

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Cotswold in Gloucestershire

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

June 2001

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

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 2001

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: 232

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>9</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>11</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>35</i>
APPENDICES	
A Final Recommendations for Cotswold: Detailed Mapping	<i>37</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>41</i>

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



Local Government Commission for England

26 June 2001

Dear Secretary of State

On 27 June 2000 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Cotswold under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in January 2001 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We are confirming our draft recommendations in full and this report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Cotswold.

We recommend that Cotswold District Council should be served by 44 councillors representing 28 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold elections every four years.

The Local Government Act 2000 contains provisions relating to changes to local authority electoral arrangements. However, until such time as Orders are made implementing those arrangements 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 District 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 Cotswold on 27 June 2000. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 9 January 2001, 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 Cotswold:

- **in 22 of the 33 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and 10 wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 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 22 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 12 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 121–122) are that:

- **Cotswold District Council should have 44 councillors, one less than at present;**
- **there should be 28 wards, instead of 33 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 30 of the existing wards should be modified and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 27 of the proposed 28 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2005.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Blockley and Cirencester;**
- **an increase in parish councillors for the parish of Bourton-on-the-Water;**
- **a reduction in parish councillors for the parish of Southrop;**
- **new parish warding arrangements for Brimpsfield parish.**

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 6 August 2001:

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

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1 Ampney Coln	1	the parishes of Ampney Crucis, Ampney St Mary, Ampney St Peter, Barnsley, Bibury, Coln St Dennis and Winson	Map 2
2 Avening	1	the parishes of Ashley, Avening, Cherington, Long Newton and Rodmarton	Map 2
3 Beacon Stow	2	the parishes of Adlestrop, Bledington, Evenlode, Mangersbury, Oddington and Stow-on-the-Wold	Map 2
4 Blockley	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Blockley	Maps 2 and A3
5 Bourton-on-the-Water	2	the parishes of Bourton-on-the-Water, Clapton and Cold Aston	Map 2
6 Campden Vale	3	the parishes of Aston Subedge, Chipping Campden, Errington, Mickleton, Saintbury, Weston Subedge and Willersey	Map 2
7 Chedworth	1	the parishes of Chedworth, Compton Abdale, Dowdeswell, Withington and Yanworth	Map 2
8 Churn Valley	1	the parishes of Bagendon, Baunton, Coberley, Colesbourne, North Cerney and Rendcomb	Map 2
9 Cirencester Beeches	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – part of Cirencester parish (Cirencester Beeches parish ward)	Map 2 and Large map
10 Cirencester Chesterton	2	part of Cirencester parish (the proposed Cirencester Chesterton parish ward)	Map 2 and Large map
11 Cirencester Park	2	part of Cirencester parish (the proposed Cirencester Park parish ward)	Map 2 and Large map
12 Cirencester Stratton Whiteway	2	part of Cirencester parish (the proposed Cirencester Stratton Whiteway parish ward)	Map 2 and Large map
13 Cirencester Watermoor	2	part of Cirencester parish (the proposed Cirencester Watermoor parish ward)	Map 2 and Large map
14 Ermin	1	the parishes of Brimpsfield, Cowley, Daglingworth, Duntisbourne Abbots, Duntisbourne Rouse, Edgeworth, Elkstone, Syde and Winstone	Maps 2 and A2
15 Fairford	2	the parishes of Fairford, Hatherop and Quenington	Map 2
16 Fosserridge	1	the parishes of Batsford, Bourton-on-the-Hill, Broadwell, Condicote, Donnington, Longborough, Sezincote and Todenham	Map 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
17	Grumbold's Ash	1	the parishes of Beverstone, Boxwell with Leighterton, Didmarton, Kingscote, Ozleworth, Shipton Moyne, Tetbury Upton and Westonbirt with Lasborough	Map 2
18	Hampton	1	the parishes of Down Ampney, Driffield, Maiseyhampton and Poulton	Map 2
19	Kempsford Lechlade	2	the parishes of Kempsford and Lechlade	Map 2
20	Moreton-in-Marsh	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Moreton-in-Marsh	Map 2
21	Northleach	1	the parishes of Hampnett and Northleach with Eastington	Map 2
22	Rissingtons	1	the parishes of Great Rissington, Icomb, Little Rissington, Upper Rissington, Westcote and Wick Rissington	Map 2
23	Riversmeet	1	the parishes of Aldsworth, Barrington, Coln St Aldwyns, Eastleach, Farmington, Sherborne, Southrop and Windrush	Map 2
24	Sandywell	1	the parishes of Andoversford, Hazelton, Notgrove, Sevenhampton, Shipton, Turkdean and Whittington	Map 2
25	Tetbury	3	the parish of Tetbury	Map 2
26	Thames Head	1	the parishes of Coates, Kemble and Sapperton	Map 2
27	Three Rivers	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Cutsdean, Guiting Power, Lower Slaughter, Naunton, Swell, Temple Guiting and Upper Slaughter	Map 2
28	Water Park	3	the parishes of Poole Keynes, Preston, Siddington, Somerford Keynes and South Cerney	Map 2

Notes: 1 The district is entirely parished.

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Cotswold

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Ampney Coln	1	1,430	1,430	-1	1,476	1,476	-1
2 Avening	1	1,433	1,433	-1	1,508	1,508	1
3 Beacon Stow	2	2,767	1,384	-4	2,911	1,456	-3
4 Blockley	1	1,489	1,489	3	1,565	1,565	5
5 Bourton-on-the-Water	2	2,762	1,381	-4	2,814	1,407	-6
6 Campden Vale	3	4,707	1,569	9	4,875	1,625	9
7 Chedworth	1	1,409	1,409	-2	1,442	1,442	-3
8 Churn Valley	1	1,377	1,377	-4	1,416	1,416	-5
9 Cirencester Beeches	2	2,872	1,436	0	3,096	1,548	4
10 Cirencester Chesterton	2	3,013	1,507	5	3,127	1,564	5
11 Cirencester Park	2	2,733	1,367	-5	2,763	1,382	-8
12 Cirencester Stratton Whiteway	2	2,754	1,377	-4	2,784	1,392	-7
13 Cirencester Watermoor	2	3,162	1,581	10	3,226	1,613	8
14 Ermin	1	1,420	1,420	-1	1,468	1,468	-2
15 Fairford	2	3,150	1,575	9	3,221	1,611	8
16 Fossebridge	1	1,509	1,509	5	1,538	1,538	3
17 Grumbold's Ash	1	1,519	1,519	5	1,586	1,586	6
18 Hampton	1	1,294	1,294	-10	1,399	1,399	-6
19 Kempsford Lechlade	2	3,009	1,505	4	3,156	1,578	6
20 Moreton-in-Marsh	2	2,499	1,250	-13	2,758	1,379	-8
21 Northleach	1	1,497	1,497	4	1,521	1,521	2
22 Rissingtons	1	1,430	1,430	-1	1,500	1,500	0
23 Riversmeet	1	1,498	1,498	4	1,572	1,572	5
24 Sandywell	1	1,417	1,417	-2	1,476	1,476	-1

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
25 Tetbury	3	4,186	1,395	-3	4,241	1,414	-5
26 Thames Head	1	1,449	1,449	1	1,497	1,497	0
27 Three Rivers	1	1,543	1,543	7	1,617	1,617	8
28 Water Park	3	4,078	1,359	-6	4,189	1,396	-7
Totals	44	63,406	–	–	65,742	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,441	–	–	1,494	–

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

Note: 1 The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 There is a small anomaly in the electorate figures supplied between the total electorate data for 2000 and 2005 shown in figures 2 and 4.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Cotswold in Gloucestershire. We have now reviewed the six districts in Gloucestershire 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 Cotswold. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1977 (Report No. 261). The electoral arrangements of Gloucestershire County Council were last reviewed in May 1982 (Report No. 424). We intend reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, 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 District Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

5 We have also had regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000), which sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

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

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a district's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, 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 have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities' electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Orders under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in the two-tier district areas, and our current *Guidance*.

10 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 27 June 2000, when we wrote to Cotswold District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Gloucestershire County Council, Gloucestershire Constabulary, the local authority associations, Gloucestershire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Member of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 2 October 2000. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

11 Stage Three began on 9 January 2001 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Cotswold in Gloucestershire*, and ended on 5 March 2001. 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

12 Cotswold district encompasses some 117,000 hectares, more than 70 per cent of which is designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This includes 144 Conservation Areas. The district is located within an area bounded by the M4, M5 and M40 triangle and is largely rural in character. Two intercity rail lines cross the area with stations located near Cirencester, the largest settlement in the district, and Moreton-in-Marsh. Tourism is an important feature of the region, and contributes to the low unemployment levels in the area.

13 The district contains 115 parishes and is entirely parished. Cirencester town comprises 23 per cent of the district'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 district 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 district is 63,399 (February 2000). The Council presently has 45 members who are elected from 33 wards, five of which are relatively urban in character, with the remainder being predominantly rural. One ward is represented by three councillors, 10 are each represented by two councillors and 22 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

16 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Cotswold district, with around 30 per cent more electors than two decades ago. The most notable increases have been in Lechlade ward.

17 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,409 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,461 by the year 2005 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 22 of the 33 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, 10 wards by more than 20 per cent and four wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Lechlade ward where the councillor represents 55 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Cotswold

Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Ampneys	1	1,006	1,006	-29	1,039	1,039	-29
2 Avening	1	1,459	1,459	4	1,488	1,488	2
3 Beacon	1	1,818	1,818	29	1,896	1,896	30
4 Blockley	1	1,489	1,489	6	1,565	1,565	7
5 Bourton-on-the-Water	2	2,564	1,282	-9	2,616	1,308	-10
6 Campden	2	2,250	1,125	-20	2,326	1,163	-20
7 Churn Valley	1	1,166	1,166	-17	1,203	1,203	-18
8 Cirencester Abbey	2	2,479	1,240	-12	2,509	1,255	-14
9 Cirencester Beeches	2	2,872	1,436	2	3,096	1,548	6
10 Cirencester Chesterton	2	3,991	1,996	42	4,105	2,053	41
11 Cirencester Stratton	2	1,959	980	-30	1,989	995	-32
12 Cirencester Watermoor	2	3,226	1,613	14	3,290	1,645	13
13 Coln	1	1,476	1,476	5	1,541	1,541	5
14 Ermin	1	1,631	1,631	16	1,681	1,681	15
15 Evenlode Vale	1	1,100	1,100	-22	1,117	1,117	-24
16 Fairford	2	2,588	1,294	-8	2,628	1,314	-10
17 Fossehill	1	1,367	1,367	-3	1,406	1,406	-4
18 Fossebridge	1	1,125	1,125	-20	1,144	1,144	-22
19 Grumbold's Ash	1	1,053	1,053	-25	1,091	1,091	-25
20 Hampton	1	1,175	1,175	-17	1,274	1,274	-13
21 Kempford	1	823	823	-42	834	834	-43
22 Lechlade	1	2,186	2,186	55	2,322	2,322	59
23 Mickleton	1	1,319	1,319	-6	1,325	1,325	-9
24 Moreton-in-Marsh	2	2,499	1,250	-11	2,758	1,379	-6
25 Northleach	1	1,601	1,601	14	1,633	1,633	12
26 Sandywell	1	1,704	1,704	21	1,758	1,758	20

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
27 Sherborne Brook	1	1,266	1,266	-10	1,330	1,330	-9
28 Stow-on-the-Wold	1	1,663	1,663	18	1,793	1,793	23
29 Tetbury	3	4,409	1,470	4	4,480	1,493	2
30 Thames Head	1	1,666	1,666	18	1,773	1,773	21
31 Three Rivers	1	1,543	1,543	10	1,618	1,618	11
32 Vale	1	1,138	1,138	-19	1,224	1,224	-16
33 Water Park	2	3,788	1,894	34	3,884	1,942	33
Totals	45	63,399	–	–	65,736	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,409	–	–	1,461	–

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

Note: 1 The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Lechlade ward were relatively under-represented by 55 per cent, while electors in Kempsford ward were relatively over-represented by 42 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 There is a small anomaly in the electorate figures supplied between the total electorate data for 2000 and 2005 shown in figures 2 and 4.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

18 During Stage One we received 12 representations, including district-wide schemes from the District Council and from Cotswold Liberal Democrats, and representations from five parish councils and five from local residents. 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 Cotswold in Gloucestershire*.

19 Our draft recommendations were based entirely on the District Council's proposals, which achieved a significant improvement in electoral equality, and provided a scheme of mainly single-member wards. We proposed that:

- Cotswold District Council should be served by 44 councillors, compared with the current 45, representing 28 wards, five fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 30 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements and a redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Blockley and Cirencester, an increase in parish councillors for the parish of Bourton-on-the-Water, a reduction in parish councillors for the parish of Southrop and new parish warding arrangements for Brimpsfield parish.

Draft Recommendation

Cotswold District Council should comprise 44 councillors, serving 28 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

20 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 27 of the 28 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2005.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

21 During the consultation in our draft recommendations report, 68 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of Cotswold District Council and the Commission.

Cotswold District Council

22 The District Council supported the draft recommendations for Cotswold in full.

Cotswold Liberal Democrats

23 The Cotswold Liberal Democrats (“The Liberal Democrats”) reiterated their proposals made at Stage One and stated their specific opposition to our draft recommendations that Preston parish should be included in the proposed Water Park ward, that Kempsford parish should be combined with Lechlade parish and that there should be mainly single-member wards in the rural areas of the district.

24 With regard to the electoral cycle, the Liberal Democrats proposed that council elections should be held “more frequently than once every four years”, in order to increase accountability.

Parish Councils

25 Brimpsfield Parish Council and Chedworth Parish Council supported the draft recommendations for their respective parishes. Tetbury Upton Parish Council, in its submission forwarded by Geoffrey Clifton-Brown, MP for Cotswold, also supported our proposals for its area.

26 Cold Aston Parish Council objected to our draft recommendation that it be combined with the more urban parish of Bourton-on-the-Water, arguing that it had no shared community identity with the parish and would prefer to be in the proposed Sandywell ward. Notgrove Parish Meeting stated that it was content to be included in the new Sandywell ward but objected to the proposals for Cold Aston Parish, arguing that Cold Aston has strong links with the parishes of Notgrove and Turkdean (both in the proposed Sandywell ward).

27 Preston Parish Council and South Cerney Parish Council both objected to the proposed Water Park ward. Preston Parish Council opposed our draft recommendation to include it in our proposed Water Park ward, arguing that Preston is geographically isolated from the other parishes in this ward and that it shares no community identity with them. It stated that it shared more community links with Ampney Crucis parish. South Cerney Parish Council opposed our proposal to include the parishes of Preston and Siddington in the proposed Water Park ward, arguing that they had little in common with the parishes of Poole Keynes, Somerford Keynes and South Cerney, all of which form an integral part of the Cotswold Water Park. It proposed a two-member

Water Park ward comprising these parishes, and a new single-member ward comprising the parishes of Preston and Siddington.

28 Kempsford Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations for Kempsford, arguing that Kempsford merited separate representation due to the existence of the NATO airbase within the parish and that the two communities of Kempsford and Lechlade are different.

29 Maugersbury Parish Council opposed our draft recommendations for the proposed Beacon Stow ward, arguing that the parish shares no community identity with the more urban parish of Stow. Mickleton Parish Council opposed our draft recommendations for its area on community identity grounds, arguing that Mickleton should not be combined with the larger parish of Chipping Campden as the issues of Mickleton would be dominated by those of Chipping Campden. Additionally, the Parish Council queried the forecast electorate figures for its area.

Other Representations

30 A further 56 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local councillors and residents.

31 Councillor Mrs Jones, representing Kempsford ward, objected to our draft recommendations for Kempsford, stating that Kempsford merited a councillor of its own, particularly given the issues that arise regarding the NATO airbase. Councillor Lady Steel, district councillor for Fossehill ward, objected to the proposal to place Cold Aston with Bourton-on-the-Water, as Cold Aston is more rural in nature than Bourton-on-the-Water. The Chair of Preston Parish Council objected to the proposed Water Park ward, stating the same arguments as the Parish Council.

32 We also received 51 objections from residents who were opposed to the proposal to combine Kempsford in a ward with Lechlade, for the reasons stated above. Twelve of the respondents regarding this area expressed a preference for being combined with the parish of Fairford rather than Lechlade.

33 One local resident objected to the draft recommendations for Mickleton, stating that Mickleton and Chipping Campden were too different to be joined together in a ward, and as a result, Mickleton may lose its local identity. This resident stated a preference for Mickleton to be joined with Ebrington and the Vale if changes were necessary. Another local resident objected to the proposed transfer of Cold Aston to Bourton-on-the-Water ward, proposing instead that the parish be moved to Sandywell ward. She stated that Cold Aston has community links with the other parishes in Sandywell ward, and in the interests of community identity, should remain with them. Both of these local residents queried the forecast electorate figures in their areas.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

35 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the 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.

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

37 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, 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 be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

38 At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4 per cent from 63,399 to 65,736 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expected most of the growth to be in the urban area of Cirencester, although there would be some growth in the electorate throughout the district. 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.

39 At Stage Three Mickleton Parish Council and two local residents commented on the Council’s electorate figures for Mickleton and Bourton-on-the-Water. We considered these representations and consulted the District Council. It informed us that it remains satisfied with

the original estimates, as it had used a county-wide methodology. In the light of this, we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates presently available.

Council Size

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

41 Cotswold District Council presently has 45 members. At Stage One the District Council proposed a council of 44 members. The Council considered that this council size would provide a fair balance of representation between the urban area of Cirencester and the remainder of the district and we noted that the correct distribution of councillors throughout the district would be achieved. At Stage One, the Liberal Democrats also proposed a council size of 44.

42 In our draft recommendations report, we stated that, given the consensus for a council size of 44, and having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 44 members.

43 We received no comments regarding council size during Stage Three. In the absence of any objections to our draft recommendation for a council size of 44, we are confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Electoral Arrangements

44 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the district-wide schemes from the District Council and the Liberal Democrats. Although the district-wide schemes achieved a degree of consensus in some areas, their proposals differed significantly in the rural parts of the district. While we noted that the District Council and the Liberal Democrats made identical warding proposals for Cirencester, we noted that the Liberal Democrats' proposals, which were not consulted upon locally, provided large multi-member wards in the rural area, while the District Council proposed mainly single-member wards. In drawing up our draft recommendations, we considered that a pattern of single-member wards in the rural area would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria and, in view of the good electoral equality which would result under the District Council's scheme, we concluded that we should adopt the District Council's scheme without amendment as our draft recommendations.

45 At Stage Three the District Council fully endorsed our proposed wards. The Liberal Democrats reiterated their support for their Stage One submission. The majority of the other representations concerned the arrangements for Kempford parish.

46 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Avening, Grumbold's Ash, Tetbury and Thames Head wards;
- (b) Cirencester (five wards);
- (c) Ampneys, Hampton, Northleach and Water Park wards;
- (d) Coln, Fairford, Kempsford, Lechlade and Sherborne Brook wards;
- (e) Churn Valley, Ermin, Fossehill and Sandywell wards;
- (f) Beacon, Bourton-on-the-Water, Evenlode Vale, Stow-on-the-Wold and Three Rivers wards;
- (g) Fossebridge and Moreton-in-Marsh wards;
- (h) Blockley, Campden, Mickleton and Vale wards.

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

Avening, Grumbold's Ash, Tetbury and Thames Head wards

48 The number of electors per councillor in the single-member wards of Avening (comprising the parishes of Ashley, Avening, Cherington, Long Newton and Shipton Moyne), Grumbolds Ash (comprising the parishes of Beverstone, Boxwell with Leighterton, Didmarton, Kingscote, Ozleworth, and Westonbirt with Lasborough) and Thames Head (comprising the parishes of Coates, Kemble, Rodmarton and Sapperton) is 4 per cent above, 25 per cent below and 18 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent above, 25 per cent below and 21 per cent above by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the three-member Tetbury ward (comprising the parishes of Tetbury and Tetbury Upton) is 4 per cent above the average (2 per cent above by 2005).

49 At Stage One, the District Council proposed substantial modifications to each of the four wards in this area. It proposed that a single-member Grumbold's Ash ward should be enlarged to include the parishes of Tetbury Upton and Shipton Moyne, arguing that this provided for improved electoral equality. It also contended that Tetbury parish should stand alone as a three-member district ward due to its size and electorate. It proposed that Rodmarton parish should be combined with the remainder of the existing Avening ward to form a revised single-member Avening ward. The remaining parishes of Coates, Kemble and Sapperton would form a revised single-member Thames Head ward.

50 At Stage One, Cotswold Liberal Democrats proposed a single-member South Cotswold ward and a three-member Tetbury ward which were identical to the Council's proposed Grumbolds Ash and Tetbury wards. They proposed combining the parishes of Ashley, Avening, Cherington, Coates, Daglingworth, Duntisbourne Abbots, Duntisbourne Rouse, Edgeworth, Long Newton, Rodmarton, Sapperton and Winstone to form a new two-member Daneway ward. Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals Kemble parish would be combined with the parishes of Poole Keynes, Siddington, Somerford Keynes and South Cerney in a revised Water Park ward.

51 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we noted that there was consensus on the warding arrangements for Grumbold's Ash and Tetbury and we considered that the Council's proposals for these wards would provide a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We considered that the Council's proposed single-member Avening and Thames Head wards would provide good electoral equality while allowing a more appropriate reflection of the statutory criteria than the Liberal Democrats' proposed two-member Daneway ward, which would combine 12 rural parishes in a geographically large ward. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals for this area without amendment.

52 Under our draft recommendations Avening, Grumbold's Ash, Tetbury and Thames Head wards would have 1 per cent fewer, 5 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and equal to the average by 2005).

53 At Stage Three Cotswold District Council supported our draft recommendations for this area. The Liberal Democrats reiterated their preference for their proposed Daneway ward and the revised Water Park ward. Tetbury Upton Parish Council supported the draft recommendations for Grumbold's Ash ward.

54 Having considered all of the representations received, we remain content that our draft recommendations for this area provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Given the evidence of local support, we therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations for the area as final.

55 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Avening, Grumbold's Ash, Tetbury and Thames Head wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Cirencester (five wards)

56 Cirencester is the largest urban area in Cotswold district and is situated in the south of the district. Cirencester comprises five two-member wards. The number of electors represented by each councillor is 12 per cent below the average in Cirencester Abbey ward (14 per cent below by 2005), 2 per cent above in Cirencester Beeches (6 per cent above by 2005), 42 per cent above in Cirencester Chesterton (41 per cent above by 2005), 30 per cent below in Cirencester Stratton (32 per cent below by 2005) and 14 per cent above in Cirencester Watermoor (13 per cent above by 2005).

57 At Stage One, the District Council proposed substantial modifications to warding arrangements in Cirencester. It proposed retaining five two-member wards, but proposed major boundary changes to four of the five wards. The District Council proposed combining all the properties to the north of Abbey Way and Grove Lane, currently in Cirencester Abbey ward, with the existing Cirencester Stratton ward to form a new two-member Cirencester Stratton Whiteway ward. Under its proposals, the remainder of Cirencester Abbey ward would be combined with properties to the north of Chesterton Lane and to the west of Somerford Road, which are currently in Cirencester Chesterton ward, and properties to the west of Somerford Road and north of Querns Lane and Lewis Lane, which are currently in Cirencester Watermoor ward, to form a

two-member Cirencester Park ward. It proposed that the remainder of the existing Cirencester Watermoor ward should be combined with properties to the east of Somerford Road, which are currently in Cirencester Chesterton ward, to form a revised two-member Cirencester Watermoor ward. The remainder of Cirencester Chesterton wards would form a new two-member Cirencester Chesterton ward. It proposed that there should be no change to Cirencester Beeches ward. The Liberal Democrats supported the Council's proposals for Cirencester.

58 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we noted that there was consensus between the Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals for the urban area of Cirencester. We considered that these proposals would provide strong boundaries between distinct areas, while achieving a reasonable level of electoral equality. We considered that to seek further improvements to electoral equality in this area would have an adverse impact on the statutory criteria. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals for the two-member wards of Cirencester Beeches, Cirencester Chesterton, Cirencester Park, Cirencester Stratton Whiteway and Cirencester Watermoor as part of our draft recommendations.

59 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average in Cirencester Beeches ward (4 per cent above by 2005), 5 per cent above in Cirencester Chesterton ward (unchanged by 2005), 5 per cent below in Cirencester Park ward (8 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent below in Cirencester Stratton Whiteway ward (7 per cent by 2005) and 10 per cent above in Cirencester Watermoor ward (8 per cent by 2005).

60 In response to our draft recommendations the District Council and the Liberal Democrats supported our proposals for Cirencester. We received no further comments on this area.

61 Having considered the representations received and in the light of local support, we remain content that our draft recommendations for Cirencester provide the best balance between the need to secure electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Therefore, in the absence of any objections, we propose confirming our draft recommendations for Cirencester as final.

62 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for Cirencester are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Ampneys, Hampton, Northleach and Water Park wards

63 The wards of Ampneys (comprising the parishes of Ampney St Mary, Ampney St Peter, Ampney Crucis, Driffield and Preston), Hampton (comprising the parishes of Down Ampney, Maiseyhampton and Poulton), Northleach (comprising the parishes of Coln St Dennis and Northleach with Eastington) and Water Park (comprising the parishes of Poole Keynes, Siddington, Somerford Keynes and South Cerney) extend from the south, northwards towards the centre of the district. Ampneys, Hampton and Northleach wards are each represented by one councillor, while Water Park ward is represented by two councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 29 per cent below the district average in Ampneys ward (29 per cent below by 2005), 17 per cent below in Hampton ward (13 per cent below by 2005), 14 per cent above in Northleach ward (12 per cent above by 2005) and 34 per cent above in Water Park ward (33 per cent above by 2005).

64 At Stage One, the District Council proposed combining Preston parish with the existing Water Park ward in a revised two-member Water Park ward. Although it did not formally propose it, the Council also included a caveat in its submission requesting that the Commission consider including Preston parish in the proposed Hampton ward rather than its proposed Water Park ward. This would result in the electoral variance in both of the proposed wards exceeding 10 per cent. It proposed that a modified single-member Hampton ward should include Driffield parish, and that the remainder of Ampney ward (the parishes of Ampney St Mary, Ampney St Peter and Ampney Crucis) should be combined with the parishes of Barnsley, Bibury, Coln St Dennis and Winson in a new single-member Ampney Coln ward. Under its proposals Northleach with Eastington parish would be combined with Hampnett parish to form a revised single-member Northleach ward.

65 The Liberal Democrats proposed including Kemble parish in a revised three-member Water Park ward. They proposed combining the existing wards of Ampneys and Hampton with the parishes of Bibury, Winson and Barnsley to form a new two-member Ampney Brook ward. They also proposed combining the existing Northleach ward in a single-member ward with the parishes of Aldsworth, Barrington, Clapton, Compton Abdale, Farmington, Hampnett, Sherborne, Turkdean, Windrush and Yanworth.

66 South Cerney Parish Council proposed combining the parishes of Poole Keynes, Somerford Keynes and South Cerney to form a two-member Water Park ward. Somerford Keynes Parish Council stated that it supported the existing arrangements and opposed proposals to combine the existing Water Park parishes with Preston parish. However, it also stated that, if change was inevitable, it preferred South Cerney Parish Council's proposed two-member Water Park ward.

67 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we considered that the Council's proposals would provide the best available balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We recognised that there was some local opposition to the inclusion of Preston parish in a Water Park ward, but we did not consider that the alternative outlined by the Council, to include Preston parish in the proposed Hampton ward, justified the resulting level of electoral inequality. Furthermore, we noted that the Liberal Democrats' proposals were not compatible with our proposed warding arrangements elsewhere in the district. On balance, in order to achieve a good scheme throughout the district, we adopted the District Council's proposals for the wards of Ampney Coln, Hampton, Northleach and Water Park as our draft recommendations for this area.

68 Under our draft recommendations Ampney Coln, Hampton, Northleach and Water Park wards would have 1 per cent below, 10 per cent below, 4 per cent above and 6 per cent below the district average respectively (1 per cent below, 6 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 7 per cent below the average by 2005).

69 In response to our draft recommendations the District Council supported our proposals for this area. The Liberal Democrats raised concerns regarding the proposals for Preston parish and reiterated their Stage One proposals.

70 Preston Parish Council objected to the proposal to place the parish in Water Park ward, as it was concerned that it was being placed with much larger villages than itself. It proposed that

Preston should continue to be grouped with smaller villages, such as Ampney Crucis. However, the Chairman of the Parish Council acknowledged that Preston does share some community identity with Siddington, as the two parishes share a vicar, but stated that this does not exist with the other parishes in the proposed Water Park ward. South Cerney Parish Council also objected to the proposal to place Preston parish in Water Park ward, due to the absence of any shared community identity. It again proposed a two-member ward comprising South Cerney, Somerford Keynes and Poole Keynes, and a single-member ward comprising Siddington and Preston, contending that there was a shared identity between those two parishes.

71 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received and, with regard to Water Park ward, acknowledge the local opposition to these proposals. However, we do not consider that the available alternative of warding Preston with the smaller parishes to the north provides an acceptable balance of electoral equality as this would result in two wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average by 2005. Moreover, the alternative proposal from South Cerney Parish Council would result in a detached ward. It is our opinion that detached wards lend themselves to the creation of electoral areas which lack community identity, and we do not consider that such wards provide for effective and convenient local government. In the light of this, the District Council's support for our proposals and the fact that we have received no objections to our proposals for the remainder of the area, we propose confirming our draft recommendations as final.

72 Under our final recommendations Ampney Coln, Hampton, Northleach and Water Park wards would have 1 per cent below, 10 per cent below, 4 per cent above and 6 per cent below the district average respectively (1 per cent below, 6 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 7 per cent below the average by 2005). Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Coln, Fairford, Kempsford, Lechlade and Sherborne Brook wards

73 The number of electors per councillor in the single-member wards of Coln (comprising the parishes of Barnsley, Bibury, Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop, Quenington and Winson), Sherborne Brook (comprising the parishes of Aldsworth, Barrington, Eastleach, Farmington, Sherborne, Southrop and Windrush), Kempsford and Lechlade (each covering the parish of the same name) is 5 per cent above, 10 per cent below, 42 per cent below and 55 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent above, 9 per cent below, 43 per cent below and 59 per cent above by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Fairford ward (covering Fairford parish) is 8 per cent below the district average (10 per cent below by 2005).

74 As discussed previously, at Stage One the District Council proposed combining the parishes of Barnsley, Bibury and Winson with the parishes of Ampney St Peter, Ampney St Mary, Ampney Crucis and Coln St Dennis in a new single-member Ampney Coln ward, proposing that the parishes of Quenington and Hatherop should be combined with Fairford parish in a revised two-member Fairford ward. Under its proposals the remaining parish in Coln ward, Coln St Aldwyns, would be combined with the existing Sherborne Brook ward to form a new two-member Riversmeet ward. It also proposed that Kempsford ward should be combined with Lechlade ward to form a new two-member Kempsford Lechlade ward.

75 As discussed previously, the Liberal Democrats proposed combining the parishes of Barnsley, Bibury and Winson with the existing Ampneys ward and Hampton ward to form a new two-member Ampney Brook ward. They proposed that the remainder of the existing Coln ward should be combined with Fairford ward and Kempsford ward in a revised three-member Coln ward. They proposed combining the parishes of Eastleach and Southrop with the existing Lechlade ward in a new two-member Leach ward. They argued that the remainder of the existing Sherborne Brook ward and the parishes of Compton Abdale, Hampnett, Turkdean and Yanworth should be included in a revised two-member Northleach ward. They asserted that “the geographical arrangement makes it totally illogical for Kempsford to be included with Lechlade in a new ward since travel between the two involves passing through Fairford”, arguing that the air base in Kempsford parish is a shared interest between Kempsford and Fairford, while Lechlade has more in common with the parishes of Eastleach and Southrop.

76 Kempsford Parish Council opposed the Council’s proposals to combine the parish of Kempsford with the more urban Lechlade, arguing that Kempsford would not be adequately represented if warded with Lechlade and that Kempsford was a special case as there is a NATO airbase within the parish. Moreover, it argued, Kempsford is geographically isolated from Fairford and Lechlade. Four local residents also opposed the Council’s proposals to combine Kempsford and Lechlade in one ward, expressing similar arguments to Kempsford Parish Council.

77 Having given careful consideration to the representations received at Stage One, we did not consider that the extremely high level of electoral inequality resulting from a separate Kempsford ward was justifiable. While we noted that there were specific concerns relating to the NATO airbase in Kempsford parish and the extra burden which its personnel may place upon the councillor for the area, in conducting this review we are only able to take into account the 2000 and 2005 electorates having regard to the statutory criteria. Whilst the Liberal Democrats proposed warding Kempsford in a separate ward to Lechlade, which provided for a reasonable level of electoral equality, their proposals would have involved combining Kempsford with three other parishes, including the more urban Fairford. Moreover, the Liberal Democrats’ proposals would have a consequential effect on our draft recommendations in other areas of the district. We considered that the District Council’s proposals would provide good levels of electoral equality whilst meeting the statutory criteria throughout the district and we found on examining alternative arrangements that the small electorates and rural nature of the neighbouring parishes meant that any alternative arrangements would result in worsening levels of electoral equality in surrounding areas. We therefore proposed adopting the Council’s proposed Kempsford Lechlade ward as part of our draft recommendations.

78 We considered that the Council’s proposed Ampney Coln, Fairford and Riversmeet wards would group parishes of similar interest whilst providing an improved level of electoral equality. Furthermore, we did not consider that the Liberal Democrats’ proposals for large multi-member wards would offer the best reflection of the statutory criteria in this area. We therefore adopted the Council’s proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations.

79 Under our draft recommendations Fairford, Kempsford Lechlade and Riversmeet wards would have 9 per cent, 4 per cent and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district

average respectively (8 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent more by 2005), while the figures for Ampney Coln ward are discussed earlier.

80 At Stage Three the District Council supported our draft recommendations for this area, whilst the Liberal Democrats raised the issue of local concerns regarding the proposed Kempford Lechlade ward, reiterating their Stage One proposal to keep the two parishes in separate wards.

81 Kempford Parish Council objected to the proposals for Kempford, stating that “we do not fit in with Lechlade” because of the issues regarding the airbase and the fact that they are “different communities”. It expressed that its choice would be for Kempford to remain a ward on its own. Councillor Mrs Jones reiterated this argument. Additionally, 51 local residents supported the objections of the parish council. Twelve of the representations regarding this area expressed a preference for being combined with the parish of Fairford rather than Lechlade, although Councillor Mrs Jones stated that Kempford was “so unusual it does not fit with anyone except perhaps Maiseyhampton and Down Ampney – certainly not Fairford or Lechlade”.

82 Having considered all the representations received, we recognise that there is a significant degree of local opposition to our proposal to combine the parishes of Kempford and Lechlade in a ward. However, we still do not consider that the high level of electoral inequality resulting from a separate Kempford ward (43 per cent by 2005) is acceptable. Furthermore, while we note that there are specific concerns relating to the NATO airbase in Kempford parish we are only able to take into account the 2000 and 2005 electorates, having regard to the statutory criteria. We have received no viable alternative proposals for wards in this area and, after careful consideration, we remain of the view that, because of the small electorates and rural nature of the neighbouring parishes, any alternative arrangements would have a consequential effect in terms of worsening electoral equality in the surrounding areas. We are therefore content that our draft recommendations continue to represent the best available balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area and are confirming them as final.

83 Under our final recommendations Fairford, Kempford Lechlade and Riversmeet wards would have 9 per cent, 4 per cent and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent by 2005), while the figures for Ampney Coln ward are discussed earlier. Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Churn Valley, Ermin, Fossehill and Sandywell wards

84 The number of electors represented by each of the councillors for the single-member wards of Churn Valley (comprising the parishes of Bagendon, Baunton, Colesbourne, North Cerney and Rendcomb), Ermin (comprising the parishes of Brimpsfield, Coberley, Cowley, Daglingworth, Duntisbourne Abbots, Duntisbourne Rouse, Edgeworth, Elkstone, Syde and Winstone), Fossehill (comprising the parishes of Chedworth, Cold Aston, Compton Abdale, Hampnett, Hazleton, Notgrove, Turkdean and Yanworth) and Sandywell (comprising the parishes of Andoversford, Dowdeswell, Sevenhampton, Shipton, Withington and Whittington) is 17 per cent below, 16 per cent above, 3 per cent below and 21 per cent above the district average (18 per cent below, 15 per cent above, 4 per cent below and 20 per cent above by 2005).

85 At Stage One, the District Council proposed minor changes to the boundaries of Ermin and Churn Valley wards, transferring Coberley parish from Ermin ward to a revised Churn Valley ward. It proposed combining the parishes of Dowdeswell and Withington (currently in Sandywell ward) with the parishes of Chedworth, Compton Abdale and Yanworth in a single-member Chedworth ward. As mentioned earlier, it proposed that Hampnett parish should be combined with Northleach with Eastington parish in a single-member Northleach ward. It also proposed that Cold Aston parish should be combined with the parishes of Bourton-on-the-Water and Clapton to form a revised two-member Bourton-on-the-Water ward, as discussed below. Under its proposals, the remainder of the existing Fossehill and Sandywell wards would be combined in a revised single-member Sandywell ward. The Council argued that these modifications were necessary to ensure a reasonable level of electoral equality.

86 The Liberal Democrats proposed significant changes in this area at Stage One. As discussed previously, they proposed combining the parishes of Daglingworth, Duntisbourne Abbots, Duntisbourne Rouse, Edgeworth and Winstone with the parishes of Ashley, Avening, Cherington, Coates, Long Newton, Rodmarton and Sapperton to form a two-member Daneway ward. They proposed that the remainder of the existing Ermin ward should be combined with the existing Churn Valley ward and the parish of Chedworth in a new two-member Churn ward. Under their proposals the existing Sandywell ward would be combined with the parishes of Cold Aston, Guiting Power, Hazleton, Naunton, Notgrave and Temple Guiting to form a revised two-member Three Rivers ward, while the remainder of the existing Fossehill ward would be combined with the parishes of Aldsworth, Barrington, Clapton, Coln St Dennis, Farmington, Northleach with Eastington, Sherborne and Windrush in a revised two-member Northleach ward.

87 In drawing up our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to all the views received at Stage One. We considered that the Council's proposals would group parishes of a similar nature whilst providing good levels of electoral equality. We noted that the Liberal Democrats' proposals reflected their general preference for multi-member wards, but we considered that in these sparsely populated rural areas the Council's proposed single-member wards would more appropriately reflect the statutory criteria. Furthermore, the Liberal Democrats' proposals would not be compatible with our draft recommendations elsewhere in the district. We therefore adopted the Council's scheme in this area as part of our draft recommendations.

88 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Chedworth ward (3 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent below in Churn Valley ward (5 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent below in Ermin ward (2 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent below in Sandywell ward (1 per cent by 2005).

89 At Stage Three the District Council supported our draft recommendations for these wards. The Liberal Democrats reiterated their preference for multi-member wards, in this area and for the majority of the district.

90 Brimpsfield Parish Council and Chedworth Parish Council both supported the draft recommendations for their respective parishes. Cold Aston Parish Council objected to the parish being placed in a ward with the larger Bourton-on-the-Water parish, stating that the community did "not want to be subsumed in the issues of Bourton, none of which share any similarity to

those that have to be dealt with in Cold Aston”. It proposed that Cold Aston be placed in Sandywell ward with other, more similar villages. The Notgrove Parish Meeting expressed the same views, arguing that Cold Aston had strong links with the parishes of Notgrove and Turkdean (both in the proposed Sandywell ward). These arguments were also expressed by Councillor Lady Steel and a local resident.

91 We have carefully considered the submissions we have received for this area during Stage Three. Whilst we recognise that there is some local opposition to our proposal to combine Cold Aston parish with the more urban Bourton-on-the-Water parish, the alternative proposed by Cold Aston Parish Council would result in significantly worse electoral equality (both of the revised wards would vary by 12 per cent from the district average by 2005). We therefore remain of the view that our draft recommendations represent the best available balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area and confirm them as final.

92 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Chedworth ward (3 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent below in Churn Valley ward (5 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent below in Ermin ward (2 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent below in Sandywell ward (1 per cent by 2005). Our final recommendations are illustrated in Map 2 and Map A2.

Beacon, Bourton-on-the-Water, Evenlode Vale, Stow-on-the-Wold and Three Rivers ward

93 The number of electors represented by each of the councillors for the single-member wards of Beacon (comprising the parishes of Bledington, Great Rissington, Little Rissington, Icomb, Westcote, Wick Rissington and Upper Rissington), Evenlode Vale (comprising the parishes of Adlestrop, Broadwell, Donnington, Evenlode, Mangersbury and Oddington), Stow-on-the-Wold (comprising Stow-on-the-Wold parish) and Three Rivers (comprising the parishes of Cutsdean, Guiting Power, Lower Slaughter, Naunton, Swell, Temple Guiting and Upper Slaughter) is 29 per cent above, 22 per cent below, 18 per cent above and 10 per cent above the district average respectively (30 per cent above, 24 per cent below, 23 per cent above and 11 per cent above respectively by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Bourton-on-the-Water ward (comprising the parishes of Bourton-on-the-Water and Clapton) is 9 per cent below the district average (10 per cent below by 2005).

94 At Stage One, the District Council proposed retaining the existing single-member Three Rivers ward, but proposed substantial change elsewhere in this area. It proposed combining Stow-on-the-Wold with the parishes of Adlestrop, Bledington, Evenlode, Mangersbury and Oddington in a new two-member Beacon Stow ward, arguing that a single ward for the town of Stow-on-the-Wold cannot be substantiated in terms of electoral equality, hence the need to combine it with adjacent rural parishes. Under its proposals the remainder of the existing Beacon ward would form a new single-member Rissingtons ward, while the remainder of the existing Evenlode Vale ward would be combined with the existing Fossbridge ward in a revised two-member Fossbridge ward, as detailed below. It proposed that the existing Bourton-on-the-Water ward should be combined with Cold Aston parish to form a revised two-member Bourton-on-the-Water ward, as described earlier.

95 As detailed earlier, the Liberal Democrats proposed combining the parishes of Guiting Power, Naunton and Temple Guiting with the parishes of Andoversford, Cold Aston, Dowdeswell, Hazleton, Notgrove, Sevenhampton, Shipton, Whittington and Withington in a revised two-member Three Rivers ward. They proposed combining the parishes of Lower Slaughter and Upper Slaughter with the existing Bourton-on-the-Water ward in a new two-member Bourton ward, and that Swell parish should be combined with Stow-on-the-Wold ward and the parishes of Bledington, Maugersbury and Oddington in a new two-member Stow ward. Under their proposals the remainder of the existing Beacon ward would form a single-member Rissington ward, as proposed by the Council. They also proposed that Cutsdean parish should be combined with the existing Fosseridge and Moreton-in-Marsh wards and the parishes of Adlestrop, Broadwell, Donnington and Evenlode in a new three-member Moreton ward.

96 In drawing up our draft recommendations we noted that there was consensus on the Council's proposed Rissingtons ward and that the Council's proposals would provide reasonable levels of electoral equality whilst having regard to community identity and interest. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals for a new Rissingtons ward as part of our draft recommendations. Elsewhere we noted that both schemes provided for reasonable electoral equality whilst grouping parishes of a similar nature. However, we considered that smaller single-member wards, as proposed by the Council, would provide a more appropriate reflection of the statutory criteria than the Liberal Democrats' proposals and, moreover, the Liberal Democrats' proposals were not compatible with our draft recommendations in other areas of the district. Therefore, given the good electoral equality that would be secured and in the light of the council's support, we therefore adopted the Council's proposals for this area without amendment.

97 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the district average in Beacon Stow ward (3 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent below in Bourton-on-the-Water ward (6 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent below in Rissingtons ward (equal to the average by 2005) and 7 per cent above in Three Rivers ward (8 per cent by 2005).

98 At Stage Three the District Council supported our draft recommendations for these wards, whilst the Liberal Democrats again expressed their preference for multi-member wards.

99 Maugersbury Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations for Beacon Stow ward, believing that the rural parishes share no community identity with the urban parish of Stow and should not be included within the same ward. In particular, it stated that Maugersbury often holds opposing views to the urban parish, and therefore the Parish Council felt that this would not secure effective local government.

100 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations for these wards. We recognise Maugersbury Parish Council's opposition to our proposals, but its removal from this ward would either result in a detached ward, or alternatively, significant re-warding throughout the district, which, as detailed earlier, we do not consider to be justified. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendation as final in this area.

101 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the district average in Beacon Stow ward (3 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent below in

Bourton-on-the-Water ward (6 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent below in Rissingtons ward (equal to the average by 2005) and 7 per cent above in Three Rivers ward (8 per cent by 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2.

Fosseridge and Moreton-in-Marsh wards

102 The number of electors represented by the councillor for the single-member Fosseridge ward (comprising the parishes of Batsford, Bourton-on-the-Hill, Condicote, Longborough, Sezincote and Todenham) is 20 per cent fewer than the district average (22 per cent fewer by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Moreton-in-Marsh ward (comprising the parish of Moreton-in-Marsh) is 11 per cent fewer than the district average (6 per cent fewer by 2005).

103 At Stage One, the District Council proposed no change to Moreton-in-Marsh ward, arguing that it was appropriate as Moreton-in-Marsh is the largest settlement in the north of the district and that this would reflect local community identities and interests. As detailed earlier, it proposed combining the existing Fosseridge ward with the parishes of Donnington and Broadwell in a revised Fosseridge ward.

104 As detailed earlier, the Liberal Democrats proposed combining the existing Moreton-in-Marsh ward with the existing Fosseridge ward and the parishes of Adlestrop, Broadwell, Cutsdean, Donnington and Evenlode in a three-member Moreton ward.

105 Having considered the views we received during Stage One for this area, we recognised that the Liberal Democrats' proposals provided good levels of electoral equality. However, we considered that the more urban Moreton-in-Marsh is a distinct community that merits separate representation. Therefore, we considered that the Council's proposals provided a more appropriate reflection of community identity whilst still providing a reasonable and improving level of electoral equality. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations.

106 Under our draft recommendations Fosseridge and Moreton-in-Marsh would have 5 per cent more and 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer by 2005).

107 At Stage Three we received no specific comments on this area, whilst noting the District Council's support for our draft recommendations, and the Liberal Democrats' preference for multi-member wards.

108 In the light of the Council's support, we remain content that our draft recommendations for these wards provide a good balance between the need to secure electoral equality and the statutory criteria and, in the absence of any objections, propose confirming our draft recommendations for Fosseridge and Moreton-in-Marsh wards as final.

109 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Fosseridge and Moreton-in-Marsh wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2.

Blockley, Campden, Mickleton and Vale wards

110 The number of electors per councillor in the single-member wards of Blockley, Mickleton (each covering the parish of the same name) and Vale (comprising the parishes of Aston Subedge, Saintbury, Weston Subedge and Willersey) is 6 per cent above, 6 per cent below and 19 per cent below the district average respectively (7 per cent above, 9 per cent below and 16 per cent below by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Campden ward (comprising the parishes of Chipping Campden and Errington) is 20 per cent below the district average (unchanged by 2005).

111 At Stage One the District Council proposed no change in Blockley ward and proposed combining the existing wards of Campden, Mickleton and Vale in a new three-member Campden Vale ward. The Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area were identical to those put forward by the Council.

112 In drawing up our draft recommendations we noted that there was consensus on warding arrangements in this area and were content that the Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area represented the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In the absence of alternative proposals, we adopted the Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations without amendment.

113 Under our draft recommendations Blockley ward would have 3 per cent more electors than the district average (5 per cent more by 2005), while Campden Vale ward would have 9 per cent more electors than the district average both initially and by 2005.

114 At Stage Three the District Council and the Liberal Democrats supported our draft recommendations for this area.

115 Mickleton Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations for the parish, fearing that Mickleton's issues would be dominated by those of Chipping Campden parish. It stated that if Mickleton must be joined with another area, it should be joined with the Vale villages, which share the same community identity. A local resident also objected to the proposals for Mickleton for the same reasons as the parish council, and expressed the same preference for alternative ward arrangements.

116 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations for this area. We recognise that there is some opposition to Mickleton parish being combined in a ward with Chipping Campden parish, but note that any alternative proposals would result in an unacceptable level of electoral inequality. If Mickleton parish were to be combined with the existing Vale ward in a two-member ward, it would be over-represented by 15 per cent, both initially and by 2005. As a consequence, a single-member Campden ward would be under-represented by 56 per cent, both initially and by 2005. Therefore, in the light of the consensus between the District Council and Liberal Democrats we propose confirming our draft recommendations as final in this area.

117 Under our final recommendations, Blockley ward would have 3 per cent more electors than the district average (5 per cent more by 2005), while Campden Vale ward would have 9 per cent

more electors than the district average both now and by 2005. Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A3.

Electoral Cycle

118 At Stage One we received no proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the district. Accordingly, we made no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

119 At Stage Three the Liberal Democrats expressed a preference for more frequent elections, stating that this would help councils become more accountable to their communities, “and it will probably increase public awareness of local politics”. However, in the absence of any other comments on the electoral cycle, and the lack of consensus on a change to the existing arrangements, we confirm our draft recommendation for the retention of whole-council elections as final.

Conclusions

120 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations in their entirety.

121 We conclude that, in Cotswold:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 45 to 44;
- there should be 28 wards, five less than at present;
- the boundaries of 30 of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

122 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 and 2005 electorate figures.

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	45	44	45	44
Number of wards	33	28	33	28
Average number of electors per councillor	1,409	1,441	1,461	1,494
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	22	1	22	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	10	0	12	0

123 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 22 to one with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2005, with no ward varying by more than 10 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
 Cotswold District Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 28 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

124 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards, it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Cirencester to reflect the proposed district wards and we are also proposing new parish warding arrangements in the parishes of Blockley, Bourton-on-the-Water, Brimsfield and Southrop.

125 The town of Cirencester is currently served by 15 councillors, with three councillors representing each of the five town wards of Cirencester Abbey, Cirencester Beeches, Cirencester Chesterton, Cirencester Stratton, and Cirencester Watermoor. Under our draft recommendations we proposed modifying the boundaries of the district wards of Cirencester Abbey, Cirencester Chesterton, Cirencester Stratton and Cirencester Watermoor and retaining the existing Cirencester Beeches ward. We also proposed renaming Cirencester Abbey and Cirencester Stratton district wards as Cirencester Park and Cirencester Stratton Whiteway wards. In order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements we proposed that the boundaries of Cirencester Town Council wards should be modified to reflect the proposed district wards, with two wards being renamed.

126 No further comments were received from the District Council or the Town Council during Stage Three.

127 In the light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm our draft recommendation for warding Cirencester Town as final.

Final Recommendation

Cirencester Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Cirencester Beeches ward (returning three councillors), Cirencester Chesterton ward (returning three councillors), Cirencester Park ward (returning three councillors), Cirencester Stratton Whiteway ward (returning three councillors) and Cirencester Watermoor ward (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map in the back of this report.

128 The parish of Blockley is currently served by 15 councillors representing the three parish wards of Aston Magna (three councillors), Blockley (nine councillors) and Paxford (three councillors). At Stage One, Blockley Parish Council requested a reduction in the number of parish councillors from 15 to 11 and revised parish ward boundaries to more accurately reflect the three distinct areas. The District Council supported Blockley Parish Council's proposals.

129 In drawing up our draft recommendations we carefully considered Blockley Parish Council's request for a reduction in parish councillors and revised warding arrangements. We considered the request to be reasonable and therefore proposed that Blockley Parish Council should comprise 11 parish councillors representing three revised parish wards.

130 No further comments were received from the District Council or the Parish Council during Stage Three.

131 In the light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm our draft recommendation for warding Blockley parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Blockley Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, four fewer than at present, representing three wards: Aston Magna ward (returning two councillors), Blockley ward (returning seven councillors) and Paxford ward (returning two councillors). The new parish warding arrangements are illustrated on Map A3 in Appendix A.

132 The parish of Bourton-on-the-Water is currently represented by nine councillors and is unwarded. At Stage One, the District Council, in agreement with Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council, proposed an increase in the number of parish councillors from nine to 11. Our district warding arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal and we were content to put this forward this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

133 No further comments were received from the District Council or the Parish Council during Stage Three.

134 In the light of the fact that our district warding arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal and the local support, we confirm our draft recommendation for warding Bourton-on-the-Water parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, two more than at present.

135 The parish of Brimpsfield is currently served by seven councillors and is unwarded. At Stage One, Brimpsfield Parish Council, in agreement with the District Council, requested that Brimpsfield parish be divided into two parish wards in order to provide separate representation for the two villages of Brimpsfield and Caudle Green. It requested that its proposed Brimpsfield parish ward should be represented by five councillors and that its proposed Caudle Green parish ward should be represented by two councillors.

136 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we carefully considered Brimpsfield Parish Council's request for parish warding and considered it to be reasonable. Our district warding arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal and we were content to put forward the Parish Council's proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

137 At Stage Three Brimpsfield Parish Council supported the draft recommendations for the warding of their parish.

138 Having considered all the evidence received, and in the light of local support, we confirm our draft recommendation for warding Brimpsfield parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Brimpsfield Parish Council should comprise seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Brimpsfield ward (returning five councillors) and Caudle Green ward (returning two councillors). The proposed parish warding arrangements for Brimpsfield are illustrated on Map A2 in Appendix A.

139 The parish of Southrop is currently represented by seven councillors and is unwarded. At Stage One, the District Council, in agreement with Southrop Parish Council, proposed a reduction in the number of councillors from seven to five. Our district warding arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal and we were content to put this forward as part of our draft recommendations.

140 No further comments were received from the District Council or the Parish Council during Stage Three.

141 In the light of the fact that our district warding arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal and the local support, we confirm our draft recommendation for warding Southrop parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Southrop Parish Council should comprise five councillors and should continue to be unwarded.

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

Final Recommendation

Parish and town council elections should continue to take place every four years and should be held at the same time as elections for the district ward of which they are part.

Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Cotswold

6 NEXT STEPS

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

144 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 6 August 2001.

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

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

APPENDIX A

Final Recommendations for Cotswold: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Cotswold area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 and A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Brimpsfield parish.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed warding of Blockley parish.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Cirencester.

Map A1: Final Recommendations for Cotswold: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Brimpsfield Parish

Map A3: Proposed Warding of Blockley Parish

APPENDIX B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm, requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table C1: Commission compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage	The Commission complies with this requirement
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose	The Commission complies with this requirement
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain	The Commission complies with this requirement
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals	The Commission complies with this requirement
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation	The Commission consults on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken	The Commission complies with this requirement
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated	The Commission complies with this requirement