

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
Stratford-upon-Avon town	9
North West	10
West	11
South	12
East	14
Conclusions	16
Parish electoral arrangements	16
3 What happens next?	19
4 Mapping	20
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council	21
B Glossary and abbreviations	25

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Stratford-on-Avon District Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in February 2013. This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
26 February 2013	Consultation on council size
28 May 2013	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
6 August 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
29 October 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on recommendations
7 January 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 36 members, comprising a pattern of 36 single-member wards. Our draft recommendations were based on the proposals of Stratford-on-Avon District Council for the rural area with minor amendments in the Alcester, Ettington, Kinwarton, Shipston-on-Stour, Southam, Studley, Wellesbourne and Welford-on-Avon areas. In Stratford-upon-Avon town, our draft recommendations were based on our own scheme which comprised nine single-member wards. Our draft recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

Submissions received

We received 18 submissions during our consultation on council size and 13 submissions on warding patterns including a district-wide scheme from the Stratford-on-Avon District Council. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 29 submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period of five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the 2009 Act. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 6% over this period.

In response to the consultation on warding arrangements, we received a submission from the Stratford-on-Avon Labour Party arguing that there would be a significant increase in electorate in the Shipston area. We subsequently asked Stratford-on-Avon District Council to look into the matter. The Council informed us that the original planning permission for a development in the area was refused in February 2013. However, in June 2013 it was allowed on appeal for 112 homes.

The development in question is situated at the IMI/Norgen site on Campden Road in the south of Shipston. The development is expected to house 207 electors by 2019.

Having considered the evidence received we are satisfied that the revised ward and polling district level forecast data supplied by the Council (taking account of the above development) is the most accurate available at this time. We have therefore used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have made two modifications to improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon are that the Council should have 36 members comprising a pattern of 36 single-member wards. Two wards would have electoral variances of more than 10% by 2019.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon District Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Stratford-on-Avon District Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

You can also view our final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Stratford-on-Avon District Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submission received from Stratford-on-Avon District Council ('the Council') during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon District Council*, which were published on 29 October 2013. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 6 January 2014.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and 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

Why are we conducting a review in Stratford-on-Avon?

5 We decided to conduct this review because a formal request was made by Stratford-on-Avon District Council for an electoral review of the district.

How will our recommendations affect you?

6 Our recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also determine which electoral ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish ward you vote in. Your electoral ward name may change, as may the names of parish wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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 under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon District Council is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 The achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Stratford-on-Avon District Council or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Stratford-on-Avon District Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

14 During consultation, we received 17 submissions on council size. These were from the West Midlands Green Party, three parish councils and one parish meeting, one residents’ association, two parish councillors and nine local residents. The

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Council did not make a further submission. Subsequently, we received 13 submissions on warding patterns including a district-wide scheme from the Council. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 29 submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

15 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers at the Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate figures

16 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period of five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 6% over this period.

17 In response to the consultation on warding arrangements, we received a submission from the Stratford-on-Avon Labour Party arguing that there would be a significant increase in electorate in the Shipston area. We subsequently asked Stratford-on-Avon District Council to look into the matter. The Council informed us that the original planning permission for a development in the area was refused in February 2013. However, in June 2013 it was allowed on appeal for 112 homes.

18 The development in question is situated at the IMI/Norgen site on Campden Road in the south of Shipston. The development is expected to house 207 electors by 2019.

19 Having considered the evidence received, we are satisfied that the revised ward and polling district level forecast data supplied by the Council (taking account of the above development) is the most accurate available at this time. We have therefore used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

20 We consulted on a council size of 36 elected members, as proposed by the District Council. In response we received 18 submissions. These were from the West Midlands Green Party, five parish councils and meetings, a residents' association, two parish councillors and nine local residents. The Council did not make a further submission.

21 The West Midlands Green Party and the residents' association supported the current council size of 53. The West Midlands Green Party opposed a reduction in council size. It argued that the resulting increase in councillor workload would skew the demographic of councillors towards wealthy or retired individuals, and that less attention would be given to the scrutiny role of elected members. It also asserted that a reduction in the number of councillors would increase the control of the main political parties. The residents' association was opposed to the reduction in council size, arguing that savings would not offset the reduction in democratic oversight. It

also claimed that there was local dissatisfaction with the level of accountability of the Council, citing articles in the *Stratford Herald*.

22 We received representations from five parish councils and a parish meeting. Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council supported the proposed reduction in council size, but argued that the council size should be an odd number (i.e. 35 or 37) in order to avoid the Chairman having a casting vote. Whitchurch Parish Meeting acknowledged there was some scope for a reduction, but raised concerns that non-attendance of district councillors at planning committee meetings could be exacerbated by a reduction. It also claimed that, where several parishes do not have functioning parish councils, district councillors have more of a responsibility, but are often unresponsive. Wootton Wawen Parish Council did not state a preferred council size, but argued that two district councillors were needed to cover the district ward of which it is currently part. Kinwarton Parish Council stated that it had no views on council size.

23 We received submissions from three parish councillors. Councillor Keeley agreed with the size of reduction proposed, stating that committees would be able to make quicker decisions, but suggested that council size should be either 35 or 37 as an odd number would be 'more workable'. Councillor Gerrard agreed with the proposed reduction, but argued that a council size of 35 should be chosen.

24 We received nine submissions from local residents. Five residents supported the proposed reduction. One respondent supported the proposed reduction, but on the condition that councillors would not sit on the County Council. Two residents argued that a reduction to 36 councillors would be too great and one resident was not in favour of the proposed reduction, arguing that planning committees were over-worked and that some wards were only represented by one councillor covering five or six parishes.

25 We considered that the Council had made a case for its proposed council size reduction in the context of its political management and committee structure, as well as taking account of member workload and ensuring local residents were effectively represented. We also note that the Council made its proposal largely on the basis of changes to the Council's working practices that have taken place since the last electoral review of the district. We consider that the Council has given adequate consideration to the current and future workloads of front-line councillors, particularly in the context of delegation to officers and councillors' approach to their representational role. Having considered the evidence received, we were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 36 elected members and invited proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

Electoral fairness

26 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total

electorate of the district (97,855 in 2013 and 104,082 by 2019) by the total number of councillors returning them on the council – 36 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,718 in 2013 and 2,891 by 2019.

28 Under the final recommendations, two of our proposed 36 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019.

General analysis

29 It should be noted that on 17 December 2012, the Council passed a resolution to move from elections by thirds to whole council elections commencing in 2015. Furthermore, the Council formally requested that the review proceed with a presumption in favour of single-member wards in February 2013. Prior to formulating our draft recommendations we received 13 submissions on warding arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon, including a district-wide proposal from the Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in specific areas of the district.

30 Our draft recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon were based on the Council's scheme for the rural area with minor amendments in the Alcester, Ettington, Kinwarton, Shipston-on-Stour, Southam, Studley, Wellesbourne and Welford-on-Avon areas. In Stratford-upon-Avon town, our draft recommendations were based on our own scheme which comprised nine single-member wards.

31 We received 29 submissions during the consultation on the draft recommendations. These included submissions from the Council (which supported our draft recommendations), the Kenilworth & Southam Conservatives, the Stratford-on-Avon Conservatives, one parish councillor, five district councillors, one local organisation, 15 parish and town councils (which included two submissions from Studley Parish Council) and four local residents.

32 Most of the submissions received were in relation to the north-west, east and south of the district. None of the submissions received for the north-west directly supported our draft recommendations. We received some support for our draft recommendations in the east and south of the district. However, some local residents, district councillors and parish councils argued that our proposals in these areas did not reflect community identities and alternative warding proposals were submitted.

33 In Stratford-upon-Avon town, in addition to the Council, we received support for the draft recommendations from Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council. We have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the town as final subject to a minor amendment to the boundary between our proposed Clopton and Welcombe wards to correct a small undercount in electors.

34 In the west of the district, concern was also expressed by Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council and a local resident that splitting the village between two single-member wards would be detrimental to the village. In the south of the district, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the Shipston area as final

subject to a minor amendment to the boundary between our proposed Shipston North and Shipston South wards to correct a small over-count in electors.

35 Following analysis of the submissions received, we do not consider that a sufficient case has been made to revise our draft recommendations for ward boundaries in the north-west, west and east of the district. Where objections were made to our draft recommendations, the submissions did not propose alternatives that would both reflect community identities and provide for good electoral equality. We therefore propose to confirm our draft recommendations for these areas as final.

36 The proposals for alternative ward names made by Councillor Kerridge (Sambourne ward) and the Kenilworth & Southam Conservatives were supported by reasonable evidence. We consider that some of the names proposed represent a better reflection of communities and the geographical extent of our proposed wards than those put forward in our draft recommendations. We therefore propose to rename Studley North, Studley South, Wellesbourne North and Wellesbourne South wards in accordance with the proposals of Councillor Kerridge and the Kenilworth & Southam Conservatives.

37 Our final recommendations would result in 36 single-member wards. Two wards would have an electoral imbalance of greater than 10% from the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019.

Electoral arrangements

38 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Stratford-on-Avon. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Stratford-upon-Avon town (pages 9–10)
- North West (pages 10–11)
- West (page 12)
- South (pages 12–14)
- East (pages 14–15)

39 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 21– 4 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Stratford-upon-Avon town

40 As part of our draft recommendations for the town, we proposed the nine single-member wards of Avenue, Bishopton, Bridgetown, Clopton, Guidhall, Hathaway, Shottery, Tiddington and Welcombe. Our draft recommendations were based on our own scheme for the town, with reference to the evidence received during our consultation on warding arrangements.

41 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received a single submission from Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council. The Town Council expressed its support for the draft recommendations. As stated earlier, Stratford-on-Avon District Council supported our draft recommendations.

42 During the development of our final recommendations, we discovered that 14 electors were missing from the total elector count for Welcombe ward. When taking account of these electors, there would be a consequential increase in the electoral variance for Clopton ward to 11% fewer electors per councillor than the district average. To correct the undercount, we have decided to slightly modify our draft recommendations for the town. We propose to transfer Bancroft Place from Welcombe ward to Clopton ward. Bancroft Place has a similar number of electors to those not accounted for in Welcombe ward. We also toured the area and found that Bancroft Place has good access to the rest of Clopton ward. We propose this amendment as part of our final recommendations. Our amendment would result in the wards of Clopton and Welcombe having 10% fewer and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019.

43 As previously explained in the draft recommendations, the River Avon provides a strong barrier between communities in the town and we do not propose to recommend wards that would straddle the river. Therefore, our final recommendations result in relatively high electoral variances for the town's wards east of the river. As we have received no further evidence or submissions for the remaining wards in the town, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final.

44 Our single-member wards of Avenue, Bishopton, Bridgetown, Clopton, Guidhall, Hathaway, Shottery, Tiddington and Welcombe would have 10% fewer, 4% fewer, 10% more, 10% fewer, 7% fewer, 3% fewer, 9% fewer, 12% more and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

North West

45 As part of our draft recommendations for the north-west of the district, we proposed the six single-member wards of Henley-in-Arden, Kinwarton, Snitterfield, Studley North, Studley South and Tanworth-in-Arden. Our draft recommendations were largely based on the proposals of the Council with modifications to its scheme in the Studley area. During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received seven submissions, the majority of which focused on our proposals in Studley.

46 Councillor Kerridge (Sambourne ward), Councillor Beaman (Studley Parish Council) and Studley Parish Council expressed concern at our proposals for Studley North and Studley South wards. Councillor Kerridge objected to the inclusion of Morton Bagot, Spenal and Oldberrow parishes in our proposed Studley North ward. He commented that these parishes are rural and 'are far more connected as a dispersed rural community' with our proposed Kinwarton ward. Councillor Beaman objected to Studley parish being split between two wards as this would 'cause considerable additional workload' for the parish. Studley Parish Council objected to our draft recommendations for Studley but made no further comments. Mappleborough Green Parish Council did not directly support the draft recommendations, but were prepared to accept being part of Studley North ward.

47 Studley Parish Council and Councillors Kerridge and Beaman also commented on the new Coughton and Sambourne parish boundaries (which will result from a recent community governance review, the recommendations of which will become

operative in 2015). We therefore propose to make a small amendment to our proposed boundary between Studley South and Kinwarton wards to the east of the A435 in order that it is aligned with the new parish boundary alignment.

48 Councillor Kerridge proposed that Studley North ward should be renamed Studley with Mappleborough or Studley with Mappleborough Green or Studley-Mappleborough. He also proposed that Studley South should be renamed Studley with Sambourne. Councillor Kerridge stated that these name changes ensure that all constituent communities are reflected in the name of these wards. We consider that the proposed ward names would reflect communities within the proposed wards and have therefore decided to adopt the ward names of Studley with Mappleborough Green and Studley with Sambourne as part of our final recommendations.

49 We received submissions from Haselor Parish Council which raised concerns that a single-member warding pattern for the district would make it difficult for district councillors to provide the level of attention to electors needs in the rural areas. Councillor Lawrence (Aston Cantlow ward) proposed a new warding pattern to include the village of Aston Cantlow and six adjoining parishes in a ward called Great Alne. However, these proposals would result in a Great Alne ward with 30% more electors per councillor than the district average and a Wootton Wawen ward with 31% fewer electors per councillor than the district average. We consider these to be unacceptably high electoral variances and are therefore not persuaded to adopt these proposals as part of our final recommendations.

50 In addition to Councillor Lawrence, Councillor Kerridge also proposed that Kinwarton ward should be renamed Great Alne. Both councillors stated that Great Alne is the focal point with many facilities and connects with all other parishes in the ward. We do not consider that strong enough evidence has been received for us to adopt this ward name. We note that Kinwarton is the largest settlement in the ward and would be a more accurate reflection of settlements in our proposed ward.

51 We received no other submissions relating to the wards of Henley-in-Arden, Snitterfield and Tanworth-in-Arden. After consideration of the submissions received we have decided, subject to the minor changes noted above, to confirm our draft recommendations for the north-west as final. We do not consider that a sufficient case has been made to make significant amendments to our draft recommendations for Kinwarton ward. We consider our proposed Kinwarton ward would provide for effective and convenient local government.

52 Our single-member wards of Henley-in-Arden, Kinwarton, Snitterfield, Studley with Mappleborough Green, Studley with Sambourne, Tanworth-in-Arden and Wootton Wawen would have 11% more, 3% fewer, equal to, 10% more, 4% more 8% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

West

53 As part of our draft recommendations in the west of the district, we proposed the five single-member wards of Alcester & Rural, Alcester Town, Bidford East, Bidford West & Salford and Welford-on-Avon. Our draft recommendations were largely based on the proposals of the Council with modifications to the Council's

scheme in the Welford-on-Avon area. During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received three submissions, two of which commented on Bidford-on-Avon and the other on Alcester.

54 We received a submission from Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council and one local resident, both of which objected to our draft recommendations for Bidford East and Bidford West & Salford wards. Both submissions commented that Bidford-on-Avon is an integrated community that should not be split between two wards. Both submissions also proposed that Bidford-on-Avon be represented in a two-member ward.

55 Councillor Saint (Tredington ward) objected to Alcester being split between three wards. He suggested that Alcester should be split between two wards but did not provide an alternative arrangement. He also objected to the parishes of Atherstone on Stour and Preston on Stour being located in two separate wards. He proposed that Preston on Stour parish be included within Welford-on-Avon ward.

56 After consideration of the submissions received, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Bidford East and Bidford West & Salford wards as final. We do not consider that strong enough evidence has been received to depart from the presumption of single-member wards for Stratford-on-Avon. We are also satisfied that the warding pattern recommended for Bidford-on-Avon provides the best reflection of our statutory criteria. We also confirm our draft recommendations for Welford-on-Avon ward as final as we are satisfied that the proposed ward reflects community identities while keeping electoral variances to a minimum.

57 We received no further submissions for Alcester Town and Alcester & Rural wards and have therefore decided to confirm these wards as final.

58 Our single-member wards of Alcester & Rural, Alcester Town, Bidford East, Bidford West & Salford and Welford-on-Avon would have 4% more, 9% more, 3% more, equal to and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

South

59 As part of our draft recommendations in the south of the district, we proposed the five single-member wards of Brailes & Compton, Ettington, Shipston North, Shipston South and Quinton. Our draft recommendations were largely based on the proposals of the Council with modifications to its scheme for Ettington ward. During the consultation on the draft recommendations we received nine submissions. The majority of the submissions provided localised comments on warding arrangements in the Shipston-on-Stour and Pillerton Priors areas.

60 We received a submission from Long Compton Parish Council which supported the draft recommendations for Brailes & Compton ward. Ilmington Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations for Quinton ward. It expressed a preference to be joined with Shipston North ward as it relies on Shipston-on-Stour for its services and facilities. However, including Ilmington parish with Shipston North ward would result in 23% more electors per councillor than the district average. Furthermore, Quinton ward would have 19% fewer electors per councillor than the district average.

Given the high electoral variances projected, it is not possible to accommodate such an arrangement.

61 We have therefore decided to confirm our proposed single-member ward of Quinton as final. This ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019.

62 Pillerton Priors Parish Council, Pillerton Hersey Parish Council and two other respondents objected to our proposal that Pillerton Priors and Pillerton Hersey parishes be included in Ettington ward. The parish councils stated that they should be included in Red Horse ward as both have closer community identities with other parishes in that ward. Both parish councils stated that they do not share facilities and interests with parishes in Ettington ward. The two other respondents also supported the views of the parish councils.

63 A Red Horse ward including the parishes of Pillerton Priors and Pillerton Hersey would result in 6% more electors per councillor than the district average. However, Ettington ward would have 17% fewer electors per councillor than the district average. Given the need to deliver good electoral equality across the district, it is not possible to accommodate such an arrangement.

64 In the Shipston-on-Stour area, we received submissions from the Stratford-on-Avon Conservatives, Shipston-on-Stour Town Council and Councillor Saint (Tredington ward). The Town council objected to our draft recommendations for Shipston North and Shipston South ward. The Stratford-on-Avon Conservatives and Councillor Saint both put forward alternative warding arrangements for the town. The Stratford-on-Avon Conservatives were generally supportive of the draft recommendations but proposed that Burmington parish be transferred from Shipston South ward to Brailes & Compton ward and Barcheston parish be transferred from Ettington ward to Shipston South ward. This arrangement was also proposed by Councillor Saint. Councillor Saint proposed further alternatives such as transferring Whitchurch and Whatcote parishes (in our proposed Quinton and Red Horse wards, respectively) to Ettington ward. However, accommodating this arrangement would result in Red Horse ward having 12% fewer electors per councillor than the district average.

65 After consideration of the alternatives received, we have decided it would not be possible to adopt the alternatives of the Stratford-on-Avon Conservatives and Councillor Saint.

66 In particular, while we note that the Barcheston settlement is close to Shipston-on-Stour, on our tour of the area it was apparent that electors would have to leave Shipston South ward via Mill Street to access the rest of the ward. We also note that Barcheston parish has a larger settlement called Willington with a direct road link northwards through Ettington ward. We further consider that Burmington parish has a stronger direct road connection with the rest of Shipston South ward via the A3400.

67 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the Shipston area as final subject to a minor amendment to the boundary between our proposed Shipston North and Shipston South wards. During the development of our final recommendations, we discovered that 52 more electors were included in the total elector count for Shipston North ward. Therefore, our proposed Shipston South

ward would have an electoral variance of 11% more electors per councillor than the district average. To correct the over-count, we propose to include electors on Cherry Orchard, Willow Bank and part of New Street in our Shipston North ward.

68 Subject to the small amendment outlined above, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Shipston North, Shipston South, Brailes & Compton, Quinton and Ettington wards as final.

69 Our single-member wards of Brailes & Compton, Ettington, Shipston North, Shipston South and Quinton would have 1% fewer, 4% fewer, 1% more, 10% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019, respectively. These wards can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

East

70 As part of our draft recommendations in the east of the district, we proposed the 10 single-member wards of Bishops Itchington, Harbury, Kineton, Long Itchington & Stockton, Napton & Fenny Compton, Red Horse, Southam North, Southam South, Wellesbourne North and Wellesbourne South. Our draft recommendations were largely based on the proposals of the Council. During the consultation on the draft recommendations we received eight submissions, three of which provided alternative warding arrangements.

71 We received a submission from Stockton Parish Council which supported the draft recommendations for Long Itchington & Stockton ward. Bishop's Itchington Parish Council did not state whether it supported the draft recommendations but did object to the overall reduction in district councillors.

72 Harbury Parish Council objected to its parish not being included in a ward with Ufton and Ladbrooke parishes. The Parish Council commented that Harbury parish has no ties with Lighthorne Heath parish. Both parishes are included in our proposed Harbury ward. Given the need to achieve good electoral equality in this area, we are unable to include Harbury, Ufton and Ladbrooke parishes together in one ward or find an alternative which would satisfy our three statutory criteria.

73 We also received alternative warding arrangements from Napton Parish Council, Councillor Williams (Fenny Compton ward) and a local resident.

74 Napton Parish Council's proposal comprised Stockton, Napton, Upper Shuckburgh, Lower Shuckburgh, Priors Marston and Priors Hardwick parishes in a single-member ward. However, the Parish Council did not name its ward or provide alternative warding arrangements for remaining parishes not included in its proposed ward.

75 Councillor Williams objected to Avon Dassett and Farnborough parishes being included in Red Horse ward. He commented that the two parishes along with Fenny Compton parish share facilities and have close community ties and should therefore be included in a new single-member Fenny Compton ward. In addition, he proposed warding alternatives for Bishops Itchington, Red Horse, Southam North and Southam South wards. The other alternative warding proposal was received from a local respondent who put forward an entirely new scheme covering 23 parishes in the east

of the district, proposing three single-member wards.

76 We have considered the alternatives of Napton Parish Council, Councillor Williams and the local resident and have decided that it would not be possible to accommodate these alternative warding arrangements as part of our final recommendations. None of the alternatives provided for satisfactory electoral equality. In particular, Councillor Williams' proposed Southam North ward would have 24% more electors per councillor than the district average, while the local resident's proposed Bishops Itchington ward would have 61% more electors per councillor than the district average. These variances, in our view, are unacceptably high. Furthermore, Napton Parish Council's proposals did not take account of electoral arrangements for adjoining parishes not included in its proposed ward.

77 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Bishop's Itchington, Harbury, Kineton, Long Itchington & Stockton, Napton & Fenny Compton, Red Horse, Southam North and Southam South wards as final.

78 We received two submissions from a local resident and the Kenilworth & Southam Conservatives relating to Wellesbourne North and Wellesbourne South wards. The local resident proposed the ward boundary between the Wellesbourne wards should follow the River Dene. As we have previously stated in our draft recommendations, while we note that the river would provide a reasonably clear boundary, our tour of the area suggested that the river was not a significant barrier between communities on either side. Our proposals would also achieve good electoral equality between the two wards.

79 The Kenilworth & Southam Conservatives were generally supportive of the draft recommendations but proposed two ward name changes based on the geographical nature and extent of the wards. It proposed that Wellesbourne North be renamed Wellesbourne East and Wellesbourne South be renamed Wellesbourne West. We consider that these alternative names would be a better reflection of communities in Wellesbourne and propose that the ward names of Wellesbourne East and Wellesbourne West are adopted in our final recommendations. Subject to these ward name changes, we intend confirming our draft recommendations for the two Wellesbourne wards as final.

80 Our single-member wards of Bishop's Itchington, Harbury, Kineton, Long Itchington & Stockton, Napton & Fenny Compton, Red Horse, Southam North, Southam South, Wellesbourne East and Wellesbourne West would have 3% more, 2% fewer, 1% fewer, 8% more, 9% fewer, 7% fewer, 9% fewer, 7% fewer, 8% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the average for Stratford-on-Avon by 2019. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

81 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	36	36
Number of wards	36	36
Average number of electors per councillor	2,718	2,891
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	12	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

Final recommendation
 Stratford-on-Avon District Council should comprise 36 councillors serving 36 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

82 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 divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

83 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the respective principal authority (Stratford-on-Avon District 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.

84 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for the parishes of Alcester, Bidford-on-Avon, Luddington, Shipston-on-Stour, Sambourne, Southam, Stratford-upon-Avon, Studley and Wellesbourne.

85 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Alcester Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Alcester Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, representing three wards: Alcester West (returning five members), Oversley (returning 10 members) and Oversley Green (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

86 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, representing three wards: Bidford East (returning six members), Bidford West (returning three members) and Broom (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

87 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Luddington Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Luddington Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, representing two wards: Luddington East (returning three members) and Luddington West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

88 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Shipston-on-Stour Town Council.

Final recommendation

Shipston-on-Stour Town Council should comprise 13 councillors, representing two wards: Shipston North (returning four members) and Shipston South (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

89 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Sambourne Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Sambourne Parish Council should comprise five councillors, representing two wards: Sambourne North (returning two members) and Sambourne South (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

90 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Southam Town Council.

Final recommendation

Southam Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, representing four wards: Browns Bridge (returning four members), Merestone (returning two members), Mill Hill (returning five members) and Southam Fields (represented three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

91 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council.

Final recommendation

Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, representing nine wards: Avenue (returning two members), Bishopton (returning two members), Bridgetown (returning two members), Clopton (returning two members), Guildhall (returning two members), Hathaway (returning two members), Shottery (returning two members), Tiddington (returning two members) and Welcombe (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

92 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Studley Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Studley Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, representing two wards: Studley North (returning six members) and Studley South (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

93 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Wellesbourne Parish Council.

Final recommendation

Wellesbourne Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, representing three wards: Hastings (returning five members), Mountford (returning five members) and Walton (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

94 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Stratford-on-Avon District Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Stratford-on-Avon District Council in 2015.

Equalities

95 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.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon

96 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Stratford-on-Avon District Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

You can also view our final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alcester Town	1	3,131	3,131	15%	3,155	3,155	9%
2	Alcester & Rural	1	2,992	2,992	10%	2,999	2,999	4%
3	Avenue	1	2,006	2,006	-26%	2,616	2,616	-10%
4	Bidford East	1	2,651	2,651	-2%	2,992	2,992	3%
5	Bidford West & Salford	1	2,714	2,714	0%	2,889	2,889	0%
6	Bishop's Itchington	1	2,937	2,937	8%	2,966	2,966	3%
7	Bishopton	1	2,659	2,659	-2%	2,786	2,786	-4%
8	Brailes & Compton	1	2,810	2,810	3%	2,853	2,853	-1%
9	Bridgetown	1	2,945	2,945	8%	3,168	3,168	10%
10	Clopton	1	1,906	1,906	-30%	2,604	2,604	-10%
11	Ettington	1	2,771	2,771	2%	2,784	2,784	-4%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12	Guildhall	1	2,669	2,669	-2%	2,684	2,684	-7%
13	Harbury	1	2,721	2,721	0%	2,825	2,825	-2%
14	Hathaway	1	2,295	2,295	-16%	2,977	2,977	3%
15	Henley-in-Arden	1	3,160	3,160	16%	3,209	3,209	11%
16	Kineton	1	2,776	2,776	2%	2,855	2,855	-1%
17	Kinwarton	1	2,112	2,112	-22%	2,818	2,818	-3%
18	Long Itchington & Stockton	1	3,057	3,057	12%	3,111	3,111	8%
19	Napton & Fenny Compton	1	2,576	2,576	-5%	2,642	2,642	-9%
20	Quinton	1	2,278	2,278	-16%	2,978	2,978	3%
21	Red Horse	1	2,676	2,676	-2%	2,685	2,685	-7%
22	Shipston North	1	2,915	2,915	7%	2,920	2,920	1%
23	Shipston South	1	2,907	2,907	7%	3,185	3,185	10%
24	Shottery	1	2,534	2,534	-7%	2,642	2,642	-9%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
25	Snitterfield	1	2,870	2,870	6%	2,900	2,900	0%
26	Southam North	1	2,557	2,557	-6%	2,625	2,625	-9%
27	Southam South	1	2,684	2,684	-1%	2,691	2,691	-7%
28	Studley with Mappleborough Green	1	3,062	3,062	13%	3,185	3,185	10%
29	Studley with Sambourne	1	2,938	2,938	8%	2,993	2,993	4%
30	Tanworth-in-Arden	1	2,650	2,650	-3%	2,662	2,662	-8%
31	Tiddington	1	3,105	3,105	14%	3,233	3,233	12%
32	Welcombe	1	2,614	2,614	-4%	2,626	2,626	-9%
33	Welford-on-Avon	1	2,616	2,616	-4%	2,660	2,660	-8%
34	Wellesbourne East	1	3,092	3,092	14%	3,117	3,117	8%
35	Wellesbourne West	1	2,463	2,463	-9%	3,028	3,028	5%
36	Wootton Wawen	1	3,006	3,006	11%	3,019	3,019	4%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Totals	36	97,855	-	-	104,082	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,718	-	-	2,891	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Stratford-on-Avon District 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.

Appendix B

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, 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 county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority

Electorate	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
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or ward represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Parish	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
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'
Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	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
Parish ward	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

PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or ward varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	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