, we are able to improve the level of electoral equality and also reflect the view that Purley on Thames has stronger links to Tilehurst than other areas to the west.
## Western areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford &amp; Kintbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambourn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Downlands and Lambourn

97 We received identical submissions from the Council and Liberal Democrats for a proposed one-member Lambourn ward, comprising Lambourn parish only.

98 We received a submission from East Garston Parish Council requesting that they continue to be included in a Lambourn ward. They provided strong evidence of shared community interests between East Garston and Lambourn parish, stating that retaining this existing arrangement was preferable to being included in a larger ward with parishes with which they share fewer interests. While the Commission does recognise the strong community interests that are shared within the existing Lambourn ward, this would produce a ward with a -25% variance and the Commission does not consider this level of inequality is acceptable.

99 The Liberal Democrats proposed a Downlands ward made up of the following parishes: Beedon, Brightwalton, Catmore, Chaddleworth, East Garston, Farnborough, Fawley, Great Shefford and Leckhampstead. The Council’s proposal for this area was similar but included Beedon parish in a ward to the south. Both of these proposals would have good electoral equality.

100 A district councillor proposed two large rural wards in this area. His proposed Lambourn ward would comprise Lambourn, East Garston, Great Shefford, Fawley, Chaddleworth and Welford parish. His proposed Downlands ward would comprise Brightwalton, Catmore, Farnborough, Leckhampstead, Peasemore, East Ilsley, West Ilsley and Compton parishes. This ward would provide for good levels of electoral equality but was supported by no evidence of community identity.

101 We note that we have received proposals for wards in the Downlands area that have good levels of electoral equality. However, we received little community identity evidence in this area and we welcome further views during our consultation. We are recommending proposals in this area which we consider will facilitate a good warding pattern across the north of the borough. The only parish council who responded in the Downlands area was Compton Parish Council which considered Compton parish should be included with other parishes to the east and south.

102 Our proposed Lambourn and Downlands wards are identical to the Liberal Democrats’ proposal.

Hungerford & Kintbury

103 We received different views in this area. Two local residents provided submissions requesting that the existing ward of Hungerford be represented by two councillors, so they could better represent the north/south characteristics of Hungerford town. However, we received five submissions proposing that Hungerford should be included in a ward with neighbouring parishes, as this would better reflect community interests.

104 The Liberal Democrats proposed a Kintbury ward that comprised the following parishes: Kintbury, Hampstead Marshall, Welford and the western part of Enborne, using the A34 as a boundary. The Council’s proposed Kintbury ward comprised Kintbury, Hampstead Marshall and Enborne parishes.
105 Inkpen Parish Council proposed that a new three-member ward be created to reflect the shared interests across the existing Hungerford and Kintbury wards. Its proposed Hungerford & Kintbury ward was supported directly by two local residents and a district councillor. Another local resident provided evidence of transport links and shared resources between Inkpen and Kintbury parishes.

106 Hungerford Town Council proposed a smaller two-councillor alternative ward that linked the areas of Combe, West Woodhay and Inkpen parishes with the existing Hungerford ward. This proposal is identical to the ward proposals from the Council and the Liberal Democrats.

107 We received a submission from Enborne Parish Council that simply requested they be included in a three-member ward.

108 Where possible we aim to not separate communities with common interests and the majority of the submissions we received for this area provided strong evidence of overlapping community interests across the proposed wards. We have therefore decided to base our proposed Hungerford & Kintbury ward on the existing wards of Hungerford and Kintbury, with the addition of Boxford parish, as we believe they share similar rural characteristics and facilitate good levels of electoral equality. We welcome further views on this proposal during the consultation.
Conclusions

109 The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2017 and 2023 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 30% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft recommendation
West Berkshire Council should be made up of 43 councillors serving 20 wards representing four single-councillor wards, nine two-councillor wards and seven three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in the table below and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping
Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for West Berkshire Council.
You can also view our draft recommendations for West Berkshire on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

112 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Cold Ash parish, Greenham parish, Newbury parish, Thatcham parish and Tilehurst parish.

113 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Cold Ash parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Cold Ash Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold Ash</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Copse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park &amp; Manor Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Greenham parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Greenham Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandleford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Newbury parish.
Newbury Parish Council should comprise 23 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Fields</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Hill</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speenhamland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Common</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fields</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Thatcham parish.

Thatcham Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Crookham</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Tilehurst parish.

Tilehurst Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Have your say

118 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole borough or just a part of it.

119 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for West Berkshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

120 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

121 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (West Berkshire)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

122 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for West Berkshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

123 A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

124 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

125 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents’ association or other group that represents the area?
• Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
• Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

126 Effective local government:

• Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
• Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
• Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

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

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

129 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

130 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for the West Berkshire in 2019.

Equalities

131 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.
Appendix A

Draft recommendations for West Berkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2017)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2023)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aldermaston &amp; Bucklebury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,244</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Basildon &amp; Compton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Burghfield &amp; Mortimer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,204</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9,982</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chieveley &amp; Cold Ash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,496</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clay Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Downlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Greenham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,224</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>9,569</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hungerford &amp; Kintbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lambourn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Newbury &amp; Speen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>6,174</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Newbury Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2017)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
<td>Electorate (2023)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Pangbourne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Thatcham Central &amp; Crookham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Thatcham North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,011</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Thatcham West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Theale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Tilehurst &amp; Purley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,526</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tilehurst Birch Copse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tilehurst South &amp; Holybrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,726</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5,809</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wash Common</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>9,476</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,480</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>130,217</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,825</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,028</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by West Berkshire Council.

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

1. Aldermaston & Bucklebury
2. Basildon & Compton
3. Burghfield & Mortimer
4. Chieveley & Cold Ash
5. Clay Hill
6. Downlands
7. Greenham
8. Hungerford & Kintbury
9. Lambourn
10. Newbury & Speen
11. Newbury Central
12. Pangbourne
13. Thatcham Central & Crookham
14. Thatcham North East
15. Thatcham West
16. Theale
17. Tilehurst & Purley
18. Tilehurst Birch Copse
19. Tilehurst South & Holybrook
20. Wash Common

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/berkshire/west-berkshire
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Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/berkshire/west-berkshire

Local Authority
- West Berkshire Council (2)

Political Group
- Newbury & West Berkshire Liberal Democrats (2)

Councillors
- Cllr A. Edwards
- Cllr A. Law (2)
- Cllr M. Lock
- Cllr A. Macro (2)
- Cllr A. Stansfield
- Cllr J. Cole

Local Organisations
- West Berkshire UNISON
- Volunteer Centre for West Berkshire

Parish and Town Council
- Aldermaston Parish Council and Beenham Parish Council
- Beech Hill Parish Council
- Bucklebury Parish Council
- Burghfield Parish Council
- Chieveley Parish Council
- Cold Ash Parish Council
- Compton Parish Council
- East Garston Parish Council
- Enborne Parish Council
- Hampstead Norreys Parish Council
- Hungerford Town Council
- Inkpen Parish Council
- Sulhamstead Parish Council
- Thatcham Town Council (2)
- Theale Parish Council (2)
- Tilehurst Parish Council
- Winterbourne Parish Meeting

Local Residents
- 40 local residents
## Appendix D

### Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council size</td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fairness</td>
<td>When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral inequality</td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-represented</td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish council</td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</td>
<td>The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
<td>A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>